

**An Investigation into ELT Students' Academic  
Achievement and Their Use of Language Learning  
Strategies Across Gender Groups**

**Özlem Özyılmaz**

Submitted to the  
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts  
in  
English Language Teaching

Eastern Mediterranean University  
September 2012  
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

---

Prof. Dr. Elvan Yılmaz  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülşen Musayeva Vefalı  
Chair, Department of English Language Teaching

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

---

Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam  
Supervisor

---

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam

2. Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali Sıdkı Ağazade

3. Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan



## ABSTRACT

This study intended to investigate whether there is a significant mean difference in academic achievement across gender groups, to find out the difference in strategy use between genders, and to reveal the link between strategy use and academic achievement. 90 students (51 female, 39 male) from the Department of English Language Teaching at Eastern Mediterranean University participated in the study. Firstly, 90 students' GPA and CGPA scores were obtained to see whether there is a significant mean difference in academic achievement across gender groups. Then, in order to find out language learning strategy types used by gender groups, a Turkish version of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Cesur and Fer (2007) was given to the students. The instrument is based on Oxford's (1990) classification of the language learning strategies, which is composed of 50 items in six subscales. The data were analyzed through SPSS (15.0) for Windows. A series of t-tests was used.

The findings of the study revealed that there is a significant mean difference in academic achievement across gender groups. Females are more successful than males. However, although male students employ more LLS than female students, there is no significant mean difference between strategy use and academic achievement.

**Keywords:** Gender, Language, Language Learning, Language Learning Strategies, Academic Achievement.

## ÖZ

Bu çalışma, akademik başarıda cinsiyet bağlamında anlamlı bir farklılık olup olmadığını, ve farklı cinsiyet grupları tarafından kullanılan dil öğrenme stratejilerini tespit edip bu durumun İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü'ndeki öğrencilerin akademik başarılarıyla bağlantısını belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmaya Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü'nden 90 öğrenci (51 kız, 39 erkek) katılmıştır. İlk olarak, cinsiyet ve başarı arasındaki ilişkiyi görmek için, 90 öğrencinin dönem sonu not ortalamaları ve genel not ortalamaları belirlenmiştir. Daha sonra, cinsiyet grupları tarafından kullanılan dil öğrenme stratejilerini bulmak için, öğrencilere Cesur ve Fer'in (2007) Türkçeye çevirdiği SILL (Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri) verilmiştir. Oxford'un (1990) dil öğrenme stratejileri sınıflandırmasını temel alan araç altı alt kategori içinde 50 madde içermektedir. Veriler, SPSS (15.0) programında analiz edilmiştir. Bir dizi t-test yöntemi uygulanmıştır.

Çalışma sonunda, cinsiyet grupları ve akademik başarı arasında anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmuştur. Kızların erkeklerden daha başarılı olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Ancak, erkeklerin kızlardan daha fazla dil öğrenme stratejisi kullandıklarının tespit edilmesine rağmen, akademik başarı ve strateji kullanımı arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Cinsiyet, Dil, Dil Öğrenme, Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri, Akademik Başarı.

To my family

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would first like to express my gratitude to my thesis supervisor Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam for his expertise, invaluable guidance, patience and encouragement during the preparation of this work.

I am deeply grateful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali Sıdkı Ağazade and Erkan Arkın who helped me a lot in data analysis process.

I would like to thank all of my teachers in the Department of English Language Teaching for their help in data collection process.

I want to express my gratitude to İlder Ömeroğlu who encouraged and trusted me during the writing process. Without his warm support this process could have been very challenging for me to complete.

I am greatly indebted to my family who allowed me to be here, supported, trusted and encouraged me all throughout my studies here.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iii
ÖZ .....	iv
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. ....	vi
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background to the Study .....	1
1.2 Problem Statement .....	6
1.3 Purpose of the Study .....	6
1.4 Research Questions .....	6
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	7
1.6 Definitions of Terms .....	7
1.6.1 Gender.....	7
1.6.2 Language.....	8
1.6.3 Language Learning Strategies.....	9
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	10
2.1 Gender .....	10
2.1.1 Background Definition .....	10
2.1.2 The Recent History of Studies on Language Use, Language Learning and Gender.....	11
2.1.2.1 Gender and Language Use .....	11
2.1.2.2 Gender and Language Learning .....	13
2.1.3 Explanations into Gender Differences.....	13



2.2 The Role of Gender in Foreign Language Learning Attitudes .....	14
2.3 Gender and Motivation.....	15
2.4 Gender and Academic Achievement.....	17
2.5 Language Learning Strategies .....	17
2.5.1 Main Features of Language Learning Strategies .....	19
2.5.2 The Classification of Language Learning Strategies .....	20
2.5.2.1 Direct Strategies .....	20
2.5.2.1.1 Memory Strategies .....	20
2.5.2.1.2 Cognitive Strategies .....	21
2.5.2.1.3 Compensation Strategies .....	22
2.5.2.2 Indirect Strategies.....	23
2.5.2.2.1 Metacognitive Strategies .....	24
2.5.2.2.2 Affective Strategies.....	24
2.5.2.2.3 Social Strategies.....	26
2.6 Summary.....	26
3. METHODOLOGY .....	27
3.1 Research Design of the Study.....	27
3.2 Context .....	28
3.3 Participants .....	29
3.4 Data Collection Instruments .....	29
3.4.1 Document Analysis .....	29
3.4.2 Strategy Inventory for Language Learners .....	29
3.5 Data Collection Procedures .....	31
3.6 Data Analysis .....	32
3.7 Limitations .....	33

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....	34
4.1 Research Question 1 .....	34
4.2 Research Question 2.....	37
4.3 Summary of the Findings .....	41
4.4 Discussion.....	42
5. CONCLUSION.....	46
5.1 Overview of the Study.....	46
5.2 Pedagogical Implications.....	47
5.3 Suggestions for Further Research .....	49
REFERENCES .....	51
APPENDICES .....	68
APPENDIX A: The Strategy Inventory for Language Learners .....	69
APPENDIX B: SILL (Original Version) .....	74
APPENDIX C: General Information Form for the Students.....	77
APPENDIX D: Consent Form (Turkish Version) .....	79
APPENDIX E: Request Letter to Collect Data .....	80
APPENDIX F: Independent Samples T-tests for 50 Items .....	81
APPENDIX G: Curriculum of ELT Department.....	86

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Distribution of GPA Scores .....	35
Table 4.2: Distribution of CGPA Scores .....	35
Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics for GPA and CGPA Scores of Participants .....	36
Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics for GPA and CGPA Scores of Gender Groups .....	36
Table 4.5: Independent Samples t-tests for GPA and CGPA Scores of Gender Groups .....	37
Table 4.6: Descriptive Statistics for SILL and Its Subscales of Participants .....	38
Table 4.7: Descriptive Statistics for SILL and Its Subscales of Gender Groups .....	38
Table 4.8: Independent Samples t-tests for SILL and Its Subscales of Gender Groups .....	40
Table 4.9: Descriptive Statistics for GPA and CGPA Scores of 33 Students .....	41
Table 4.10: Independent Samples t-tests for GPA and CGPA Scores of 33 Students .....	41

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

LLS: Language Learning Strategies

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELT: English Language Teaching

SILL: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

EMU: Eastern Mediterranean University

GPA: Grade Point Average

CGPA: Cumulative Grade Point Average

# Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION

This first chapter gives information about the background to the study, problem statement, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, and definitions of terms.

### 1.1 Background to the Study

The most studied foreign language around the world is English. Montgomery (2004) says that “English has become the dominant language of science, with an estimated 80 to 90 percent of papers in scientific journals written in English” (p. 1334), although only half of them came from authors in English-speaking countries. As a result of this increasing interest, researchers have been investigating how English is learnt by looking from different angles. In the field of SLA research, it was inevitable to carry out research on the learners themselves because many studies showed that there are many learner-related factors that influence language learning; even though the same instruction was given to a group of learners the outcome turned out to be considerably different and varied. In recent years, language and gender is a growing area of study. A closer look at the historical development of the gender concept in language studies revealed that the perspectives and the philosophies underlying the research have changed over time.

Some shifts in the world in terms of political issues brought change in the perception of language and gender in the world (Cameron, 2004). According to Cameron

(1995), "a crude historical-typological account of feminist linguistic approaches since 1973 would probably distinguish between three models of language and gender (p. 33)": the deficit model, the cultural difference model and the dominance model. In the deficit model, females are seen as disadvantaged speakers and communicators, mostly in the professional world, because of their nurture and socialization as females (Block, 2002). When we look at the dominance model, studies of gender related language structures and use of language put forward that males get and maintain power over females in social interaction through interrupting and overlapping females' speech, or condescending females (Davis and Skilton-Sylvester, 2004). Because of such studies, most scholars called for nonsexist use of English (Cooper, 1989; Nichols, 1999). This call resulted in a model which has traditionally existed in feminist linguistics, and the dominance model started. "In this model women are perceived to perform their 'woman-ness' in an ethnomethodological frame as they continually negotiate their position of relative powerlessness vis a vis men" (Block, 2002, p.53). Thirdly, in the cultural difference model males and females belong to separate but equal cultures which predate the development of individuals who are socialized into them (Block, 2002). All of these post-structuralist approaches to gender support the belief that "gender is a social phenomenon; it is about doing as opposed to having or being; it is the outcome of engagement, in particular, social practices as opposed to preceding and causing such engagement; and it is imminently unstable across different contexts" (Block, 2002, p. 54). Davis and Skilton-Sylvester (2004) too mention the claims of numerous scholars (e.g., Cameron, 1990; Holmes, 1991; Freed, 1995) who believe that gender behaviors are not predictable and universal. As a result of this perception, studies began shifting from understanding gender as an individual model to understanding gender

as a social structure in explicit cultural and situational contexts (Davis and Skilton-Sylvester, 2004).

So, research about second language shifted from the positivistic conceptualization of gender as an individual variable to a constructivist view of gender as social relations working within complex systems created wealthier perceptions of the relations between gender and language learning across societies, communities, and classrooms (Norton and Pavlenko, 2004). Considering these, many researchers and theorists are slowly going away from traditional frameworks towards the relationships between gender and language learning across societies, communities and classrooms (Davis and Skilton-Sylvester, 2004).

So, the recognition of the complex nature of language and gender requires language studies done within authentic communicative contexts and increased cooperation among linguists, philosophers, educators, and psychologists (Freed, 1995). The focus of feminist-critical and poststructuralist scholars on the effects of power relations contributed a lot to gender and language education. Research on power relations can tell valid or apparent strategic appeals to differences and document ways in which gender differences are constructed in interaction.

Besides these studies, the most significant studies were done in the areas of language learning and strategy use. In many studies, the relationship between the use of language learning strategies and achievement in learning a second language or foreign language has been investigated.

Language learning strategies can be said as specific ways or techniques that students use in order to improve progress in developing L2 skills. Oxford (1990) and Rigney (1978) point out “Strategies encompass a wide range of behaviors that can help the development of language competence in many ways”. A good language learner can use a variety of LLS, such as guessing the meaning of an unknown word accurately and willingly, dealing with emotional issues in language learning process, developing the foreign or second language as a meaning and structure system, and monitoring one’s own speech (Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, and Todesco, 1978; Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1983). According to O'Malley and Chamot (1990), effective language learners are aware of the LLS they use and why they use them. Many second language acquisition and learning models have included LLS (McLaughlin, 1987). According to Skehan (1989) LLS are one of the most significant individual difference factors in second language acquisition.

Language learning strategies allow students to get responsibility for their own progress. In some instances, learner training that involves teaching of individual learning styles has been successful but this depends on language skills (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Oxford and Crookall, 1989). According to Oxford (1992), in order to create an effective learning training, there should be a clear focus on specific strategies, opportunities to practice these strategies, and a way of showing learners how to transmit these strategies to new situations.

In studies examining gender as a variable in the use of LLS, most researchers (Behçetoğulları 1993; Yılmaz, 1997) conclude that females use learning strategies more efficiently than males; particularly regarding general study strategies,



functional practice strategies, strategies for searching and communication meaning and self-management strategies (Ehrman and Oxford, 1989; Oxford and Nyikos, 1993).

In his dissertation, Lee (2001) conducted a study with 817 high school senior students attending two different schools. He had equal proportions of male and female students. The study showed that high school students were medium strategy users and that two strategy categories that were used most often were compensation and metacognitive strategies. Also, the study discovered more strategy use by females than males.

Similarly, in Turkey, Dursun (2007) found out that females use cognitive and compensation strategies more than males. Also, Aslan (2009) conducted a research about the relationship between language strategies and gender at Middle East Technical University. The findings of the study revealed that use of language learning strategies are positively effective in success in English, that females were considerably more successful than males in terms of achievement tests, and that they used more LLS in learning English. In TRNC, Ersay (1998) found different results in her study at Eastern Mediterranean University. The participants included ten EFL students from Engineering, Architecture, and Communication Departments. The study revealed that gender does not have a strong influence on learning preferences and different learning strategies affect students' language achievements considering participants as individuals rather than males and females. It can be said that there is a significant relationship between gender, language leaning strategies and achievement in learning English.

Having established these facts, firstly, this study provides the relationship between gender and academic achievement. Next, it gives various definitions and taxonomies of language learning strategies presented by several researchers and then the relationship between LLS use, academic achievement and gender.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

The language teacher who aims at educating his students in using language learning strategies should learn about the students, their interests, motivations, and learning styles. The teacher then can learn what language learning strategies students already appear to be using, by observing their behavior in class. Thus, it seems necessary to design a research on language learning strategies and its relationship between their demographic variables such as academic achievement and gender.

## **1.3 Purpose of the Study**

The present study is conducted in order to find out whether there is a significant mean difference in academic achievement across gender groups in the department of ELT. Second purpose in this study is to investigate most preferred language learning strategies used by gender groups to reveal the link between strategy use and achievement levels.

## **1.4 Research Questions**

This study was carried out in order to answer two research questions. These are;

*1. Is there any statistically significant mean difference in academic achievement across gender groups in the department of English Language Teaching at EMU?*

2. *Is there any specific language learning strategy type used differently by a gender group? If yes, is there any statistically significant mean difference in academic achievement across language learning strategy types?*

## **1.5 Significance of the Study**

Based on the results of this study, teachers in the ELT department can realize the link between strategy use and academic achievement better and, in their instruction, focus on the specific strategies that more successful learners use. In addition, seeing the difference between males and females in terms of strategy use, they can develop strategy instruction accordingly addressing males' and females' needs for better learning.

## **1.6 Definitions of Terms**

### **1.6.1 Gender**

According to Butler (1990), there are brute facts of biology and gender is a phenomenon which is brought into being when it is performed. In her own words, "Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a 'natural' kind of being" (Butler, 1990, p.32). Therefore, one's *gender* is not equivalent to his/her *sex*; though, most of the time, building on the biological base he/she has from birth, he/she constructs it through his/her life with the experiences which take place first in the family then in society. One's social context and culture he/she lives in shapes his/her gender identity accompanied with unique individual experiences. As a consequence, every society has a distinct gender identity and any individual living in them may or may not comply with the presumed gender identity.

In this study, the term *gender* is used following this conceptualization of gender which is composed of culturally constructed male identity and female identity, not the biological differences between males and females.

### **1.6.2 Language**

Sapir (1921) defines language as a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of voluntarily produced symbols.

Bloch and Trager (1942) expresses that a language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group cooperates.

Chomsky (1957) state that a language is a set of finite or infinite of sentences, each finite in length and constructed out of a finite set of elements.

According to Fred (2005), language is behavior which utilizes body parts: the vocal apparatus and the auditory system for oral language; the brachial apparatus and the visual system for sign language. Such body parts are controlled by none other than the brain for their functions.

Weiten (2007) states that a language consists of symbols that convey meaning, plus rules for combining those symbols, that can be used to generate an infinite variety of messages.

Goldstein (2008) defines language as a system of communication using sounds or symbols that enables us to express our feelings, thoughts, ideas, and experiences.

### **1.6.3 Language Learning Strategies**

The term language learning strategy has been defined by many researchers. Wenden and Rubin (1987, p. 19) define learning strategies as "... any sets of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval, and use of information." Richards and Platt (1992, p. 209) state that learning strategies are "intentional behavior and thoughts used by learners during learning so as to better help them understand, learn, or remember new information." Faerch Claus and Casper (1983, p.67) stress that a learning strategy is "an attempt to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language." According to Stern (1992, p. 261), "the concept of learning strategy is dependent on the assumption that learners consciously engage in activities to achieve certain goals and learning strategies can be regarded as broadly conceived intentional directions and learning techniques."

## **Chapter 2**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

This chapter provides lots of explanations about the term ‘gender’. The studies done so far and different views of different researchers are also mentioned. Gender differences in language use and language learning, the relationship between gender and motivation, and gender and academic achievement are dealt with in detail. Also, language learning strategies and types of these strategies are examined.

#### **2.1 Gender**

##### **2.1.1 Background Definition**

The term ‘gender’ is mostly confused with sex. Therefore, it is important to make a distinction between two concepts. The differences in these terms come from biological and physiological characteristics of males and females. Gender refers to the changing appropriate roles, behaviors, activities, and attributes for men and women that are constructed by the society (Bem, 1983; Springer and Deutsch, 1989; Sunderland, 1993; Bulut, 1994; Begley, 1995; Kobayashi, 2002; Lippa, 2005). Education and economics are significant factors in these roles. So, aspects of gender vary widely among cultures unlike the aspects of sex that do not vary considerably between different human societies. Gender roles and expectations are often identified regarding the status of women in society which is highly effective in social and family, even in economic settings. (Bardwick, 1971; Kramarae, 1981; Coşgun, 2002). The studies done in 2000s showed that gender is a powerful social phenomenon and does not show a relationship with simple biological or social

categories. Moreover, gender is accepted as a major factor in foreign language learning.

### **2.1.2 The Recent History of Studies on Language Use, Language Learning and Gender**

Language and gender is a growing area of study among researchers in recent years. There are some journals that publish articles about gender and language such as *Gender and Education*, *Discourse and Society*, and *TESOL Quarterly*. Also, there are research studies about this issue such as the relationship between language and gender (Litosseliti and Sunderland, 2002); and women's needs and voices in EFL situations (McMahill, 1997 and 2001). Furthermore, there has been an increase in the number of conferences that focus on language and gender. In April, 2002, *International Gender and Language Association Conference* was held at Lancaster University.

About the relationship between language use and language learning, Kramarae (1981) states that in most countries, males dominate the public sphere while females in the private. In these two spheres public speech is more assertive and direct. On the other hand, private speech is more nurturing and indirect. This situation shows that males and females learn and use a language differently.

#### **2.1.2.1 Gender and Language Use**

In the empirical literature gender differences have been observed in the use of languages. Mulac and Lundell (1986) found that females use high levels of tag questions. On the other hand, Dubois and Crouch (1975) found the opposite. Males have been found to use articles and long words more than females. Also, males have been seem to use more references to places (e.g., Mehl and Pennebaker, 2003; Mulac and Lundell, 1986). Thomas and Murachver (2001) stated that females refer to

emotion more than males. According to Mehl and Pennebaker (2003) females used more references to positive feeling, but males referred more to anger.

Ehrlich (1997) argues that focusing on male/female difference creates a fixed and static belief of gender differences in language related processes. Thus, this situation ignores the cultural and social contexts in which language is acquired and used. According to Ehrlich, current trends in language and gender research focus on the constructivist notion that “language use constructs gender difference as a social category” (p. 424) and that “individuals construct or produce themselves as women or men by habitually engaging in social practices that are associated with culturally and community-defined notions of masculinity and femininity” (p. 436). The social construction of gender difference in language use is examined in feminist poststructuralist approaches to gender and language in bilingual or multilingual contexts (Pavlenko, 2001). According to Pavlenko (2001), gender is a system of social relations rather than an individual feature. So, there is no one to one relation between gender and language, there are several relations and meanings. Pavlenko (2001) recognizes the limitations of the traditional approaches to gender and language which these poststructuralist approaches try to overcome. These limitations contain a “deficit” or “dominance” framework, which views females as innately inferior language users, and a “difference” pattern that correlates with linguistic variables with the sex of the language user. Wareing (1994) discusses that the “dominance” approach has discovered unequal gender relations of power by examining cross-gender conversations, while the difference approach has explored gender-specific communicative norms by examining same-sex interactions. The difference model is set in different studies in social sciences which highlight



objectivity. However, though the scientific and neutral attitude behind the “differences approach,” there is an assumption that norm should be male language. Therefore, although the differences and deficit approaches have explain the relationships among language, power, and gender, both of them support the argument that females should change their language styles instead of challenging the male dominance put forward in language use (Wareing, 1994). All these views suggest that the relationship between language and gender is always changing and dynamic. The important point is not gender but rather social settings, roles and expectations.

#### **2.1.2.2 Gender and Language Learning**

The relationship between gender and second or foreign language learning has been examined in many studies. Attitudes, motivation and learning strategies are the factors in which the effects of gender appear most. In most of the studies about attitudes towards language learning with regard to gender, it is clear that due to various beliefs, social expectancies, conditions and cultural orientations, females are more positive than males and this creates higher motivation with a better acquisition. (Kobayashi, 2002; Demir, 2005). Motivation is another factor in foreign language related to gender. Spolsky (1989), Behçetoğulları (1993) reported high motivation of females in their studies. Third factor is learning strategies which reflect a significant difference between males and females. According to Politzer (1983), Nyikos (1990), Gass and Varonis (1986) females are superior in using language strategies. However, Wafa (2003) and Salem (2006) found no difference between males and females in terms of using learning strategies.

#### **2.1.3 Explanations into Gender Differences**

Two categories are mentioned in order to explain gender differences in foreign language learning. First category is biological explanations which focus on different

hormones and brain organization of each sex and differences in cognitive development (Stringer and Deutsch, 1989; Halpern, 1992; Carr and Pauwels, 2005). In many studies, it has been revealed that there are greater nerve linkages between both hemispheres for females than males. This situation leads to greater fluency and speech and sensitivity to emotional, nonverbal communication which results in better language acquisition (Bryden, 1979; Moir and Jessel, 1991; Lippa, 2005). Second category is social explanations which involve social effects, expectations of the society, perception of language and language learning, and their effects on males and females (Loulidi, 1989; Matlin, 1993; Carr and Pauwels, 2005). In recent studies, it is claimed that nature of the social constructs direct the expectations about the personal development of males and females are often encouraged to study foreign languages (Behçetoğulları, 1993; Özek, 2000, Demir, 2005).

Another explanation about gender differences in language learning focuses on the image of foreign language learning and its effect on gender performances. According to Loulidi (1989) different perceptions of foreign language learning between gender groups which are constructed by the society might cause a rise or fall in achievement. Similarly, Carr and Pauwels (2005) claim that males tend to emphasize their gender separation from females since foreign language study is being called 'a female business'.

## **2.2 The Role of Gender in Foreign Language Learning Attitudes**

Research on attitudes towards second language learning have been conducted for many years in the area of applied linguistics, mostly from the psychological perspective (Skehan, 1989; Dornyei, 1994; McGroarty, 1996). Also, the relationship between attitudes and gender in second language learning have been witnessed

frequently, putting gender as an significant issue of study and discussion in second language acquisition. (Powell and Batters, 1985; Clark and Trafford, 1995). For example, Powell and Batters (1985) conducted a survey with 494 girls and 459 boys from six schools in the UK. It was found that females had more positive attitudes about foreign languages. Kobayashi (2002) presupposed gender as social construction, as known in the constructionist research. Kobayashi (2002) discovered that Japanese social elements are likely to explain Japanese female high school students' more positive attitudes towards English.

### **2.3 Gender and Motivation**

In the field of SLA, researchers have found some evidence implying the existence of gender differences in motivation and attitudes (e.g., Clark and Trafford, 1995; Ludwig, 1983). Although most of the studies were conducted with elementary school students, if the same patterns apply to university students, one might presuppose that females have higher self perception for English. In fact, this assumption is similar with findings of some foreign language studies that indicate greater motivation and more favorable attitudes in female students (Pritchard, 1987; Jones and Jones, 2001). Motivation plays a key role in all learning. Many theorists (e.g. Williams, Burden, and Lanvers 2002) argue that motivation to learn a second or foreign language is a particularly complex phenomenon. The truth that foreign language learning requires the investment of additional personality and social dimensions by the learner in order to employ some form of second-language identity and to relate to aspects of the target language culture necessitates a broader understanding of language learning motivation (Dornyei 1998, 2003). In order to understand what is going on about foreign-language learning in schools in terms of gender models of motivation and foreign-language learning focus on the integrative (motivation to learn a language

from a desire to identify with the culture of the speakers of that language) and the instrumental (motivation arising from external goals such as passing examinations, financial rewards or furthering a career) orientations in language learning. Stronger integrative and instrumental motivations have been identified among female foreign-language learners at all levels. These may be recognized to more positive personal attitudes, identity and feelings of agency among girls concerning languages or to external factors such as the generally more positive attitudes and influence of society, parents and peers of female language learners towards female foreign language learning (Clark and Trafford 1996; Williams, Burden, and Lanvers 2002). According to Dornyei and Clement (2001), female students scored significantly higher than male students on the scales of all of the seven motivational dimensions in most of the target languages. Those motivational dimensions include integrativeness, direct contact with L2 speakers, vitality of L2 community, cultural interest, and instrumentality.

## **2.4 Gender and Academic Achievement**

Investigating academic performance at pre-collegiate level, Lao (1980) finds female students to obtain higher CGPA compared to males. Examining sex-related difference in classroom grades, Kimball (1989) finds that in contrast to standardized measures of mathematics achievement tests like SAT-M3, female students outperform males in math classes. Wilberg and Lynn (1999) arrive at a similar conclusion for history classes vs. history tests. The authors explain this pattern by stating that females tend to work more conscientiously and have a stronger work ethic than males. They also tend to have better language abilities including essay writing skills, vocabulary and word fluency which contribute to better course work. Stage and Kloosterman (1995) note that although gender differences in math

achievement continue to exist on high cognitive level tasks at the high school level, such differences appear to be declining. Young and Fisler (2000) examining SAT-M scores of high school seniors, find males to score better than females. However, they note that males generally come from households where the parents' socioeconomic status as measured by examinee reported educational levels and income, is higher. In contrast, female test takers are more diverse and include more low-income students than the boys group. Others have argued that the content of the test or of its administration favors males (Bridgeman and Wendler, 1991). Yet other researchers have explained the gap by adhering to such factors as differences in course taking behavior, classroom experiences and cognitive processing (Byrnes, Hong and Xing, 1997; Young and Fisler, 2000)

Furthermore, Younger, Warrington and Williams (1999) focus on the gender gap in English secondary schools. Their analysis is based on the performance of boys and girls in GCSE examinations in the UK and girls are found to get better grades than boys. This phenomenon is explained by boys' disregard for authority, academic work and formal achievement, differences in students' attitudes to work and their goals and aspirations and girls' increased maturity and more effective learning strategies.

## **2.5 Language Learning Strategies**

Research about language learning strategies started in the 1960s. Developments in cognitive psychology affected the research on LLS. In most of the research on language learning strategies, the main stress has been on "identifying what good language learners report they do to learn a second or foreign language, or, in some cases, are observed doing while learning a second or foreign language." (Rubin and Wenden 1987, p.19). Rubin (1975) classified strategies in terms of processes

contributing directly or indirectly to language learning. Rubin (1975, p.43) provided a very broad definition of LLS as “the techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge”. Stern (1975) produced a list of ten language learning strategies as characteristic of good language learners and he put “personal learning style” at the top of the list (p.311). When O’Malley *et al* (1985) conducted their research, they used the definition of learning strategies as being “operations or steps used by a learner that will facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval or use of information” (p.23), a definition originally used by Rigney (1978). In order to provide a classification format with the categories, O’Malley and his colleagues developed a categorization of their 26 strategies which they divided into three categories: cognitive, metacognitive, and social. Oxford (1990) took this process a step further. She took Rigney’s definition as a base. She classified LLS into six groups: memory strategies (remembering language), cognitive (thinking about learning), compensation (making up for limited knowledge), metacognitive (managing learning), affective (feelings), and social (interaction with others). These six categories brought the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and this inventory was used by Oxford and others in the area of learning strategy. Then, these six categories were divided into two groups: direct strategies and indirect strategies.

Almost all of the language learners use LLS either consciously or unconsciously when they perform a task or process new information in the classroom. When they come across difficult tasks, they need to find quickest way to accomplish the tasks most probably using LLS.

### **2.5.1 Main Features of Language Learning Strategies**

When discussing LLS, Oxford (1990) and others such as Wenden and Rubin (1987) mention about a desire for control and autonomy of learning for the learner through LLS. Oxford (1990, pp. 8-14) summarizes her view of LLS by listing twelve key features:

- 1-The main goal of the strategies is to contribute to communicative competence.
- 2-Learning strategies allow learners to become more self-directed.
- 3-Learning strategies expand the role of teachers. Traditionally teachers are expected to be authority, director, manager etc. In this case teachers need to help learners to be more independent and they need to identify students' learning strategies. Finally, they accept new roles such as guider, diagnostician, consultant, advisor etc.
- 4-Learning strategies are problem oriented, since these strategies are tools to be used to solve problems, or to accomplish a task, or to meet an objective. For example a learner can use reasoning or guessing strategies to understand a reading text better.
- 5-Learning strategies are action based, for they are specific actions taken by the learner in order to enhance their learning.
- 6-Learning strategies involve many aspects of the learner, since they are beyond cognition. There are metacognitive, social and emotional functions as well.
- 7-Learning strategies support learning both directly and indirectly.
- 8-Learning strategies are not always observable to the human eye.
- 9-Learning strategies are often conscious, for most of them are conscious efforts of learners to take control of their learning.
- 10-Learning strategies can be taught. They are teachable and the main concern of this work is strategy training that can be considered as an essential part of language education.

11-Learning strategies are flexible, that is, they are not always found in predictable sequences or in precise patterns.

12-Learning strategies are influenced by a variety of factors. Some examples of these factors might be degree of awareness, learning stage, task requirements, teacher expectations, age, sex, nationality/ethnicity, learning style, personality traits, motivation level, purpose for learning and the language itself.

### **2.5.2 The Classification of Language Learning Strategies**

According to Oxford's (1990) taxonomy, language learning strategies are divided into two major classes: *Direct Strategies* and *Indirect Strategies*. These two classes are subdivided into a total of six groups. Memory strategies, cognitive strategies and compensation strategies are under the direct strategies while metacognitive strategies, affective strategies and social strategies are under the indirect strategies.

#### **2.5.2.1 Direct Strategies**

Direct strategies are specific language learning strategies which directly involve the target language. The main feature of all direct strategies is that they require mental processing of the language while each of the three subgroups of direct strategies does this process in its own way. Direct strategies are further classified into three groups: Memory strategies, Cognitive Strategies and Compensation Strategies.

##### **2.5.2.1.1 Memory Strategies**

Memory Strategies are the ones that are used for entering information into memory and retrieving it. Memory-related strategies help learners to link one L2 item or concept with another but do not necessarily involve deep understanding. Many memory related strategies help learners learn and retrieve information in an orderly string (e.g., acronyms), while other techniques create learning and retrieval via sounds (e.g., rhyming), images (e.g., a mental picture of the word itself or the



meaning of the word), a combination of sounds and images (e.g., the keyword method), body movement (e.g., total physical response), mechanical means (e.g., flashcards), or location (e.g., on a page or blackboard) (Oxford, 2003). She also underlines that memory strategies are often used for memorizing vocabulary and structures in initial stages of language learning, but that learners need such strategies much less when their lexicon and structures have become larger. Memory strategies can contribute powerfully to language learning. Nevertheless, various research studies revealed that language students rarely report using memory strategies (Oxford, 1990).

Oxford (1990) classifies memory strategies in another set of four: *Creating Mental Linkages, Applying Images and Sounds, Reviewing Well and Employing Actions*.

### **Memory Strategies**

#### **A. Creating Mental Linkages**

1. Grouping
2. Associating / Elaborating
3. Placing New Words into a Context

#### **B. Applying All Images and Sounds**

1. Using Imagery
2. Semantic Mapping
3. Using Keywords
4. Representing Sounds in Memory

#### **C. Reviewing Well**

1. Structured Reviewing.

#### **D. Employing Action**

1. Using Physical Response or Sensation
2. Using Mechanical Techniques (Oxford, 1990, p. 18)

### **2.5.2.1.2 Cognitive Strategies**

Cognitive strategies involve strategies like practicing, analyzing expressions, summarizing, etc. The common feature they all have is that they enable the learner to

manipulate or transform the target language. For this reason, cognitive strategies are seen as essential for learning a new language. According to Oxford (1990), cognitive strategies are the most popular strategies among language learners. Oxford (1990) states that there are four sets of cognitive strategies: *Practicing, Receiving and Sending Messages, Analyzing and Reasoning and Creating Structure for Input and Output.*

### **Cognitive Strategies**

#### **A. Practicing**

1. Repeating
2. Formally Practicing with Sounds & Writing System
3. Recognizing and Using Formulas and Patterns
4. Recombining
5. Practicing Naturalistically

#### **B. Receiving and Sending Messages**

1. Getting the Idea Quickly
2. Using Resources for Receiving and Sending Messages

#### **C. Analyzing and Reasoning**

1. Reasoning Deductively
2. Analyzing Expressions
3. Analyzing Contrastively (Across Languages)
4. Translating
5. Transferring

#### **D. Creating Structure for Input and Output**

1. Taking Notes
2. Summarizing
3. Highlighting (Oxford, 1990, pp. 18-19)

### **2.5.2.1.3 Compensation Strategies**

Compensation strategies are the strategies that enable learners to use the new language for either comprehension or production despite possible limitations in information. As Oxford (1990) indicates that compensation strategies are intended to make up for an inadequate repertoire of grammar and vocabulary, they serve as auto fillers in learning a language where information gaps occur. As compensation is present both in comprehension and in production, these strategies let learners

produce spoken and written expressions in the target language though they lacked the required complete knowledge. Compensation strategies for production serve as helper in carrying on using language. Besides, some of these strategies help learners become more fluent in their prior knowledge. Oxford (1990) states that learners who reported to use more compensation strategies sometimes communicated better than learners who are not.

There are ten compensation strategies listed under two sets of strategies. They are:

*Guessing Intelligently and Overcoming Limitation in Speaking and Writing.*

### **Compensation Strategies**

#### **A. Guessing Intelligently**

1. Using Linguistic Clues
2. Using Other Clues

#### **B. Overcoming Limitations in Speaking and Writing**

1. Switching to the Mother Tongue
2. Getting Help
3. Using Mime or Gesture
4. Avoiding Communication Partially or Totally
5. Selecting the Topics
6. Adjusting or Approximating the Message
7. Coining Words
8. Using a Circumlocution or Synonym. (Oxford, 1990, pp. 19)

### **2.5.2.2 Indirect Strategies**

Oxford (1990) says that other language learning strategies are called indirect strategies because they support and manage language learning, in many instances, directly involving the target language. However, they are interrelated with the direct strategies and they are useful in all language learning situations and the four skills of language (reading, writing, listening and speaking). Indirect strategies are further

separated into three subgroups: Metacognitive Strategies, Affective Strategies and Social Strategies.

#### **2.5.2.2.1 Metacognitive Strategies**

Metacognitive strategies allow learners to manage their own learning process. Skills such as paying attention and linking with already existing knowledge are involved in them. Consciously using metacognitive strategies, students can regain their focus. Nevertheless, (Oxford, 1990; Green and Oxford, 1995) reported that although the significance of metacognitive strategies, learners rarely use these strategies. They seem to use these strategies more infrequently than cognitive strategies. There are three sets of metacognitive strategies. They are: *Centering Learning, Arranging and Planning Learning and Evaluating Learning.*

#### **Metacognitive Strategies**

##### **A. Centering Your Learning**

1. Overviewing & Linking with Already Known Material
2. Paying Attention
3. Delaying Speech Production to Focus on Listening

##### **B. Arranging and Planning Your Learning**

1. Finding Out About Language Learning
2. Organizing
3. Setting Goals and Objectives
4. Identifying the Purpose of a Language Task
5. Planning for Language Task
6. Seeking Practice Opportunities.

##### **C. Evaluating Your Learning**

1. Self-Monitoring
2. Self-Evaluating (Oxford, 1990, pp. 20)

#### **2.5.2.2.2 Affective Strategies**

Oxford (1990) refers the term “affective” to emotions, attitudes, motivation and values. Affective factors are always deep into language learning, as they are in all kinds of learning. Positive feelings will result in better performance in language

learning. Thus, while learning a new language, learners can gain control over factors related to emotions, attitudes, motivations and values through the use of affective strategies.

Affective strategies have been shown to be significantly related to L2 proficiency in research by Dreyer and Oxford (1996) among South African EFL learners and by Oxford and Ehrman (1995) among native English speakers learning foreign languages. However, in other studies, such as that of Mullins (1992) with EFL learners in Thailand, affective strategies showed a negative link with some measures of L2 proficiency. One reason might be that as some students progress toward proficiency, they no longer need affective strategies as much as before. Perhaps because learners' use of cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies is related to greater L2 proficiency and self-efficacy, over time there might be less need for affective strategies as learners progress to higher proficiency (Oxford, 2003).

There are ten skills listed under three sets of affective strategies. They are: *Lowering Your Anxiety, Encouraging Yourself and Taking Your Emotional Temperature.*

### **Affective Strategies**

#### **A. Lowering Your Anxiety**

1. Using Progressive Relaxation, Deep Breathing and Meditation
2. Using Music
3. Using Laughter

#### **B. Encouraging Yourself**

1. Making Positive Statements
2. Taking Risks Wisely
3. Rewarding Yourself

#### **C. Taking Your Emotional Temperature**

1. Listening to Your Body
2. Using a Checklist

3. Writing a Language Learning Diary
4. Discussing Your Feelings with Someone Else (Oxford, 1990, p. 20)

### **2.5.2.2.3 Social Strategies**

Social strategies help the learner to work with other people and understand the target culture as well as the language. (Oxford, 1990) There are three sets of social strategies. They are: *Asking Questions*, *Cooperating with Others* and *Empathizing with Others*.

#### **Social Strategies**

- A. Asking Questions
  1. Asking for Clarification or Verification
  2. Asking for Correction
- B. Cooperating with Others
  1. Cooperating with Peers
  2. Cooperating with Proficient Users of the New Language
- C. Empathizing with Others
  1. Developing Cultural Understanding
  2. Becoming Aware of Others' Thoughts and Feelings (Oxford, 1990, pp. 21)

## **2.6 Summary**

In conclusion, the discussion of the role of gender in SLA has been in the agenda of many scholars for a long time; yet the results they reached are still far from being conclusive. Because gender itself is not a stable factor; it depends on many variables such as biological factors, cultural and social elements etc. Besides, along with gender, there are various other factors that also affect the process of language acquisition; namely, motivation, attitude, nationality and language learning strategies, one of the leading indicators of learning a foreign language. In this study, it is intended to reveal the interdependency of gender, language learning strategies and academic achievement.

## Chapter 3

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the overall design of the study. It also includes the research questions, description of participants, data collection instruments and data collection procedure.

#### 3.1 Research design of the study

This study was designed to investigate whether there is a significant mean difference in academic achievement across gender groups in the department of ELT. Secondly, the study aimed to find out whether there is a specific strategy type used differently by a gender group. Also, the study focuses on the link between academic achievement and strategy use.

The study depends on quantitative research design including descriptive and inferential statistics. Firstly, ELT students' GPA and CGPA scores were analyzed using SPSS 15.0 (Statistical Package of Social Sciences; SPSS Inc,1995). Then, an adapted Turkish version of Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was used as the data collection instrument. The data obtained through questionnaire (SILL) was analyzed through SPSS as well.

The current study considered the following research questions:

*1. Is there any statistically significant mean difference in academic achievement across gender groups in the English Language Teaching department at EMU?*

*2. Is there any specific language learning strategy type used differently by a gender group? If yes, is there any statistically significant mean difference in academic achievement across language learning strategy types?*

### **3.2 Context**

The subjects involved in this study were 90 students in English Language Teaching department at Eastern Mediterranean University.

Department of English Language Teaching (ELT) aims to help the students to integrate with the modern world of education. The department, with its eminent staff, provides the students with every possible opportunity to improve their language skills and to be educated as modern language teachers.

A well-balanced emphasis on theory and application is maintained throughout the BA study; commencing with the first year of language work and culminating with school experience and practicum at the close, students have opportunities to relate theory to practice and to explore career options. Moreover, a range of Major Area elective courses provide students with opportunities to familiarize themselves with the most recent developments in the field.

The program curriculum (See Appendix G) covers most of the courses that are considered critical to successful language instruction such as linguistics foundation, approaches to ELT, special teaching methods, teaching language skills, language acquisition, research methods, classroom management, testing and evaluation, as well as other courses crucial to effective teaching performance and professional growth.



### **3.3 Participants**

The participants consisted of 90 students (51 female, 39 male) from the department of ELT. The number of the females was higher than the males in the study, because there were slightly more female students in the department and the questionnaires were distributed to the whole department without considering the male/female ratio.

Their ages ranged between 19 and 25. 12 students stayed or visited English speaking countries. Also, 15 students said that they know other languages besides English.

### **3.4 Data Collection Instruments**

#### **3.4.1 Document Analysis**

The first data collection instrument was GPA and CGPA scores of students in the department of ELT. The documents were taken from Registrar's Office of Eastern Mediterranean University.

#### **3.4.2 Strategy Inventory for Language Learning**

The second data collection instrument was Turkish version of Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (See Appendix A) by Cesur and Fer (2007). The original version of SILL (See Appendix B) was not used because the first year students were not proficient enough in English to understand the statements, and such an attempt would have misled the study. SILL was designed in 1985 and revised later by Oxford. It was designed to identify the strategies that help students be more effective language learners. The survey provides information about the strategies that the individual learner employs to learn a second language (Tercanlioğlu, 2004). The inventory contains 50 statements in the style of "I do such-and-such"; students give their responses on a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 ("Never or almost never true of me") to 5 ("Always or almost always true of me")

(Green & Oxford, 1995). The SILL is based on Oxford's (1990) system for classifying strategies into six groups (and the 50 statements are distributed into those six categories):

1. **Memory related strategies**, such as grouping, imagery, moving physically and reviewing. Memory Strategies include items from 1 to 9.
2. **General cognitive strategies**, such as reasoning, analyzing, summarizing and practicing. Cognitive Strategies include items from 10 to 23.
3. **Compensatory strategies**, such as guessing meanings from context and using synonyms and gestures to convey meaning. Compensation Strategies include items from 24 to 29.
4. **Metacognitive strategies** for evaluating one's progress, consciously searching for practice opportunities, paying attention and monitoring errors. Metacognitive Strategies include items from 30 to 38.
5. **Affective strategies** for anxiety reduction, self-encouragement and self-reward. Items from 39 to 44 are used for Affective Strategies.
6. **Social strategies** such as asking questions, cooperating with native speakers, and becoming culturally aware. Finally, Social Strategies include items from 45 to 50.

In their study of the validity and reliability of the Turkish version of SILL, Cesur and Fer (2007) discovered the following:

Pearson's correlations between the Turkish and English versions of the survey (except for items 5., 12. and 29., .38 to .91 among the 6 subscales) indicated acceptable reliability; the correlations were significant at the .00 and .01 level the results of factor analysis for construct validity of the inventory addressed six dimensional constructs with 47 items; the total internal reliability of scale was .92 reliability coefficients; findings demonstrated that the subscales had internal consistency reliabilities, item total correlation, ranged from .27 to .62, and (that) test re-test reliability for external reliability of subscales was between .67-.82 (p. 49).

### 3.5 Data Collection Procedures

In order to find out whether there is a significant difference in academic achievement across gender groups, transcripts of the students in the Department of English Language Teaching (90 in total) in 2011-2012 academic year were taken from Registrar's Office of EMU by the researcher. Then, the students' GPA and CGPA scores were analyzed through SPSS. The mean scores of GPA and CGPA results will be evaluated according to the criteria which was determined by the researcher. This criteria is:

*1.00 – 1.99: low*

*2.00 – 2.49: average*

*2.50 – 2.99: successful*

*3.00 – 4.00: very successful*

The current study was carried out during the spring term of the 2011-2012 academic year. Before conducting the study, the researcher first informed the department of ELT about the study by writing a request letter to collect data (See Appendix E) and received the required permission. The researcher provided the questionnaire (SILL) online. Firstly, the students were informed about the study. Then, the researcher collected the e-mail addresses of all the students in the ELT department. They were aware of the fact that their answers to the questionnaire were used only for research purposes, so they wrote their e-mail addresses voluntarily on the list provided by the researcher. Also, they signed the consent form (See Appendix D). After getting all the e-mail addresses of the learners, the researcher sent the link of questionnaire to the students. 33 students completed general information form (See Appendix C) and

the online questionnaire. Their answers to the questionnaire were analyzed through SPSS.

### **3.6 Data Analysis**

Quantitative method including descriptive and inferential statistics was used in the research design of the study. Firstly, ELT students' GPA and CGPA scores were analyzed using SPSS 15.0 (Statistical Package of Social Sciences). First of all, distribution of GPA and CGPA scores was used to have a clear idea about the students' averages of academic achievement. Secondly, a descriptive statistics was done to see minimum, maximum and mean values of GPA and CGPA scores. Finally, an independent samples t-test was applied to the data set in order to see whether there is a significant mean difference in academic achievement across gender groups.

Afterwards, an adapted Turkish version of Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was used as the data collection instrument. The SILL was designed online and 33 students completed the survey on the internet. The data obtained through questionnaire (SILL) was analyzed through SPSS as well. Firstly, a descriptive statistics was used to see the minimum, maximum and mean values of overall strategy use. Then, an independent samples t-test was done to see LLS types used by gender groups.

Finally, another independent samples t-test was applied to the data set in order to see whether there is a significant mean difference in academic achievement of the students who completed the survey.

### **3.7 Limitations of the Study**

From 90 participants only 33 students completed the online questionnaire. So, it can be hard to generalize the results to the whole department in terms of strategy use. This research is a case study conducted in TRNC. Thus, the study can not give certain findings for other contexts. Also, the study did not take into account the students' motivation level, social, educational and cultural backgrounds of the students. Furthermore, the study only focused on academic achievement of ELT students across gender groups.

## Chapter 4

### THE FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the findings of the research and discussion will be presented. The findings will be shown in the light of the research questions with the help of descriptive and inferential statistics.

#### **4.1 Research Question 1: Is there any statistically significant difference in academic achievement across gender groups in the department of English Language Teaching at EMU?**

First of all, the mean scores of GPA and CGPA results will be evaluated according to the criteria which was determined by the researcher. This criteria is:

<i>1.00 – 1.99:</i>	<i>low</i>
<i>2.00 – 2.49:</i>	<i>average</i>
<i>2.50 – 2.99:</i>	<i>successful</i>
<i>3.00 – 4.00:</i>	<i>very successful</i>

As it is shown in Table 4.1, GPA scores of 40 students are between 1.00-1.99 out of 4.00. 21 students' GPA scores are between 3.00-4.00. 17 students' GPA scores are between 2.00-2.49 and finally 12 students' GPA scores are between 2.50-2.99.

Table 4.1 Distribution of GPA scores

<i>GPA</i>	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.00-1.99	40	44,4	44,4
2.00-2.49	17	18,9	63,3
2.50-2.99	12	13,3	76,7
3.00-4.00	21	23,3	100,0
Total	90	100,0	

In table 4.2, it can be seen that 35 students' CGPA scores are between 1.00-1.99 out of 4.00. 25 students' CGPA scores are between 2.00-2.49. 17 students' CGPA scores are between 2.50-2.99 and 13 students' CGPA scores are between 3.00-4.00. So, it can be concluded that the majority of participants have a low degree of achievement according to the criteria.

Table 4.2 Distribution of CGPA scores

<i>CGPA</i>	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.00-1.99	35	38,9	38,9
2.00-2.49	25	27,8	66,7
2.50-2.99	17	18,9	85,6
3.00-4.00	13	14,4	100,0
Total	90	100,0	

The first research question of the current study aimed to answer whether there is a statistically significant mean difference in academic achievement across gender groups.

First of all, a descriptive statistics was applied to the data set. The results revealed that the participants have a mean of 2,13 for GPA and 2,21 for CGPA scores as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics for GPA and CGPA Scores of Participants

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
GPA	90	,00	4,00	2,1329	1,07662
CGPA	90	,26	3,93	2,2170	,73779

It can be understood from the Table 4.4 that female students have a mean of 2,36 for GPA and CGPA while male students have a mean of 1,83 for GPA and 2,01 for CGPA. The mean scores indicated that the female students' GPA and CGPA scores were higher than the male students.

Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics for GPA and CGPA scores of Gender Groups

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
GPA	Female	51	2,3606	1,00597	,14086
	Male	39	1,8351	1,10573	,17706
CGPA	Female	51	2,3686	,67620	,09469
	Male	39	2,0187	,77590	,12424

To understand if the difference between the male and female students' scores is significant, an independent samples *t*-test was applied to the data set. According to Levene's test for equality of variances, the significance values were ,334 and ,306, which were bigger than .05. Therefore, it was assumed that the variances were equal. As a result, the corresponding *t*-test values were observed in the table. The given sig. (2-tailed) values were ,021 for GPA scores and ,025 for CGPA scores. Both of the



values of sig. (2-tailed) are smaller than .05. As a result, it can be concluded that the difference in the GPA and CGPA scores of males and females was significant, which can be interpreted that there was significant mean difference in academic achievement of the participating male and female students. So, it can be concluded that female students' GPA and CGPA scores are higher than those male students as shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Independent Samples t-tests for GPA and CGPA Scores of Gender Groups

			Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
			F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std.Error Difference
GPA	Equal	variances	,945	,334*	2,352	88	,021*	,52546	,22340
	assumed	not assumed			2,322	77,677	,023	,52546	,22626
CGPA	Equal	variances	1,062	,306*	2,282	88	,025*	,34991	,15336
	assumed	not assumed			2,240	75,583	,028	,34991	,15621

\* 'alpha' for the sig. of  $F > 0.05$  and 'alpha' for the sig. of  $t < 0.05$

#### **4.2 Research Question 2: Is there any specific language learning strategy type used differently by a gender group? If yes, is there any statistically significant mean difference in academic achievement across language learning strategy types?**

The second and the last question of the current study sought an answer as to whether there is a specific language learning strategy type used differently by a gender group.

To answer this question, firstly a descriptive statistics was done for SILL and its subscales. The results indicated that compensation strategies have the highest mean (4,06) among the other scales as shown in Table 4.6 below.

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics for SILL and Its Subscales of Participants

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
SILL	33	2,29	5,00	3,7162	,60794
Memory	33	1,78	5,00	3,4848	,74526
Cognitive	33	2,71	5,00	3,8009	,55321
Compensation	33	1,83	5,00	4,0606	,76809
Metacognitive	33	2,33	5,00	3,9865	,66304
Affective	33	1,00	5,00	3,2374	,89174
Social	33	2,167	5,000	3,72727	,696990

Secondly, in the descriptive statistics for overall strategies and its subscales, it can be understood that female students have a mean of 3,84 while male students have a mean of 4,48 for Compensation Strategies. However, for the overall strategies, females have a mean of 3,59 and males have a mean of 3,95 which can be said that male students' overall strategy use is higher than female students. Table 4.7 presents the results.

Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics for SILL and Its Subscales of Gender Groups

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SILL	Female	22	3,5949	,65706	,14009
	Male	11	3,9589	,42301	,12754
Memory	Female	22	3,3788	,81119	,17295
	Male	11	3,6970	,56676	,17088
Cognitive	Female	22	3,7338	,59443	,12673
	Male	11	3,9351	,45564	,13738
Compensation	Female	22	3,8485	,82281	,17542
	Male	11	4,4848	,41133	,12402
Metacognitive	Female	22	3,9192	,71614	,15268
	Male	11	4,1212	,54762	,16511
Affective	Female	22	3,0606	,98607	,21023
	Male	11	3,5909	,54449	,16417
Social	Female	22	3,62879	,736307	,156981
	Male	11	3,92424	,593313	,178891

Finally, to understand if the difference between the male and female students' strategy use is significant, an independent samples *t*-test was applied to the data set. According to Levene's test for equality of variances, the significance values of all the subscales were bigger than .05 except Compensation Strategies. The sig. value in Compensation Strategies is .05. Therefore, it was assumed that the variances were not equal. As a result, the corresponding *t*-test values were observed in the Table 4.8. The given sig. (2-tailed) value was .00 which is smaller than .05. As a result, it can be concluded that the difference in the use of Compensation Strategies by gender groups is significant. So, it can be concluded that male students use Compensation Strategies more than female students. In terms of subscales in SILL, the only significant mean difference was found in Compensation Strategies. When the items in each subscales were analyzed, 4 items was found significant out of 6 (c25, c27, c28, c29). In item c24, sig. value was ,969 which was bigger than .05. So, it was assumed that the variances were equal. As a result, sig. (2-tailed) value was .85 which is bigger than .05. Therefore, it can be said that the difference in item c24 is not significant. In item c26, sig. value was ,900 which is bigger than .05. Thus, it was assumed that the variances were equal. Sig. (2-tailed) value was ,64 which is bigger than .05. Thus, the difference in item c26 is not significant as well. Another significant difference was found in item e40 which belongs to Affective Strategy. The sig. value in item e40 is ,00 which is smaller than .05 so it was assumed that the variances were not equal. As a result, sig. (2-tailed) value was .00 which is smaller than .05. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in Affective Strategies in terms of gender because of the fact that only item e40 was significant (See Appendix F).

Table 4.8 Independent Samples t-tests for SILL and Its Subscales of Gender Groups

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std.Error Difference
SILL	Equal variances assumed	,700	,409*	-1,665	31	,106	-,36394	,21852
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,921	28,754	,065	-,36394	,18945
Memory	Equal variances assumed	,352	,557*	-1,162	31	,254	-,31818	,27371
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,309	27,326	,202	-,31818	,24313
Cognitive	Equal variances assumed	,615	,439*	-,985	31	,332	-,20130	,20438
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,077	25,476	,292	-,20130	,18691
Compensation	Equal variances assumed	3,883	,058*	-2,406	31	,022	-,63636	,26454
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,962	30,984	,006*	-,63636	,21484
Metacognitive	Equal variances assumed	1,022	,320*	-,821	31	,418	-,20202	,24610
	Equal variances not assumed			-,898	25,526	,377	-,20202	,22489
Affective	Equal variances assumed	1,881	,180*	-1,653	31	,108	-,53030	,32072
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,988	30,558	,056	-,53030	,26674
Social	Equal variances assumed	,428	,518*	-1,154	31	,257	-,295455	,256058
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,241	24,432	,226	-,295455	,238002

\* 'alpha' for the sig. of  $F > 0.05$  and 'alpha' for the sig. of  $t < 0.05$

Another independent samples t-test was applied to the data in order to see the relationship between LLS use and academic achievement of these 33 students. In the Table 4.9, females have a mean of 2,86 for GPA and 2,66 for CGPA scores and male students have a mean of 2,29 for GPA and 2,18 for CGPA scores.

Table 4.9 Descriptive Statistics for GPA and CGPA Scores of 33 Students

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
GPA	Female	22	2,8636	,65270	,13916
	Male	11	2,2945	1,23722	,37304
CGPA	Female	22	2,6600	,52176	,11124
	Male	11	2,1882	1,02260	,30833

According to Levene's test for equality of variances, the significance values of CGPA and CGPA scores were .001 and .005 which are smaller than .05. Therefore, it was assumed that the variances were not equal. The given sig. (2-tailed) values were .177 and .174 which are bigger than .05. As a result, it can be concluded that there is not a significant difference in academic achievement of the students who completed the SILL.

Table 4.10 Independent Samples t-tests for GPA and CGPA Scores of 33 Students

			Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
			F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
CPA	Equal variances assumed		12,769	,001*	1,742	31	,091	,56909	,32663
	Equal variances not assumed				1,429	12,858	,177*	,56909	,39815
CGPA	Equal variances assumed		9,110	,005*	1,769	31	,087	,47182	,26673
	Equal variances not assumed				1,439	12,671	,174*	,47182	,32778

\* 'alpha' for the sig. of  $F > 0.05$  and 'alpha' for the sig. of  $t < 0.05$

### 4.3 Summary of the Findings

To sum up, it was found that there is a significant difference in academic achievement across gender groups. Also, on the whole the strategies that are included in the subscales of the inventory, direct: memory, cognitive, compensation; indirect:

metacognitive, affective and social, indicated a difference between male and female participants. Analyses showed a significant male superiority in the use of language learning strategies. Male students used Compensation Strategies more than the other types of strategies. However, results showed that strategy use does not have an influence on academic achievement.

#### **4.4 Discussion**

The findings of the study showed that there was a significant difference in academic achievement across gender groups. GPA and CGPA scores of the female students were higher than the scores of the male students, and the difference was proved to be significant with the follow up statistical procedures.

Several scholars such as Burstall (1975) Boyle (1987) relating to female superiority in learning languages of both such studies and the current study can neither be generalized to other settings nor be evaluated on their own. Because there are other studies (Nyikos, 1990; Bacon, 1992 etc.) that found contrastive results indicating that males scored better in overall language ability or specific language skills.

The second question was “Is there any special LLS type used differently by a gender group? If yes, is there any statistically significant difference in academic achievement across language learning strategy types?” To answer this question, the data set was analyzed according to the subscales of the language learning strategies; namely direct and indirect strategies. According to the analyses, there was a significant difference in strategy use favoring males. Male students used compensation strategies more than female students. It can be said that male students make guesses to understand unfamiliar words. They use gestures during a

conversation in English, make up new words if they do not know the right ones in English. They also read English without looking up every new word and when they can not think of an English word, they use a word or phrase that has the same meaning. Finally, they try to guess what the other person will say next in English.

Tercanlioğlu (2004) also found a male superiority in her study; but she also indicated female superiority in the affective domain. As Alptekin states, compensation strategies are employed as a crucial means of communication embodying all four skills. They are also reported to be most frequently used in formal language learning settings where learners encounter communication breakdowns due to inadequate or missing knowledge, the learning context and the type of indirect strategy preferred (Bremmer, 1999, in Alptekin, 2007).

Özseven (1993) designed a study based on the investigation of the relationship between language learning strategies and oral performance of Turkish EFL science graduate participants at the English Preparatory School at Dokuz Eylül University. The researcher applied Oxford's Strategy Inventory Version 7.0 (1989), which had also been applied in some other researches, to the participants. According to the data analysis and interpretation, most of the participants preferred indirect strategies rather than direct strategies. Those who preferred indirect strategies employed metacognitive strategies. The researcher also compared those results to the scores of the oral performances of the participants. It was found that there is no direct correlation between the participants' language learning strategies and their success in an oral performance.

Acunsal (2005) conducted a study about language learning strategies according to nationality, academic achievement and gender. The study revealed that male students among Turkish participants prefer different strategies according to their academic achievement. Turkish male participants with a low level academic achievement prefer social strategies; whereas participants whose academic achievement is at average prefer metacognitive strategies most of the time. On the other hand, male participants having a high level academic achievement among Turkish participants generally prefer compensation strategies.

Yalcin (2006) sought answer to the question whether there was a difference in students' use of language learning strategies based on their gender. 334 prep-class students participated in the study at Gazi University. These students were in three different proficiency levels. Not like the current study, the findings indicated that more successful students used more language learning strategies and females used language learning strategies more than males. He, also, found that there were statistically significant differences between males and females in their use of language learning strategies, all favoring females, in memory, cognitive, metacognitive, affective and social strategies. However, not like the case in this study, there was no statistically significant difference related to compensation strategies.

Similar to this study, Tabanlıoğlu (2003) studied the relationship between learning styles and language learning strategies of pre-intermediate EAP (English for Academic Purposes) participants at the University of Bahçeşehir. In addition, she attempted to determine whether there are any differences between the learning styles and strategies of female and male participants. She gave two different inventories to



participants in order to identify their learning styles and strategies during class time. Afterwards, Tabanlıoğlu collected data by using the Think Aloud Protocols. She used it to determine which strategies participants are using as they are reading texts. SPSS was employed to obtain the results from the inventories. According to the results, no significant difference was found between the strategy preferences according to gender. On the contrary, this study revealed significant difference in strategy use across gender groups.

In a final study, Cesur (2008) found that females were superior to males in terms of language learning strategy use and they were more successful in learning English. In all the subscales female participants employed more language learning strategies.

To sum up, some researchers found similar results to this study but some of them found different results. This study indicated that females were significantly more successful than males in terms of academic achievement. However, the study showed that male students employ more language learning strategies than female students especially in compensation strategies. Therefore, it can be understood that the use of LLS is not parallel with academic achievement results. Males use more strategies than females but their academic success is lower than female students. It should be noted, though, that why males use more strategies and what other factors effect achievement or use of language learning strategies, need to be further investigated.

## Chapter 5

### CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the overview of the study, pedagogical implications and recommendations for further research.

#### 5.1 Overview of the Study

This study intended to investigate the relationship between gender and academic achievement and to find out language learning strategy types used by gender groups and its influence on their academic achievement. 90 students in the Department of English Language Teaching participated in the study.

Firstly, students' GPA and CGPA scores were compared to see the relationship between gender and achievement. The data were analyzed through SPSS (15.0). Descriptive statistics and independent t-test was applied to the data set. Then, in order to find out learning strategy types used by gender groups. The data were gathered through Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) of Oxford (1990), which was translated to Turkish by Cesur and Fer (2007). The underlying reason for using the Turkish version of the instrument was that the students could understand the statements clearly and respond accordingly. The instrument is based on Oxford's (1990) classification of the language learning strategies, which is composed of 50 items in six subscales. The data, then, were analyzed through SPSS (15.0) to see the relation between gender and strategy use.

To summarize, it was found that there is a significant difference in academic achievement of the students in the department of ELT across gender groups. In terms of language learning strategy use, male students used more strategies than female students. According to the results, males employed compensation strategies more than the other strategy types. However, there is no significant difference between strategy use and academic achievement.

## **5.2 Pedagogical Implications**

During the teaching and learning process, many English language teachers may be faced with various difficulties. For example, teachers have to consider classroom management issues, such as discipline, disruptions and allocating equal time for all students. Accordingly, the factors which effect learning can be age, motivation, culture, individual learning style or language learning strategies of the participants. Considering this, teachers should have awareness of the reasons being teaching and the knowledge of what they are teaching. Moreover, the teaching style should appeal to all participants in the classroom. Shortly, what is needed more is to conduct learning materials that lead students to acquire language concepts meaningfully.

In this study, it was found that there is no significant difference between academic achievement and strategy use. Males used more strategies than females. Also, there was a significant difference only in Compensation Strategies. There are a number of factors which affect the choice of the learners' strategy, such as a learner's age, gender, nationality or his degree of awareness. If the learners are informed about the use of strategies, they would choose the best one for themselves. Moreover, when participants use language learning strategies, teachers are also informed about the learners' personalities or their learning preferences. In this way, teachers can prepare

activities or tools which will help participants to get the most benefits out of the learning process so that the difference in academic achievement across gender groups can be decreased.

Brown (2001) states that language teachers are to equip their students with a sense of what successful language learners do to achieve success and to aid them in developing their own unique, individual pathways to success in the classroom. Being welltrained in language learning strategies, teachers should inform their participants how to identify and employ different language learning strategies and increase their learning awareness in order to create a learning environment. After some time, participants might learn how to match their language learning strategies with their needs. Additionally, they might contribute to their proficiency level. In this way, the participants' success in the classroom and individual learning of the participants may increase. Hence, participants can overcome any problems about learning new items when learning materials which appeal to their language learning strategies used in the classroom. By distributing informal selfchecklists, assigning occasional readings, lectures, discussions and encouraging 'good language learner' behaviors as a rule, teacher can also develop students' self-awareness in language learning strategies. Moreover, using interactive or compensatory techniques, administering a strategy inventory and making use of impromptu teacher-initiated advice are some approaches that teachers can take to teach language learning strategies in the classrooms.

Research on gender and other factors interconnected with it provides the teachers with valuable information about the learners they are teaching. It should be noted

that high motivation and positive attitude towards a foreign language affects achievement. About the LLS, It is also important while teaching language learning strategies explicitly that not every student need the same strategies or in the same amount. Green and Oxford (1995) found that some strategies used by effective language learners of the lower levels are used less often by the same learners when they reach higher levels, as they needed to develop new strategies to meet the requirements of more challenging language tasks. The need for strategies also differs with the language tasks. As a result, students should know their needs and learn to employ the required language learning strategies. Finally, students should be informed of the broad range of strategy options available. It can be seen clearly from this study that LLS do not always have influence on academic achievement. Language learning strategies are not limited to the ones cited in SILL. There are many more strategies proposed by other scholars and still there may be more that have not been explored yet.

### **5.3 Suggestions for Further Research**

This study answered some questions relating to gender, language learning strategies and achievement. However, further research is needed to better understand their interconnection and test their accuracy. First of all, the participant number is not enough in terms of analyzing strategy use. Another study can be done with more participants to have a clear idea about LLS use. As a consequence, it is generally believed that learning a foreign language is quite difficult. For that reason, language learning strategies are the areas where more research is required. Therefore, further research on language learning strategies might focus on factors such as motivation, social, educational and cultural backgrounds which affect participants' language learning strategies and achievement. Furthermore, the relationship between the

language learning strategies, styles and different parts in multiple intelligence can be analyzed. Additionally, in further studies, the impact of vocabulary language learning strategies on the achievement, gender and nationality of the participants might be analyzed by using experimental and control groups consisting of larger number of participants.

## REFERENCES

- Acunsal B. D. H., (2005). A Study on Language Learning Strategies of 8th Grade Students According to their Nationality, Academic Achievement and Gender. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Başkent Üniversitesi, Turkey.
- Alptekin, C. (2007) Foreign language learning strategy choice: Naturalistic versus instructed language acquisition [Electronic version]. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 2007, 3(1), 4-11.
- Aslan, O. (2009). The Role of Gender and Language Learning Strategies in Learning English. M.A. Thesis, METU, Turkey.
- Bacon, S. (1992). The relationship between gender, comprehension and, proceeding strategies and cognitive and affective response in second-language listening. *The Modern Language Journal* 76(2), 160-178.
- Bardwick, J. (1971). *Psychology of Women: A study of Biocultural Conflicts*. New York: Harper&Row.
- Begley, T., 1995. Using Founder Status, Age of the Firm, and Company Growth Rate as the Basis for Distinguishing Entrepreneurs From Managers of Smaller Businesses. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10, 249-263.

- Behçetoğulları, S. (1993). A Comparative Study of Gender Differences in English Foreign Language Proficiency among Turkish University Preparatory School Learners. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Bilkent University, Turkey.
- Bem, S. L. (1983). Gender schema theory and its implications for child development: Raising genderaschematic children in a gender-schematic society. *Signs*, 8(4), 598–616.
- Block, D. (2002). Language & Gender and SLA. [Electronic version] *Quaderns de Filologia. Estudis Linguistics*. 7, 49-73.
- Bloch, B and Trager, G (1942). *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*. Waverly Press.
- Boyle, J. (1987). Sex differences in learning vocabulary. *Language Learning*, 37(2), 273-284.
- Bremmer, S. (1999). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: Investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55(4), 490-514.
- Bridgeman, B. & Wendler, C. (1991) Gender Differences in Predictors of College Mathematics Performance and in College Mathematics Course Grades, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 275-284.



Brown, D. H. (2001), *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*, Second Edition, New York: Prentice Hall.

Bryden, M. P. (1979). Evidence for Sex-Related Differences in Cerebral Organization. In M.A. Writing and A.C. Peterson (Eds.) *Sex-Related Differences in Cognitive Functioning* (121-143). New York: Academic Press.

Bulut, S. (1994) *The Effects of Different Teaching Methods and Gender on Probability Achievement and Attitudes toward Probability*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, METU, Turkey.

Burstall, C. (1975). Factors affecting foreign-language learning: a consideration of some relevant research findings. [Electronic version]. *Language Teaching and Linguistics Abstracts*, 8, 105-25.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of the Identity*. New York:Routledge.

Byrnes, J. P., Hong, L. & Xing, S. (1997) Gender Differences on the Math Subtest of the Scholastic Aptitude Test May Be Culture-Specific, *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 34, 49-66.

Cameron, D. (1990). *Feminism and linguistic theory* (2nd ed.). London: Macmillan.

Cameron, D. (1995). Rethinking language and gender studies: Some issues for the 1990s. In Mills, S. (Ed.). *Language and Gender: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (31-44). London: Routledge.

Cameron, D. (2004). Language, gender, and sexuality: Current issues and new directions. *Applied Linguistics* 26(4), 482-502. Oxford University Press.

Carr, J & A. Pauwels (2005). *Women, Men and Language*. London: Longman.

Cesur, O. (2008), Üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin yabancı dil öğrenme stratejileri, öğrenme stili tercihi ve yabancı dil akademik başarısı arasındaki açıklayıcı ve yordayıcı ilişkiler oruntusu. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Turkey.

Cesur, M. O. & Fer, S. (2007) Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanterinin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması nedir? *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(2), 49-74.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton & Co, 1957.

Clark, A. & Trafford, J. (1995) Boys into modern languages: an investigation of the discrepancy in attitudes and performance between boys and girls in modern languages, *Gender and Education*, 3, 315–325.

- Clark, A. & Trafford, A. J. (1996). Return to gender: boys' and girls' attitudes and achievements. *Language Learning Journal*, 14, 40–9.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Coşgun, Z. (2002) Eğitim ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet: Okul Öncesi Dönemde Cinsiyete Dayalı Toplumsal Rollerin Öğrenilmesi. M.A. Thesis, Sakarya University, Turkey.
- Davis, K.A. & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2004). Looking back, taking stock, moving forward: Investigating gender in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly* 38(3), 381-404.
- Demir, C. (2005). “Perceived Significance of Factors Influencing Leisure Participation by Gender: An Implication from Turkey”, *Journal of the Canadian Association for Leisure Studies*, 29(1), 121-136.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994) Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom, *Modern Language Journal*, 3, 273–284.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31, 117-135.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Clément, R. (2001). Motivational characteristics of learning different target languages: Results of a nationwide survey. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt

(Eds.), Motivation and second language acquisition (Technical Report, 23, 399-432). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientation, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning*, 53, 3-32.

Dubois, B. L., & Crouch, I. (1975). The question of tag questions in women's speech: They don't really use more of them, do they? *Language in Society*, 4(3), 289–294.

Dreyer, C. & Oxford, R. L. (1996). Learning strategies and other predictors of ESL proficiency among Afrikaans-speakers in South Africa. In Oxford, R. (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-cultural Perspectives* (61-74). Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.

Dursun, E. (2007). An Investigation Into Reasons of Gender Differences in Foreign Language Learning Success at University Level Prep Classes. M.A. Thesis, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey.

Eastern Mediterranean University, 2012. Available:

[http://mevzuat.emu.edu.tr/5-1-0-RegulationEducation\\_Examination\\_Success.htm](http://mevzuat.emu.edu.tr/5-1-0-RegulationEducation_Examination_Success.htm)

Ehrlich, S. (1997). Gender as social practice: Implications for second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 421–446.

- Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 1-13.
- Ersay, A. (1998). Gender related learning strategies and student achievement in EFL language classes at EMU. M.A Thesis, Eastern Mediterranean University, TRNC.
- Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. 1983. *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Fred, C.C (2005). *Language in the Brain: Critical Assessments*. Continuum.
- Freed, A. F. (1995). Language and gender. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 3-22.
- Gass, S. & Varonis, E. (1986). Sex differences in non-native speaker interactions. In Day, R. (Ed.) *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition* (327-351). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 Proficiency and Gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261-297.
- Goldstein, E. B. (2008) *Cognitive Psychology: Connecting Mind, Research, and Everyday Experience*, 2nd ed. Thomson.

Halpern, D.F. (1992). *Sex differences in cognitive abilities* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Holmes, J. (1991). State of the art: Language and gender. *Language Teaching* 24, 207–220.

Jones, B., & Jones, M., 2001. *Boy's Performance in Modern Foreign Languages*. Centre for Information on Language Teaching, London.

Kimball, M. M. (1989) A New Perspective on Women's Math Achievement, *Psychological Bulletin*, 105, 198-214.

Kobayashi, Y. (2002) The Role of Gender in Foreign Language Learning Attitudes: Japanese female students' attitudes towards English learning *Gender and Education*, 14, (2), 181–197.

Kramarae, C. (1981) Women as a muted group, in: *Women and Men Speaking* (Rowley, MA, Newbury House).

Lao, R. C. (1980) Differential Factors Affecting Male and Female Academic Performance in High School, *The Journal of Psychology*, 104, 119-127.

Lee, M.B (2001). *Language Learning Strategies, EFL Performance, and Gender: A Synchronized Look at the Forest and the Trees* University of Kansas, Teaching and Leadership.

- Lippa, R. A. (2005). Gender, personality, and the ability to judge emotions from the eye regions of human faces. American Psychological Society. Los Angeles, California.
- Litosseliti, L. & Sunderland, J. (2002). *Gender identity and discourse analysis*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ludwig, J. (1983). Attitudes and expectations: A profile of female and male students of college French, German, and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal* 67(2), 216-227.
- Matlin, M. W. (1993) *The Psychology of Women*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers: USA.
- McGroarty, M. (1996). Language attitudes, motivation, and standards, in: S. L. Mckay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds) *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- McMahill, C. (1997). Communities of resistance: A case study of two feminist English classes in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 612–622.
- McMahill, C. (2001). Self-expression, gender, and community: A Japanese feminist English class. In Pavlenko, A., Blackledge, A., Piller, I. & Teutsch-Dwyer, M. (Eds.), *Multilingualism, Second Language Learning, and Gender* (307–344). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second-language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Mehl, M. R. & Pennebaker, J. W. (2003). The sounds of social life: A psychometric analysis of students' daily social environments and natural conversations. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 84, 857–870.
- Moir, A. & Jessel, D. (1991) *Brain Sex: The Real Difference Between Men and Women*, Mandarin, London.
- Montgomery, S. (2004). Of Towers, Walls, and Fields: Perspectives on Language in Science. *Science* 303, 1333 DOI: 10.1126/science.1095204.
- Mulac, A. & Lundell, T. L. (1986). Linguistic contributors to the gender-linked language effect. *Journal of Language & Social Psychology*, 5, 81–101.
- Mullins, P. (1992). *Successful English Language Learning Strategies of Students Enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, United States International University, San Diego, CA.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner*. Toronto: OISE Press.



- Nichols, P. C. (1999). The role of social networks and the strength of weak ties in changing language policy: Gender neutralization in American English. In Huebner, T. & Davis, K. A. (Eds.), *Sociopolitical Perspectives on Language Policy and Planning in the USA* (67–98). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Norton, B., & Pavlenko, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Gender and English Language Learners*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Nyikos, M. (1990). Sex related differences in adult language learning: socialization and memory factors. *The Modern Language Journal*, 3, (2), 273-287.
- O'Malley, J.M. et al. (1985). Learning Strategy Applications with Students of English as a Second Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, (3).
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. L. (1992). Gender differences in styles and strategies for language learning: What do they mean? Should we pay attention? In Alatis, J. (Ed.), *Strategic Interaction and Language Acquisition: Theory, Practice, and Research* (541–557). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning styles and strategies: an overview. *Learning Styles & Strategies*. GALA, 2003 on [web.ntpu.edu.tw/-language/workshop/read2](http://web.ntpu.edu.tw/-language/workshop/read2)
- Oxford, R. L., & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on language learning strategies: Methods, findings, and instructional issues. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 403-419.
- Oxford, R. L. and Nyikos, M. (1993). A factor analytic study of language-learning strategy use: interpretations from information-processing theory and social psychology. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77, 11-22.
- Ozek, Y. (2000). The influence of various motivational factors on foreign-language learning. In *Individual differences and foreign language learning: Effects of aptitude, intelligence, and motivation*, (Eds). S. Cornwell & P. Robinson. Tokyo: Aoyama Gakuin University.
- Özseven, S. (1993). The Relationship between Language learning strategies and Oral Performance of Turkish EFL Graduate Science Participants in Preparatory Programs, Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Bilkent University, Turkey.
- Pavlenko, A. (2001). Bilingualism, gender, and ideology. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(2), 117–151.

- Politzer, R.L. (1983). An exploratory study of self reported language learning behaviors and their relation to achievement. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6, 54-68.
- Powell, R. & Batters, J. (1985) Pupils' perceptions of foreign language learning at 12 : some gender differences, *Educational Studies*, 1, 11–23.
- Pritchard, R.M.O. (1987). Boys' and girls' attitudes towards French and German. *Educational Research*, 29, 65–72.
- Richards, J. & Platt, J. (1992). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Essex: Longman.
- Rigney, J.W. (1978). Learning strategies: A theoretical perspective. In O'Neil, H.F. (Jr) (Ed.). *Learning Strategies* (165-205). New York: Academic Press.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'good language learner' can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9,41-51.
- Rubin, J. and Wenden, A. (1987), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. UK: Prentice-Hall International.
- Salem, N. M. (2006). *The Role of Motivation, Gender and Language Learning Strategies in EFL Proficiency*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, American University of Beirut, Lebanon.

- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Skehan, P. (1989). Motivation, in: *Individual Differences in Second Language Learning* (London, Edward Arnold).
- Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Springer, S. & Deutsch, G. (1989). *Left brain, right brain*. (3rd Edition) New York: W.H. Freeman.
- SPSS Inc. (1995). *SPSS 15.0 for Windows*. Chicago: Statistical Package for Social Sciences.
- Stage, F. K. & Kloosterman, P. (1995) Gender, Beliefs, and Achievement in Remedial College-Level Mathematics, *Journal of Higher Education*, 66, 294-311.
- Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 34, 304-318.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Stern, H.H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Sunderland, J. (1993). *Exploring Gender: Questions and Implications for English Language Education*. (Ed.) Lancaster University: Prentice Hall
- Tabanlıoğlu, S. (2003), *The Relationship between Learning Styles and Language learning strategies of Pre-Intermediate EAP Participants*, Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Turkey.
- Tercanlıoğlu, L. (2004). Exploring gender effect on adult foreign language learning strategies [Electronic version]. *Issues in Educational Research*, 14, 181-193.
- Thomas, R., & Murachver, T. (2001). Predicting gender from electronic discourse. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 193–208.
- Wafa, A. (2003). Language Learning Strategy Use in Palestine. *TESL-EJ*. 7(2)-A3.
- Wareing, S. (1994). Gender differences in language use. In J. Sunderland (Ed.), *Exploring gender: Questions and implications for English language education* (34–38). New York: Prentice Hall International English Language Teaching.
- Weiten, W. (2007) *Psychology: Themes And Variations*, 7th ed. Thomson Wadsworth.

- Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Wilberg, S. & Lynn, R. (1999) Sex Differences in Historical Knowledge and School Grades: A 26 Nation Study, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27, 1221-1229.
- Williams, M., R. Burden, & U. Lanvers. 2002. Student perceptions of issues related to motivation in learning a foreign language. *British Educational Research Journal*, 28, (4), 503-28.
- Yalcin, M. (2006) Differences in the perceptions on language learning strategies of English preparatory class students studying at Gazi University. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Gazi University, Turkey.
- Yilmaz, V. (1997). *Language Learning Strategies of Turkish EFL Students and the Effects of Proficiency Level and Gender on Strategy Use*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Anadolu University, Turkey.
- Young, J. W. & Fisler, J. L. (2000) Sex Differences on the SAT: An Analysis of Demographic and Educational Variables, *Research in Higher Education*, 41, 401-416.

Younger, M., Warrington, M. and Williams, J. (1999) The Gender Gap and Classroom Interactions: Reality and Rhetoric? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20, 325-341

## **APPENDICES**



# APPENDIX A: The Strategy Inventory of Language Learning

## DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ ENVANTERİ Oxford (1990)

Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenler için hazırlanmıştır. Bu envanterde İngilizce öğrenme stratejilerinize ilişkin ifadeler okuyacaksınız. Her ifadenin sizin için ne kadar doğru ya da geçerli olduğunu, aşağıdaki derecelendirme ölçeği üzerinde işaretleyiniz. *Verilen ifadenin, nasıl yapmanız gerektiğine da başkalarının neler yaptığı değil, sadece sizin yaptıklarınızı ne kadar tasvirettiğini göz önünde bulundurunuz.* Maddeleri yapabildiğiniz kadar hızlı şekilde, çok zaman harcamadan ve dikkatlice işaretleyip bir sonraki maddeye geçiniz. Anketi cevaplandırmak yaklaşık 10-15 dakikanızı alacaktır.

- 5= Her zaman doğru**  
**4= Genellikle doğru**  
**3= Bazen doğru**  
**2= Nadiren doğru**  
**1= Hiçbir zaman doğru değil**

### BÖLÜM A:

1. İngilizcede bildiklerimle yeni öğrendiklerim arasında ilişki kurarım.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri hatırlamak için bir cümlede kullanırım.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri akılda tutmak için kelimenin telaffuzuyla aklıma getirdiği bir resim ya da şekil arasında bağlantı kurarım.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Yeni bir kelimeyi o sözcüğün kullanılabileceği bir sahneyi ya da durumu aklımda canlandırarak, hatırlarım.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Yeni kelimeleri aklımda tutmak için, onları ses	5	4	3	2	1

benzerliđi olan kelimelerle iliřkilendiririm.					
<b>6.</b> Yeni öğrendiđim kelimeleri aklımda tutmak için küçük kartlara yazarım.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>7.</b> Yeni kelimeleri vücut dili kullanarak zihnimde canlandırırım.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>8.</b> İngilizce derslerinde öğrendiklerimi sık sık tekrar ederim.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>9.</b> Yeni kelime ve kelime gruplarını ilk karşılařtıđım yerleri (kitap, tahta ya da herhangi bir işaret levhasını) aklıma getirerek, hatırlarım.	5	4	3	2	1

### **BÖLÜM B:**

<b>10.</b> Yeni sözcükleri birkaç kez yazarak, ya da söyleyerek, tekrarlarım.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>11.</b> Anadili İngilizce olan kişiler gibi konuşmaya çalışırım.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>12.</b> Anadilimde bulunmayan İngilizcedeki “ <b>th /θ / hw</b> ” gibi sesleri çıkararak, telaffuz alıştırması yaparım.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>13.</b> Bildiđim kelimeleri cümlelerde farklı şekillerde kullanırım.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>14.</b> İngilizce sohbetleri ben başlatırım.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>15.</b> TV’de İngilizce programlar ya da İngilizce filmler izlerim.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>16.</b> İngilizce okumaktan hoşlanırım.	5	4	3	2	1
<b>17.</b> İngilizce mesaj, mektup veya rapor yazarım.	5	4	3	2	1

18. İngilizce bir metne ilk başta bir göz atarım, daha sonra metnin tamamını dikkatlice okurum.	5	4	3	2	1
19. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelimelerin benzerlerini Türkçede ararım.	5	4	3	2	1
20. İngilizcede tekrarlanan kalıplar bulmaya çalışırım.	5	4	3	2	1
21. İngilizce bir kelimenin, bildiğim kök ve eklerine ayırarak anlamını çıkarırım.	5	4	3	2	1
22. Kelimesi kelimesine çeviri <b>yapmamaya</b> çalışırım.	5	4	3	2	1
23. Dinlediğim ya da okuduğum metnin özetini çıkarırım.	5	4	3	2	1

### BÖLÜM C:

24. Bilmediğim İngilizce kelimelerin anlamını, tahmin ederek bulmaya çalışırım.	5	4	3	2	1
25. İngilizce konuşurken bir sözcük aklıma gelmediğinde, el kol hareketleriyle anlatmaya çalışırım.	5	4	3	2	1
26. Uygun ve doğru kelimeyi bilmediğim durumlarda kafamdan yenisözcükler uydururum.	5	4	3	2	1
27. Okurken her bilmediğim kelimeye sözlükten bakmadan, okumayı sürdürürüm.	5	4	3	2	1
28. Konuşma sırasında karşımdakinin söyleyeceği bir sonraki cümleyi tahmin etmeye çalışırım.	5	4	3	2	1
29. Herhangi bir kelimeyi hatırlayamadığımda, aynı anlamı taşıyan başka bir kelime ya da ifade kullanırım.	5	4	3	2	1

**BÖLÜM D:**

30. İngilizcemi kullanmak için her fırsatı değerlendiririm.	5	4	3	2	1
31. Yaptığım yanlışların farkına varır ve bunlardan daha doğru İngilizce kullanmak için faydalanırım.	5	4	3	2	1
32. İngilizce konuşan bir kişi duyduğumda dikkatimi ona veririm.	5	4	3	2	1
33. “İngilizceyi daha iyi nasıl öğrenirim?” sorusunun yanıtını araştırırım.	5	4	3	2	1
34. İngilizce çalışmaya yeterli zaman ayırmak için zamanımı planlarım.	5	4	3	2	1
35. İngilizce konuşabileceğim kişilerle tanışmak için fırsat kollarım.	5	4	3	2	1
36. İngilizce okumak için, elimden geldiği kadar fırsat yaratırım.	5	4	3	2	1
37. İngilizcede becerilerimi nasıl geliştireceğim konusunda hedeflerim var.	5	4	3	2	1
38. İngilizcemi ne kadar ilerlettiğimi değerlendiririm.	5	4	3	2	1

**BÖLÜM E:**

39. İngilizcemi kullanırken tedirgin ve kaygılı olduğum anlarda rahatlamaya çalışırım.	5	4	3	2	1
40. Yanlış yaparım diye kaygılandığımda bile İngilizce konuşmaya gayret ederim.	5	4	3	2	1
41. İngilizcede başarılı olduğum zamanlar kendimi ödüllendiririm.	5	4	3	2	1

42. İngilizce çalışırken ya da kullanırken gergin ve kaygılı isem, bunun farkına varırım.	5	4	3	2	1
43. Dil öğrenirken yaşadığım duyguları bir yere yazarım.	5	4	3	2	1
44. İngilizce çalışırken nasıl ya da neler hissettiğimi başka birine anlatırım.	5	4	3	2	1

### **BÖLÜM F:**

45. Herhangi bir şeyi anlamadığımda, karşımdaki kişiden daha yavaş konuşmasını ya da söylediklerini tekrar etmesini isterim.	5	4	3	2	1
46. Konuşurken karşımdakinin yanlışlarımı düzeltmesini isterim.	5	4	3	2	1
47. Okulda arkadaşlarımla İngilizce konuşurum.	5	4	3	2	1
48. İhtiyaç duyduğumda İngilizce konuşan kişilerden yardım isterim.	5	4	3	2	1
49. Derste İngilizce sorular sormaya gayret ederim.	5	4	3	2	1
50. İngilizce konuşanların kültürü hakkında bilgi edinmeye çalışırım.	5	4	3	2	1

## APPENDIX B: SILL Questionnaire (Original Version)

STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL) Version 7.0  
(ESL/EFL) by R. Oxford, 1989

### Directions

This questionnaire is prepared for students of English as a second or foreign language. You will find 50 statements about learning English. Please read each statement. On the separate worksheet, write your response (1,2,3,4,5) that tells HOW TRUE YOU THINK THE STATEMENT IS FOR YOU.

### LIST OF RESPONSES:

1. **Never** or almost never true of me \_ means the statement is very rarely true of you
2. **Usually not** true of me \_ means the statement is true less than half the time
3. **Somewhat** true of me \_ means the statement is true about half the time
4. **Usually** true of me \_ means the statement is true more than half the time
5. **Always** or almost always true of me \_ means the statement is true almost always

Answer in terms of **how well the statement describes you**. Do not answer on how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are **no right or wrong answers** to these statements. Work as quickly as you can without being careless. This usually takes about 20-30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, let the teacher know immediately.

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### Part A- Memory

1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.

6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.
7. I physically act out new English words.
8. I review English lessons often.
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.

#### **Part B- Cognitive**

10. I say or write new English words several times.
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.
12. I practice the sounds of English.
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.
14. I start conversations in English.
15. I watch English TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.
16. I read for pleasure in English.
17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.
20. I try to find patterns in English.
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.

#### **Part C- Compensation**

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.
25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.
27. I read English without looking up every new word.
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.
29. I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

#### **Part D- Meta-cognitive**

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.
31. I notice my English mistakes and I use that information to help me do better.
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.

34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.
38. I think about my progress in learning English.

**Part E- Affective**

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.
41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.
43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

**Part F- Social**

45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.
47. I practice English with other students.
48. I ask for help from English speakers.
49. I ask questions in English.
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.



## APPENDIX C: General Information Form for Students (Turkish Version)

Sayın katılımcılar,

Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi bölümünde yüksek lisans program öğrencisiyim. Yabancı dil (İngilizce) öğrenmede kullanılan stratejiler hakkında bir araştırma yapmaktayım. İlişikteki anketi doldurarak araştırmaya önemli katkı sağlamış olacaksınız. Anketi doldurmak için kimliğinizi açıklamanıza gerekmemektedir. Katılımınız ve katkılarınız için çok teşekkür ederim.

**Özlem ÖZYILMAZ**

Genel Bilgi Formu

Aşağıda yanıtlayacağınız sorular yalnızca araştırmanın amacına yöneliktir ve bu bilgiler kesinlikle saklı tutulacaktır.

1. Yaşınız:.....
2. Cinsiyetiniz: .....Kadın .....Erkek
3. Doğduğunuz ülke:.....
4. İngilizce dil eğitimine kaç yaşında başladınız:.....
5. İngilizceden başka eğitimini gördüğünüz diller var mı?  
..... Evet .....Hayır

Eğer var ise:

- a. Hangi dil/dillerdir?.....
- b. Kaç yıldır eğitimini gördünüz?.....
- c. Bu dili /dilleri öğrenmeye kaç yaşında başladınız?.....

6. İngilizce konuşulan herhangi bir ülkede yaşadınız mı? Veya böyle bir ülkeyi ziyaret ettiniz mi?

.....Evet .....Hayır

7. Lütfen en son dönem ortalamanızı (GPA) ve genel not ortalamanızı (CGPA) belirtiniz.

..... / .....

## APPENDIX D: Consent Form (Turkish Version)

Sevgili Öğrenciler,

Bu anket, Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümünde yabancı dil öğrenimindeki farklı stratejileri incelemek amacıyla yapılan araştırmanın bir parçasıdır. İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü öğrencileri olarak bu anketi doldurmanız rica olunur. Bu anket aracılığıyla elde edilen bilgiler sadece araştırmanın amacı için kullanılacaktır ve bilgileriniz kesinlikle gizli tutulacaktır. Bu araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorsanız lütfen aşağıdaki izin formunu doldurunuz.

Özlem Özyılmaz

Yüksek Lisans Adayı

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü, Eğitim Fakültesi

Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi

elsa.ozlem@gmail.com

(548) 878 9240

---

Bu araştırmanın neyle ilgili olduğunu ve bilgilerin nasıl kullanılacağını anladım ve imzalayarak katılmaya gönüllü olduğumu bildiririm.

Ad Soyad :

İmza:

Tarih:

## **APPENDIX E: Request Letter to Collect Data**

To Chair of English Language Teaching Department

I am writing a thesis supervised by Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam. The thesis focus on the effect of gender on EFL achievement and learning strategies used by the students. My supervisor and I decided to use a Turkish adaptation of Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Cesur and Fer (2007) to conduct the study. Therefore, I want to get permission to collect data in the department.

One of the purposes of the study is to find out the relationship between gender and strategy use in ELT department. Oxford's SILL will be delivered to all 90 students to learn their strategy use and find out if there is a specific strategy type used by gender groups. The participants will submit their mail addresses to the researcher and complete the questionnaire online. In compliance with the rules and regulations of conducting educational research, the data collected will be used for research purposes only and the information the students provide will definitely be kept confidential.

I hereby apply for approval and I would be grateful if you would grant me the permission to collect data from the students at their convenient time. You may reach me through my e-mail at [elsa.ozlem@gmail.com](mailto:elsa.ozlem@gmail.com) or call me at 05488789240.

Sincerely,

Özlem ÖZYILMAZ

Attachment 1: Students' Questionnaire

-----

-----

Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam

Thesis Supervisor

Department

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülşen Musayeva Vefalı

Chair of the English Language Teaching

## Appendix F: Independent Samples T-tests for 50 items (SILL)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. tailed	(2- Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	
a1	Equal variances assumed	1,414	,243*	-,867	31	,393	-,182	,210	
	Equal variances not assumed			-,917	23,392	,368	-,182	,198	
a2	Equal variances assumed	1,801	,189*	-1,519	31	,139	-,455	,299	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,627	24,149	,117	-,455	,279	
a3	Equal variances assumed	,213	,647*	,223	31	,825	,091	,408	
	Equal variances not assumed			,220	19,541	,828	,091	,412	
a4	Equal variances assumed	3,782	,061*	-1,596	31	,121	-,545	,342	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,855	29,163	,074	-,545	,294	
a5	Equal variances assumed	3,213	,083*	,000	31	1,000	,000	,443	
	Equal variances not assumed			,000	27,629	1,000	,000	,391	
a6	Equal variances assumed	,384	,540*	-,685	31	,498	-,273	,398	
	Equal variances not assumed			-,773	27,433	,446	-,273	,353	
a7	Equal variances assumed	1,571	,219*	-1,272	31	,213	-,545	,429	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,410	26,351	,170	-,545	,387	
a8	Equal variances assumed	,160	,692*	-1,053	31	,300	-,455	,432	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,068	20,882	,298	-,455	,426	
a9	Equal variances assumed	,106	,747*	-1,160	31	,255	-,500	,431	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,133	18,914	,271	-,500	,441	
b10	Equal variances assumed	,362	,552*	,253	31	,802	,091	,360	
	Equal variances not assumed			,229	15,716	,822	,091	,398	

b11	Equal variances assumed	,580	,452*	-.315	31	,755	-.136	,433
	Equal variances not assumed			-.355	27,373	,725	-.136	,384
b12	Equal variances assumed	2,650	,114*	-.298	31	,767	-.136	,457
	Equal variances not assumed			-.341	28,320	,735	-.136	,399
b13	Equal variances assumed	,858	,362*	,397	31	,694	,136	,343
	Equal variances not assumed			,380	17,976	,708	,136	,358
b14	Equal variances assumed	,030	,864*	-1,109	31	,276	-.409	,369
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,103	19,845	,283	-.409	,371
b15	Equal variances assumed	8,646	,006*	-1,646	31	,110	-.364	,221
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,934	29,686	,063	-.364	,188
b16	Equal variances assumed	9,206	,005*	-1,515	31	,140	-.364	,240
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,826	30,615	,078	-.364	,199
b17	Equal variances assumed	2,416	,130*	,000	31	1,000	,000	,402
	Equal variances not assumed			,000	24,063	1,000	,000	,376
b18	Equal variances assumed	,013	,910*	-.549	31	,587	-.136	,249
	Equal variances not assumed			-.543	19,540	,593	-.136	,251
b19	Equal variances assumed	1,509	,229*	-.682	31	,500	-.273	,400
	Equal variances not assumed			-.774	27,854	,445	-.273	,352
b20	Equal variances assumed	2,039	,163*	-.207	31	,837	-.091	,439
	Equal variances not assumed			-.231	26,672	,819	-.091	,394
b21	Equal variances assumed	2,713	,110*	-1,959	31	,059	-.818	,418
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,316	29,942	,028	-.818	,353
b22	Equal variances assumed	2,245	,144*	-.521	31	,606	-.273	,524
	Equal variances not assumed			-.566	25,122	,576	-.273	,482
b23	Equal variances assumed	,368	,549*	-.111	31	,912	-.045	,410

		Equal variances not assumed			-1,108	18,782	,915	-,045	,421
c24		Equal variances assumed	,002	,969*	-,183	31	,856	-,045	,249
		Equal variances not assumed			-,181	19,540	,858	-,045	,251
c25		Equal variances assumed	5,083	,031*	-2,397	31	,023	-,955	,398
		Equal variances not assumed			-2,868	30,405	,007*	-,955	,333
c26		Equal variances assumed	,016	,900*	-,459	31	,649	-,227	,495
		Equal variances not assumed			-,434	17,413	,670	-,227	,524
c27		Equal variances assumed	10,901	,002*	-2,734	31	,010	-1,091	,399
		Equal variances not assumed			-3,750	25,173	,001*	-1,091	,291
c28		Equal variances assumed	2,694	,111*	-2,111	31	,043*	-,864	,409
		Equal variances not assumed			-2,405	28,046	,023	-,864	,359
c29		Equal variances assumed	6,693	,015*	-1,922	31	,064	-,636	,331
		Equal variances not assumed			-2,491	29,781	,019*	-,636	,255
d30		Equal variances assumed	1,082	,306*	-,737	31	,466	-,182	,247
		Equal variances not assumed			-,834	27,596	,412	-,182	,218
d31		Equal variances assumed	,670	,419*	-1,482	31	,148	-,409	,276
		Equal variances not assumed			-1,723	29,166	,095	-,409	,237
d32		Equal variances assumed	,712	,405*	-,165	31	,870	-,045	,276
		Equal variances not assumed			-,173	22,963	,864	-,045	,263
d33		Equal variances assumed	2,972	,095*	-1,386	31	,176	-,591	,426
		Equal variances not assumed			-1,602	28,869	,120	-,591	,369
d34		Equal variances assumed	,128	,723*	-1,134	31	,266	-,500	,441
		Equal variances not assumed			-1,121	19,519	,276	-,500	,446
d35		Equal variances assumed	,845	,365*	,093	31	,926	,045	,488
		Equal variances not assumed			,097	22,484	,924	,045	,468

d36	Equal variances assumed	1,756	,195*	-.115	31	,909	-.045	,395
	Equal variances not assumed			-.116	20,766	,908	-.045	,390
d37	Equal variances assumed	4,351	,045*	-.251	31	,803	-.091	,362
	Equal variances not assumed			-.299	30,289	,767	-.091	,304
d38	Equal variances assumed	,000	1,000*	,000	31	1,000	,000	,343
	Equal variances not assumed			,000	23,176	1,000	,000	,325
e39	Equal variances assumed	2,540	,121*	-1,742	31	,091	-.727	,418
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,124	30,875	,042	-.727	,342
e40	Equal variances assumed	10,257	,003*	-3,151	31	,004	-1,273	,404
	Equal variances not assumed			-4,205	27,742	,000*	-1,273	,303
e41	Equal variances assumed	,608	,442*	-.384	31	,704	-.182	,474
	Equal variances not assumed			-.408	23,693	,687	-.182	,446
e42	Equal variances assumed	,472	,497*	-1,137	31	,264	-.455	,400
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,291	27,854	,207	-.455	,352
e43	Equal variances assumed	,079	,780*	-.763	31	,451	-.318	,417
	Equal variances not assumed			-.806	23,216	,429	-.318	,395
e44	Equal variances assumed	1,248	,273*	-.446	31	,658	-.227	,509
	Equal variances not assumed			-.468	22,816	,644	-.227	,486
f45	Equal variances assumed	2,370	,134*	,000	31	1,000	,000	,398
	Equal variances not assumed			,000	30,933	1,000	,000	,325
f46	Equal variances assumed	1,195	,283*	-.284	31	,778	-.136	,480
	Equal variances not assumed			-.263	16,520	,796	-.136	,519
f47	Equal variances assumed	,561	,460*	-.718	31	,478	-.318	,443
	Equal variances not assumed			-.770	24,178	,449	-.318	,413
f48	Equal variances assumed	2,922	,097*	-1,255	31	,219	-.591	,471



	Equal variances not assumed			-1,504	30,452	,143	-,591	,393
f49	Equal variances assumed	1,895	,179*	-1,881	31	,069	-,727	,387
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,230	30,084	,033	-,727	,326
f50	Equal variances assumed	1,233	,275*	,000	31	1,000	,000	,422
	Equal variances not assumed			,000	16,059	1,000	,000	,462

---

\* 'alpha' for the sig. of  $F > 0.05$  and 'alpha' for the sig. of  $t < 0.05$

## APPENDIX G: Curriculum of ELT Department

### COURSES

#### 1. YEAR I. Semester

COURSE CODE	COURSE TITLE	L	LT	C
ELTE101	Contextual Grammar I	3	0	3
ELTE103	Advanced Reading and Writing I	3	0	3
ELTE105	Listening and Pronunciation I	3	0	3
ELTE107	Oral Communication Skills I	3	0	3
EDUC101	Introduction to Educational Sciences	3	0	3
TREG111	Turkish I : Written Communication *	2	0	2
ITEC105	Computer I	2	2	3
GPSC109	Effective Communication Skills	3	0	3
<b>Total:</b>				<b>23</b>

#### 1. YEAR II. Semester

COURSE CODE	COURSE TITLE	L	LT	C
ELTE102	Contextual Grammar II	3	0	3
ELTE104	Advanced Reading and Writing II	3	0	3

ELTE106	Listening and Pronunciation II	3	0	3
ELTE108	Oral Communication Skills II	3	0	3
ELTE112	Vocabulary	3	0	3
EDUC114	Educational Psychology	3	0	3
TREG112	Turkish II : Oral Communication	2	0	2
ITEC106	Computer II	2	2	3
<b>Total:</b>				<b>23</b>

## 2. YEAR I. Semester

COURSE CODE	COURSE TITLE	L	LT	C
ENGL211	English Literature I	3	0	3
ELTE203	Linguistics I	3	0	3
ELTE205	Approaches in English Language Teaching I	3	0	3
ELTE207	English-Turkish Translation *	3	0	3
ELTE209	Presentation Skills	3	0	3
EDUC205	Principle and Methods of Instruction	3	0	3
EDUC207	History of Turkish Education	2	0	2
<b>Total:</b>				<b>20</b>

## 2. YEAR II. Semester

COURSE CODE	COURSE TITLE	L	LT	C
ENGL212	English Literature II	3	0	3
ELTE204	Linguistics II	3	0	3
ELTE206	Approaches in English Language Teaching II	3	0	3
ELTE208	Language Acquisition	3	0	3
ELTE303	Special Teaching Methods I	2	2	3
EDUC306	Instructional Technology and Materials Design	2	2	3
EDUC336	Research Methods in English Language Teaching	2	0	2
<b>Total:</b>				<b>20</b>

## 3. YEAR I. Semester

COURSE CODE	COURSE TITLE	L	LT	C
ELTE301	Teaching Eng. to Young Learners I	2	2	3
ELTE304	Special Teaching Method II	2	2	3
ELTE305	Teaching Language Skills I	2	2	3
ELTE307	Literature and Language Teaching I	3	0	3
EDUC311	Classroom Management	2	0	2
EDUC309	Language and Society	3	0	3

SFLN1	Second Foreign Language I	2	0	2
<b>Total:</b>				<b>19</b>

### 3. YEAR II. Semester

COURSE CODE	COURSE TITLE	L	LT	C
ELTE302	Teaching Eng. to Young Learners II	2	2	3
ELTE212	Turkish-English Translation *	3	0	3
ELTE306	Teaching Language Skills II	2	2	3
ELTE308	Literature and Language Teaching II	3	0	3
EDUC313	Measurement and Evaluation	3	1	3
ELTE310	Application of Service to Community	1	2	2
SFLN2	Second Foreign Language II	2	0	2
<b>Total:</b>				<b>19</b>

### 4. YEAR I. Semester

COURSE CODE	COURSE TITLE	L	LT	C
ELTE401	Materials Development and Adaptation in English	3	0	3
ELTE01	Major Area Elective I	2	0	2
ELTE411	School Experience	1	4	3
EDUC312	Counseling	3	0	3

EDUC413	Special Education	2	0	2
TARH101	Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reform I*	2	0	2
SFLN3	Second Foreign Language III	2	0	2
<b>Total:</b>				<b>17</b>

#### 4. YEAR II. Semester

COURSE CODE	COURSE TITLE	L	LT	C
ELTE402	Testing and Evaluation in ELT	3	0	3
ELTE02	Major Area Elective II	2	0	2
ELTE406	Teaching Practice	2	6	5
ELTE03	Major Area Elective III	2	0	2
EDUC412	Comparative Education	2	0	2
TARH102	Atatürk Principles and History of Turkish Reforms II *	2	0	2
EDUC307	Turkish Education System and School Administration	2	0	2
<b>Total:</b>				<b>18</b>