MUĞLA SITKI KOÇMAN UNIVERSITY

THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

THE EFFECT OF READING STRATEGY TRAINING ON HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' LEARNING STYLES

MA THESIS

MEHMET ABİ

ASSOC. PROF. DR. ŞEVKİ KÖMÜR

JUNE, 2014

MUĞLA

MUĞLA SITKI KOÇMAN ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ ANA BİLİM DALI

THE EFFECT OF READING STRATEGY TRAINING ON HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' LEARNING STYLES

MEHMET ABİ

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsünce
"Yüksek Lisans"
Diploması Verilmesi İçin Kabul Edilen Tezdir.

Tezin Enstitüye Verildiği Tarih :
Tezin Sözlü Savunma Tarihi :

Tez Danışmanı : Doç. Dr. Şevki Kömür
Jüri Üyesi :
Jüri Üyesi :

Enstitü Müdürü : Prof. Dr. Ahmet DUMAN

HAZİRAN, 2014
MUĞLA

TEZİN YAZILDIĞI DİL : İNGİLİZCE **TEZİN SAYFA SAYISI:**

TEZİN KONUSU (KONULARI) :

1. What are the learning styles of 11th graders in Dr. Mete Ersoy Anatolian High School before and after the reading strategy training?
2. What are preferred reading strategies of 11th graders in Dr. Mete Ersoy Anatolian High School before reading strategy training?
3. Is there any relationship between students' learning styles, their preferred reading strategies and strategy training?
4. Is there a difference in the development of reading skills of 11th grade high school students before and after the implementation of reading strategy training?

ÜRKÇE ANAHTAR KELİMELER :

1. Okuma Stratejileri

2. Dil Öğrenme Stilleri

3. Strateji Temelli Eğitim

4. Okuma Stratejileri Eğitimi

5. Üst Bilişsel Strateji Eğitimi

İNGİLİZCE ANAHTAR KELİMELER:

1. Reading Strategies

2. Language Learning Styles

3. Strategy Based Instruction

4. Reading Strategy Training

5. Metacognitive Strategy Training

Yazarın İmzası : **Tarih : 25/07/2014**

YEMİN

Yükseklisans tezi olarak sunduğum "The Effect of Reading Strategy Training on High School Students' Learning Styles" adlı çalışmanın, tarafımdan bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurulmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin Kaynakça'da gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanmış olduğumu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

25/07/2014

MEHMET ABİ

ABSTRACT

Beginning from the early times of language teaching, researchers have been trying to find out how to achieve successful and efficient teaching and learning outcomes. Throughout the history, they have investigated many aspects of this process and reading has been among the several topics that have been paid attention most. Moreover, over the last three decades individual differences in teaching and learning environments have begun to gain importance. Together with many other factors, the way of each individual student's approaching language learning and their unique preferences have come forward. As a result, researchers have focused on the characteristics of 'good language learner' and found out that successful learners differ from less successful ones in terms of their way of handling with problems or difficulties. Consequently, the classification of 'Language Learning Strategies' has emerged. In this vein, researchers have reached the conclusion that strategy based instruction can help students develop their strategy use. On the other hand, what have been discovered by researchers so far is that each individual student's language learning preferences are unique. That is, each student has a different language learning style preference and they have proposed a possible match between the teachers' teaching style and learners' learning styles may result in more successful language learning. Therefore, by extending strategy based instruction they have developed 'Style and Strategy Based Instruction'.

This study aimed at investigating any possible effect of reading strategy instruction on students' language learning style preferences and their language proficiency levels. 62 11^{th} grade students in three classes from Dr. Mete Ersoy Anatolian School took part in this experimental study which lasted for 8 weeks. One of the classes (SB) was chosen as the treatment group whereas the others(SC and SA) were chosen as control groups. In the scope of this study in order to find out students' reading strategy use, language learning style preferences and language proficiency levels, Learning Style Survey (LSS) developed by Cohen, Oxford and Chi (2005), and Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) by Kouider Mokhtari ve Ravi Sheorey (2002) and Key English Test (KET) were applied both before and after the treatment. After

students' language learning style preferences, their reading strategy uses and language proficiency levels were diagnosed before and after the treatment, the data obtained from these three instruments were compared. In conclusion, in terms of the effect of reading strategy training on language proficiency levels, any meaningful result was not found. But in terms of language style preferences, it is found out that reading strategy training may have some kind of effect on to students' style preferences, especially on parts 6 and 9. That is, it may lead students be more synthesizing and field dependent.

Key words: Reading Strategies, Language Learning Styles, Strategy Based Instruction, Reading Strategy Training, Metacognitive Strategy Training

ÖZET

Dil öğretiminin daha ilk başından itibaren, araştırmacılar başarılı ve verimli öğretme ve öğrenme sonuçlarını nasıl elde edebileceklerini bulmaya çalışmaktadırlar. Tarih boyunca, bu sürecin bir çok yönünü araştırmışlar ve okuma araştırmacıların üzerinde durduğu başlıca konulardan birisi olmuştur. Dahası, son otuz yılda, öğretme ve öğrenme ortamlarındaki bireysel farklılıklar önem kazanmıştır. Diğer birçok etkenle birlikte, her bir bireyin dil öğrenmeye olan yaklaşımı öğrencilerin dil öğrenmedeki eşsiz tercihleri öne çıkarmıştır. Sonuç olarak, araştırmacılar 'iyi dil öğrencileri' kavramı üzerine yoğunlaşmışlardır. Başarılı öğrencilerin zorluk veya bir problemle karşılaştıklarında kullandıkları araçlar bakımından daha az başarılı öğrencilerden ayrıldıklarını bulmuşlardır, ve bunları 'Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri' başlığı altında sınıflandırmaya çalışmışlardır. Bu bağlamda, araştırmacılar strateji eğitiminin öğrencilerin strateji kullanımını geliştirmede yardımcı olabileceği sonucuna varmışlardır. Diğer taraftan, şimdiye kadar araştırmacılar tarafından keşfedilen bir başka konu ise her bir öğrencinin dil öğrenme tercihinin kendine özgü olduğudur. Yani, her öğrenci farklı dil öğrenme stiline sahiptir ve öğretmenin öğretme stili ile öğrencinin öğrenme stili arasındaki olası bir uyum daha başarılı bir dil öğrenimine neden olabilir. Bu yüzden araştırmacılar strateji tabanlı eğitimi genişleterek 'Stil ve Strateji Temelli Eğitim' kavramını geliştirmişlerdir.

Bu çalışma okuma stratejileri eğitiminin öğrencilerin dil öğrenme stil tercihleri ve dil yeterlilikleri üzerindeki herhangi bir olası etkisinin olup olmadığını amaçlamıştır. Dr. Mete Ersoy Anadolu Lisesinde üç sınıftan okumakta olan 62 11inci sınıf öğrencisi 8 hafta süren bu çalışmada yer almıştır. Bu sınıfların bir tanesi (SB) deney diğerleri ise kontrol grupları (SC ve SA) olarak seçildiler. Çalışma kapsamında, öğrencilerin okuma stratejilerini kullanma tercihlerini; dil öğrenme stil tercihlerini; ve dil yeterlilik düzeylerini belirleyebilmek için Cohen, Oxford ve Chi (2005) tarafından geliştirilen Dil Öğrenme Anketi (LSS); Kouider Mokhtari ve Ravi Sheorey (2002) tarafından geliştirilen Okuma Stratejileri Anketi (SORS); ve Key English Test (KET) uygulamanın başında ve sonunda uygulandı. Öğrencilerin uygulama öncesi ve sonrasındaki okuma stratjilerini kullanımları, dil öğrenme stil tercihleri ve dil

yeterlilik seviyeleri belirlendikten sonra bu araçlardan elde edilen bulgular karşılaştırılmıştır. Sonuç olarak, okuma stratejileri eğitiminin dil yeterlilik düzeyleri üzerindeki etkileri bakımından, herhangi bir anlamlı sonuç bulunamamıştır. Fakat, dil öğrenme stilleri bakımından, okuma stratejileri eğitiminin öğrencilerin dil öğrenme stilleri üzerinde, özellikle 6. ve 9. kısımlarda, bir çeşit etkiye sahip olabileceği tespit edilmiştir. Yani, okuma stratejileri eğitimi öğrencileri daha fazla sentezleyici ve alana bağlı olmaya yöneltebilir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Okuma Stratejileri, Dil Öğrenme Stilleri, Strateji Temelli Eğitim, Okuma Stratejileri Eğitimi, Üst Bilişsel Strateji Eğitimi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the support of many people. First of all, I wish to express my gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şevki KÖMÜR who was abundantly helpful and offered invaluable assistance, support and guidance. Deepest gratitude are also due to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Eda ÜSTÜNEL, Assist. Prof. Dr. Sezer Sabriye İKİZ and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hasan ŞEKER without whose knowledge and assistance this study would not have been successful. I owe sincere thanks to Dr. Kyoung Rang Lee for her consents to use the materials developed by her.

Special thanks also to all my fellow colleagues and friends in Dr. Mete Ersoy Anatolian High School, Milas, Turkey, especially Aynur BURAN, Hasan ÖRENÇ and Ali AKTAŞ for their invaluable assistance and tolerance.

I would also like to convey thanks to the Turkish Ministry of Education and Dr. Mete Ersoy Anatolian High School for their consent and approval and for providing facilities.

Finally, I wish to express my love and gratitude to my beloved family; for their understanding and endless love, through the duration of my studies.

Mehmet ABİ

June, 2014 – MUĞLA

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

CALLA
Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach 38, 43

EFL - English as a Foreign Language..... 3, 7, 12, 13, 32, 48, 49, 50, 57, 58, 62, 65

ELT - English Language Teaching 63

ESL - English as a Second Language 3, 12, 13, 32, 43, 48

ID - Individual Differences 8

iSTART - Interactive Strategy Training for Active Reading and Thinking 56

KET - Ket English Test..... xv, 62, 94, 95, 103, 104, 108

L1 - First Language..... 3, 7, 21, 35, 46, 47, 49, 50, 53, 59, 66, 95, 96, 106

L2 - Second Language 3, 7, 8, 12, 19, 21, 22, 23, 29, 30, 34, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 59, 96

LSI - Learning Style Inventory 13

LSS - Learning Style Survey..... 13, 62, 63, 69, 73, 74, 82, 96, 103

MST - Metacognitive Strategy Training 57

n - Number of Students 63, 70, 72, 75, 80, 83, 85, 86, 92, 98

PLSPQ - Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire 13

SA - Control Group 2 61, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101

SAS - Style Analysis Survey..... 13

SB - Experimental Group 61, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101

SBI - Strategy Based Instruction..... 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 42, 43

SC - Control Group 1 61, 63, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101

SERT - Self-Explanation Reading Training 56

SILL - Strategy Inventory for Language Learning 22

SLA - Second language Acquisition..... 26, 47

SORS - Survey of Reading Strategies..... 62, 63, 64, 65, 83, 84, 88, 96, 103, 104, 108

SSBI - Style and Strategy Based Instruction 33, 34, 38, 44

USA - United States of America..... 13

ZPD - Zone of Proximal Development 6

1. FIELD AND CONTENT OF THE TOPIC

1.1. Statement of the Problem

For decades, researchers have been trying to find the most appropriate and efficient ways of teaching foreign languages. For this purpose, they have developed many methods and approaches ranging from Grammar-Translation to Communicative Language Teaching. But they have not been able to achieve their goals completely. In search for the ideal method that fits for everybody and every class, they have always come up with the complicated nature of human kind. Thus, instead of trying to find the ideal method, they have shifted their focus to the learners themselves, especially to the features of good language learners (Richard and Rodgers, 2010).

Although, for the past forty years, researchers have been examining the characteristics of good language learners to develop an ideal method or approach for language teaching, the questions of how to improve the efficiency of a language class and ensure the success of language classes and students are still unresolved. On the other hand, it is generally accepted that there are a lot of variables, all of which are interwoven with each other affecting the success of language learners. As Oxford (2003) states, of these intricate variables, language learners' learning style preferences and their language learning strategy use are the two most important variables. It is accepted that the way to improve the success of language teaching and learning process passes through understanding these two variables and calibrating the instruction according to them. This means that utilizing a single method, approach or material that suits for all students is no longer possible. Some students may want to learn by listening whereas some other may prefer visual channels. Some may like to approach a reading passage generally and deduce the meaning from the whole of the passage whereas others may tend to pay attention to the details and want to know every detail before reaching a conclusion.

On the other hand, even if students in a certain classroom have similar learning style preferences, they may differ in their strategy use. Depending on their proficiency

levels, context, task and many other factors, the strategies preferred by students with similar learning style preferences may show great difference. For example, of the two visual students, one may use highlighting strategy for important parts in a text but the other may prefer taking notes or using illustrations. So, it should be noted that learners' strategy preferences affect the level of success.

Teachers, therefore, have begun to search ways of reaching better understanding of their students' learning style preferences and making necessary adaptations in their teaching styles. To achieve the desired results, for example, teaching style may be matched with students' learning styles or style stretching can be allowed to enable students to be able to make use of the process even if there is no match. Also, they should be aware of their students' strategy use and carry out strategy training so that students can use strategies more effectively.

In an English as a Second Language (ESL) environment in which students are exposed to target language outside the classroom setting and have chance to use all kinds of means, it is easier to develop such kind of instruction. But in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) situation it changes according to the context. If English is not a native language or is not frequently spoken, and students have little opportunity to use the target language communicatively out of the classroom environment, getting students to use the language and take part in the communicative activities willingly is not an easy task to fulfil. Most of the students prefer to remain silent and passive when it comes to use the language in a speaking class, such as acting out a dialogue, and lose their motivation. In this respect, reading comes forward as the most preferred skill. Moreover, reading materials are the ones that are met most frequently in daily life regardless of the context. With the development of internet and technological devices, there is something to be read everywhere. As a result, the need for developed reading skills has gained importance and people have to read more than ever. Therefore, we need to be competent readers not only in our first language (L1) but also in second language (L2). It is known that being a proficient readers means knowing how, when, where, and why to orchestrate the strategies or strategy clusters.

1.2. Topic of the Study

In classrooms where reading skill is dominant, individual differences in terms of reading strategies and learning styles become highly important and should be taken into consideration seriously in order to achieve the desired goals. Therefore, in order to find a way to motivate language learners and help them directly as well as getting them to engage in activities in the classroom, being aware of students' language learning styles and strategy preferences is almost compulsory. Here, strategy training can be seen as a way of improving students' language learning performance and by training students, a more solid connection between the teachers' teaching and learners' learning styles can be established, which will surely result in successful learning.

In this respect, this study focuses on how, when, where, and why to use language learning strategies; whether it is necessary to match the teaching styles to students' learning styles, or when, and how to make adaptations according to learning style preferences of students. In addition, secondary purpose is to investigate the relationship between style preferences, strategy use and proficiency levels of the students taking part in this study.

1.3. Theoretical Background

Every country has its own identity, culture and history which makes them different from others and forms their daily life; and language is what determines the way of living this identity. People develop their identity with their language within a country as well as across countries. Even in a single country there are different societies that share different languages and cultural heritages and these causes a continual interaction between societies which makes learning the language of the others a necessity to form a shared identity. According to Grenfell and Harris (2002: 41), "language is the medium with which individuals navigate their own path through life; it mediates our position at any one time and gets things done for us".

Across countries people have to understand and respect each other to avoid conflicts and live in peace, make commerce, and share their own cultural heritage. And the only way to develop such kind of understanding is only possible via teaching and learning the languages of others and being linguistically competent individuals. Grenfell and Harris (2002: 149) state that "in order to be linguistically competent, an individual needs to have independent language skills and in order to achieve this independence, they each need means to get there".

Thus, since ancient times, people have tried to find the best way and the most effective model to teach languages. Throughout the history, this search has yielded lots of methods and approaches that were successful to varying degrees but always below the desired level. Brown (2007) argues that one's own perception of components of language determines the way he/she chooses to teach. He states that if culture and interaction are to be emphasized, then a socio linguistic set of strategies and communicative tasks will gain importance. On the other hand, if you believe that the separate pieces are important, then a grammatical approach gains importance.

1.3.1. Historical development of language teaching

Throughout the history of language teaching, people tried different approaches to get better results. According to Brown (2007: 9-19) in 1940s and 1950s, language was seen as a linear and structured system which was called structuralism followed by behaviorist approach which has had an enormous impact on education. Within the scope of this approach they tried to explain learning in terms of conditioning and were only concerned with observable behaviors by ignoring the cognitive or mental processes.

Then, having realized the role of cognitive processes which had been neglected in behaviorist approach, researchers began to look for the ways of understanding how human mind thinks and learns. Meaning, understanding, and knowing were significant for cognitive psychologists and according to cognitive approach, language learner was the active participant of the learning process and used various mental languages to sort out the problems he/she came up with in the learning process.

In the late 20th century, constructivism, which has two branches – cognitive and social – emerged as a new paradigm. In the cognitive part, it was believed that learners construct their own representation of reality. On the other hand, for social constructivism what was important was the social interaction and cooperative learning, which helped establishing both cognitive and emotional images of reality. Main drawbacks that were criticized in constructivist approach were the ignorance of effect of social environment and not accepting learners' inner worlds, thoughts, feelings, and emotions.

These paved the way for humanistic approach. According to Williams and Burden (2000) one of the significant outcomes of humanistic approach was the change in students' and teachers' roles. In that, learners individually sought for meaning in the process of learning and teachers were supposed to help learners construct a strong sense of personal values.

But according to Williams and Burden (2000), even with the development of constructivism and humanism, there was still a lack, the social dimension. Thanks to the studies by Vygotsky and Feuerstein and other researchers, a new approach has been developed which has been called as social-constructivism. According to this approach which unites the behaviorist and constructivist models, language is learned by using it in meaningful interactions with other people. This model gives importance to the dynamic interaction between teachers, learners, and tasks as well as the context. Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and Mediation theories are the two important terms emerged in this approach.

However, people have not completely failed in their struggle to learn and teach languages. Regardless of the method utilized, there have always been lots of people who have managed to learn languages and there will be in the future, too. Grenfell and Harris (2002) approve this idea by stating that the matter is not the choice of methods or theories for language teaching and learning. In a way, from the ancient times people have indeed managed to learn languages.

Therefore, in modern language teaching, teachers do not depend on one single method; instead an eclectic approach has been adopted. That is, they make use of a

range of techniques and methods that are adapted according to the needs and preferences of learners and contexts and also their own needs in particular situations.

1.3.2. Good language learner and learner variables

So, if the method is not such an important factor in teaching and learning process, then how can the success of language learning and teaching process be improved? How can teachers of EFL classrooms make the most of their classroom time and help their children be more successful learners? Having these questions in mind researchers have begun to look for new ways of improvement by changing their focus of language education from learners themselves to the learning to learn. They have begun to investigate the individual variables that affect the learning process. According to Macaro (2010) by comparing the studies on L1 acquisition and L2, applied linguists have been trying to find out why some learners do better than others and why some learners are eager to learn why others have to be forced. Especially they have tried to understand the characteristics of good or more proficient language learners like in the study of Rubin (1975) in which she aimed at finding out what the good language learner can teach us. Also, the differences among learners have been a matter of question for decades.

In earlier times, people used to determine the good language learner with the outcomes of teaching process. They tended to assess the success by just focusing on the proficiency level by conducting tests. However, Macaro (2010) is of an opinion that a proficiency test alone cannot tell us what a good language learner is as it focuses on the product (the grade) not the process (how). Getting high scores in a language test does not mean that you do the right things. Studying for a high stake exam may sometimes lead you to tactical ways and you may only focus on the grade but not on language for its own sake. Also, one may have the highest mark by just with a six-month study whereas another may get a lower grade by studying for five years. In short, more than proficiency level is needed in order to name someone as a Good-Language-Leaner.

There are many factors such as age, gender, nationality, their backgrounds, language aptitude, learning style preferences, and strategies and as Cohen (2010) states these characteristics affect the language learning success. In similar vein, Williams and Burden (2000) argue that learners bring their different characteristics to the learning environment and these all have effect on the efficiency of their language learning processes.

Dörnyei (2010) goes further and criticizes this point of view and argues that accepting individual differences as constant and mono-linguistic learner traits is problematic. Because Dörnyei (2010: 252) says that "various learner attributes are unstable and context-depended and varies considerably from time-to-time and situation-to-situation. That is, ID variables are complex and higher-order attributes". Nevertheless, since 1970s learner variables have been an attractive topic for linguists and researchers and today they have been searching various aspects of them for more than forty years.

Decades ago it was believed that the younger starting to learn a language, the more chance of becoming more successful and there was a period for acquiring a native-like fluency (reference). According to this belief, also called as 'critical period', the young learners, who still have the flexibility, have the chance to get a native like fluency (Brown, 2007: 57). On the other hand, this is true if you are in an environment where the target language is used dominantly, and where you are exposed to target language not only in classroom but also outside the classroom. That is, if you do not live in an English speaking country but live in a country where English is used in a limited way in the classroom, then you are unlikely to acquire a native like English. Therefore, if you are learning English in an English speaking country, age matters. That is, the earlier you start learning, the better. According to Cohen (2010) age related factors are not limited to the flexibility of the brain. The amount and pattern of L2 input, the amount of verbal analytical ability and the motivation are some other age related factors. Moreover, Grifiths (2008) state that the generally accepted opinion, 'the younger the better does not mean that there are no good learners who are older'. Griffiths adds that all learners, no matter what their ages are, should need optimal support.

Another variable that has been paid attention is gender. It has long been known that girls have shown better performance than their male peers. However, according to Nyikos (2008) both males and females can be good language learners. On the other hand, according to Green and Oxford (1995) women have greater overall strategy use than men. What researchers need to do is to find the ways of making students more effective regardless of gender.

In addition to age and gender factors, nationality of learners is also an effective factor. All nationalities have their own cultures, and this may affect the learning process. Nations' dominant characteristics and cultural backgrounds may require different approaches. For example, a Japanese classroom may require certain rituals to be fulfilled by learners whereas an American classroom may offer a more free approach in which students can behave more freely. Some behaviors may be accepted without any resistance in a culture but may not be welcomed in another one. In Turkish context, for example, standing up when the teacher comes into a classroom is accepted as a way of showing respect, but in another culture if a teacher wants learners to stand up, then he/she may cause some problems in terms of learners.

Another factor included in individual differences is the language aptitude. Some learners learn easily whereas some others have to struggle for a relatively long time. It means that some learners have a gift or special ability to learn the language, which may determine the rate and effectiveness of learning a foreign language. A learner without language aptitude is likely to work harder in order to be able to reach the same proficiency (Brown, 2007: 105-107).

Moreover, learners' preferences of learning have a great effect since each learner in a classroom may have a unique way of approaching to the language learning process. Their needs, desires, ways of interacting and participating in activities, and expectations are all different. The term learning style is used for this concept. Teachers can adapt their teaching styles according to the style preferences of the learners to improve the effectiveness of their classes. This might help learners to make use of the learning process in the best way.

But “learning style” of a learner is a very broad and fuzzy term. Yet, it is known that strategies utilized by learners have a close relationship with their style preferences. According to Wong and Nunan (2011) and Green and Oxford (1995), there are differences between the more and less effective language learners’ preferred strategies in that more successful learners have more overall language learner strategies than the less successful ones. More effective learners favor more communicative strategies characterized by field-independent and active whereas less effective ones prefer more authority-oriented strategies characterized by field-dependent and passive style preferences. More effective learners are more active and take more responsibility in their learning process. They spent more time for participating in activities outside the classroom and have more autonomy in terms of their strategy choices than less effective learners.

There are variables that affect the efficiency of language learning process. Yet, dealing with each factor one by one provides nothing much. As Cotteral (2008) states since learners are extremely diverse and the context they learn and use the language has a great influence, then trying to find an ideal teaching method that suits all learners or developing a ‘good language learner’ profile are futile. Instead, more attention should be paid to individual learners. Also, some variables such as age, gender and nationality are stable and out of teachers’ control. But, students can be made familiar with their learning styles and an understanding about them can be developed. Also, the strategies used by more successful learners can be identified and taught to less successful ones.

Therefore in the scope of this study, in the next parts, learners’ learning style preferences and their strategy use were investigated.

1.3.3. Learning styles

There is not a single class consisting of students who enjoy learning in the same way. Each individual brings his/her own preferences into the learning environment and these preferences are reflected in their learning style preferences. According to Dörnyei (2008) it can be said that each individual has a unique way of learning that

are affected by various variables and one of the major variables having a crucial effect is the learning style preferences of learners. To have a clear understanding of this issue, it would be useful to understand the term style first. Brown (2007: 119) defines style as "… consistent and rather enduring tendencies or preferences within individual. Styles are those general characteristics of intellectual functioning (and personality type, as well) that pertain to you as an individual, and that differentiate you from someone else".

As can be understood from the above definition your style preference is what makes you different from others because they are steady and general, and characterize your way of learning. Brown (2007: 120) states that "people's internalizations of their total environment determine their styles. This internalization process does not occur solely on cognitive base and there are physical, affective, and cognitive domains together constitute the learning style".

As to 'learning style' there are various definitions given by various researchers: Cohen (2003: 279) defines it as "general approaches to language learning" whereas Kinsella (1995, cited in Nel, 2008: 49) uses a more broad definition and defines learning styles as "natural, habitual, and preferred ways of absorbing processing, and retaining new information and skills which persist regardless of teaching methods or content area".

Other researchers, such as Oxford (2001) and Reid (1998), use similar definitions and see it as "the general approach preferred by the student when learning a subject, acquiring a language, or dealing with a difficult problem". In another study Oxford (2003: 273) defines "learning style" as an overall pattern that provides broad direction to learning and makes the same instructional method beloved by some students and hate by other". According to Hedge (2008: 18) "learning style is a characteristic and preferred way of approaching learning and processing information".

Individuals may have different learning style preferences that characterize their ways of learning. Moreover if we know about them we may achieve better results in our teaching and learning processes. In literature there are a lot of positive views about

the role of being aware of learners' language learning style preferences.. According to Erhmann, Leaver and Oxford (2003), in order to maximize the learning, learners need to be given every advantage including the opportunity to learn in their preferred learning styles instead of lecturing with one style for the majority of the classroom. For example, as Hedge (2008) states global learners might try to get a general idea of what they read while analytic learners try to analyze the text and pay attention to the details. That means that in a classroom environment there will be different individuals with different needs and preferences. Hence, one type of activity, task or material may be suitable for one kind of student whereas they may be inappropriate for others.

As Oxford (2003: 16) points out "the more that teachers know about their students' style preferences, the more effectively they can orient their L2 instruction …". Nel (2008: 57) also argues that successful learners seem to be able to adopt their learning styles according to the particular task or situation. So if learners' learning styles can be identified and if learners are aware of their own learning styles, then it is possible that they can adopt their learning styles and as a result more efficient teaching and learning situation can be achieved. On the other hand, Nel also states that "no one style which typifies good language learners has been identified".

Since this issue has a crucial role in the process of learning a language, researchers have begun to look for the ways for understanding learning styles better. One of the first studies that focused on ESL/EFL context was Reid's (1987) study which he conducted to see the differences between native and non- native ESL students. He conducted his study with 1388 students to diagnose their learning styles. He used six categories of style preferences in this study: visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, group learning and individual learning. He found out that:

1. ESL students often differ significantly in various ways from native speakers of English in their perceptual learning style.
2. ESL students from different language backgrounds sometimes differ significantly from each other in their learning style preferences

3. Analysis of other variables such as sex, length of time spent in the USA, major field, and level of education, indicates that they differ significantly in their relationship to various learning style preferences.
4. The data suggests that as ESL students adapt to the US academic environment, some modifications and extensions of learning styles may occur (Reid, 1987: 99).

According to these findings, it can be said that styles can be adopted. Also we can identify and modify the learning styles of our students. We can raise students' awareness and make them familiar with the concept of learning styles. Then their conscious learning styles become conscious learning strategies. And Reid (1987: 101-103) proposes a framework: identify learning styles, assess them and make necessary adaptations. For a successful classroom, we need to be aware of the existence of various learning style preferences of students along with the suitable teaching styles as well.

Several other researchers such as Oxford, Reid, Kolb and Erhman and Leavers have conducted studies. As a result, they developed some instruments to identify and classify the learning styles. Some of these instruments which have been proven to be highly reliable and valid are Kolb's (1976) Learning Style Inventory (LSI) (Kolb's LSI was originally aimed at native speakers but later adapted for EFL context in many studies), Reid's (1987) The Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionarie (PLSPQ), Oxford's (1993) The Style Analysis Survey (SAS), Erhmann and Leaver's (2003) The Erhman and Leaver Learning Style Questionnaire, and Cohen, Oxford and Chi's (2005) Learning Style Survey (LSS) which was adapted from Oxford (1995) and Erhmann & Leaver (2003).

Nel (2008) states that when looked at the literature, it is seen that dichotomies, such as field-independent vs. field-dependent, leveler vs. sharpener, impulsive vs. reflective and so on, are used for presenting the learner style preferences. But using dichotomies does not mean that a learner has completely one style or its bipolar opposite. Instead, they operate somewhere between them. For example, a learner who is dominantly visual may also have an auditory style in a degree, too. A well-

known classification of learning styles has been proposed by Erhman and Leaver (2003) that consists of nine dimensions:

1. Field-independence vs. field-dependence
2. Random (non-linear) vs. sequential (linear)
3. Global vs. Particular
4. Inductive vs. Deductive
5. Synthetic vs. Analytic
6. Analogue vs. digital
7. Concrete vs. abstract
8. Leveling vs. sharpening
9. Impulsive vs. reflective

One of the most comprehensive classifications of learning styles has been proposed by Oxford and Anderson (1995). According to them there are six interrelated aspects of learning styles:

1. The cognitive aspect includes preferred or habitual patterns of mental functioning
2. The execute aspect is the extent to which learners look for order, organization, and closure in managing the learning process.
3. The affective aspect consists of the attitudes, beliefs, and values that influence what learners focus on most.
4. The social aspect relates to the preferred degree of involvement with other people while learning.
5. The psychologist element involves what are at least partly automatically based sensory and perceptual tendencies of the lectures.
6. The behavior aspect concerns the learners' tendency to actively seeking situations compatible with their own learning preferences (Oxford and Anderson, 1995, cited in Cohen et al., 2005: 8).

In the questionnaire developed by Cohen, Oxford and Chi (2005), learning styles have been divided into eleven categories and aimed at providing information about learners' sensory/perceptual learning styles, psychological type (personality), and cognitive learning styles. The characteristics of these three categories and the support that teachers can provide are well documented and summarized in Cohen and Weaver's (2006) book, Styles and Strategies-Based Instruction: A Teacher's Guide. The following are some examples from a list in Cohen and Weaver (2006):

> Sensory/perceptual style preferences:
>
> • Being more visual, more auditory or more tactile/kinesthetic (hands-on).
>
> Cognitive style preferences:
>
> • Being more global or more particular/detail-oriented.
>
> • Being a more of a synthesizer and/or being analytic.
>
> • Being more deductive or more inductive.
>
> Personality-related style preferences:
>
> • Being more extroverted or more introverted.
>
> • Being more abstract and intuitive or more concrete and thinking in step-by-step sequence.
>
> • Preferring to keep all options open or being more closure-oriented
>
> (cited in Cohen, 2010: 163).

According to Cohen and Weaver (2006: 8) "there are no positive or negative traits, only preferences and even strong preferences can change". With enough support from the teacher in terms of their style preferences, students can learn better. Varying the instruction materials means that teachers can address the different preferred learning styles of the students. Sometimes instead of tuning the instruction according to the learners' styles, guiding students to stretch and expand their styles preferences, and by doing so, enabling them to think differently may result in positive consequences. For example, perceptual style dimension consists of visual, auditory and hands-on styles. Using a text in plain text format can help visual learners. Also, learners with auditory style preferences can benefit from playing a recorded version

of the text whereas learners with hands-on styles may prefer to work on the text by rewriting it or by personally dealing with it via interactive tools, such as smart-board applications. In these days it is quite easy to find materials that house all these kinds of activities in them.

According to Oxford (2003: 3) "Learning styles are not dichotomous (black or white, present or absent). Learning styles generally operate on a continuum or on multiple, intersecting continua". In other words, this does not mean that a learner does not have to have only one style preference. A learner can be more visual than auditory or more introverted than extraverted. That is, one style may be more dominant than the other, or learner may have an equal control on all style categories on sensory/perceptual learning style.

It has been assumed that by using the appropriate instrument that consists of most commonly identified dimensions of learning styles; teachers can diagnose the multi-dimensional profile of their students and adapt or plan their teaching in accordance with the different needs of their students. Besides their advantages for teachers, these instruments can also be useful for students. In that, they can enhance the self-awareness and maximize their learning opportunities. But the style identification, assessment and adoption are not free from some drawbacks. First of all, there is always a risk of turning the questionnaires used to diagnose the style preferences into stereotypes. Also, this is not a matter with only one factor but it consists of multiple variables which have to be taken into consideration. In addition, according to Dörnyei (2008), although enhancing awareness of learning styles in learners as well as teachers has some potential in terms of education, in practice, it is not free from some serious problems.

Moreover, Brown (2007: 120) argues that accepting styles as stable traits are questionable and he points that different context will evoke different styles in the same individual. An individual may be more extraverted when learning a language but may be more introverted in mathematics.

According to Cohen (2010) a match between the teachers' teaching and the way of learners' learning can maximize this process. But how can a teacher adapt his way of

teaching for each student with a wide range of differences in a classroom? So, trying to establish a match between the teaching-learning styles seems unrealizable. Even a teacher has the chance to do style matching; it will be probably really time-consuming. On the other hand, a mismatch between the teaching may lead the learners to adapt their way of learning and as a result, a style-stretching which result in more equipped and conscious learners may occur.

But this does not mean that learners do not have other style preferences. They have all styles to varying degrees. Therefore, it would be wrong to assume that one style is superior to another. According to Wong and Nunan (2011), the pedagogy needs to be style-neutral and learners should be encouraged to stretch their styles. On the other hand, they say that learners stretch their styles if teacher stretch their teaching styles. Through stretching and varying their teaching styles, teachers can meet the needs of different learner types.

1.3.4. Language learning strategies

Another important variable that has a significant effect on the success of language learning process is language learning strategies. Also, it is known that learning style preferences and learners strategy choices have a close relationship with each other. Moreover, there is a relationship between language learning, language use and the strategies employed by learner. Cohen (2007: 44) states that there is an agreement that language learning and language use both in general and in specific tasks are improved with strategies. According to Cohen it is possible to make language learning faster, easier, and more enjoyable with strategies, "the terms like autonomy, self-regulation, and self-management, independent and individual language learning related in systematic ways to a learner's use of strategies".

Thus, many researchers such as Macaro (2010), Grenfell and Harris (2002), Brown (2001, 2007), Grenfell and Macaro (2007),Oxford (1990, 1993, 1995), Cohen (2003, 2008), Wenden and Rubin (1987), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), Griffiths (2008), and Scarcella and Oxford (1992), have tried to define strategies and language

learning strategies. But as Macaro (2010) states, there is a disagreement in defining strategy, learning strategy, and language learning strategy.

Brown (2001: 119) defines the term 'strategy' as "specific methods of approaching a problem or task, modes of operation for achieving a particular end, or planned designs for controlling and manipulating certain information". Similarly Grenfell and Macaro (2007: 10) define it as "some form of activity that is used in response to problems when and where they arise. These problems might be found within discourse, within the social text, or inside the head of the learner – or all three". On the other hand, according to Oxford (1990: 8) "learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations".

As to what language learning strategies are there are also various definitions given by the researchers. According to Wenden and Rubin (1987: 23) "the strategies that contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affect learning directly constitute language learning strategies". In addition, Cohen (2003) first defines the term as "specific behaviors that learners select in their language learning and use" and later he (2008: 46) develops it and states that "they are processes consciously selected by learners to assist them in learning and using language in general and in the completion of specific language tasks". Similarly, O'Malley and Chamot (1990: 1) define them as "the special thoughts and behaviours that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information".

Another leading expert in language learning strategies issue, Oxford (1990: 1) defines them as "steps taken by students to enhance their own learning". Scarcella and Oxford (1992: 63) together define them as "specific actions, behaviours, steps, techniques [or thoughts] – such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task – used by students to enhance their own learning". Before long, in another study of her Oxford (1993: 175) provides another definition by emphasizing 'conscious' dimension and states that "they are specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques that students employ – often consciously – to improve their progress in internalizing, storing, retrieving, and

using the L2". In her later study she (1995: 262) gives a more simple definition and defines the term as "specific actions or techniques that students use, often intentionally, to improve their progress in developing L2 skills".

Griffiths (2008: 87) gives a similar definition and states that they are "activities consciously chosen by learners for the purpose of regulating their own language learning". In addition, Cohen (2010: 164) defines 'language learning strategies' as "conscious or semi-conscious thoughts and behaviors used by learners with the explicit goal of improving their knowledge and understanding of a target language".

As can be seen there are many definitions and researchers have not been able to reach a consensus, yet. According to Dörnyei (2008) language learning strategies cannot be claimed to be one of the factors among individual differences. Because, the terms "action, behavior, thoughts" used to define language learning strategies by researchers are not individual differences but constitutes an aspect of language process. Besides, Dörnyei (2008) argues that there are a lot of fuzzy points. Research has come up short on clearly stating what kind of learning behaviors are accepted as strategic and how to distinguish students' desired choice that are strategic from that are non-strategic. Hence, a sound definition of learning strategies still has to be put forward.

Grenfell and Macaro (2007) points out that defining the language learning strategies is problematic. In his study Macaro (2006: 325) lists some of these problems that undermine the theoretical basis of learner strategy research:

1. There is no apparent consensus about where learner strategies occur, inside the brain or outside it.
2. There is no consensus about what learner strategies are. Do they consist of knowledge, intention, action, or all three?
3. It is unclear how general or abstract learner strategies are and whether there exist sub-strategies as well as strategies and, as a consequence, if they can be classified in a framework or a hierarchy.
4. A lack of clarity also exists about whether their integrity survives across learning situations, tasks, and contexts.

5. There is no consensus about what they do, especially whether they are always facilitative and effective.
6. It is unclear whether they are integral to language processing of if they are some kind of extra facility that speed up learning.
7. Strategy definition in the literature is arrived at through the use of equally undefined terms.
8. There is lack of consensus on a strategy's relationship to skills and processes.
9. A lack of consensus remains on how strategies lead to both language learning and skill development over the long term.

According to Macaro (2006), in earlier research on learner strategies, the driving factor that led researchers in this field was their attempt to change the way of research on language acquisition. When viewed within a historical context, what researchers had done was to look at the process of learning rather than the final product, provide a learner's perspective, and narrow the gap between the theory practices. According to Macaro, this was the reason why researchers assume strategies in broad terms with the purpose of providing easy implementation for language teachers. In order to eliminate some of the problems, Macaro purposes a framework within cognitive psychology.

1. Researchers should describe strategies in terms of a goal, a situation, and a mental action.
2. Strategies are the raw material of conscious cognitive processing, and their effectiveness or non-effectiveness derives from the way they are used and combined in tasks and processes.
3. Strategies need to be distinguished from sub-conscious activity, language learning processes, skills, learning plans, and learning styles (Macaro, 2006: 326).

In another study, Grenfell and Macaro (2007: 27) conducted a literature review and as a result of this review, they list the claims that had been put forward by various researchers up to that time. According to them:

1. The strategies that learners use are accessible and can be documented
2. A strategy is a construct that can be defined, what it is and what it does can be described in practical terms.

3. Strategies are important because they are associated with successful learning.
4. Some learner types are more likely to use strategies or use them more successfully than other types.
5. Strategies can be taught and learners, as a result, can develop more effective strategic behaviour (Macaro, 2007: 27).

There may be some conclusions about the strategies as a result of the research up to now but still a question has to be answered: Where do L2 learners get their strategic behavior from? According to Macaro (2010: 279) much strategic behavior is present in L1 language use. In other words we already use strategies to overcome the problematic parts we confronted. In a reading text, inference, guessing, monitoring etc. are the strategies that are used. However, most of the time, since the strategies used in L1 have already been internalized and automatized; they have become skills that are used unconsciously. But in L2 strategic behavior things are not so easy. Usually the task is much harder for a L2 learner than L1, but L2 learners can use their L1 strategies in order to handle the problem. They can take their L1 strategies into consideration when needed. In other words, "strategic behavior is present in both L1 and L2 processing but occurs with greater intensity in the latter" (Macaro, 2010: 279). The more the task gets difficult in L2, the more strategies need to be put into action to overcome it. For example, in order to understand a text without unknown words, a L2 reader needs a few or no strategies. But in the event that the text has some unknown words, then, the reader will need to apply more strategies in order to get the meaning.

Researchers believe that the strategic competence that learners have in their L1 will help them in L2 settings sufficiently. But, whether learners have sufficient strategic knowledge in their L1 is not known completely and this is a highly debatable issue. Also, according to Grenfell and Harris (2002), since the strategies often unconsciously operated in L1 of the learner, they may not be transferred to the L2 settings successfully.

> Learning of the L2 is brought about, in long-term memory via strategic behavior in working memory, through the development of declarative and procedural knowledge. Performance in the L2 is enhanced as

> a result of the way clusters of strategies interact with language processes, and these in turn contribute to skills through their acceleration and automatisation. It is the way that clusters of strategies interact with processes and thence skills that both knowledge of the language and performance in the language process. In that sense, strategies do not make learning more efficient, they are the raw material without which L2 learning cannot take place (Macaro, 2006: 332).

1.3.4.1. Factors affecting strategy use

Green and Oxford (1995: 285-292) argue that not all strategies suit each student equally. Some strategies may be more suitable for students with certain individual differences and there are various factors affecting the use of strategies. Gender, proficiency and motivation levels of learners may cause them to choose certain strategies. Of these individual differences the preferred learning style plays a crucial role in the selection of strategies. Grenfell and Harris (2002) adopt a similar opinion and according to them there are many factors that affect strategy use: age, sex, background knowledge, proficiency level and cultural background all of which are related to the individual learner, and they added that there are task related factors such as the difficulty level of the given task or language modality. They state that the interaction between these variables is also important.

Nonetheless, the research on variables affecting language learner strategies is not free from conflicts. There can be different findings all of which have been supported with sound data from the research conducted by experts on this field. For example, in their study Su and Duo (2012) found out that when compared to male students, female ones tend to use a variety of learning strategies more than male ones. But the difference in the usage of language learning strategies between males and females does not mean that one gender is more successful than the other. But in a previous study in which Lee and Oxford (2008) had implemented SILL questionnaire, developed by Oxford (1990: 23) with over 1000 Korean students ranging from middle school to university, it is pointed out that "gender did not affect strategy use and awareness significantly", which is inconsistent with the findings of previous studies. They say that only with other variables does the gender plays an important

role. But this can be specific to that culture. Moreover, for Lee and Oxford (2008) education level plays a crucial role in strategy awareness and use.

1.3.4.2. Features of language learning strategies

According to Oxford (1990: 11) all appropriate language learning strategies are aimed at developing communicative competence as their main goal. They contribute to developing more self-directed learners. Since self-directed students will gradually take more responsibility in their own learning processes, they will gain confidence, involvement and proficiency. Also, language learning strategies change the conventional role of the teacher as the only authority in the classroom and put them in a position in which they help and guide learner to become more independent. On the other hand, other features of language learning strategies are that they are problem oriented, action basis, and require involvement beyond cognition. They, also, support learning directly or indirectly; have a degree of observability, level of consciousness; and they are teachable, flexible, and have influences on strategy choice.

According to Oxford (2003), if a strategy is suitable to the L2 task at hand, and applied effectively and linked to the other strategies for the task and used in accordance with student's learning style preference to one degree or another, then it is likely to be useful which, as Oxford states, result in easy, fast, enjoyable, effective, self-directed and transferrable learning. Green and Oxford (1995) mention that active use of strategies in L2 language learning situations play an important role, and students have to be made aware of the importance of active use of strategies and broad range of strategy options available to them.

1.3.4.3. Good language learner and language learner strategies

In learner strategies field researchers looked for a relationship between the strategy use of successful language learners and less successful ones. According to Griffiths and Parr (2001), it has been accepted that there are some students who are more successful and this may resulted from their using language learning strategies more

effectively. So those strategies can be taught to and learnt by less successful learners. Similarly, Macaro (2010) argues that, improving the effectiveness of language learning strategies depends on understanding the strategies used by more successful learners and their ways of using these strategies.

According to Griffiths (2008) higher level students use more strategies more frequently than the lower level students. But by taking this into consideration, we cannot conclude that by teaching more strategies and encouraging students to use them frequently will help us promote good language learning. In other words, not all strategies may be suitable for all learners. Learners may need different kinds of strategies or strategy clusters for a similar or same activity or task in their language learning process. A strategy used by higher level students during a listening to the news on TV may not be appropriate for lower-level students who do not have enough proficiency for this kind of activity and they may become demotivated or lose their confidence. Therefore, a strategy used by higher-level students does not necessarily mean that it should be taught just because of frequency. Teachers should act carefully while planning their instruction and about the level of support they are going to give to the students. In other words, they should tailor their instruction according to the students.

The strategies chosen by a learner should be appropriate to the task at hand and also learners should know when to use them. Poor language learners are unable to integrate the useful strategies into their learning process with correct timing. In order to be able to choose right strategy, students should be aware of the options available to them and this requires explicit instruction of strategies in classroom.

On the other hand, knowing which strategy to use and when to use it is not enough. Since strategies occur interdependently, leaners should be taught how to integrate the use of various strategies together. Nam and Oxford (1998) and state that what makes some students less successful or unsuccessful is not the number of strategies they apply but the way they use them. Also Oxford (1996) points out students should be able to decide whether they are doing well or not. According to Griffiths (2008) good language learners can decide if they understand, and stop to do something. Therefore,

instruction of metacognitive skills needs to be integrated to the teaching/learning process. As Anderson (2008) states, while good learners can evaluate the outcomes of his/her learning, poor learners often fail to diagnose the failure. In this respect, it can be said that language learner strategies should be handled not only in cognitive but also in meta-cognitive dimension.

1.3.4.4. How to diagnose the language learning strategies

One of the most intricate issues in strategy training is to identify them. Although some of the strategies can be observed most of them occur in learners' brains and there is no way to observe them. But in a way they have to be diagnosed.

According to Cohen (2008) taking strategic approach to language learning means raising awareness of what strategies and of how appropriately they will work for specific task and for particular learner. Because it is known that, as Wong and Nunan (2011: 145) argue, "every task and exercise will be underpinned by at least one strategy…" and most of the language learners are not aware of these strategies which cause failures or less success in the process of language learning. Just as some parts of language are easier to learn, some strategies such as using a dictionary for translation are easier to use than others.

Grenfell and Harris (2002) state that understanding the learning process better may help us construct more appropriate pedagogic conditions. As one part of this, to be able to teach the learner how to improve their learning processes and become more successful, we can categorize the strategies used by individuals at various development stages and in particular contexts.

In this respect, the first thing to do is to name or identify the strategies used by learners. But, one of the most challenging problems that come along with strategy issue emerges here – how to identify them since strategies are not always observable. According to Chamot (2008) although learning strategies are mostly unobservable, there surely exist some observable ones, too. While a learner's drawing images in his mind is unobservable, his/her using color-coding during reading a text is an observable strategy.

We can identify the strategies used by learners by just asking language learners how they perform a specific task, stimulating class observations on language learning and use, conducting questionnaires about learners' preferred leaning styles and strategies, discussions, getting learners write journals, and making learners read articles on the topic. However, all of these data collecting methods bear some reliability and validity problems in varying degrees. Whichever method is chosen, since the learner will be a part of the process, we cannot be sure if they respond to the material in a biased or unbiased way.

1.3.4.5. Classification of language learner strategies

Having agreed upon some possible ways of identifying language learner strategies, researchers have begun to study on a classification scheme. According to Nambiar (2009), from 1970s to 1980s studies, most of which examine the good language learners' strategy use, conducted in SLA field helped us understand how language learning was improved and supported by strategies. From 1980s, researchers (Brown and Palinscar, 1982; O'Malley et al., 1985) began to classify the strategies and in 1990s, studies focused at the variables that affect learning strategy and proficiency.

Researchers like Cohen (2008a: 46-47; 2011: 682), Brown (2007: 132-139), Grenfell and Harris (2002), and Oxford (1990: 16-21) more or less offered similar classification schemes of language learning strategies. Taking their classification schemes into consideration there are mainly three types of classification.

A classification of learning strategies can be made by differentiating the strategies that are directly related to learning the language from the strategies employed while using the language that has been learned. According to Cohen (2003: 280) language learning strategies will help to improve the effectiveness of language learning process and allow learners have their own individualized way of learning. On the other hand language use strategies help learners utilize the language they have already learned. Communication strategies, compensation strategies and conversational interaction strategies, or as Cohen points out, retrieval strategies, rehearsal strategies, and cover strategies, can be counted as language use strategies.

Another classification of strategies can be done according to the skill area which can be divided into two major groups: receptive compromising listening and reading skills and productive compromising speaking and writing skills. However, as Singhal (2011) points out, strategies may not be limited to one area. While some specific strategies can be in one single skill area, some other strategies such as vocabulary, translation and grammar strategies cut across all four areas. For example, predicting can be used as a reading strategy as well as a speaking or listening strategy. A learner can use pictures or title to guess what a text is about. He/she may also observe the counterparts mimics and gestures to predict what the topic is while speaking or listening to someone.

According to Williams and Burden (2000: 149), learning a language is different from learning other subjects since it is a social and communicative process in nature. In order to learn a language, one needs to develop appropriate cognitive skills as well as social and communicative ones. This leads us to another main classification of language learning strategies; classification according to the function. Cognitive, metacognitive, affective and social strategies are the four classes used by researchers for this category.

Grenfell and Harris (2002) argue that cognition embraces virtually any mental manipulation of information and cognitive strategies include mental engagement with language in materials or tasks in order to develop understanding and hence learning, or as Cohen (2010: 45) states they include a lot of strategies related to processes or mental manipulations that a learner comes across during the learning and using the target language. In other words they are processes that learner go through while learning or using the language. Cognitive strategies act on language in the acquisition process and may be specifically involved in production of language. Guessing the meaning, using imaginary and repetition, translation, deduction, taking note, working on key words, identification, grouping (language learning strategies), retrieval, rehearsal and comprehension strategies (language use strategies) can be given as the examples of cognitive strategies.

As to metacognitive strategies preplanning a linguistic task, monitoring it and evaluation can be metacognitive strategies. That is, metacognitive strategies include the strategies the learner use to control his/her cognition by planning, checking, evaluating the process of learning.

Social strategies are the strategies used in interaction with peers or native speakers whereas affective strategies help to control emotions motivations and attitudes. A learner's entering a language exam, talking to himself/herself, speaking to a friend to ease his/her tension or dictating himself not to answer the problematic questions can be counted as affective strategies.

Cohen (2010) argues that in the classification of language learning strategies according to their function, the problem is that a single strategy used by the learner may actually represent a continual 'shift' or 'dance' from one of these categories to another. For example, in a reading exam, a learner may first focus on the pictures or headings and/or familiar words to get the gist of the passage. In this case, what he does is a cognitive strategy. But if the learner has planned to do so in advance, then it is a metacognitive one. On the other hand, if focusing on the familiar points and trying to get the gist of the text decreases his/her anxieties, then we have to call this strategy as an affective one.

One of the most comprehensive and mostly used classifications of language learning strategies has been made by Oxford (1990: 16-21). Oxford first divides language learning strategies into two major categories: direct strategies and indirect strategies. Direct strategies that require mental processing of the language involve the target language and are divided into three sub categories: memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies. Similarly, indirect strategies have three sub-categories: metacognitive strategies, affective strategies and social strategies.

1.3.4.6. Strategy training

A learner learns in a complex individual and situational context. Also, learner's own individual characteristics that he/she brings into the learning situation have effects on the outcomes. So, in order to achieve more successful outcomes and deal with the

contextual complexities he/she must make the most of himself/herself. Above literature points out that one of the possible ways to do is to tailor the activities, tasks and teachers' teaching style preferences according to learners' dominant learning style preferences. Also, it is clearly understood from the literature review so far that learners' learning style preferences are reflected in their strategy use in a way. In that case, teaching learners appropriate strategies and how, when, where, and why to use them can improve efficiency of language classes.

Takeuchi, Griffiths and Doyle (2007: 92) advocate that "… learners learn best in an environment where students are supported, where goals are shared, where strategic activity is transparent". Moreover, Nambiar (2009) adds that understanding a learner's individual style preference can help teachers to orient their L2 instruction and also apply appropriate strategy training.

According to Williams and Burden (2000: 156-158) there are some common assumptions about strategy training:

- that we can identify the strategies used by good language learners
- that we can teach these processes to our learners
- there will be resulting increase in the learners' effectiveness in learning
- that these are the right strategies to teach to all learners

According to Lee and Oxford (2008: 27), strategy awareness and English learning self-image, as part of the metacognition, affect the strategy use. So, promoting positive self-image and strategy awareness should be integrated into the teaching process. In addition, Anderson (2008: 99) says that strong metacognitive skills empower language learner: when learners reflect upon their learning, they become better prepared to make conscious decisions about what they can do to improve their learning. And metacognition in language learning can be divided into five intersecting components: (1) preparing and planning for learning; (2) selecting and using strategies; (3) monitoring learning; (4) orchestrating strategies; and (5) evaluating learning. According to Griffiths (2008: 104) who uses the term kaleidoscopic view for metacognition, it is the mixture of these five components

which interacts each other and which is nonlinear process. She states that when teachers and learners use metacognition to improve the language teaching and learning, language acquisition can be accelerated.

Preparing and planning has a crucial role in learning. Activation of background knowledge before beginning to read a text and planning the steps to be applied during reading can be given as examples.

According to Cohen (2007, 2011) strategies occur in sequences or clusters. So, learners can use their strategies as individual strategies, strategy sequences or strategy clusters. Their choice depends on the nature of task and the learner. For example, a learner confronting with an unfamiliar vocabulary in a text may only look it up in the dictionary, or after finding it, he/she may try to memorize or use the word in his/her own sentence, or plan his/her way of reading, try to guess or infer the meaning of unknown words by using the clues in the text, and later can evaluate his/her approach and change his/her own approach. As Cohen (2008) says what is important is that learners should develop their own strategy knowledge repertoire and also know which strategies will work best for the task at hand and in general. Therefore, it may not be possible to identify the effect of one strategy alone since it cannot be separated from those of others. As a result, determining which strategy is in action can be a trivial issue because of this fuzziness.

Similarly Macaro (2006) points out that strategies, with some exceptions, are available to all learners, operate in clusters, and in relation to language tasks become L2 processes. The nature of individual strategy remains constant. It is the problems posed by task demands that vary and that bring about variation in the selection and orchestration of strategy clusters. Also, successful learning is no longer linked to individual learner's frequency of strategy use, but to his or her orchestration of strategies available to him/her. The framework addresses the problems of specificity and generalizability of strategies. In order to reduce the total number of learning situations or tasks, strategies must remain both situation specific and transferable.

1.3.5. Learning styles and strategies

Researchers have been studying the relationship between language learning styles and strategies instead of investigating them separately because of the fact that, as Jie (2006) points out; learning styles have significant influence on learners' strategy choices. In the same vein, Hedge (2008) points out that a new direction of studies dealing with learning style is to investigate the relationship of it with the strategies used by successful language learners.

Although these two terms are very different in their nature, they have a close and complex relationship. Brown (2001) states that while styles are constant and predictable, strategies vary within individual and successful language learners can manipulate their style and strategies in day-to-day language situations. In another study, Brown (2007: 27) argues that styles vary across individuals but strategies vary within individual. Brown also says that "many strategies are related to, and actually become the outward manifestation of styles". Shi (2011) who has a similar opinion argues that learning styles are unconscious learner traits whereas learning strategies are specific actions taken by learners to make learning more efficient. In a quantitative study which Shi (2011) carried out with 178 second year undergraduates from the foreign language school of a university in Wuhan, she aimed at finding the relationship between cognitive styles and learning strategies of the learners. According to the findings of this study, learners' choices of learning strategies are effected significantly by cognitive styles. Synthesizing style, sharpener style, field-independent style and impulsive style from the cognitive styles correlate positively almost every strategy presented in the study. So, it can be said that these aforementioned types of cognitive styles are the most influential ones that effect language learners' strategy choice.

Cohen (2011) argues that learners try to relate their preferred learning styles and strategies to each other. Therefore, for him by investigating the characteristics of the task together with the learners' preferred learning style, their strategy use can be predicted since series of strategies that they will draw on will probably be consistent with their learning styles. Similarly, Nam and Oxford (1998) states that students

often tend to choose strategies according to their style preferences. Different learners can apply some strategies in different ways due to the style preferences like other individual difference variables such as age, gender, motivation and contextual variables.

Two issues can exist in the style and strategy relationship; there can be either a match or a mismatch between learners' learning styles and strategies they orchestrate. According to Cohen (2010) learning styles, strategies and motivation are interrelated in numerous ways. So, a match between preferred style and strategies they used during language learning process has a crucial role in promoting more conscious and efficient learners who are aware of their preferred learning styles and strategies. Finding the learning strategies that suit a particular learning style may improve the chance of success and enhance the interest of the learners which will eventually increase the motivation and have a positive effect on performance of learners. According to Oxford et al. (1991), Reid (1995), Nam and Oxford (1998) the success of ESL/EFL student depends partially on the degrees of understanding his/her own learning style and choosing learning strategies in accordance with it.

There are different ideas, too. Cohen (2011) states that in the case of having mismatches, students try to vary and modify their preferences according to available opportunities they have and try to style-stretch to acquire the match. In this respect, the inconsistency between the strategies used and students' own learning style and the type of task result in the failure in the process of language learning. Similarly, using language learning strategies in an ineffective way inadequately causes similar failures.

Nam and Oxford (1998) give another viewpoint in this issue. They accept that finding the most related strategies to the learning style is important but they also advocate that this may not be true for every situation and for every task. Some degree of 'style-stretching' or 'style-flexing' may be necessary, too. That is, a mismatch may not be necessarily a bad thing that causes failure directly. On the contrary, it can be used in a useful way. For example, a learner with analytic style preference may want to break down the text into manageable units to understand it. On the other

hand, a more global learner may get the gist of the text from dealing with it in general terms.

According to Cohen (2003) ideally, teachers' teaching styles need to be consistent with their students' preferred learning styles and strategies they use according to these preferences. But, in reality, it is highly unlikely to make such an instruction. So, having students become aware of their own learning styles and strategy preferences may help them overcome the challenges in and out of classroom environment. In order to enable learners to find out their own style and strategy preferences, they need reliable tools.

Cohen (2010) points out that there are various instruments developed to identify learning styles and strategy use. 'Learning Style Survey' developed by Cohen, Oxford and Chi (2005) focuses on the identification of language learner styles whereas 'Strategy inventory for language learning' by Oxford (1990; 283-291) is frequently used instruments that have been proven to be valid and reliable across the world. Hedge (2008) states that the data obtained from the instruments such as questionnaires and self-reports do not yield sound enough information since they are likely to mismatch with the observed behavior.

1.3.6. Strategy based instruction (SBI)

After having diagnosed the language learner styles and strategies of good language learners, the next step is to determine to find a proper way of training less successful learners to improve their proficiency levels. In this respect, SBI and SSBI come forward as the two effective means of providing training. According to Hedge, (2008: 85) learner training means a set of procedures or activities which varies learners' awareness of what is involved in learning a foreign language, which encourages learners to become more involved, active, and responsible in their own learning, and which helps them to develop and strengthen their strategies for language learning.

As can be understood from the literature, finding out what students' preferred language learning styles and the strategies they orchestrate during their language learning process do not bring about much but provide a basis for a further training. It is also evident that conducting a Strategy Based Instruction (SBI) may yield valuable results but without calibrating it by considering students' preferred language learning styles, it will have limited effect. Therefore, Styles and Strategy Based Instruction (SSBI) is seen as an efficient approach for maximizing the success of language classes. In the following section SBI will be examined first, and then SSBI. What is more, Cohen (2008) states that it is possible to say that since the use of strategies have been proven to improve the outcomes of learning, not only teaching L2 but also helping students to become strategic in their learning has gained significance. What is aimed with the term strategy instruction is to make efficient foreign language learners by enhancing awareness of their language strategy repertoire

Researchers like Carrell, Pharis, & Liberto (1989) carried out SBI for reading strategies in their studies and found out that after the SBI, the reading comprehension of the students had improved. In another study Cohen (2008b), after examining the 38 studies, finds out that research shows effective strategy instruction enhance the use of strategies in a short term but there is lack of evidence for a long term effect. Moreover, Cohen (2011: 683) admits that strategy instruction may have various applications in which the following features are: raising awareness of strategies that are already in-use; improving learners' own thinking and learning processes, presentation and modeling of the strategies; providing multiple practice opportunities to enable autonomous learners by decreasing the scaffolding provided by the teacher gradually; and letting the evaluation of the strategies by learners themselves and trying to enable the transfer of them.

In addition to these views, Oxford (1990) gives another rationale for SBI by stating that in terms of acquiring communicative competence in an acceptable level, we cannot provide everything ready to the students. They must have some self-direction to some degree or other. That is, they must learn how to learn. As a result, strategy training emerges as a solution. According to the research by means of strategy training, students outperform the ones who do not take training in terms of success in

learning process. Cohen (2008b) states that, by strategy training, students' metacognitive awareness can be raised and their strategies can develop.

Although Hedge (2008: 102) did not directly name the training as SBI, language training has some goals. First, it prepares students "to work with the systems and pathways of self-access facilities". Secondly, it encourages learners to acknowledge the possible ways of using the language in and out of classroom setting. Finally, a third is to enhance learners' ability to use the learning activities of the classroom effectively by means of the application of effective strategies to the task.

1.3.6.1. Historical background

The historical background of styles- and strategies-based instruction is well documented in Cohen and Weaver (2005: 5-6). According to Cohen and Weaver, traditionally, it was believed that teaching language was the teachers' job and it was under their responsibility to bring about the success. But soon it was realized that without students' active involvement into the learning process and sharing the responsibility, it was impossible to realize effective learning.

In 1960s, with the new trends in language education, researchers shifted their focus from learners to learning to learn. Having seen that behaviorist approach that ignored the cognitive dimension of learning was not enough, they began to accept that some rules could not be taught by stimulus and response, but acquired automatically by the learners.

In 1970s, with the study of Rubin (1975) on good language learners paved the way for new interest areas. Researchers began to pay attention to what good language learners can teach us and started to research the characteristics of good language learners.

In 1980s, researchers such as Oxford (1990) and O'Malley and Chamot (1990) classified the learner strategies under the metacognitive, cognitive, social, affective or other function classes. While doing these, they made use of the studies on L1 reading and reading strategies as their main source.

In 1990s, since researchers had a good deal of knowledge on the characteristics of good language learner and had several classification schemes of strategies, they began to conduct experiments to see whether they could enhance learning by teaching the learners new strategies or using the ones they already had. Within this perspective, different intervention frameworks have been developed.

In 2000s, with the emergence of styles- and strategies-based approach, a new trend has become to dominate this field. Researchers integrated the learner style variable, among the other individual difference variables, to the intervention programs and have sought the ways of explaining how specific tasks might favor certain learning style preferences.

1.3.6.2. Variables that affect SBI

According to Cohen (2011: 49), among the factors that affect the effectiveness of strategy instruction, with any given learner, are the specific learning context and task, learner's background knowledge, goals for learning [Japanese], style preferences and language strategy repertoire. Therefore, "the impact of strategy instruction will depend on the teachers' ability to deliver it and on the learners' receptivity of it".

According to Grenfell and Harris (2002) the effectiveness of strategy instruction depends on who are the particular learners, the particular strategies that are to be taught, the particular strategies that are to be taught besides the motivational and attitudinal factors. The strategies that are going to be used in the strategy instruction should be suitable with the age group of learners. In addition, the selected strategies should be practiced in a particular context. In a country where the learners are learning the language as a foreign language and where there is little or no chance to practice the language with native speakers, some strategies may not be appropriate because strategies can change across different contexts. Moreover, choosing strategies that are most readily transferrable can be preference but this does not mean that strategies related to one specific skill area, reading or listening, are not so important to teach. Finally strategies that are most readily teachable should be used.

1.3.6.3. The principles of SBI

According to Rubin, Chamot, Harris, and Anderson (2007: 155), for accurate and reliable SBI reports the research and instructional methodology used must be carefully described including: what strategies taught; how they were taught; the level of explicitness of the instruction; types of activities students were engaged in to practice the strategies; how the use of strategies has evaluated; the length of time the SBI took; and whether the instruction included metacognitive awareness raising. Also, not only the effect of strategy instruction on students' self-reports of strategy use, but also on proficiency level need to be assessed. So, common underlying principles of SBI should be as:

1. Strategy intervention should be directly related to problems that learners are seeking to solve
2. Strategic intervention should lead to immediate and recognizable success.
3. Teachers need to become more aware of the sources of variation (individual, group, cultural, and developmental) and need to develop skills and knowledge to facilitate the learning process given this kaleidoscopic diversity.
4. Strategy intervention should include sufficient scaffolding, modeling, practice, and development of self-assessment.
5. The amount of time it takes to develop a learner's ability to manage his/her own learning can vary tremendously (Rubin et al., 2007: 159-160).

If SBI effectively done it increases ability to manage cognitive and affective strategies; it increases learner motivation; it increases performance; and it provides learners with the knowledge and skills to continue learning on their own (Rubin et al., 2007: 160).

1.3.6.4. Models of SBI

There are various models of strategy instruction proposed by the researchers. One of them was proposed by Cohen (2008: 49). According to him, there are the common sequences of steps that can be found in the studies raising awareness for already in-

use strategies of learners. These are: presenting and modelling strategies to improve learners' awareness of their own thinking and learning processes; providing multiple opportunities to practice to make more autonomous learners; and getting students monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies used their efforts to transfer these strategies to new tasks.

According to Green and Oxford (1995) learner training focusing on specific skills explicitly and clearly, providing various opportunities for practicing strategies, integrated into class work, and showing how to transfer the strategies to new situation is the best (Oxford, 1992/1993; Oxford, et al., 1990; Green and Oxford, 1995).

Also, Chamot (2008) reviews three models of language learning strategy instruction in her chapter in which she mentions the relationship between strategy instruction and good language learner. These are Cohen's (1998) 'Styles and Strategy Based Instruction (SSBI), Chamot et al., (1999)'s 'Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA), and 'Grenfell and Harris' model (1999).

According to Chamot (2008) these three models share many features. First of all, in all these three models, developing a metacognitive understanding of the learning strategies bear great importance, and teacher's modelling and demonstration of the strategies can help to develop this. In addition, developing autonomous students is important. So, multiple practice opportunities should be provided. Also, in all these instruction models, students should be able to evaluate their language learning processes, choose appropriate strategies according to the task, and transfer these strategies to the new tasks. Another point is that they all begin with the identification of learners' strategies that are already in use in several ways such as applying questionnaires, conducting discussions and so on. Finally, these models are in favor of explicit strategy instruction and teachers' modelling the new strategy.

Dörnyei (2008) mentions similar models in his article. According to him, there are various strategy frameworks and these have almost the same common goals in spite of the differences in details. Raising awareness of the learning strategies constitutes the first phase. Then, with task modelling the strategies and encouraging and

supporting the use of strategies by students followed by providing a range of strategies related to the task and various practice opportunities with scaffolding. Finally, providing a post-task analysis by students and construction of a self-evaluation stage comes as the last phase.

According to Oxford (1990: 202) there are three types of strategy training: awareness training; one-time strategy training; and long-term strategy training. In awareness training, students get familiar with the idea of learning strategies and their use in accomplishing certain tasks. But in this kind of training students do not need to use the strategies in the tasks at hand. They are just introduced to the very concept of learning strategies.

Chamot et al. (1999) points out in her study that there are four steps common to all models of SBI:

1. Raising awareness of strategies learners are already using;
2. Teacher presentation and modeling of strategies so that students become increasingly aware of their own thinking and learning processes;
3. Multiple practice opportunities to help students move towards autonomous use of strategies through gradual withdrawal of scaffolding; and
4. Self-evaluation of the effectiveness of the strategies used and transfer of strategies to fresh tasks (cited in Rubin et al., 2007: 142).

1.3.6.5. How to conduct SBI

According to Rubin et al. (2007), SBI is not a mechanical process and the learning context, the nature of task, and each learner's style, goals, and background knowledge influence. In order to increase the awareness of students about strategies and learning about which strategies they are already using, teachers can use various instruments. They can directly ask students to name the strategies on a specific task in classrooms or they can use self-reports or think-aloud protocols to find out these. On the other hand, various questionnaires developed by various researchers can be used.

In the presentation stage, especially with younger learners who may have difficulties in understanding the strategies because of their abstract nature, teachers present the strategies by modelling. Here, they can make use of thinking-aloud while applying a strategy in a task. Also, info-graphs and posters showing the use of strategies may help to make the process more concrete.

The more students get used to using the strategies through various practicing opportunities, the more they will take the responsibility for using them. Any learning task can be used for practice but they must not be too easy. If there is no challenge, students do not feel the need to use strategies. Activities that involve collaboration, problem solving, inquiry, role-playing and hands-on experiences will surely provide new practicing opportunities as well as providing the additional source of scaffolding. Moreover, according to Rubin et al. (2007) younger learners may need extensive opportunities in which they can find more assistance from their peers since students will explain the use of strategies to each other better than teachers.

Students not only become aware of what the strategies are and how to use them, but also they learn to evaluate their application process and success of the task. Checklists, journals, class-discussions and learners' logs can all be used for this purpose.

Finally, according to Rubin et al. (2007: 147) teachers can enable the transfer of strategies to different situation "by developing students' metacognition through explicit strategy instruction and second by discussing with students how they might apply a strategy in a different context".

In Oxford's (1990) model, during on-time teaching, students are taught one or more strategies in one or a few sessions by using actual learning tasks. These are usually very identifiable and targeted strategies appropriate for learners' needs. The value of the strategy and when and how to use it and also how to evaluate the success of strategy are the things given during the training. But this kind of strategy training is not seen as valuable as long-term strategy training. In long-term training model there are eight steps:

1. Determine the learners' needs and the time available
2. Select strategies well
3. Consider integration of strategy training
4. Consider motivational issues
5. Prepare materials and activities
6. Conduct completely informed training
7. Evaluate the strategy training
8. Revise the strategy training (Oxford, 1990: 204-208).

The first step is to determine the characteristics of learners – demographic variables, their needs, abilities, weak and strong sides, form of the classroom and so on – and the time available should be taken into consideration. Then appropriate strategies according to the needs and characteristics of the students should be selected. According to Oxford (1990: 204-208) these strategies should be transferrable and have a balance. Besides easy-to-learn ones, there should be challenging ones.

Moreover, strategy training should be conducted in an integrated manner not in a separated way. Considering the motivational issues is the next phase. It will affect the efficiency of the language learning process together with materials and activities.

Another important issue is that students need to know how to transfer the strategies to new situations and how to evaluate the process. In this way, more effective results are likely to be obtained. Students self-monitoring and self-evaluation of the training process will surely yield useful data for the last step which is revising the strategy training. In the event that unsatisfying results are obtained the whole process or the problematic part should be revised.

In addition, according to Macaro (2010) one way of finding out the relationship between strategy use and success is to test a learner's performance in a language task beforehand a strategy instruction and after the instruction to post-test to see whether there are any differences. Also, he suggests that in order to see whether the instruction has a long-term effect, a delayed test can be applied. Moreover,

measuring strategic behavior before and after the implementation of SBI enables us to discover how and why our SBI is effective or not.

1.3.6.6. Problems with SBI

But SBI is not the perfect way of training learners and has its own drawbacks. According to Chamot (2008) whether the instruction should be explicitly or implicitly conducted, whether it should be integrated into the language class or should be given separately, what the instruction language should be are the controversial issues in the literature of language learning strategy instruction.

Some researchers, one of whom is Kellerman (1991), advocate that the classroom time is so precious that it should not be wasted for extra training. Separate instruction can take place before beginning a course or parallel to the language lessons. But on the other hand, some researchers embrace a different approach and advocate an integrated model. For example, Grenfell and Harris (2002) suggest that training in strategy use shouldn't be an additional action for traditional classroom. Instead, communicative competence and learner autonomy should be backed up with it.

In integrated instruction, strategies are embedded into the curriculum and students are taught without being explicitly told why they need to know them. But it is known from the students that in order to be able to develop learner autonomy students need to participate in making choices, planning, implementation process, and assessment process. This means that a metacognitive dimension has to be integrated into the process of training. Because, if the successful use of strategies requires students' conscious selection, then, students should be able to select, apply, and assess their conscious choices.

Another controversial issue is whether the instruction should be explicit or it should be done implicitly. According to Chamot (2008) teachers should adopt explicit instruction by integrating it into the regular course work. In terms of the language of the instruction, Chamot (2008) points out that although giving instruction in target language may work for high-level language students; it will not be feasible for beginner-level students who do not have the proficiency to understand the

instruction. Therefore, in a classroom in which all students and the teacher can speak the same first language, language learning strategy instruction can be given in the first language. Some guiding principles for teaching learning strategies should be:

- Strategy instruction should be integrated into everyday lessons,
- The purpose of strategy instruction should be made explicit to the learners,
- Strategy instruction should involve collaborative learning
- Strategy instruction should be in the target language as far as possible,
- Strategy instruction should be geared towards the level and needs of the learners (Grenfell and Harris, 2002: 103-107).

Another well-known model for implementing SBI is Chamot and O'Malley's (1996) Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) in which content area instruction is given through language development activities and explicit instruction in learning strategies. CALLA is an instructional model designed for English language-learning students and other ESL students aiming at increasing their achievement in language learning.

Cognitive learning theory, which sees the learners as active participants in the teaching interaction, based on the premise that learning occurs through active, dynamic mental processes. "Learners select information from the environment, organize that information, relate it what they already know, retain what they consider to be important, use the information in appropriate contexts and reflect on the success of their learning effort" (Chamot and O'Malley, 1996: 262).

CALLA model has three interrelated components: high-priority content topics, academic language development based on content and explicit instruction in learning strategies that can help students understand and remember both the content and the language (Chamot and O'Malley, 1996: 263).

In CALLA model, Chamot and O'Malley's (1994) classification of learning strategies is used and the instructional sequence of CALLA consists of five steps: introducing, teaching, practicing, evaluating, and applying content, language and learning strategies.

1.3.7. Style and strategy based instruction (SSBI)

Carrell, Pharis and Liberto (1989) metacognitive strategy training in semantic mapping and in the experience-text-relationship method are effective in enhancing second language reading. Also, there are similarities in terms of enhanced second language reading and significant interactions between students' learning styles and the effectiveness of training. Brown (2007) argues that language learning training is getting more and more successful when students become aware of their styles and preferences and take action on the basis of that awareness with the help of the teacher.

Cohen (2010) proposes steps for teachers to make style and strategy based instruction. In order to improve the consciousness of the learners and make them more willing to use strategies, teachers should enhance the learners' awareness at first. Later, they should identify the style preferences, and strategies which are already in use or may be used by the learner. Thirdly, in addition to teaching new strategies, they should also show how the 'style-stretching' can be realized. Moreover, since learners will use the strategies and develop new ones when they believe that those strategies will be useful for them, a rationale needs to be provided. This should be followed by guided exercises and activities that will give learners the chance to practice the strategies. In addition, learners should be encouraged to improve strategy repertoire and use them even there will be some risks. Then, teachers should stress the importance of cross-cultural differences in strategy use. A strategy used in a culture may not be appropriate for another. Finally, providing sharing sessions in which learners find the chance to share their experiences they got in this process may be useful.

According to Erhmann et al., (2003) when the strategy instruction is tuned according to the style preferences, it will yield more effective results. In addition Cohen and Weaver (2005) points out that SSBI has a series of components: strategy preparation, strategy awareness raising, strategy instruction, strategy practice, and personalization of strategies.

1.3.8. Reading

Starting from the early days of language teaching up to now, lots of researchers have been interested in lots of aspects of language teaching. Among these reading has been one of the hottest topics for decades. However, as Clarke (1980) who states the situation from his point of view and addresses that although reading is studied thoroughly, it is the least understood process in education. Lots of books, articles, journals and studies have been devoted to reading but people were unable to reach a general acceptance. Nonetheless, it seems that the trend will go on like this and reading will preserve its popularity as the subject of research since new means of reading is emerging together with the technology and changing world.

1.3.8.1. What's reading?

Throughout the history of language teaching, lots of researchers have tried to provide a sound conceptual framework and a solid basis in order to enable a consensus by trying to define what reading and reading comprehension are. The definitions of reading are uncountable. Palinscar and Brown (1984: 65) state "reading comprehension is a highly complex process which operates on decoded language at various linguistic levels (words, sentences, paragraphs, etc.)". As to Grellet (1994: 3) "understanding a written text means extracting the required information from it as efficiently as possible". In more recent studies Ediger (2001) argues that reading is seen as an interactive process which includes text, writer and social context. Similarly, Schramm (2008: 231) defines reading from a cognitive point of view. For him it is an active process of constructing meaning in which the activation and topic specific pre-knowledge and psycholinguistic processing of text information play an important role.

By taking these kinds of definitions into consideration, like Ediger (2001) who says reading is seen as an interactive process which includes text, writer and social context, it can be said that despite some differences, it is generally accepted that reading is not a linear process but an interactive one in which reader and writer take part.

1.3.8.2. Purpose of reading

We read for lots of reasons and there are lots of ways we use reading as a means of communication. These range from reading a simple advertisement to reading online news and to books or short messages on our phones. Yet, according to Grellet (1994), there are two main reasons for reading: reading for pleasure and reading for information both of which involves a variety of skills such as recognizing, deducing the meaning, understanding the explicitly stated and metaphoric meanings. That is, our purposes of reading vary greatly. We may read to search for information, for a general understanding, to synthesize and evaluate information, and for pleasure. As to Grabe and Stoller (2001), reading plays a major role in learning new information and reaching alternative explanations and interpretations in academic context. Also, no matter what the goal is, reading is at the centre of developing independent learning.

It is clear that the purpose of reading is context-depended. As Wallace (1992: 4) states "the way we perceive reading behavior is linked to different reader purposes which, in turn, are linked to situational context and also to social expectations …". For example, reading in classroom setting differs significantly in terms of purpose and expectations from the reading a novel at home for pleasure. Moreover reading in our first language will show great differences reading in L2. In other words we cannot read in L2 context like we do in L1.

1.3.8.3. L1 reading vs L2 reading

It is inevitable that L1 and L2 readers will have some differences. As Ediger (2001) points out, native speakers of English and English language learners bring different language background to the task of acquiring literacy. Moreover, children learning to read in their L1 are already fairly fluent in speaking and understanding the language and have an oral ability whereas L2 learners do not have this. For him, learners' L1 and literacy background can be valuable assets in the process of acquiring L2 literacy. That is, the reading skills that learners have developed in their own L1 can

be transferred to the L2 learning settings and researchers can look at language learners' first language in order to find out what involves in L2 reading and literacy.

In one of the studies on L1 and L2 readers, Grabe and Stoller (2001) find out that L2 reader generally have weaker linguistic skills, less vocabulary, and difficulties in understanding the text organization and structures used in the text. In addition, they have comprehension problems because of not being able to understand the information presented in the text.

In the process of learning reading in L2, according to Schramm (2008) there are three levels involved in learning to read in L2. In this process, learners become aware of higher-level activity and they decide what their particular reading goal and who controls their reading with respect to this activity. Then as the second level, there exists an interaction between the readers and author and readers reconstruct author's goal and organize their mental action steps for their own goals. Finally, they monitor the process, evaluate the problems occurred during reading for their particular goal and take precautions for understanding according to this evaluation.

1.3.8.4. Successful readers

To reach a better understanding of reading process, researchers looked at the ways successful readers read. Hosenfeld's (1977) study, one of the pioneers in this field, initiated the reading strategy research in SLA context. In her study, in which she compared 20 successful and 20 unsuccessful students' use of reading strategies in French, she reached the following conclusions: successful readers kept the meaning of the passage in mind while reading, skipped unimportant words, read in 'broad phrases', relied on context to determine word meaning, and were confident as readers. Unsuccessful readers translated sentences and lost the general meaning of the passage, rarely skipped words, looked up words, and had a poor self-concept as readers (cited in Zhang et al., 2008: 248). These results show that students use strategies in their reading process and the way they employ strategies depends on their proficiency level.

In the same vein, Haynes and Zacarian (2010) give some characteristic strategy use of good readers. According to them, good readers ask questions to themselves before, during and after reading. They can draw inferences during reading. In other words, they can reach conclusions and understand what is implied in the passage. Also, another characteristic of good readers is that they can differentiate important and unimportant information which is the key ability to understand the content. Finally, good readers not only can use summarization strategy but also incorporate it in the schema.

1.3.8.5. Reading strategies

Today, there are several definitions of what reading strategies are. Although there may be some minor differences it is generally accepted that as Erler and Finkbeiner (2007: 189). state, they are "intentional actions chosen to facilitate reading at any level of processing According to Singhal (2011) in the second language learning context, strategies that improve the effectiveness of learning are called as language learning strategies whereas strategies used by the learner to facilitate the reading process and develop comprehension are called comprehension or reading strategies.

1.3.8.6. Use of reading strategies

There are different points of view in literature as to reading strategy use and its effects on students' success. Different from Hosenfeld, Anderson (1991), who examined the individual differences of adult L2 learners' strategy use, points out that there is no single set of processing strategies. Low and high achievers use the same strategies in their reading process which indicates that the important thing is not to know what strategies to utilize but to know how to use and how to orchestrate the strategies for success. Also, strategy use may be affected by the vocabulary level and schema. In her another study, Anderson (2003) states that when compared to ESL students, EFL students use problem solving strategies, including rereading, adjusting the reading rate, and pausing for reading, more frequently just as online readers. Metacognitive online strategies play an important role for both EFL and ESL readers.

In a recent study, conducted with 18 pupils in grades Primary 4, 5 and 6 in Singapore, Zang et al., (2008) indicate that according to language proficiency, the use of reading strategies shows differences. Higher-proficiency learners utilize reading strategies which involve both top-down and bottom-up strategies during the reading process. They both try to understand the text literarily and utilize the strategies reconstructing, interpreting, summarizing and making inferences in addition to their world/schematic knowledge. On the other hand, low-proficiency pupils have perceptual problems and could not orchestrate their strategy use for reasonable level of comprehension. They spent most of their time for trying to decode, repeating phrases or words, and could not establish links between information, and monitor their interpretation and understanding.

Tsai states (2012) that reading in EFL context is a complex process that requires both lower-level and higher-level processing skills and interaction between L1 and L2 plays an important role in this process. According to Block (1986), EFL readers did not show differences in terms of strategies or patterns of strategies they had used from those of native speakers of English. In other words, second language readers bring with them their knowledge of reading process and of approaches and apply these to specific language features in the text. Therefore, it can be said that development of strategy use does not seem to depend on language specific features. That is, some aspects of reading ability can be transferred from one language to another.

According to Ediger (2001) fluent readers have the following components and use them in their process of reading: they recognize the words in print and get the meaning; by using their structural knowledge they form a mental notion of the topic; in order to make predictions and form hypothesis, they use their background knowledge and schemata in addition to the semantic and syntactic information from the text; later, they use their meta-cognitive knowledge to reflect on their reading process. They, also, use various strategies before, during and after reading. Some of these strategies may involve using background knowledge to compensate the lack of knowledge, changing the reading speed by slowing down, rereading the text or part of the text, or looking or key words. Ediger (2001) states that ELL students must

improve their reading ability in a way that orchestrate all of these elements together simultaneously and rapidly in order to be fluent.

In his study in which the relationship among learning styles, learning motivation and reading strategy use is investigated, Tsai (2012) indicates that there are significant differences between skilled and less skilled readers on their motivation and reading strategy use. That is, skilled readers can use more strategies within various categories to improve their comprehension whereas less skilled ones do not utilize as many strategies as skilled counterparts, which may result in lower achievement. Moreover, although there was a strong correlation between motivation and reading strategies in terms of reading comprehension, there was no correlation between learning styles and reading performance. Finally, according to the data, learning styles, motivation and reading strategies were inter-correlated with each other while reading strategies were highly correlated with learning styles and motivation.

Tsai's (2012) study shows positive effect of reading strategy instruction on EFL reading comprehension. When their findings are examined it is evident that since reading strategies are significantly correlated with learning styles, a program designed in accordance with learners' learning styles may be more supportive.

As it can be understood from the above literature review, reading has received great interest and has been researched deeply. In every context researchers have tried to define the concepts related to reading and proposed various approaches. They have examined the reading processes and characteristics of readers in L1 contexts and begun to use their knowledge on L1 to investigate L2 reading. They have found out that these two contexts have different features. Also, researchers have investigated the characteristics of successful and less successful readers in order to find out the way we read in the pursuit of forming a general approach. Moreover, they have diagnosed the variables affecting the success and level of comprehension. This has provided useful knowledge and researchers have found out that more successful learners use strategies more effectively and efficiently than less successful ones.

1.3.8.7. Reading strategy classifications

Having found a relationship between successful reading and reading strategies, researchers have tried to classify the reading strategies. This has resulted in the identification of the strategies used by learners and researchers tried to classify the reading strategies either as part of language learners' strategies or reading strategies alone.

When looked at the literature to find out reading strategies, several classification systems can be found. Some researchers have classified them according to the reading stage they are employed whereas others have classified them, as part of the language learning strategies, according to their function such as cognitive, metacognitive, or affective. Moreover, it is also possible to see that some other researchers have classified them according to their role such as supportive or problem solving strategies while some others have just named the strategies used during reading. In short, there are several ways researchers have used to name or organize reading strategies. However, no matter which system has been utilized, more or less the same strategies have been identified by researchers.

One of the most comprehensive classifications of reading strategies is done by Oxford (1990) who has several works on language learners' strategy use. Most of the reading strategies chosen for reading strategy instructions are either directly taken or adapted from her studies. As part of her classification system of language learner strategies, she names reading strategies and classifies them according to their function.

Throughout the reading process it is mostly accepted that there are three main reading activities: pre-, while-, and post-reading activities. Researchers like Grabe and Stoller (2001), Wallace (1992), and Zang (2008) organize reading strategies in terms of pre-, during-, and post-reading stages.

Grabe and Stoller (2001) state that pre-reading instruction stimulates students' background knowledge, provides general information about the text, sets up students' expectations; arouse interest and models strategies for students. Text title,

headings, subheadings, illustrations, captions, and sections can be used for previewing and getting a general understanding of the text.

During-reading instructions leads students during reading process and have them focus on the difficult parts, make sense of complex sentences, pay attention to the relationships among ideas or characters, and read purposefully and strategically. Outlining or summarization of the text, examining emotions and attitudes of key characters, identifying difficulty, finding the possible pays of clarification, finding answers are some of the activities used in this stage. Students can also find answers for the questions posed in the pre-reading stage and make predictions about what will come next in this stage.

Post-reading instruction extends ideas and information from the text; ensure the understanding of major and supporting ideas. Completing graphic organizers such as tables and charts, and grids with the information obtained from the text, extending and changing the semantic map prepared in earlier stages, listing the information according to the importance, and answering questions for comprehension are some commonly used activities during this stage.

In a more recent study which was conducted as a reading strategy instruction with Chinese students, Zang (2008) classified the reading strategies according to these three stages of reading. For pre-reading stage, he selected previewing, predicting content, and scanning for highlighted words or expressions. For while-reading stage, he selected reading heading, subheadings and so on, self-questioning, self-monitoring, focusing on meaning, relating meaning to what is already known, reviewing main ideas after each chunk of reading, asking how the main idea or purpose is related to previous paragraph, looking for familiar affixes and roots in unknown vocabulary, using context to make inferences, identifying main ideas and supporting details, and identifying organizational patterns of text. For post-reading stage he selected evaluating reading, giving personal response, reviewing to summarize text meaning, checking effectiveness in strategy use.

However, these kinds of strategy classes are not free from some problems. First of all, it is not possible to put strategies into strict classes. Because one strategy put in a

class or stage may be utilized in another one as well. That is, there is not a linear hierarchy. In addition, one strategy used in L1 may not be beneficial in L2 setting.

Which strategy we should use and how to use or combine it with other strategies is determined by the context and the task at hand. As Grellet (1994) states, we use different reading strategies for different tasks. For example, reading an advertisement differs from reading a novel in terms of the strategies used. He states that competent reader has the ability to differentiate the relevant information from irrelevant information. Besides researchers such as Singhal (2011) state that in terms of strategy use there are differences between more successful and less successful readers. She, also, states that there exist a tight relationship between the level of readers' proficiency and his/her use of reading strategies. In accordance with the findings of studies on language learning strategies in general, successful or high proficient readers both seem to use more strategies than the less successful ones and they also know how and when to apply those strategies. In other words they have more metacognitive awareness of their strategy use. According to Singhal (2011: 9) "there is a close relationship between reading strategies used by readers, metacognitive awareness, and reading proficiency". But which strategies should be taught at which levels of instruction is not clearly stated. But on the other hand, according to Haynes and Zacarian (2010), six reading strategies should be taught in all levels: visualizing, activating background knowledge, asking mental questions, inference, determining the importance of information in a text, and synthesizing information.

There are also other classifications given by the researchers such as Brown (2001) and Erler and Finkbeiner (2007). According to them there are two major strategy classes used during the process of reading: top-down and bottom-up. Top-down processes are higher level processes such as using background knowledge or schemata and getting the meaning from the whole text. Bottom-up processes are lower-level processes using words and phrases to understand the text and there are always successful readers and less successful readers. In addition, as to Brown (2001: 306-310), strategies for reading comprehension are: identifying the purpose of reading, using graplemic rules and patterns to aid in bottom-up decoding, using

efficient silent reading techniques for relatively rapid comprehension, skimming the text for main ideas, scanning the text for specific information, using semantic mapping or clustering, guessing when you are not certain, analysing vocabulary, distinguishing between literal and implied meanings, and capitalize on discourse markers to process relationship.

What has come out as a result of these strategy classification studies is that strategies playing an important role in the development of language proficiency can be taught systematically. Because as Grabe and Stoller (2001: 195) argue, strategic readers understand the goal of reading, have a variety of strategies which they apply effectively in combinations, can monitor comprehension and identify problematic parts and repair effectively. Thus, they point out that "a major goal for academic reading instruction is the development of strategic readers". With classified strategy groups at hand strategy based instruction have been developed. Researchers have begun to propose different frameworks and approaches for reading strategy instruction.

1.3.8.8. Reading strategy instruction

After decades of hard work, it has been found out that reading can be improved successfully by teaching appropriate strategies as well as when, where, why, and how to apply them. There have been various opinions about the way reading instruction should take. Mostly debate took place around whether the instruction should be explicitly or implicitly taught. That is, should students be aware that they are being taught or not. However, data obtained from language strategy studies showed us that explicit teaching and metacognition play a significant role in this kind of instruction. Carrell (1985) points out that students' reading comprehension can be improved by teaching top-level rhetorical organization of texts explicitly and overtly since this might help them recall the topics, subtopics, and supporting details more easily. As to Casanave (1988), successful reading comprehension depends both on readers' ability to access appropriate content and formal schema, and their ability to observe their understanding and to take appropriate strategic actions when needed. In another study, Yaylı (2010: 244) argues, proficient readers use more cognitive and

metacognitive strategies than less-proficient readers, although both groups use mainly the same strategy types.

By taking these opinions into consideration, for successful instruction students should be aware of what they are learning. It should not be forgotten that all these language learning strategy issues began in search of better learners. Decades ago, classical classrooms and methods were not responding to the needs of modern learners. And people were looking at the ways to make classrooms more student-centered. Then, with a shift from teacher directed learning environments to individualized learning, people began to examine good language learners. Today, teachers are wanted to be facilitators during the learning process not the directors, controlling the way learners learn. Also, for more individualized learning learners should take their own responsibility in this process. In this respect, metacognition, which means preparation, planning, monitoring and evaluating, plays an important role. Metacognition can be divided into five categories all of which interact with each other.

1. Preparing and planning for effective reading
2. Deciding when to use particular reading strategies,
3. Knowing how to monitor reading strategy use,
4. Knowing how to orchestrate various reading strategy use,
5. Evaluating reading strategy use (Anderson, 2003: 10).

It is understood that in its nature any instruction of strategies should be explicit and include metacognitive dimension for better results.

1.3.8.9. Types of reading strategy instruction

One of the early studies on systematic strategy training was conducted by Palinscar and Brown (1984) who introduced the reciprocal method. According to this method teachers and students work together and discuss about a text in turns. First, students are given an informative text, then it is worked on in a discussion during which strategy instruction takes plays. In this method, teacher leads the process by modelling how to use the strategies. In time, teacher lessens the degree of scaffolding and students gradually take the control and responsibility. Questioning, clarifying,

summarizing and predicting were the four strategies used in this method. According to Palinscar and Brown (1984) this method is effective in improving the students' performance on reading and listening tasks.

Another reading strategy instruction framework is developed by McNamara (2004) named Self-Explanation Reading Training (SERT) to teach readers to use active reading strategies (comprehension monitoring, paraphrasing, elaboration, logic or common sense, predictions, and bridging) with the aim of improving general reading comprehension and overall class performance by self-explaining. That is, students learn to self-explain the text and they learn the reading strategies that help this process. There are three phrases in SERT training: introduction, demonstration and practice.

Introduction stage includes definitions and examples of reading strategies associated with self-explanation. In the second stage, by being modelled the use of strategies, readers are expected to understand the strategies and learn how to implement them. In the final phrase, students work in pairs to practice the SERT strategies while instructors assist and monitor the students. Mcnamara et al., (2006) state that by combining self-explanation training and metacognitive reading strategy training, it is aimed at improving the learners' self-explaining ability of science texts with SERT.

But SERT was very time-consuming to implement and brings extra burden on teachers. According to Mcnamara (2009), they have to learn the strategies and how to teach them, and converting the content materials for training takes time. Another difficulty was adapting the training according to the individuals' needs of students. Finally providing practice opportunities was very problematic. For these reasons, they have automated the core components of SERT, and designed Interactive Strategy Training for Active Reading and Thinking (iSTART) which also has three stages similar to SERT. Introductory explanation stage of iSTART provides training on self-explanation and reading strategies with definitions and examples of the strategies, and makes use of animated agents. The demonstration module of iSTART, shows the techniques in action. Two animated agents demonstrate the use of strategies in the context of science passage and the trainee identifies the strategies. In

the final phase, namely practice phase, trainee practices the self-explanation using the repertoire of strategies and animated agents coaches and gives feedback to the trainee by asking the trainee to modify the unsatisfactory points.

More recently, Macaro and Erler (2008) conducted a strategy instruction program with 62 11-12 year-olds during 14 months. The instruction had these five steps: awareness raising and modelling of strategies, scaffolded practice, removal of scaffolding, and evaluation of attitudes towards reading. Their results suggest that through instruction learners' comprehension of both simple and more elaborate texts increased, changes occurred in the way they use strategies and their attitudes towards reading improved. Students began to use strategies in combination and they become more self-autonomous.

Another well-known and commonly applied instruction framework is Metacognitive Strategy Training (MST). According to Carrell, Pharis and Liberto (1989) metacognition is an important aspect of strategic reading. When learners are conscious of their own progress, it is highly likely to achieve long lasting results. In their study in which they applied semantic mapping and Experience-Text-Relationship methods, they found out that metacognitive strategy training in these methods were affective in developing second language reading. There are innumerable studies on meta-cognition. And citing all of them in this study is impossible. Yet, more recently Zhang and Sirinthron (2012) have found out that MST is effective in enhancing students' academic reading comprehension. They suggest that explicit MST had better take place in the early stages of students' reading ability development process. Secondly, teachers should implement MST explicitly and systematically by employing whole sets of strategies rather than teaching them one-by-one. Explicit instruction of metacognitive strategies will help students develop self-control over their own reading process and consider the possible ways of improving their reading ability. Here journals can play an important role. Fourthly, vocabulary teaching in EFL reading should be given more attention since students believe that the more vocabulary they have, the more effective they acquire strategies. Finally, both quantitative and qualitative tools should be integrated into the research design to enable triangulation.

2. AIM AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

2.1. Aim of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the language learning style preferences, reading strategy use and language proficiency levels of 87 students attending 11th grade classes in Dr. Mete Ersoy Anatolian High School, Milas, Turkey and it is also in the scope of this study to investigate any possible relationships between reading strategy training and development of their reading skills in connection with their learning styles, their use of certain reading strategies and proficiency levels.

2.2. Significance of the Study

Although there are quite a lot of studies on learning styles and learning strategies, there are relatively fewer studies dealing with the relationship between strategy training and development of reading skills of high school students in connection with language learners' learning styles, strategy preferences and proficiency levels.

This study was expected to lead teachers to understand and learn about their students' different learning styles and strategies that they bring into the classroom setting.

In addition, teachers can decide whether it is necessary to tailor his/her own teaching styles according to the learning styles and strategy use of students or not. If necessary, when, how and to what degree this adjustment should be can be determined by using the data that this study will yield.

Also, it was expected that this study would provide data on the reading strategies used by the EFL students in Turkish context and provide a framework for reading strategy instruction as well as necessary materials for such intervention classes. Besides, by identifying the possible relationships among learning styles, preferred

reading strategies and the effect of reading strategy training, this study could provide a basis for further studies.

2.3. Research Questions

Research questions were addressed as follows:

1. What are the learning styles of 11th graders in Dr. Mete Ersoy Anatolian High School before and after the reading strategy training?
2. What are preferred reading strategies of 11th graders in Dr. Mete Ersoy Anatolian High School before reading strategy training?
3. Is there any relationship between students' learning styles, their preferred reading strategies and strategy training?
4. Is there a difference in the development of reading skills of 11th grade high school students before and after the implementation of reading strategy training?

2.4. Limitation of the Study

This study, during which the data was collected in the both first and second term of 2012-2013 education year, was not free from some limitations. First of all, this study was specific to Turkish context and could not be generalized. Moreover, the students taking part in the study were not chosen randomly from the 11th grade population, but rather, the ones attending 11th grade English classes in Dr. Mete Ersoy Anatolian High School were chosen.

In addition, students' L1 reading proficiency and L1 reading strategies were not investigated. As a result, the effect of L1 reading proficiency and strategy use on L2 couldn't be investigated. Whether students understand a specific strategy because of his/her being familiar with it from his/her L1 strategy repertoire could not be identified, either.

In addition, only six reading strategies were chosen for this study. Although they were taught not only as individual strategies but as strategy clusters, it is for sure that this number may not be enough to reach a generalization. Besides, 8-week time for such kind of strategy training may be short. That is, the timespan for this study may not be enough to yield more sound data.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study was designed to identify the language learning style preferences, reading strategy use and proficiency levels of the students at 11th grade in an Anatolian high school in Turkey as an experimental study. It, also, aimed to examine the relationship between reading strategy instruction and students' preferred language learning styles, reading strategy use and their proficiency levels.

3.2. Sampling

Purposive sampling design was used in the scope of the study and the participants of this study were 65 11th grade students from Dr. Mete Ersoy Anatolian High School, Milas, Turkey. They entered in this school by taking the national entrance examination, that is, there were not many differences in terms of their academic achievements. Moreover, they had completed the CEFR A1 and A2 levels in 9th and 10th grades and were supposed to study B1 level.

Of the three 11th grade classes taking part in, one was chosen as the experimental group (SB) in which the reading strategy training would be conducted whereas the others would be the control groups (SC, SA). SB and SC were mainly studying numeric-science which means they had lessons mainly related to positive science such as Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics, Biology and Turkish. On the other hand, students in SA were studying Mathematics, Geometry, Turkish, Geography and History as their majors.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

In the scope of this study, it was expected to look for any indicator of the effect of strategy instruction on students' language strategy choice, learning style preferences and their proficiency levels. For this purpose, Key English Test (KET), Learning Style Survey (LSS), and Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) were used. These were credited as highly reliable and valid tools across the world. However, they were all applied to a piloting group consisting of 25 students, which was chosen among the 10th graders, to calculate the reliability coefficient before beginning the experiment. In addition, three 11th grade classes were chosen to conduct the experiment and LSS, SORS and KET were applied to all the students in these classes, too. Of the three classes chosen for this study, the two classes taught in traditional way without explicitly mentioning reading strategies were compared with the strategy instruction group in terms of the effect of strategy instruction on students preferred language learning styles, reading strategy use and proficiency levels.

KET developed by Cambridge University Press used all across the world was applied before and after the strategy instruction to all three classes. Nevertheless, since this study was carried out in Turkey with EFL students, the test first was applied to a piloting group. As a result of the statistical analysis, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for item reliability of KET was found as .76. When looked at the reliability of KET in all three groups before and after the experiment the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was .86. By applying this test both before and after the treatment, enough data were obtained to juxtapose the students according to their proficiency level and also it would became possible to comment on any relationship between reading strategy instruction and students' proficiency levels.

To identify the students' learning style preferences and their strategy use, LSS developed by Cohen, Oxford and Chi (2005) was chosen. The survey consist of 110 items with five-point Likert scale ranging from 0= never, 1= rarely, 2= sometimes, 3= often and 4= always. With eleven major activities representing twelve different aspects of learning styles, LSS is designed to assess the general approach to learning and indicate the overall style preference. In other words it only gives a general

description of someone's learning style preferences, an idea of their tendencies when they learn. There is not a total point but instead each aspect is measured independently from each other. As a result of the statistical analysis of the data obtained from the piloting group, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for item reliability was .895 and its sub group reliability was calculated as .85. From the treatment and control groups reliability analysis of LSS .91 for sub groups and .94 for items.

Before beginning the strategy training students were asked to complete the LSS survey developed by Cohen et al., 2002, and translated into Turkish by researcher and then the expert opinion from the professionals studying in English Language Teaching (ELT) field was obtained. After that the learning style preferences of each student in three classrooms were identified in all eleven dimensions. The data obtained from this survey is summarized in Table 1. Instead of giving each individual student's style preferences the results indicate the number of students (n) in each style dimension and their percentages (%) in comparison to total number of students in that classroom. It would not be wrong to say that the preferences have been given as the dominant preferences of students not as the exact and sole ones. This means that students still have, to some degree or equally, the other styles or style on the other end of the dichotomy. Some of the students stated two equal style preferences on a part. In this case while computing the *n* and *%* of the styles, these students' style preferences were computed as two single differences. For example, the n number of SC is 23. Nevertheless, when the given n numbers in part 2 for the extraverted (12 students) and introverted (12 students) styles are added together, it makes 24 which exceeds the total n of this class. 24 means that 1 student in this classroom has equal style preferences in this part.

SORS by Kouider Mokhtari ve Ravi Sheorey (2002) were chosen as it is used in many studies studies both across the world and in Turkey. This survey provides information about the various strategies used when reading school-related academic materials in English such as course book, examinations etc. It consists of 30 statements with 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1= never and 5= always and these 30 items gives information about the frequency of reading strategy use when reading academic materials in three subgroups: global, problem solving and support

reading strategies. Also, overall average indicates how often reading strategies are used in general. A low score on any of the subscales or parts of the inventory indicates that there may be some strategies need to be studied. Statistical analysis of the SORS results from piloting group, the Cronbach's Alpha value was .90 for each item and .93 for subgroups and overall strategy values.

In order to be able make comparisons, these two instruments were applied to all groups both before and after the strategy instruction.

3.4. Procedure

The main purposes of this study were to find out (1) learning styles and language learning strategy use of the students, from Dr. Mete Ersoy Anatolian High, Milas, Muğla, before and after the reading strategy instruction; (2) to examine the relationships between students preferred learning style preferences and their language learning strategy use; (3) the effect of reading strategy instruction on students' reading proficiency levels; and (4) to find out whether there is a difference in the development of reading skills of the students before and after the implementation of reading strategy instruction.

The study was designed and carried out with three classes. Two of these classes were chosen as control groups and they had not given any specific instruction on reading strategies. The third class was chosen as the instruction group and given a reading strategy instruction during eight weeks.

There were two phases in this study: (1) data collection phase including data collection on learning style preferences, learning strategy use, and proficiency levels both before and after the implementation of strategy instruction; and (2) reading strategy instruction phase consisting of choosing appropriate materials; implementation; and obtaining data from students' journals and teacher's logs.

In the first phrase all the necessary data were collected and analyzed in terms of frequencies and percentages. Then students were told about the scope of the study.

In the second phase of this study, one of the most crucial things was to determine the strategies to be taught and the materials appropriate for the instruction of these strategies. Also, choosing a framework for the instruction was very significant since almost all the researchers argue that it is the most important part of strategy based instruction.

In accordance with the data obtained from SORS, the strategies predicting, making inferences, translating (finding patterns), summarizing, clarifying were chosen together with grouping strategy. Besides, all the activities that took part in this intervention had been orchestrated according to the framework proposed by Chamot, Anstrom, Bartoshesky, Belanger, Delett, Karwan, Meloni, and Keatley (2003) which have been created as a five-stage – preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion – guide for strategy instruction.

For each strategy, teacher-researcher first handed out informative worksheets. The materials for preparation and presentation of the strategies were adapted from the dissertation of Lee (2007) with her written consent who also studied the reading strategy instruction in the EFL context. For each strategy, a presentation paper, which was adapted according to Turkish context, was presented to the students. These presentation papers were including the information about what the strategy was; why, when, how, and where to use the strategy; how to evaluate it; and also example texts. At this stage researcher presented the usage of the strategy via a power-point presentation, worksheets or online tools. For example, during the instruction of first strategy, predicting, teacher-researcher used the materials from the book 'High-Interest: Reading Comprehension Skills & Strategies' published by Saddleback Educational Publishing in 2002.

In addition to these, for further practice, several activities for each strategy were taken from the same book (High-Interest: Reading Comprehension Skills & Strategies). Moreover, to increase the interest of the students some interactive exercises from the following address http://www.tv411.org/reading/understanding-what-you-read/strategies-better-reading/activity were used together with some presentations. For example, having realized that students were a bit bored from

studying merely paper-based materials, researcher used the online tool for the strategies such as summarizing, inferring and translation.

At the end of each lesson, students were asked to self-evaluate the strategy and the strategy instruction by filling journals originally prepared by Lee (2007). Also some other data such as the reading habits of the students in their mother tongue, their L1 reading strategies and general self-evaluation of the reading strategy instruction was obtained from these journals.

According to the literature what was important was not only to know why, where and how to use the single strategies but also to utilize the strategy clusters. In this respect, before beginning the instruction of each strategy researcher first repeated and reminded the previous strategy and during the practice stage of each strategy he wanted students to use the strategy together with the previous ones. For assessment and evaluation, students were also asked to write down the strategies either in English or Turkish since the aim was not to assess their writing ability in English. For example, when they were training about summarizing strategy, they were first asked to use the previously taught strategies and write down what they did.

Finally, since all aforementioned data collection tools have drawbacks to some degree, teacher-researcher of this study kept classroom logs for each strategy instruction class and recorded both the process and his observations of the students for triangulation.

3.5. Data Analysis

Language learning process is in itself a very complicated issue and there are lots of variables and factors affecting it. Each individual has their unique characteristics that they bring to learning environments and also almost everyone has, to varying degrees, effect on the process and outcomes of language learning. Moreover, there are many options which a learner can prefer throughout his language learning. Therefore, because of this complicated nature of language learning style preferences and language learning strategies, developed statistical analysis were avoided. The

data derived from the instruments were organized by using SPSS and the findings were examined and compared in terms of percentages and ways of changes in students' preferences. In this way and together with using the qualitative data obtained from students' journals and teacher logs, any possible relationship between treatment and control groups in terms of their language learning style preferences, reading strategy uses and their language proficiency levels were sought.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Throughout this study, first the field and content of the topic was tried to be determined. After examining the problems which are faced by students in today's classroom, language learning style preferences that each individual student brings to the learning environment were diagnosed as one of the most important variables that may affect the outcomes of our teaching and learning processes. According to the literature, if a match between teachers' teaching styles and learners' learning styles could be found, this might result in more successful learning. In the event that there might not be any kind of match, then style matching or style stretching might be the two solutions among others.

Then, it was known that students' language learning strategy uses were shaped according to their language learning style preferences. However, since researching the whole language learning strategies was not possible, reading strategies were chosen for the study since they were among the mostly investigated issues.

As the next stage the theoretical background of these topics was investigated so that more sound foundation for the study could be established. In this part, first the historical development of language teaching was mentioned. Then, literature related to language learning styles and reading strategies as well as strategy and styles and strategy based instructions were investigated. As a result of the literature review, proper strategy training was designed.

Then the data collection instruments were determined in order to obtain information about students' language style preferences, reading strategy use and language proficiency levels.

The results obtained are addressed in the following order: (1) identifying language learning style preferences before and after the implementation of strategy training; (2) identifying the preferred reading strategies by students and the effect of reading strategy training on their preferences; (3) identifying the reading proficiency levels of students and the effect of reading strategy training on them; (4) the relationship between the style preferences and strategy training.

4.1. Language Learning Style Preferences before the Implementation of Strategy Training

Table 4.1.1. shows the first six parts of LSS. According to it, the students in treatment group (SB), control group 1 (SC), and control group 2 (SA) have similar language learning style preferences in terms of using their physical senses Part 1 (How I use my physical senses). In SB, 19 (82.61%) students were visual whereas 6 (26.09%) students were auditory and 2 (8.60%) were tactile/kinesthetic. In SC, 13 (56.25%) students were visual, 9 (39.13%) students were auditory, and 2 (8.70%) students had tactile/kinesthetic style preferences. In control group 2, SA, similar figures can be seen. Here, 11 students who consisted of 68.75 % of the whole classroom were visual; 5 students who consisted of 31.25 % of the classroom were auditory; and only one student, 6.25 % of the class, had a tactile/kinesthetic style preferences. According to these figures it can be said that in all of these three classes the majority of the students were more visual than auditory or tactile/kinaesthetic.

When looked at Part 2 which shows whether the student is extraverted or introverted (Part 2: How I open myself to learning situations) more different distribution of preferences across classrooms is seen. In terms of this style dimension, students in SB were more extraverted than introverted. In this classroom, 15 (65.22%) of the students were extraverted whereas 9 (39.13%) of the students were introverted. In SC we see that equal number of students, 12, (52.17%), stated that they were extraverted or introverted whereas in SA, 11 (68.75%) of the students stated that there were more extraverted than introverted whereas 5 (31.25%) students stated they were extraverted. These results indicate that the compositions of all three classrooms in terms of students being introverted or extraverted are completely different from each other.

As to being random-intuitive or being concrete-sequential (Part 3: How I handle possibilities) the majority of students in all three classes stated that they were more random-intuitive than concrete-sequential with varying degrees. In SB out of 23 students, 15 (65.22%) were random-intuitive and 8 (34.78%) were concrete-sequential. In SC 21 (91.30%) of the students stated that they were random-intuitive

Table 4.1.1. Students Language Style Preferences Before the Implementation of Strategy Training, Parts 1-6

	Part 1 - How I Use My Physical Senses			**Part 2** - How I Open Myself to learning Situations			**Part 3** - How I Handle Possibilities			**Part 4** - How I deal with Ambiguity and with Deadlines			**Part 5** - How I Receive Information			**Part 6** - How I Further Process Information		
	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%
SB	Visual	19	82.61%	Extraverted	15	65.22%	Random In.	15	65.22%	Closure O.	19	82.61%	Global	15	65.22%	Synthesizing	20	86.95%
	Auditory	6	26.09%	Introverted	9	39.13%	Concrete Se.	8	34.78%	Open	7	30.43%	Particular	10	43.48%	Analytic	6	26.09%
	Tactile/Kinesthetic	2	8.70%															
SC	Visual	13	56.52%	Extraverted	12	52.17%	Random In.	21	91.30%	Closure O.	20	86.95%	Global	19	82.61%	Synthesizing	19	82.61%
	Auditory	9	39.13%	Introverted	12	52.17%	Concrete Se.	3	13.04%	Open	3	13.04%	Particular	10	43.48%	Analytic	4	17.39%
	Tactile/Kinesthetic	2	8.70%															
SA	Visual	11	68.75%	Extraverted	5	31.25%	Random In.	11	68.75%	Closure O.	13	81.25%	Global	13	81.25%	Synthesizing	14	87.50%
	Auditory	5	31.25%	Introverted	11	68.75%	Concrete Se.	5	31.25%	Open	6	37.50%	Particular	5	31.25%	Analytic	3	18.75%
	Tactile/Kinesthetic	1	6.25%															

*SB = Treatment Group, SC = Control Group 1, SA = Control Group 2; n = number of students, % = percentage of students

but only 3 (13.04%) of them were concrete-sequential. In SA while 11 (68.75%) of the 16 students were random-intuitive, only 5 (31.25%) students out of 16 were concrete-sequential.

The next part of this survey, Part 4 (How I approach tasks), aims to find out whether the student is closure-oriented or open. Students in all classes more or less had the same style preference in this part. They stated that they were more closure-oriented than open. In SB 19 (82.61%) students, in SC 20 (86.95%), and in SA 13 (81.25%) of the students stated that they were closure-oriented whereas 7 (30.43%) in SB, 3 (13.04%) in SC, and 6 (37.50) students in SA stated that they were open. These results indicate that in all three classes, as Cohen and Weaver (2005: 21) state, students focus carefully on most or all learning tasks, strive to meet for deadlines, plan ahead for assignments and want explicit instructions.

When the next part, Part 5 (How I receive Information), showing the students' way of receiving information – global or particular – examined, again a parallelism can be found in all groups. In SB out 23 students, 15 (65.22%) stated that they were global whereas 10 (43.48%) were particular. In SC 19 (82.61%) of the students were global while 10 (43.48%) were particular. In SA out of 16 students, 13 (81.25%) were global while 5 (31.25%) of them stated they were particular. As can be understood from the above figures majority of the students in each class seemed to be global about the way they receive information.

In the Part 6 (How I further process the information) dealing with the way students process the information further, a similar composition is seen. Of all the students, 20 (86.25%) from SB, 19 (82.61%) from SC, and 14 (87.50%) from SA stated that they were much more synthesizing than being analytic. Only 6 (26.09%) students from SB reported that they tend to be more analytic and similarly 4 (17.39) students from SC and 3 (18.75%) students from SA were analytic. According to Cohen and Weaver (2005) being more synthesizing means that students can be able to summarize well, enjoy guessing meanings, predict outcomes and notice similarities quickly whereas being more analytic means to be able to pull the ideas apart, do logical analysis and tend to focus on grammatical structures.

Table 4.1.2. Students Language Style Preferences Before the Implementation of Strategy Training, Parts 7-11

	Part 7 - How I Commit Material to Memory			**Part 8** - How I Deal with Language Rules			**Part 9** - How I Deal with Multiple Inputs			**Part 10** - How I Deal with Response Time			**Part 11** - How Literally I Take Reality		
	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%
SB	Sharpener	16	69.57%	Deductive	18	78.26%	Field Ind.	14	60.87%	Impulsive	5	21.73%	Metaphoric	17	73.91%
	Leveler	9	39.13%	Inductive	7	30.43%	Field Dep.	11	47.83%	Reflective	20	86.96%	Literal	15	65.21%
SC	Sharpener	15	65.21%	Deductive	14	60.87%	Field Ind.	16	69.57%	Impulsive	3	13.04%	Metaphoric	16	65.57%
	Leveler	11	47.83%	Inductive	10	43.48%	Field Dep.	11	47.83%	Reflective	22	95.65%	Literal	12	52.17%
SA	Sharpener	10	43.48%	Deductive	12	75.00%	Field Ind.	9	56.25%	Impulsive	1	6.25%	Metaphoric	8	50.00%
	Leveler	8	34.78%	Inductive	7	43.75%	Field Dep.	8	50.00%	Reflective	15	93.75%	Literal	10	62.50%

*SB = Treatment Group, SC = Control Group 1, SA = Control Group 2; n = number of students, % = percentage of students

In Table 4.1.2. the data about the other parts of LSS, parts 7-11, can be examined.

Part 7 (How I commit material to memory) determines whether the student is a sharpener or a leveler. The former identifies students as a person who can notice and distinguish differences and retrieve details whereas the latter assumes ones who can see similarities. In SB of the 23 students, 16 (69.57%) tended to be more sharpener whereas 9 (39.13%) of them were more leveler. In SC there was relatively similar situation of the 23 students there, 15 (65.21%) were sharpener while 11 (47.83%) were leveler. In SA less number of students stated that they were more sharpeners. In this class 10 (43.48%) students were sharpener whereas 8 (34.78%) students were levelers. From this data, it can be understood that in all three classroom the dominant style preference was being sharpener but with varying percentages.

Part 8 (How I deal with language rules) aims to put forward as Leaver, Erhman and Shekhtman (2005) stated whether you use examples to figure out the rules (induction) or use rules to identify and understand examples (deduction). Both in treatment group and in control groups, the majority of students stated that they were more deductive than inductive. That is, they apply generalizations to experience and like to start with rules. In SB 18 (78.26%) of the students stated that they were more deductive whereas 7 (30.43%) of them stated that they were more inductive. In SC 14 (60.87%) of the students were deductive and 10 (43.48%) of them were inductive. Similarly, in SA 12 (75%) students were deductive and 7 (43.75%) of them were inductive.

When we examined how students deal with multiple inputs in Part 9 (How I deal with multiple inputs), in other words, within a given context, whether students can separate and abstract material and less effected from distractors (field-independent) or have difficulty to work with distractors and deal with information in a more holistic way (field-dependent). Again, there can be seen a parallelism among three classes. From their answers it was seen that in SB 14 (60.87%) students were field-independent whereas 11 (47.83%) were field-dependent. In SC, 16 (69.57%) of the total 23 students were field-independent and 11 (47.83%) were field-dependent. In SA 9 (56.25%) students were field-independent and 8 (50%) of them were field-

dependent. In this part the number of students who had two style preferences equally was higher than the previous parts, especially in SB and SC.

Another learning style preference issue is whether you are an impulsive which means you think and response almost simultaneously or a reflective one who takes time and thinks before taking action. This part (Part 10: How I deal with response time) diagnose this. In all three classrooms according to the results of the LSS questionnaire, students were found to be reflective. In SB, only 5 (21.73%) of the students identified themselves as being impulsive whereas 20 (86.96%) of them were identified as being more reflective. In SC, 22 (95.65%) students were reflective whereas 3 (13.04%) were impulsive. Similarly, in SA, only 1 (6.25) student was impulsive while 15 (93.75) were reflective.

Finally, in the last part (Part 11: How literally I take reality) the survey identifies you a metaphoric learner or a literal one. If you are a literal learner you prefer to learn more or less on the surface. That is, you prefer relatively a literal representation of concepts. But if you are a metaphoric learner you can deal with metaphorical terms and develop and apply a metaphor. In SB 17 (73.91%) students were metaphoric whereas 15 (65.21%) were literal. These numbers show us that 9 students stated equal preference in this class. In SC, 16 (65.57%) students were metaphoric while 12 (52.17%) were literal and in SA, 8 (50%) students were metaphoric while 10 (62.50%) were literal.

Above results show us that except from parts 2 and 11, in all parts all classrooms more or less had the same composition in terms of students' preferred learning styles.

4.2. Language Learning Style Preferences after the Implementation of Reading Strategy Training

Language learning style preferences of the students after the implementation of reading strategy training are given in Tables 4.2.1. and 4.2.2.

Table 4.2.1. Students Language Style Preferences After the Implementation of Strategy Training, Parts 1-6

	Part 1 - How I Use My Physical Senses			**Part 2** - How I Expose Myself to learning Situations			**Part 3** - How I Handle Possibilities			**Part 4** - How I deal with Ambiguity and with Deadlines			**Part 5** - How I Receive Information			**Part 6** - How I Further Process Information		
	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%
SB	Visual	15	65.22%	Extraverted	13	56.52%	Random In.	17	73.91%	Closure O.	20	86.96%	Global	20	86.96%	Synthesizing	20	86.94%
	Auditory	5	21.74%	Introverted	11	47.82%	Concrete Se.	6	26.08%	Open	3	13.04%	Particular	4	17.4	Analytic	6	26.08%
	Tactile/Kinesthetic	3	13.04%															
SC	Visual	16	69.57%	Extraverted	13	56.52%	Random In.	19	82.61%	Closure O.	20	86.96%	Global	19	82.61%	Synthesizing	17	73.91%
	Auditory	8	34.78%	Introverted	13	56.52%	Concrete Se.	5	21.74%	Open	5	21.74	Particular	7	30.43%	Analytic	9	39.13%
	Tactile/Kinesthetic	4	17.39%															
SA	Visual	12	75%	Extraverted	9	56.25%	Random In.	12	75%	Closure O.	11	68.75%	Global	12	75%	Synthesizing	13	81.25%
	Auditory	3	18.75%	Introverted	7	43.75%	Concrete Se.	5	31.25%	Open	7	43.75%	Particular	5	31.25%	Analytic	5	31.25%
	Tactile/Kinesthetic	3	18.75%															

*SB = Treatment Group, SC = Control Group 1, SA = Control Group 2; n = number of students, % = percentage of students

Table 4.2.1. shows the language style preferences of students in the first six parts after the implementation of reading strategy training. When it is examined, in terms of Part 1, it is found out that students had similar tendencies about using their physical senses. Like pre-implementation results, the majority of the students in all classrooms were dominantly more visual than being auditory or tactile kinesthetic. In SB, 65.22% of the students were visual, in SB this rate was 69.57% and in SA it was 75%. Besides, 21.74% of the students in SB were auditory. In SC, this rate was 34.78% and in SA it was 18.75%. When compared to the pre-implementation results it can be seen that in all three classes there were less students who stated being auditory. As to tactile and kinesthetic style preferences, although this style was the least preferred one in all three classes as was in the pre-implementation stage, the percentages in all classrooms were considerably higher than the pre-implementation. Of the 23 students in SB 3 (13.04%) had tactile kinesthetic style preference. In SC 4 students (17.39%) had the same preference and in SA this number was 3 students (18.75%).

In Part 2 related to being extraverted or introverted, before the implementation of the study in SB and SC the majority of students were extraverted whereas in SA the majority were introverted. However, according to the post-implementation results in all three classrooms the majority of the students declared themselves as being more extraverted than being introverted. In SB, 56.52%, in SC, 56.52% and in SA 56.25% of the students were extraverted whereas in SB 47.82%, in SC 56.52% and in SA 43.75% of the students were introverted. What is interesting is that according to these data, within the treatment group, SB, there was a decrease in the number of extraverted students whereas there were increases in control groups, SC and SA. On the other hand, while the number of students who were introverted increased in SB, the control group, and SC, one of the treatments groups, there was a decrease within the other control group SA.

When we examined, Part 3, we see that there was not many difference among the three classes in terms of their prevailing way of handling the possibilities before and after the implementation of strategy training. Majority of students in all classes regarded themselves as more random initiative than concrete sequential in both pre

and post materials. Nevertheless, there were some changes. According to the post treatment results, 73.91% of the students in SB were random initiative whereas this figure had been 65.22% before the treatment, which means an increase occurred. In SC, 82.61% of the students were random initiative after the 8-week period but 91.30% of the students had stated that they had been random initiative beforehand. When we looked at SA, there was an increase in the number of students. Before the 8-week period, 68.75% of students had been random initiative while this figure had risen to 75% after this period. As to being concrete sequential, in SB, 26.08% of 23 students stated that they were concrete sequential after the treatment, which means there was a decrease when compared to pre-treatment period. In SC, 21.74% of the students and in SA, 31.25% of the students were concrete sequential after the 8-week period. Thus, there was an increase in the number students who were concrete sequential in SC whereas there was no change in SA.

In Part 4, again there was not a significant difference in terms of prevailing style preference. Both before and after the implementation of reading strategy training, closure oriented style preference by far the most stated one. Yet, this style dimension was not free from some small changes. For example, in SB, the percentage of open students decreased from 30.43% to 13.04% although the percentage of closure oriented students increased slightly from 82.61% before the implementation to 86.96% after the implementation. In SC, the percentage of closure oriented students was almost equal before and after the implementation (86.95% before and 86.96% after). But, it increased to 21.74% from 13.04% at the of the 8-week period. As to SA, in terms of closure oriented style, there was a situation contrary to the one in SB and SC where there was not much change. In this class, initially the percentage of closure oriented students had been 81.25% but it decreased to 68.75% at the end of the period. On the other hand, the number of open students increased to 7 which consisted the 43.75% of the whole class. When these data were analyzed, it can be said that in terms of closure oriented style preference there was not a similarity among the three classes taking part in this study. However, in terms of open style preference in contrary to the control groups which showed an increase in the number

of students, there was a decrease in treatment group which may be said to be related to the treatment since the control groups differed similarly from this group.

When the next part, Part 5, examined, it can be seen that there was not a particular pattern in which control groups showed similar tendencies whereas the treatment group showed different results. In all three groups, the dominant preference was being more global than particular as to how they receive information both before and after the implementation of reading strategy training. In SB, the percentage of global students was 86.96% which means there was a significant increase in the number of students who changed their preferences after the implementation but before the treatment, it was 65.22%. In SC, it was 82.61% which was the same in the pre-treatment results. In SA, the percentage dropped to 75% from 81.25% after the end of 8-week period. But since we cannot see similar tendency in SC, it may not be correct to reach a conclusion about this style. When we looked at the particular students, we see decreases in SB and SC in the numbers of students whereas same number of students preferred to be particular in SA. In SB, the percentage of particular students dropped to 17.40% from 43.48 and in SC it was to 30.43% from 43.48%. On the other hand, both before and after the period 31.25% of the students were particular in SA.

The other part was related to the way of processing information further and was determining whether the students were synthesizing or analytic. When the data obtained from both before and after the implementation of strategy training, it can be seen that in this style dimension the control groups had similar figures but the experiment group differed from them in terms of the way of change even though the majority of students in all classes were synthesizing both before and after the training. However, the percentages of students who were synthesizing in SC had dropped to 73.91% from 82.61% and in SA to 81.25% from 87.50%. On the other hand the number of students who were synthesizing remained the same as was in pre-treatment in SB. As to, being analytic, again the percentage of students was the same in SB both before and after the experiment. Yet, they increased to 39.13% in SC and 31.25% in SA. By taking this into consideration what caused SB remained

the same may be the strategy training we applied and the strategies used in treatment since the control groups had showed similar tendencies.

Table 4.2.2. shows students' language style preferences after the implementation of strategy training for parts 7-11.

Part 7 includes two styles which are related to committing the materials to memory. According to the post-training results, the percentage of sharpener students in SB (from 69.57% to 60.87%) and SC (from 65.21% to 52.17%) decreased when compared to pre-training results. However, in SA the percentage of sharpener students rose to 68.75% from 43.45%. When leveler students were examined, in all three classes, the percentages of leveler students had risen. In SB it was 52.17% which means that it increased but still less than the percentage of sharpener students in the same class. In control groups, it had risen to 82.61% in SC, and to 75% in SA. In both of these classes, the number of leveler students not only increased considerably but also outnumbered the sharpener students. At the end of the 8-week period, the controls groups consisted of more leveler students than sharpener ones whereas although there was an increase in the number of leveler students, in experiment group consisted of more sharpener students than levelers.

Part 8 was about how students deal with language rules. That is, whether they were using deductive or inductive approach while dealing with rules of language. In SB, the percentage of deductive students increased (to 86.96%) at the end of the training period while the percentage of inductive students decreased (to 26.08%). In SC, both the percentages of deductive and inductive students increased at the end of the 8-week period. The percentage of deductive students was 69.75% whereas it had been 60.87% before; and the percentage of inductive students was 47.82% after the training while it was 43.48% before. In SA, there was a similar situation as in SB. The number of deductive students increased (from 75% to 87.50%) while the number of inductive students (from 43.75% to 25%) decreased. To sum up it is not possible to reach a conclusion from this data about the way students deal with language rules Since there was not consistency in which there was a resemblance between the two control groups whereas experiment group had a different composition.

Table 4.2.2. Students Language Style Preferences After the Implementation of Strategy Training, Parts 7-11

	Part 7 - How I Commit Material to Memory			**Part 8** - How I Deal with Language Rules			**Part 9** - How I Deal with Multiple Inputs			**Part 10** - How I Deal with Response Time			**Part 11** - How Literally I Take Reality		
	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%	Style	n	%
SB	Sharpener	14	60.87%	Deductive	20	86.96%	Field Ind.	11	47.82%	Impulsive	2	8.70%	Metaphoric	15	65.22%
	Leveler	12	52.17%	Inductive	6	26.08%	Field Dep.	15	65.22%	Reflective	22	95.65%	Literal	7	30.43%
SC	Sharpener	12	52.17%	Deductive	16	69.75%	Field Ind.	15	65.22%	Impulsive	1	4.35%	Metaphoric	18	78.26%
	Leveler	19	82.61%	Inductive	11	47.82%	Field Dep.	11	47.82%	Reflective	22	95.65%	Literal	10	43.47%
SA	Sharpener	11	68.75%	Deductive	14	87.50%	Field Ind.	10	62.50%	Impulsive	2	12.50%	Metaphoric	13	81.25%
	Leveler	12	75%	Inductive	4	25%	Field Dep.	10	62.50%	Reflective	15	93.75%	Literal	3	18.75%

*SB = Treatment Group, SC = Control Group 1, SA = Control Group 2; n = number of students, % = percentage of students

In Part 9 provided data about whether students deal with the multiple inputs as field dependently or field independently. Data obtained from pre-training instrument had showed that in all three classes most of the students were field independent. But according to the post-training instruments the situation was different. In SB, the percentage of the field independent students dropped to 47.83% from 60.87% and the percentage of field dependent students rose to 65.22% from 47.83. In SC, while the percentage of filed independent students dropped to 65.22% from 69.57% the percentage of the field dependent students remained same as 47.83%. As to SA, the percentage of field independent students rose to 62.50% and likewise the percentage of field dependent students rose to 62.50%. In this respect, since there were inconsistent differences among three classes, it may not be possible to reach any conclusion in terms of the effect of reading strategy training on field dependent and independent style dimensions. However, it may be worth saying that, although there were less field dependent students in all classes predominantly before the implementation of reading strategy training, only in SB there were more field dependent students than field independent ones after the reading strategy training.

Part 10 supplied information about whether students prefer to response immediately or they took their time before replying, that is, whether they were impulsive or reflective. In terms of impulsive students, after the reading strategy training there were decreases in SB and SC whereas the number of impulsive students increased in SA. The percentage of impulsive students in SB dropped to 8.70% from 21.73%, and in SC, to 4.35% from 13.04%. On the other hand, it rose to 12.50% from 6.25% in SA. Since these results were not consistent, it may not be correct to mention any possible effect of reading strategy training on this style dimension. As to reflective students, the percentage of them rose to 95.65% from 86.96% in SB. On the other hand, there were no change in the number of students who declared themselves more reflective in SC and SA and the numbers were the same before and after the implementation of 8-week period. That is, although the number of students who were impulsive had changed, there was no change in this style dimension in the two control groups. Thus, since similar a pattern was observed in the both control groups about being reflective and experiment group showed different tendency, it may not

be wrong to assume that reading strategy training may enable students to be more impulsive.

As the last part, Part 11 deals with being literal or metaphoric. In SB, the proportion of metaphoric students to all students in classroom was 73.91% according to pre-training results. However, it dropped to 65.22% after the implementation of reading strategy training. On the other hand, in SC and SA there were different trend. In both classes the number of metaphoric students rose considerably. In SC, the percentage rose from 65.57% to 78.26%; and in SA it rose from 50% to 81.25%. In this respect, since the tendencies of students in both control groups seemed similar and the experiment group differed from them, it may not be wrong to assume that this may have been caused by reading strategy training. That is, reading strategy training may cause students be less metaphoric. As to literal style dimension, the number of students who stated they were literal in pre-training period dropped in all three classes considerably. Hence, it might not be correct to reach any conclusions about this style.

To sum up, in Parts 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11, there were patterns in which control groups provided similar tendencies whereas the treatment group showed different figures. In Part 2, according to post-LSS results, the number of extraverted students dropped whereas it rose in control groups. In Part 4, this time, the number of open students increased in SB but it decreased in SC and SA. In Part 6, there was a downward tendency in terms of synthesizing style dimension in SC and SA. Yet, in SB there was a reverse situation. In Part 7, in SC and SA, there were more leveler students at the end but in SB, there were more sharpeners. In Part 9, while there were clearly more field-dependent students in SB, the same thing cannot be said for the control groups. As to Part 10, at the end of the 8-week period the majority of the students were reflective in control groups whereas the majority was impulsive in treatment group. Finally, in Part 11, the number of metaphoric students decreased in SB but it increased in SC and SA.

So, as the above findings point out, in some style dimensions the two control groups and the treatment group differed, it may be possible to assume that some of these

differences may be because of the reading strategy training applied to SB for 8-week. But the above finding has been arrived as a result of diagnostic data. Therefore, they may not provide enough data or may not reveal the actual information. For better understanding, the changes in individuals' preferences should be paid out.

4.3 Reading Strategy Use before Treatment

In the second phase of the data analysis, students' preferred reading strategy use were diagnosed by applying SORS both before and after the treatment to all three groups.

Table 4.3.1. Reading Strategy Use Before the Implementation of Reading Strategy Training

	SB			SC			SA		
	Frequency	n	%	Frequency	n	%	Frequency	n	%
Global Reading Strategies	High	14	60.87%	High	14	60.87%	High	9	56.25%
	Med	9	39.13%	Med	8	34.78%	Med	6	37.50%
	Low	0	0	Low	1	4.35%	Low	1	6.25%
Problem Solving Strategies	High	14	60.87%	High	15	65.21%	High	10	62.50%
	Med	8	34.78%	Med	8	34.78%	Med	4	25.00%
	Low	1	4.35%	Low	0	0	Low	2	12.50%
Supportive Reading Strategies	High	11	47.83%	High	6	26.09%	High	7	43.75%
	Med	11	47.83%	Med	13	56.52%	Med	6	37.50%
	Low	1	4.35	Low	4	17.39	Low	3	18.75
Overall Reading Strategies	High	12	52.17%	High	14	60.87%	High	8	50.00%
	Med	11	47.83%	Med	9	39.13%	Med	6	37.50%
	Low	0	0	Low	0	0	Low	2	12.50%

*SB = Treatment Group, SC = Control Group 1, SA = Control Group 2, n= Number of students

Table 4.3.1. shows in which categories the students were before the implementation of reading strategy training according to their average scores on four categories. Of the 23 students from SB, 14 (60.87%) students stated high use of "global reading strategies" whereas 9 (39.13%) of them were in medium frequency group. In this class, none of the students were in low use group. In SC, 14 (60.87%) students usages of strategies were high, 8 (34.78%) were medium, and one student was in low group. As to SA, 9 (56.25%) out of 16 students were in high, 6 (37.50%), and 1 (6.25%) was in low group.

When problem solving strategy use is investigated more or less similar results can be seen in all three classes. In SB, 14 (60.87%) of the students stated that they use problem solving strategies in high frequency. Besides, 8 (34.78%) students were in medium frequency whereas 1 student was in low frequency. Of the 23 students in SC, 15 (65.21%) were in high and 8 (34.79%) were in medium frequency group. Similarly, in SA, 10 (62.50%) students were in high frequency, 4 (25%) were in medium and lastly 2 students were in low frequency group.

Another strategy group about which SORS provides information is the "Supportive reading Strategies". These strategies some of which can be using a dictionary, taking notes, underlying, or highlighting are helpful in understanding the text. Table 4.3.1. shows that in SB 11 (47.83%) students use these kinds of strategies very frequently which means that they are in high frequency category. Similarly another 11 (47.83%) students reported a moderate use of supportive strategies so they were in medium usage category. On the other hand, only one (4.35%) student was in low usage category. In SC, only 6 (26.09%) students reported being in high frequency category whereas 13 (56.52%) were in medium usage category. In this class the other 4 (17.39%) students were in low usage category. Finally, when SA is examined, it can be seen that 7 (43.75%) were in high; 6 (37.50%) were in medium; and 3 (18.75) were in low usage categories. From these results, it can be said that before the implementation of strategy training there was no consistency across groups in terms of reported usage of supportive reading strategies.

The last data which can be obtained from Table 4.3.1. is about the overall strategy use of the students taking part in this study. The overall score average indicates how often students believe they use the strategies in the instrument when reading academic materials. According to the results, the majority of the students in all three classes reported that they use the reading strategies in the instrument highly frequently or in moderate frequency. In SB, 12 (52.17%) of the 23 students reported high frequency usage whereas 11 (47.83%) of them stated they use moderately. In SC, 14 (60.87%) of the students were in high frequency category whereas 9 (39.13%) were in medium category. None of the students in both of these classes reported to be in low frequency category.

In short when Table 4.3.1. is examined, it is seen that before the implementation of reading strategy training, the tendencies were more or less similar except from the supportive strategy usage which was used more moderately in SC unlike the other two classes in which much higher scores were stated.

4.4. Reading Strategy Use after the Implementation of Strategy Training

Table 4.4.1. Reading Strategy Use After Treatment

	SB			SC			SA		
	Frequency	n	%	Frequency	n	%	Frequency	n	%
Global Reading Strategies	High	17	73.91%	High	9	39.13%	High	9	56.25%
	Med	6	26.09%	Med	13	56.52%	Med	7	43.75%
	Low	0	0	Low	1	4.35%	Low	0	0

Table 4.4.1. (Continues)

Problem Solving Strategies	High	19	82.61%	High	12	52.17%	High	12	62.50%
	Med	4	17.39%	Med	9	39.13%	Med	4	25.00%
	Low	0	0	Low	2	8.7	Low	0	0
Supportive Reading Strategies	High	12	52.17%	High	6	26.09%	High	6	37.50%
	Med	10	43.48%	Med	14	60.87%	Med	8	50.00%
	Low	1	4.35	Low	3	13.04	Low	2	12.50%
Overall Reading Strategies	High	16	69.57%	High	10	43.48%	High	8	50.00%
	Med	7	30.43%	Med	13	56.52%	Med	8	50.00%
	Low	0	0	Low	0	0	Low	0	0

*SB = Treatment Group, SC = Control Group 1, SA = Control Group 2, n= Number of students

Table 4.4.1. shows in which categories the students were after the implementation of reading strategy training according to their average scores on four categories. In terms of global reading strategies, when compared to the pre-training data, in SB, the number of students who stated they used global reading strategies highly frequently had risen to 17 (73.91%) from 14 (60.87%) students after the implementation of reading strategy training. On the other hand, the number of students who reported using global reading strategies at medium frequency had dropped to 6 (26.09%) from 9 (39.13%) students after the training. For the same strategy group in SC, there was a different situation. In contrast with SB in which reading strategy training had been carried out, in SC in which no training carried out in terms of reading strategies together with the group SA the number of students who stated using global reading strategies highly frequently dropped to 9 (39.13%) students from 14 (60.87%). Students who use global reading strategies at medium rate had increased from 8 (34.78%) students to 13 (56.52%) students after the 8-week period. Also, there was one student who reported low usage of global reading strategies at the beginning and this number remained the same after the 8-week period. In SA, at first there were 9

students (56.25%) who used global reading strategies before and after the 8-week period. However, the number of students who used these strategies at medium rate had increased from 6 (37.50%) students to 7 (43.75%) at the end. One student from this classroom who had stated using these group of strategies at low rate changed his tendency, so at the end of the 8-week period there were no students in this rate group in SA.

As can be understood from this data, SB, the experiment group, was the only classroom where the number students who used global reading strategies highly frequently had risen. Also, although at the beginning there scores were quite close to each other in three classrooms, at the end of the 8-week period the gap between the experimental group and control groups were evident in terms of high frequency usage. In SB 73.91% of the students were in high frequency category whereas it was 39.13% in SC, and 56.25% in SA. Therefore, it would not be wrong to argue that reading strategy training may have resulted in such a difference and such kind of training may develop students' global reading strategy use.

As to problem solving reading strategies, there were similar results as in global reading strategies. In SB, the number of students who stated high usage in this category had risen from 14 (60.86%) to 19 (82.61%) at the end of training. Naturally, the number of students who were using problem solving strategies at medium rate had dropped to 4 (17.39%). Moreover, although there was one student at the beginning, there were no students who used these strategies at low rate at the end of the training. When looked at SC, the number of students who stated using problems solving reading strategies highly frequently at the beginning of 8-week period had dropped from 15 (65.21%) students to 12 (52.17%) at the end. On the other hand, in this group, the number of students who reported using problem solving strategies at medium rate had risen from 8 (34.78%) students to 9 (39.13%) students at the end. Moreover, even though there was no student in low rate category at the beginning, 2 (8.7%) students reported themselves as being in this category. In SA, the situation was more or less similar to the one in SC. In this group, the number students in high frequency category and medium frequency category were the same both before and

after the end of 8-week period. On the other hand, although there were 2 (12.50%) students who were initially in low rate group, there was no student at the end.

So, it is clearly seen that in the experiment group, the number of students who stated using problem solving strategies highly frequently had risen significantly whereas there was not such a change in control groups. As a result of these data, it can be said that what caused such a difference between experiment and control groups may be the reading strategy training applied for 8 weeks. In other words, reading strategy training may result in positive results and an increase in the use of problem solving strategies.

The next category SORS provides data is about supportive reading strategies. There was a similar result in this category too. While in SB, the percentage of students using supportive strategies highly frequently had risen from 47.83% to 52.17%, it either remained the same as in SC or dropped as in SA. In SC, 6 students were in high frequency category both in the first and second application of the instrument. In SA, the number of students in the same category dropped from 7 (43.75%) to 6 (37.50%). In terms of medium use of supportive strategies 10 students reported using them at medium rate which means it dropped from 47.83% to 43.48%. On the other hand, in SC, the number of these students had risen from 13 (56.52%) initially to 14 (60.87%) after the period. In SA, there was a similar tendency and a rise had been seen in the number of students using these strategies at medium rate – from 37.50% to 50%. Initially, there was only one student (4.35%) both at the beginning and at the end in SB whereas the number of low frequent user had dropped from 17.39% to 13.04% in SC and from 18.75% to 12.50% in SA.

According to the results above, it can be said that in terms of the effect of reading strategy training on the frequency of strategy use, the training had a positive effect by providing more high-frequent user in treatment group than control groups. Therefore, it may be correct to say that reading strategy training result in positive results on students' use of supportive reading strategies.

The last data was about the overall strategy use. Again, the tendency was in the same direction as in the previous categories. In SB, the number of students stated using

overall strategies highly frequently had risen from 12 (52.17%) students to 16 (69.57%) students at the end of the training. However, in neither of the control groups there was not such a figure. In SC, the number of high-frequent users had dropped from 14 (60.87%) to 10 (43.48%) students whereas in SA, the number of students remained same – 8 (50%). In terms of medium frequency use of overall reading strategies, in SB, there were initially 11 (47.83%) students but at the end of the reading strategy training it had dropped to 7 (30.43%), which means that 4 students became high-frequent users. In SC, there was a reverse situation and the number of students using overall reading strategies at medium rate had risen from 9 (39.13%) students to 13 (56.52%) at the end of the 8-week period. In SA, initially there were 6 (37.50%) students in this category but at the end this figure was 8 (50%). Moreover, the 2 (12.50%) students were in low-frequency group but at the end there were no students in this group in SA.

As it is stated clearly above, the only rise in the number of high-frequent user group was in the treatment group which means it may have resulted from the reading strategy training because in control groups the number of students in the same category either remained same or dropped. In other words, reading strategy training may have a positive effect on the use of overall reading strategy use and may cause students use them more frequently.

In the analysis above, only the students who had achieved to change their categories are paid attention. However, this may cause some problems such as ignoring the changes within categories. A student may improve his/her score but may not be able to shift category since 8-week training may not be long enough for individual student to improve his/her use of related strategies in desired levels. In other words, in SB, there were 3 students who improved their use of global reading strategies. However, actually there were totally 15 students who stated that they increased their use of strategies. This means that among these students 3 shifted category whereas the others showed improvement but had to be counted within the same group. For example, the student SB15 improved his/her average by 0.24 points. He/she was initially in medium-use category with 3.38 average. As a result, with 0.24 point improvement he was in high-use category with 3.62 average. On the other hand, in

SA was initially had an average of 2.69 in global strategy use. He/she improved his/her use of global reading strategies by 0.62 points and had an average of 3.31. However, he/she had to be counted in medium-use group since he/she was not able to pass the required average for high-use category.

Moreover, another issue was that a student could be in high-frequency category with a relatively low average but may have eventually improved. For example, SB3 from SB was in high-use category with 4.00 averages. He was in the same category after the training but this time with an average of 4.92 which means he managed to improve his use of global reading strategies but accepted as success in the previous analysis. So, in order to reach more sound results besides the categories – high, medium and low – the way of change in each individual student' average was investigated.

Table 4.4.2. shows the way of change. In SB, 65.22% of the students improved their use of global reading strategies after the reading strategies training whereas 30.43% decreased and only one student had the same average at the end. In SC, only 10 students were able to improve their use of global reading strategy use whereas 12 students reported a decrease. Just like SB, in SC, one student was neutral. In SA, there was a similar result as in SC. Only 7 students were able to develop their use of global strategies whereas 9 students were not. These results show us that only in SB where the majority of students showed improvement there was a different tendency. In contrast, in SA and SC the number of students who showed improvement was less than the ones showing increase. Depending on this data, it would not be wrong to assume that such an increase may have been because of the application of reading strategy training.

As to problem solving reading strategies, in SB, 73.91% of the students showed increase but for 21.73% of them there was a decrease while one student remained neutral. In SC, 43.48% of the students were able to increase their use of problem solving strategies. In this classroom, 47.83% of the students stated decrease in their averages and 2 students had the same average at the end of the 8-week period. In SA,

62.50% of the students improved their strategy use and 31.25% showed decrease

Table 4.4.2. The way of Change in the Use of Reading Strategies

	Global Reading Strategies			Problem Solving Strategies			Supportive Reading Strategies			Overall Reading Strategies		
	Way of Change	n	%	Way of Change	n	%	Way of Change	n	%	Way of Change	n	%
SB	Positive	15	65.22%	Positive	17	73.91%	Positive	15	65.22%	Positive	17	73.91%
	Negative	7	30.43%	Negative	5	21.73%	Negative	7	30.43%	Negative	6	26.09%
	Neutral	1	4.35%	Neutral	1	4.35%	Neutral	1	3.45%	Neutral	0	0
SC	Positive	10	43.48%	Positive	10	43.48%	Positive	10	43.48%	Positive	12	52.17%
	Negative	12	52.17%	Negative	11	47.83%	Negative	9	39.13%	Negative	11	43.83%
	Neutral	1	4.35%	Neutral	2	8.70%	Neutral	4	17.39%	Neutral	0	0
SA	Positive	7	43.75%	Positive	10	62.50%	Positive	7	43.75%	Positive	7	43.75%
	Negative	9	56.25%	Negative	5	31.25%	Negative	8	50.00%	Negative	7	43.75%
	Neutral	0	0	Neutral	1	6.25%	Neutral	1	6.25%	Neutral	2	12.50%

whereas 1 student was neutral. As a result of the analysis of the data, the students who had taken reading strategy instruction during 8 weeks outnumbered the ones who had not in control groups. In SA, there were more students who were able to show improvement than not but their percentage according to the classroom's population was below the treatment group. Therefore, it can be said that reading strategy instruction may have effect on problem solving reading strategy use and may improve students' averages on this category.

Next part provides information about supportive reading strategies. In this category the situation was not much different as in the previous ones. In SB, the number of students who increased their use of supportive strategies was much higher than the two control groups. In this classroom, 65.22% of the 23 students had higher averages after the training compared to initial results. Moreover the number of students who showed a change in their averages in negative way was less than the ones in control groups. Only 30.43% of the students had negative results whereas 1 student did not change his/her average in this classroom. In SC, 43.48%of the students increased their averages whereas 39.13% decreased. Also, 4 students did not change their averages in SC. As to SA, 43.75% of the students were able to increase their use of reading strategies. However, 50% of them decreased their averages and 1 student had the same average. As can be understood from above findings, reading strategy training may affect the use of supportive reading strategy use in positive way.

When overall reading strategy use is examined, it is seen that treatment group had better averages than the control groups. In SB, 73.91% of the students increased their averages on overall reading strategy use whereas 26.09% decreased. Nonetheless, in control groups the results were different. In SC, 51.17% of all students increased their use of reading strategies while 43.83% were decreased, and in SA 43.75% of all students improved their averages but another 43.75% decreased it. Besides, 2 students did not change their averages in this class. So, it can be said that what caused such a difference between treatment group and the control groups may be reading strategy training.

According to the findings above, it would not be wrong to say that reading strategy training can improve the use of reading strategies in global, problem solving, supportive and overall strategy use categories and may result in higher averages in students' preferences.

4.5. KET Scores before the Implementation of Reading Strategy Training

In order to identify the reading proficiency levels of students reading part of a KET exam was applied. Table 8 shows the KET scores of all students in three classes in terms of minimum and maximum scores, the range, mean scores and standard deviation for each class.

Table 4.5.1. KET Scores Before Treatment

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Mean	Std. Deviation
SB	23	18	70	52	39.30	12.900
SC	23	26	64	38	43.83	9.889
SA	16	16	80	64	33.25	14.640

*SB = Treatment Group, SC = Control Group 1, SA = Control Group 2

As it can be seen from the Table 4.5.1., there is not much difference among three classes in terms of their mean scores. Although there were quite high scores (70 max in SB, 64 max. in SC, and 80 max.in SC) the mean scores were relatively low. The mean score of SB was 39.30. In SC it was 43.83 whereas it was 33.25 in SA. In other words, despite some students who scored rather highly, the proficiency levels of the majority of students in all classes were low. Moreover, the standard deviations in all three classes were relatively high. In SB it was 12.9, in SC it was 9.889 and in SA 14.640. Therefore, it can be said that since the standard deviation was lower than the other two classes and the mean score of the students was higher, the students in SC were comparatively more successful and proficient than the other students in classes SB and SA.

4.6. KET Scores after the Implementation of Reading Strategy Training

Table 4.6.1. KET Scores After Treatment

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Mean	Std. Deviation
SB	23	20	74	54	36.78	12.041
SC	23	28	54	26	39.83	8.244
SA	16	18	78	60	34.38	13.995

*SB = Treatment Group, SC = Control Group 1, SA = Control Group 2

Table 4.6.1. gives information about the post KET scores of students. According to the Table 4.6.1., students from SB and SC decreased their mean scores on post KET test when compared to pre-KET scores whereas students in SA increased theirs. The minimum score in SB increased to 20 and the maximum score increased to 74 and the standard deviation was 12.041 in this classroom. In SC, the minimum score which had been 26 before the treatment was 28 at the end of 8-week period and the maximum score dropped to 54 which resulted in 8.244 standard deviation and a mean score of 39.83 which is 1.00 point less than the pre-KET score. As to SA, like students in other groups the minimum score increased 2 points. On the other hand the maximum score in this classroom dropped to 78. As a result, the mean score of post-KET test in SA was 34.38 which mean there was an increase when compared to the pre-KET scores. And the standard deviation was 13.995 in this classroom after the 8-week period.

According to these findings, any comment about the effect of reading strategy training on students' proficiency levels may not be appropriate since the data obtained both from pre-KET and post-KET test show no distinctive pattern in which treatment group differed from the control groups clearly. However, these results may not mean that reading strategy training is inefficient in terms of language proficiency levels because students from all classrooms were in low proficiency levels and also as the data from both teacher logs and students' journal provided, their reading abilities in their L1 was not sufficient and they do not know using reading strategies in their L1. As a result, an improvement in students' proficiency levels may not be

expected. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to state that reading strategy training with low achievers in English may not have a direct effect on their proficiency levels but may enable them to become aware of the existence of reading strategies and of benefits of using them both in L1 and L2 since the finding from LSS and SORS have provided enough results to reach such a conclusion.

4.7. The Relationship between Language Learning Styles and Reading Strategy Training

The findings above provided us with information about the students' preferred language learning styles both at initial stage and at the end of 8-week period. As it can be seen from the results, students' style preferences are not stable and continuously evolve, which may be resulted from the nature of being educated and becoming more mature throughout the education. Also, in accordance with the previous findings in literature, the findings of SORS applied both at initial stage and after the treatment points out that in all categories – global reading strategies, problem solving reading strategies, supportive reading strategies, and overall reading strategies – reading strategy training, to varying degrees, has positive effects on students' average scores, showing how frequently they were using the related strategy clusters. Yet, there were not conclusive results that may lead us to believe strategy training has a positive effect on students' language proficiency levels.

Seeing that reading strategy training effected students' averages scores in positive way and students' language learning style preferences are not stable and tend to change, it would not be wrong to assume that the former may cause some changes in the latter. In this respect, what was necessary was to look for a pattern in which the two control groups yielded similar results and the treatment group differed from them clearly. According to the results obtained from the comparison of data between Tables 4.1.1. and 5.1.2. with Tables 4.2.1. and 4.2.2., several such kind of patterns can be observed. For example, in parts 2,4,6,7,9,10 and 11, there were some situations in which control groups had similar figures whereas treatment group

differs. Thus, in order to be able to have more sound data, changes in students' preferences have been investigated.

Table 4.7.1. shows the percentages of changes in each group within each part of the LLSS. According to this data, in Parts 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, the pattern in which control groups yielded similar results and treatment group differed from them can be seen clearly. In Part 2, whereas the percentages of students who had changed their preferences were very close to each other in control groups, the percentage in treatment group was above them. In Part 5, there was a similar situation. The percentages of changes in control groups were very close. The difference between these classrooms was 1.63. However, the percentage of changes in SB was more than the control groups. As to Part 6, the percentage of students who had changed their preferences was 39.13%. It was 30.43% in SC and 25% in SA. In Part 7, the treatment group was the one with least change. 43.48% of the students had changed their preferences on this dimension but in SC this figure was 56.52% and in SA it was 75%. In Part 8, again the least change occurred in SB. The rate of change in this class was 26.09% whereas it was 47.83% in SC and 56.52% in SA. In Part 9, the distinction between control groups and treatment group was clearer. The rate of change in SB was 56.52% but it was 43.48% in SC and 43.75% in SA. The last part where the pattern could be observed was Part 11. In this part, 52.17% of the students had changed their preferences. However, this figure was 65.22% in SC and 68.75% in SA.

With regard to these findings, it can be said that there are some changes which may resulted from reading strategy training. However, when the data obtained from Table 4.7.1. is compared to the previous data, it is seen that some of the parts which were initially thought to show the pattern that was looked for did not provided the same pattern in this phase. Initially, it was thought that Parts 2, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 10 might have effected from the treatment. But when the changes were investigated only the Pars 2, 6, 7 and 9 overlapped them and the Parts 4, 5, 8 and 10 did not provide the pattern in this analysis.

Table 4.7.1. Change in Students' Language Learning Style Preferences

		Part 1	Part 2	Part 3	Part 4	Part 5	Part 6	Part 7	Part 8	Part 9	Part 10	Part 11
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SB	CH *	47.83%	34.78%	26.09%	34.78%	47.83%	39.13%	43.48%	26.09%	56.52%	17.39%	52.17%
	NCH	52.17%	65.22%	73.91%	65.22%	52.17%	60.87%	56.52%	73.91%	43.48%	82.61%	47.83%
SC	CH	52.17%	26.09%	34.78%	17.39%	39.13%	30.43%	56.52%	47.83%	43.48%	8.70%	65.22%
	NCH	47.83%	73.91%	65.22%	82.61%	60.87%	69.57%	43.48%	52.17%	56.52%	91.30%	34.78%
SA	CH	50%	25%	18.75%	43.75%	37.50%	25%	75%	56.25%	43.75%	18.75%	68.75%
	NCH	50%	75%	81.25%	56.25%	62.50%	75%	25%	43.75%	56.25%	81.25%	31.25%

* CH= Change, NCH= No Change; SB = Treatment Group, SC = Control Group 1, SA = Control Group 2; n = number of students, % = percentage of students

When the way of change in each individual was further investigated, only the parts in which the desired pattern can be found in previous analysis are paid attention. The direction of each style dimension was calculated in proportion to change value. The results obtained are given in Table 4.7.2..

Accordingly, in Part 2 which provides information about whether the individual is extraverted or introverted, there is not a specific pattern in which controls groups and treatment group differed from each other. Because of the mixed results it may not be possible to mention about any effect of the reading strategy training in this part.

Part 5 provides us information about being global or particular while receiving information. In this part, treatment group shows considerable difference. In this part most of the change was from being particular to being global. 81.82% of the students who changed their style preferences in this classroom stated that they were more global than particular. On the other hand, in SC this figure was 66.67% and it was 50% in SA. Therefore, it would not be wrong to mention about an effect of reading strategy training on this dimension.

In the next part, which provides information about being synthesizing or analytic, a significant difference between control groups and treatment group can be seen. In Table 4.7.1., it had been found out that the most change in part 6 was in SB and 44.44% of this change was towards being more synthesizing and 55.56% of it was towards being analytic. However, in SC the 14.29% of the change was towards synthesizing whereas 85.71% of it was towards being more analytic. In SA, there was a similar result. 25% of the change in this classroom was from analytic towards synthesizing while 75% of it was towards vice versa. Therefore, it can be said that reading strategy training may enable students to be more synthesizing than the students who did not take part in such kind of training.

About Part 7, since there was not a pattern, it cannot be possible to mention about any effect of reading strategy training on students' way of committing materials to memory. In this part, while SB and SC yielded similar numbers, in SA there was a different situation. In SB, 70% of the change was from sharpener towards leveller and 30% of the change was towards sharpener. In SC, similar numbers can be

Table 4.7.2. The Way of Change in Parts 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11

	Part 2 - How I Expose Myself to learning Situations		Part 5 - How I Receive Information		Part 6 - How I Further Process Information		Part 7 - How I Commit Material to Memory		Part 8 - How I Deal with Language Rules		Part 9 - How I Deal with Multiple Inputs		Part 11 - How Literally I Take Reality	
	Extraverted (E) - Introverted (I)		Global (G) - Particular (P)		Synthesizing (S)- Analytic (AN)		Sharpener (SH) - Leveler (L)		Deductive (D) - Inductive (IN)		Field Ind. (FI) - Field Dep. (FD)		Metaphoric (M) - Literal (LT)	
	Way of Change	%	Way of Change	%	Way of Change	%	Way of Change	%	Way of Change	%	Way of Change	%	Way of Change	%
SB	E > I	62.50%	P > G	81.82%	S > AN	55.56%	SH > L	70.00%	D > IN	33.33%	FD > FI	30.77%	M >LT	22.22%
	I > E	37.50%	G > P	18.18%	AN > S	44.44%	L > SH	30.00%	IN > D	66.67%	FI >FD	69.23%	LT > M	77.78%
SC	E > I	50.00%	P > G	66.67%	S > AN	85.71%	SH > L	76.92%	D > IN	45.45%	FD > FI	40.00%	M >LT	40.00%
	I > E	50.00%	G > P	33.33%	AN > S	14.29%	L > SH	23.08%	IN > D	54.55%	FI >FD	60.00%	LT > M	60.00%
SA	E > I	0.00%	P > G	50.00%	S > AN	75.00%	SH > L	50.00%	D > IN	33.33%	FD > FI	42.86%	M >LT	18.18%
	I > E	100.00%	G > P	50.00%	AN > S	25.00%	L > SH	50.00%	IN > D	66.67%	FI >FD	57.14%	LT > M	81.82%

*SB = Treatment Group, SC = Control Group 1, SA = Control Group 2

observed. 76.92% of the change was from being sharpener to leveller whereas 23.08% of it was from leveller to sharpener. In SA, 50% of the change was from being sharpener to leveller.

Part 8 was about dealing with language rules. Like Part 7, no desired pattern could be observed in this part. In SB and SA 33.33% of the change was from being deductive towards being inductive whereas 66.67% of it was from inductive towards deductive. However, in SC, 45.45% of the change was from deductive towards inductive and 54.55% was vice versa. Thus, it is not possible to mention a meaningful relationship between reading strategy training and language learning style preferences for this part.

When Part 9 was examined, a significant difference between the control groups and treatment group can be observed. In SB, 30.77% of the change was from being field-dependent towards field-independent whereas 69.23% of it was vice versa. However, in SC, 40% of the change was from field-dependent towards field-independent and in SA, 42.86% of it was towards field-independent. According to these findings, it would not be wrong to say reading strategy training may have an effect on students' way of dealing with multiple inputs as the change towards being field-dependent in treatment group was almost 10% more than control groups. That is, by using reading strategy training it would be more likely to make students more filed-dependent.

Finally, when the data about Part 11 is examined, since no difference between control groups and treatment group could be observed, it may not be possible to mention about any effect of reading strategy training on this style dimension. In SB, 22.22% of the change was towards being literal and 77.78% of it was towards being metaphoric. In SC, this figure was 40% towards being literal and 60% towards being metaphoric. In SA, it was 18.18% towards literal and 81.82% towards metaphoric.

The analysis process of the effect of reading strategy training on language learning styles was summarized in Table 4.7.3.

The data obtained throughout the study was evaluated in three phases. First, students' language learning style preferences both before and after the treatment were

Table 4.7.3 Phases of Analysis

	Part 1	Part 2	Part 3	Part 4	Part 5	Part 6	Part 7	Part 8	Part 9	Part 10	Part 11
Patterns in Diagnostic stage		x		x		x	x		x	x	
Patterns in Percentages of Changes		x			x	x	x	x	x		x
Patterns in the Way of Change					x	x			x		

diagnosed. After that data from SORS having been analyzed it was found out that reading strategy training had effects on students' preferences. What was looked for in this phase was the pattern in which treatment group differed from control groups which showed similar tendencies. In this phase in Parts 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10 the pattern was seen. However, this findings might not be conclusive because the change in individual students' preferences were not paid attention. That is, changes in students' style preferences might not be seen in this kind of analysis. Therefore, the percentages of changes were investigated to see how many students changed his/her preferences. As a result of this analysis, in Parts 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11 the pattern could be seen. Finally, the way of change in students' learning style preferences was investigated for more sound data. In Parts 5, 6, and 9 the pattern could be seen in this phase.

As a result of the above findings in Table 4.7.3 it is seen that only in Parts 6 and 9 the pattern could be observed in all three phases of analysis. So, it would not be wrong to assume that reading strategy training may have some kind of effect on Parts 6 and 9.

5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1. Implications for Further Research

In this study three important instruments were used, the Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) (Mokhtari and Sheorey, 2002), Key English Test (KET) and the Learning Style Survey (LSS) (Oxford, Cohen and Chi, 2005). A metacognitive reading strategy training consisting of the strategies predicting, making inferences, translating (finding patterns), summarizing, grouping, clarifying were chosen. The training was carried out in accordance with the framework proposed by Chamot, Anstrom, Bartoshesky, Belanger, Delett, Karwan, Meloni, and Keatley (2003) created as a five-stage instruction – preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion – guide for strategy instruction. This study showed that such kind of reading strategy training result in improvements in terms of students' frequency of use of reading strategies and led them to become more aware about the reading strategies. In order to provide more valid results further reading strategy training should be carried out by using different strategies and frameworks.

This study presented possible effects of reading strategy training on students' language learning style preferences. Further research focusing on language learning style dimensions and calibrated for specific styles is needed for more effective results. According to the findings of this study, it was found out that students' language leaning style preferences are not fixed. There was a continual movement from one side of the continuum to the other. So, it could be said that as a natural result of education students received change in their style dimensions occurred. This means that there are new questions to be answered in future studies.

First of all, if change occurs naturally and it is highly possible that this happens continually, then is it important to know what students' language learning style preferences are? Also, should there be any style matching or stretching between

teachers' teaching styles and students' learning styles? On the other hand, this study revealed that reading strategy training may affect students' language learning style preferences in a certain way. In further studies what kinds of instructions are most effective and effects what types of styles should be investigated.

In this study students' language style preferences were evaluated twice and it was seen that they were not stable. In further studies, also, the issue of evaluation frequency should be considered. Should style preferences be evaluated frequently or not?

Also, in the scope of this study a metacognitive training model was employed and only the possible effects of reading strategies were investigated. It is recommended that further studies should employ different kinds of strategy trainings and different types of language learning strategies.

In addition, six strategies selected from SORS were taught for 8 weeks in this study. They were taught in cyclonic order. That is, each strategy was revised together with the next one/ones and possible ways of using them as strategy clusters were shown to the students. To validate the findings of this study, more strategies should be investigated. Also, the kinds of strategies and their order of teaching should be paid attention and variances should be tried for more sound data.

Lastly, the findings obtained from KET exam in this study showed that reading strategy instruction did not have any effect on students' language proficiency levels. It is recommended that to assess students' reading proficiency levels, several exam or assessment types should be employed for more valid results.

5.2. Pedagogical implications

For successful language learning, being a competent reader is highly crucial. In order to make use of the language learning process, to be able to read academic reading

materials gains importance. In this respect, metacognitive reading strategy training comes forward as an effective tool.

In this study, I, first, chose six strategies and designed reading strategy training according to the frameworks purposed by Chamot, Anstrom, Bartoshesky, Belanger, Delett, Karwan, Meloni, and Keatley (2003). In addition I preferred it to be metacognitive strategy training since in literature there are many positive remarks about it.

In treatment group, in order to improve the awareness of students, I first tried to find out about the level of students' reading strategy knowledge. For this purpose I wanted them to fill in a journal consisting of questions related to this issue. Then, I explained the importance of reading strategies and their use.

After these initial steps, since repetition plays a crucial role in learning and since the students' taking part in this study proficiency levels of English were relatively low, seven strategies were taught in a cyclonic way. Each strategy was taught together with the previous one/ones. Also, the frameworks proposed by researchers previously were very helpful.

In the first week the strategy 'predicting' was studied. I used materials which I had gathered together from several reading strategy instruction books. All of the materials were handed out to students in the forms of worksheets. Although students seemed to understand what the strategy was for and how to use it, it was observed by the researcher that they got quite bored.

In the next weeks, for presentation and practising stages interactive exercises and Power Point Presentations which were available online at the time of study were embedded into the instruction programme. It should be noted that in this way students were more interested in the process and more easily concentrated. Therefore, it can be said that using more interactive materials may be helpful in classrooms while conducting reading strategy training.

Sometimes there were some problems that I came up with throughout the strategy instruction. One of the most distinctive of them was the problem with students' reading strategy knowledge in their native language. For this purpose, from time to time, I asked students to complete some practising sheets in their native language before beginning to teach that strategy. In one of these, I wanted them to summarize the tale "The Girl with Scarlet Scarf". Since I wanted to see their use of summarizing strategy in their mother tongue, I wanted them to summarize it in their L1. As a result, it was found out that almost all of the students were aware of the existence of such a strategy but none of them were able to use it accurately. Then I explained what it was, how and when to use it, how to evaluate it and so on. According to the teacher logs and students journals this approach was very useful and efficient. Therefore it can be assumed that using such kind of activities before beginning the instruction of specific strategies may be very beneficial in terms of warm-up activities and evoking students'' schemata and teachers may want to integrate this kind of activities in their lessons.

Before the instruction of each strategy, first the previous strategies were revised. According to teacher's logs, this was very helpful since from time to time students found it difficult to remember the previous strategies in the next lesson. Also, after each strategy was shown, the difference of it from the previous ones or the similarities of it with the previous ones were paid attention. In this way a more sound understanding was achieved. For example after the instruction of predicting strategy there was no problem with it. But when students were taught how to make inferences, there aroused some misunderstanding and they had difficulties in differentiating each other. So paying attention to similarities and differences between the strategies may increase the efficiency of instruction.

Another thing was the issue of strategy clusters. Since strategies are more efficient when they are used in clusters, not only the chosen strategies were taught one by one but also how to combine them for different purposes was paid attention. In the 6th week of the instruction the grouping strategy was taught. Having been informed about the use and importance of, in practising stage, students were asked to apply the

previous strategies first. And then, they were asked to apply grouping strategy. This helped students to use grouping strategy more easily. So, in classroom environments teachers may utilize this approach in their teaching of reading strategy clusters for better results.

5.3. Conclusion

This study provided some very useful information regarding language learning styles and strategies. It was found out that language learning style preferences are like floating objects. However, reading strategy training may have some kind of effect on them. In other words, by using reading strategy instruction, styles may be directed into desired ways.

If an analogy is to be established for better understanding of the language learning styles, a river analogy may work. It can be said that education of a child is like a river. It comes out from spring at birth and after that it begins to flow non-stop. Gradually it grows in velocity, volume and content. In each step new branches merge and make it a river. And every river has its own way of flow. Some flow wildly, some flow with great volume but slowly whereas some expands to a large area. Also there are many variables that affect their flow. Rocks, hills, soil, descents or ascends increases or decreases in volumes, even humankind affect its content, way of flow, or route.

But each river can be controlled and used for several purposes but they may still have a general tendency although they may seem to change their way of flow. They can be used to for agriculture or to produce energy. And if they are controlled or used properly, the gains from them will be great. Several strategies can be employed to make use of them best.

Students' language learning style preferences are like rivers. We cannot change, adapt or stretch them completely. But when needed, we can control them for our purposes. In the natural process of education, students' style preferences will surely

be changed and adapted according to the conditions. Like rivers, they become more and more complicated during instruction process and as students become more mature, more and more variables begin to affect them. However, teachers may control them so that they can be utilized best. By using several strategies, students' style preferences may be shaped for better performance and also students themselves may be taught how to take the advantage of them by being taught strategies. The field of language learning may be water by just diverting the river. However, if this is done with fine-tuning by employing strategies, then, maximum efficiency can be achieved.

In short, language learning styles are constantly changing. So matching teachers' teaching style with students' learning style may be neither logical nor possible. What is needed is not to establish a complete matching or enable stretching but tuning them for most efficiency according to the needs. In this respect, the effects of different types of instructions must be known.

This study provided some possible effects of reading strategy training on students' language learning style preferences. According to the findings, reading strategy training may make students more analytic than the ones who do not take such kind of instruction. Also, reading strategy instruction may lead students change their style preferences towards being more filed-depended than the ones who have not taken such kind of instruction.

On the other hand this study showed the effectiveness of reading strategy instruction on development of reading strategy awareness and increase in the frequency of using them. After taking 8-week instruction, students in experiment group displayed better averages in all sub-scales of SORS.

However, a similar effect could not be observed on language proficiency levels of students. When the data from KET exams investigated, no meaningful change could be observed in reading scores. Therefore, it may not be right to say that reading strategy training has clear effects on students' language proficiency levels.

All in all, it can be said that metacognitive reading strategy training may not improve students language proficiency levels in short term. Yet, it certainly improves students' reading strategy awareness and increases the frequency of usage and it may have effects on students' language learning style preferences in terms synthesizing/ analytic and filed-dependent/ field-independent style dimensions.

6. References

Anderson, N. (2003). Scrolling, Clicking, and Reading English: Online Reading Strategies in a Second Foreign Language. *The Reading Matrix, 3*(3), pp. 1-33.

Anderson, N. J. (1991). Individual Differences in Strategy Use in Second Language Reading and Testing. *Modern Language Journal, 75*, pp. 460-472.

Anderson, N. J. (2008). Metacognition and good langauge learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from Good Language Learners* (pp. 99-109). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK.

Block, E. (1986). The Comprehension Strategies of Second Language Readers. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(3), 463-494.

Brown, A. L., & Palinscar, A. S. (1982). Introducing strategic learning from text by means of informed, self-controlled training. *Topics in Learning and Learing Disabilities, 2*, 1-17.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2 ed.). NY.: Pearson Education.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education: NY.

Carrell , L. P., Pharis, G. B., & Liberto, C. J. (1989, December). Metacognitive Strategy Training for ESL Reading. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(4), 647-678.

Carrell, P. L. (1985). Facilitating ESL Reading by Taeching Text Structure. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(4), 727-752.

Casanave, C. P. (1988, June). Comprehension Monitoring in ESL Reading: A Neglected Essential. *TESOL Quarterly, 22*(2), 283-302.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1996). The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach: Linguistically Diverse Classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal, 96*(3).

Chamot, A. U. (2008). Strategy instruction and good langauge learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from Good Language Learners* (pp. 266-281). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK.

Chamot, A. U., Anstrom, K., Bartoshesly, A., Belanger, A., Delett, J., Karwan, V., . . . Keatley, C. (2003). *The elementary immersion learning strategies resourceguide.* Retrieved from www.ncrlc.org/eils/

Chamot, A. U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P. B., & Robbins, J. (1999). *The learning strategies handbook.* White Plains: NY: Addison Wesley Longman.

Clarke, M. A. (1980). The Short Circuit Hypothesis of ESL Reading - Or When Language Competence Interferes with Reading Performance. *The Modern Language Journal, 64*(2), 203-209.

Cohen , A. D. (2003). The learners' side of foreign langauge learning: where do styles, strategies, and tasks meet? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 41*(4), pp. 279-291.

Cohen , A. D. (2010). Focus on the language learner styles, strategies and motivation. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (Second ed., pp. 161-178). London: Hodder Education.

Cohen , A. D., Oxford, R. L., & Chi, J. C. (2005). *Learning Style Survey for young Learners: Assesing your own Learning Styles.* Retrieved from http://www.carla.umn.edu/about/profi les/Cohen.html

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language.* London: Longman.

Cohen, A. D. (2007). Coming to terms with language learner strategies: surveying the experts. In A. D. Cohen, & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language Learner Strategies: Thirty Years of Research and Practice* (pp. 29-46). New York: Oxford Univesity Press.

Cohen, A. D. (2008). Strategy instruction for learners of Japanese: how do you do it and what's in it for them? In Y. A. Hatasa (Ed.), *Gaikokugo to shite no nhongo kyooiku: Takakutei shiya ni motozuku kokoromi 'Japanese as a foreign language education: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 45-60). Tokyo: Kurosia Shuppan.

Cohen, A. D. (2011). Method and instruction in second language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching* (pp. 681-698). Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Cohen, A. D., & Weaver, S. J. (2006). *Styles-and Strategies-Based Instruction: A Teachers' Guide.* Minneapolis: MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

Cotteral, S. (2008). Autonomy and good langauge learner. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from Good Langauge Learners* (pp. 110-120). Cambridge: Cambridge Universtiy Press, UK.

Dörnyei, Z. (2008). *The Psychology of the Language Learner. Individual differences in second language acquisition.* New Jersey: Taylor & Francis e- Library.

Dörnyei, Z. (2010). The Relationship between Language Aptitude and Language Learning Motivation: Individual Differences from a Dynamic Systems Perspective. In E. Macaro (Ed.), *Continuum Companion to Second Langauge Acquisition* (pp. 247-267). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Ediger, A. (2001). Reading: Teaching Children Literacy Skills in a Second Language. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (Third ed., pp. 151-170). USA: Heinle & Heinle.

Erhman, M. E., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief overview on individual differences in second language learning. *System, 31*, 313-330.

Erler, L., & Finkbeiner, C. (2007). A review of reading strategies: focus on the impact of first language. In A. D. Cohen, & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language Learner Strategies: Thirty Years of Research and Practice* (pp. 187-206). New York: Oxford Universtiy Press.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2001). Reading for Academic Purposes: Guidelines for ESL/EFL teacher. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 187-203). USA: 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.

Grellet, F. (1994). *Developing Reading Skills.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grenfell, M., & Harris, V. (2002). *Modern Languages and Learning Strategies in Theory and Practice.* London: Routledge.

Grenfell, 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). New York: Oxford University Press.

Griffiths , C. (2008). Startegies and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from Good Language Learners* (pp. 83-98). Cambridge: Cambridge University press, UK.

Griffiths, C. (2008). Teaching/learning method and good langauge learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from Good Langaugae Learners* (pp. 255-265). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK.

Griffiths, C., & Parr, J. M. (2001). Language-Learning Strategies: theory and perception. *ELT Journal*, *55*(3).

Haynes, J., & Zacarian, D. (2010). *Teaching English Language Learners Across the Content Areas.* Alexandria, Virginia, USA: ASCD.

Hedge, T. (2008). *Teaching and Learning in the Classroom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hosenfeld, C. (1977). A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of successful and unsuccessful language learners. *System, 5*, 11-123.

Jie, L. (2006). Language Learning Styles and Learning Strategies of Tetriary Level English Learners in China. *Regional Language Center Journal, 37*(1), 67-90.

Kellerman, E. (1991). Compensatory strategies in second language research: A critique, a revision and some implications forthe classroom. In R. Philipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second Language Pedagogy Research.* (pp. 142-161). Clevendon: Multilingual Matters, UK.

Kinsella , K. (1995). Understanding and empowering diverse learners. In J. M. Reid (Ed.), *Learning Styles in the ESL/EFL classroom* (pp. 170-194). Boston, Mass: Heinle.

Kolb, D. (1976). Learning Style Inventory: Self-scoring Test and Interpretation.

Leaver, L., Erhman, M., & Shekhtman, B. (2005). *Achieving Successin Second Language Acquisition.* New York.

Lee, K. R. (2007). *Strategy Awareness-Raising for Success:Reading Strategy Instruction in the EFL Context (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation).* University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Lee, K. R., & Oxford, R. L. (2008). Understanding EFL Learners' Strategy Use and Strategy Awareness. *The Asian EFL Journal, 10*(1), 7-32.

Macaro , E. (2007, December). Language Learner Strategies: adhering to a theoretical framework. *Language Learning Journal, 35*(2), 239-243.

Macaro, E. (2006). Startegies for Language Learning and for Language Use: Revising the Theoretical Framework. *The Modern Language Journal, 90,* 320-337.

Macaro, E. (2010). Second Language Acquisition: the landscape, the scholarship and the reader. In E. Macaro (Ed.), *Continuum Companion to Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 3-28). London: Continuum International Publishing.

Macaro, E., & Erler, L. (2008). Raising the Achievement of Young Readers of French through Strategy Instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(1), 90-119.

Macaro, E., Vanderplank, R., & Murphy, V. A. (2010). A Compedium of Key Concepts in Second Language Acquisition. In Macaro Ernesto (Ed.), *Continuum Companion to Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 29-107). London: Continuum International Publishing.

McNamara, D. S. (2004). SERT: Self-explanation reading training. *Discourse Processes, 38*, 1-30.

McNamara, D. S. (2009). The Importance of Teaching Reading Strategies. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy*, 34-40.

McNamara, D. S., O'Reilly, T. D., Best, R. M., & Ozuru, Y. (2006). Improving Adolescent Students' Reading Comprehension with iSTART. *J. Educational Computing Research, 34*(2), 147-171.

Nam, C., & Oxford, R. L. (1998). Portrait of a future teacher: case study of learning styles, strategies, and language disabilities. *System, 26*, 51-63.

Nambiar, R. (2009). Learning Strategy Research. Where are we now? *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal, 9*(2), 132-149.

Nel, C. (2008). Learning style and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from Good Language Learners* (pp. 49-60). Cambridge: Cmabridge University Press, UK.

Nyikos, M. (2008). Gender and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from Good Language learners* (pp. 73-82). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learing strategies in second language acquisition.* Chambridge: Chambridge Universtiy Press.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L., & Russo, R. P. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL Students. *Language Learning, 35*(1), 21-46.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know.*

Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The Story of the SILL: Evolution, Use, Reliability, and Validity of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning.* University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

Oxford, R. L. (1995). *Patterns of Cultural Identity.* Boston: Heinle.

Oxford, R. L. (1996). *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Crosscultural Perspectives.* University of Hawaii, Honolulu Second language Teaching and Curriculum Centre, Universith of Hawaii Press.

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

Oxford, R. L. (2003). Langauge learning styles and strategies: concepts and relationships. *Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 41*, 271-278.

Oxfrod , R. L. (1993). Style Analysis Survey (SAS).

Oxfrod, R. L., & Anderson, N. (1995). A crosscultural view of learning styles. *Language Teaching, 28*(4), 201-215.

Palinscar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension fostering and comprehension monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 12*, 117-175.

Reid, J. M. (1987, March). The Learning Style Preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(1), 87-110.

Reid, J. M. (1995). *Learning Styles in the ESL/EFL Classroom.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle .

Reid, J. M. (1998). *Understanding Learning Styles in the Second language Classroom.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall Regents.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2006). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Chambridge University Press.

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

Rubin, J., Chamot, A. U., Harris, V., & Anderson, N. J. (2007). Intervening in the use of strategies. In A. D. Cohen , & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language Learner Strategies: Thirty Years of Research and Practice* (pp. 141-160). New York: Oxfrod University Press.

Scarella, R. C., & Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in the Communicative Classroom.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Schramm, K. (2008). Reading and good langauge learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from Good Language Learners* (pp. 231-243). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK.

Shi, C. (2011, June). A Study of the Relationship between Cognitive Styles and Learning Strategies. *Higher Education Studies, 1*(1).

Singhal, M. (2011). Reading Proficiency, Reading Strategies, Metacogniive Awareness and L2 Readers. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal, 1*(1), 1-23.

Su, M.-H., & Duo, P.-C. (2012). EFL Learners' Language Learning Strategy Use and Perceived Self-Efficacy. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 27*(3), 335-345.

Takeuchi, O., Griffiths, C., & Coyle, D. (2007). Applying strategies to contexts: the role of individual, situational, and group differences. In A. D. Cohen , & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language Learner Strategies: Thirty Years of Research and Practice* (pp. 69-92). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tsai, Y.-R. (2012, July). Investigating the Relationships among Cognitive Learning Styles, Motivation and Strategy use in Reading English as a Foreign Language. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(13).

Wallace, C. (1992). Reading. In C. N. Candlin, & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *Language Teaching: A Scheme for Teacher Education.* Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Wenden, A. L., & Rubin, J. (. (1987). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (2000). *Psychology for Language Teacher: a Social Constructivist Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK.

Wong, L. L., & Nunan, D. (2011). The learning style and strategies of effective language learners. *System*, *39*, 144-163.

Yaylı , D. (2010). A Think-Aloud Study: Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies of ELT Department Students. *Euroasian Journal of Educational Research*(38), 234-251.

Zhang, L. J. (2008). Constructivist pedagogy in strategic reading instruction: exploring pathways to learner development in the English as a second language. *Instr Sci*(36), 89-116.

Zhang, L. J., Gu, P. Y., & Hu, G. (2008). A Cognitive Perspective on Singaporean Primary School Pupils' Use of Reading Strategies in Learning to Read. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*(78), 245-271.

Zhang, L., & Sirinthorn, S. (2012). Effects of MST (Metacognitive Strategy Training) on Academic Reading Compregension of Chinese EFL Students. *US-China Foreign Language, 10*(2), 933-943.

KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER

- **İsim: Mehmet ABİ**
- **Doğum Yeri: Afyonkarahisar**
- **Doğum Tarihi: 07/04/1979**
- **Medeni Durumu: Evli**
- **Askerlik Durumu: Tamamlandı**

İŞ TECRÜBELERİ

- 2014 - … - Okutman – Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üni. Sıktı Koçman Yabancı Diller Y.O.
- 2010 – 2012 - Proje Koordinatörü, Avrupa Birliği, Yaşam Boyu Öğrenim Programmı, Comenius Çift Tarflı Okul Ortaklığı Projesi: Geçmişte, Günümüzde ve Gelecekte Avrupalılar. GA No: 2010-1-TR1-COM07-16368 1
- 2010 – İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programları, Yönetim ve Teknikleri Kursu, Kızılcahamam, Ankara
- 2007 – 2014 - İngilizce Öğrt. – Dr. Mete Ersoy Anadolu Lisesi/MİLAS
- 2006 – 2007 - İngilizce Öğrt - Anadolu Kız Meslek ve Meslek Lisesi/MİLAS
- 2002 – 2005 - İngilizce Öğrt - Selimiye Timıçin Biliktan Ç.P.L./MİLAS

ÖĞRENİM DURUMU

- **1998 – 2002 – Selçuk Üniversitesi – KONYA**

  Lisans – Eğitim Fak. İngilizce Öğretmenliği
- **1993 – 1997 – Afyon Anadolu Öğretmen Lisesi – AFYONKARAHİSAR**

BİLDİRİLER

- Eda Üstünel, **Mehmet Abi,** (2013), The Effects of Flipped Classroom Model on Language Learners' Learning Strategy Use and Self Efficacy Beliefs: An Overview of Literature. Book of Proceedings, 2nd International Sympsium on Language and Communication: Exploring Novelties, June 17-19, Izmir, Turkey
- Eda Üstünel, **Mehmet Abi**, (2013), The Role of Questions in Idiom Teaching. Projecting onto Teaching Young Learners, IATEFL TTEd SIG Conference, 20-21 September, Muğla, Turkey

YABANCI DİL

- İngilizce