# KELİME ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ VE YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENEN TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN DİL ÖĞRENME SONUÇLARINA ETKİSİ

**VOCABULARY LEARNING STRATEGIES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON TURKISH EFL LEARNERS OUTCOMES**

**Neslihan MUTLU EKMEKÇİ**

**(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)**
**Eskişehir, 1999**

# VOCABULARY LEARNING STRATEGIES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON TURKISH EFL LEARNERS OUTCOMES

By

Neslihan Mutlu Ekmekçi

Thesis of Master of Arts

Advisor: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Nüvit MORTAN

Eskişehir
Anadolu University
The Institute of Social Sciences
July, 1999

# YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÖZÜ

## KELİME ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ VE YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENEN TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN DİL ÖĞRENME SONUÇLARINA ETKİSİ

Neslihan Mutlu Ekmekçi
Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Temmuz 1999
Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Nüvit Mortan

Bu çalışmanın amacı yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen Türk üniversite öğrencilerinin kelime öğrenme stratejilerini saptamak ve bu stratejilerin dil öğrenme sonuçlarına etkisini araştırmaktır. Bu amaçla, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü bütün birinci sınıf öğrencileri seçilerek betimleyici bir çalışma desenlenmiştir. Başka bir çalışmanın tekrarı olan bu çalışmada, bütün veriler bağımsız değişkenleri içeren kelime öğrenme stratejileri anketi ve ayrıca bağımlı değişken olarak da kelime bilgisi testi ile TOEFL sınavının birinci sınıf öğrencilerine uygulanması ile toplanmıştır. Fakat eksik olan bazı verilerin sonucunda öğrenci sayısı 120 olmuştur. Kelime öğrenme stratejileri anketinin betimleme istatistikleri sonucuna göre denekler birçok strateji kullandıklarını belirtmiştir. Daha sonra ankete verdikleri cevaplar korelasyon analizi ile kelime bilgi testi ve TOEFL (dil seviyesi) sonuçları ile ilişkilendirilmiştir. Çoklu regresyon analizinde ise kelimenin yapısını kullanma stratejisi pozitif yönde, fakat görsel tekrar ile kelimeyi etkin hale getirme stratejisi negatif yönde TOEFL sonuçları ile ilişkilidir. Kelime Bilgi testi ise sadece seçici dikkat stratejisi ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir.

Sonuç olarak denekler birçok strateji kullanmış olmalarına rağmen her iki bağımlı değişken ile aralarında bir anlamlı bir ilişki yoktur. Ayrıca, korelasyon analizi birçok stratejinin daha çok kelime bilgisi testi ile anlamlı olarak ilişkide olduğunu gösteriyor. Buna rağmen çoklu regresyon analizi her iki değişken ile farklı fakat sadece bir tane stratejinin anlamlı olarak ilişkide olduğunu gösteriyor.

# ABSTRACT

This study aims at establishing the vocabulary learning strategies used by Turkish EFL learners, and investigating the effects of these strategies on their English learning outcomes. For this purpose a descriptive study was conducted among the freshman at Anadolu University, Education Faculty, English Language Teaching Department. In this study, being a replication, all data were collected with the administration of a Vocabulary Learning Strategies Questionnaire including all the independent variables and a vocabulary size test and TOEFL practice exam for language proficiency as the dependent variables to all freshman. However, deletion of missing data defined the number of subjects as 120. As a result of the descriptive statistics of the vocabulary learning strategies questionnaire subjects reported using a wide variety of vocabulary learning strategies. Then the replies to the questionnaire were correlated with the results on the vocabulary size test and on the TOEFL exam (language proficiency). In a multiple regression analysis, using word structure emerged as positive, but visual repetition and activation as negative predictors of TOEFL results. Only Selective Attention emerged as a positive predictor of vocabulary size test.

In conclusion, results showed that, although subjects tend to use a variety of strategies, there was not much relation with the two dependent variables. Furthermore, correlation analysis showed that more strategies were related to vocabulary size, whereas, multiple regression analysis revealed a similar relation to both variables.

# JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI

İmza

Üye (Tez Danışmanı) : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Nüvit Mortan

Üye : Prof. Dr. Gül Durmuşoğlu

Üye : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ümit Deniz Turan

Neslihan Mutlu Ekmekçi'nin 'Kelime Öğrenme Stratejileri ve Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğrenen Türk Öğrencilerinin Dil Öğrenme Sonuçlarına Etkisi' (Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Their Effects on Turkish EFL Learners Outcomes) başlıklı tezi .....28-5-1999..... tarihinde, yukarıdaki jüri tarafından Lisansüstü Eğitim Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliğinin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim, Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak değerlendirilerek kabul edilmiştir.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Nüvit Mortan for her guidance, patience, understanding throughout the course of this study. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Prof. Gül Durmuşoğlu Köse and Ass. Prof. Ümit Deniz Turan who guided me with their helpful suggestions until the end of the research.

I would also like to thank Ass. Prof. Handan Kopkallı Yavuz, who answered my questions whenever I needed help and guidance and for her encouragement, and I would also like to extend my gratitude to my colleague and friend, Nilay Yılmaz, who really was always supportive of me. There is also Ayşegül Mutlu Baylan, my sister in Germany, who was helpful in providing the vocabulary size test I used in this study.

My warmest thanks go to Mesut Ekmekçi, my husband, for his endless patience, sympathy, encouragement, love, and understanding throughout the study.

I also wish to express my deepest gratitude to my students who willingly participated in this study. Without them, it would have been impossible.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**CHAPTER III: Review of Literature**



**CHAPTER IV: Methodology**



**CHAPTER V: Results**

# LIST OF TABLES

# CHAPTER 1
# INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. Background to the Problem

For many years vocabulary instruction has been ignored in many second language (L2) classes, on the assumption that students themselves will simply find ways to memorize words without any help. Vocabulary was necessary to give students something to hang on to when learning structures, but was frequently not a main focus for learning itself (Wallace, 1982; Crow and Quigley, 1985; Laufer, 1990).

Recently, however, methodologists and linguists have increasingly been turning their attention to vocabulary (Carter and McCarthy, 1988), stressing its importance in language teaching and reassessing some of the ways in which it is taught and learnt. It is now clear, for example, that the acquisition of vocabulary is just as important as the acquisition of grammar. Therefore, teachers should have the same kind of expertise in the teaching of vocabulary as they do in the teaching of structure (Channel, 1988, cited in Harmer, 1991).

Not being able to find the words you need to express yourself is the most frustrating experience in speaking another language. Of course, vocabulary is not the whole story: another important aspect of language learning is the system of language (its 'grammar' or 'structure'): how the plural is formed, how past tense is signified, and so on. Nevertheless, it is possible to have a good knowledge of how the system of a language works and yet not be able to communicate in it. The need to acquire vocabulary becomes increasingly obvious and important when learners face real conversation and authentic texts (Wallace, 1982).

If language structures make up the skeleton of language, then vocabulary provides the vital organs and the flesh. As mentioned before, an ability to manipulate grammatical structure does not have any potential for expressing meaning unless words are used. So the important point is to choose the words carefully in certain situations, and not structures- unless, of course, in a language classroom. In real life, it is even possible that where vocabulary is used correctly it can cancel out structural inaccuracy. For example, Harmer (1991,p. 153) states that if a student says 'Yesterday... I have seen him yesterday.', he or she is committing one of the most notorious tense mistakes in English but he or she will be understood as having seen him yesterday because of the word 'yesterday'.

To know a word in a target language as well as the native speaker knows it may mean the ability to:

(a) recognize it in its spoken or written form;

(b) recall it at will;

(c) relate it to an appropriate object or concept;

(d) use it in the appropriate grammatical form;

(e) in speech, pronounce it in a recognizable way;

(f) in writing spell it correctly;

(g) use it with the words it correctly goes with, i.e. in the correct collocation;

(h) use it at the appropriate level of formality;

(i) be aware of its connotations and associations.

(Wallace, 1988, p. 27)

Vocabulary is an important area of concern for teachers, because children who know many words are more likely to be competent readers than those with limited

vocabularies are (Harmon, 1998). However, there is a way of looking at vocabulary learning, which suggests that students should go home every evening and learn a list of fifty words 'by heart' (the inefficient use of rote learning). Such a practice may have beneficial results, of course, but it avoids one of the central features of vocabulary use, namely that words occur in context. If we are really to teach students what words mean and how they are used, we need to show them being used, together with other words, in context. Words do not just exist on their own: they live with other words and they depend upon each other. (Harmer, 1991)

Thus, the context we need is provided in reading. First language research (Krashen, 1989) indicates that reading is one of the main ways of learning new words, and that people who do more reading know more words. So, as reading is important for first language development, it is also assumed to be important for second language development as well. Language teachers believe that extensive reading helps their students acquire new words, and second language researchers have determined that learning new words from reading should be possible (Krashen, 1989; Wodinsky and Nation, 1988).

One can say that there is a cyclical effect between vocabulary, reading, and knowledge. Word knowledge affects reading comprehension, which in turn helps students expand their knowledge bases, which in turn facilitates vocabulary growth and reading comprehension.

However, in order to see this cyclical effect, students should become familiar with some vocabulary learning strategies. Learning strategies in general are strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affect learning directly. Researchers (Rubin, 1987; Oxford, 1992), recently, have

recognized that two kinds of strategies exist: metacognitive and cognitive strategies. Rubin (1987) defines metacognitive strategies as 1) knowledge about cognitive processes, and 2) regulation of cognition or executive control or self-management through such processes as planning, monitoring, and evaluating. Cognitive strategies are defined as the steps or operations used in learning or problem-solving that require direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials. In connection with vocabulary learning, strategies should be taught to students since, as Nation (1990) argues, large number of low-frequency words exist in a language and because of their infrequent occurrence and narrow range, it is best to teach the strategies for dealing with these words rather than to teach the words themselves. (Types of vocabulary learning strategies will be given in the following chapter)

### 1.1.1. Problems in the Teaching of Vocabulary

Learners and researchers see vocabulary as being a very important, if not the most important, element in language learning. Learners feel that many of their difficulties in both receptive and productive language use result from an inadequate vocabulary. So, word learning can be seen as a complex task that occurs in many settings.

For the beginning foreign-language student, vocabulary acquisition is not a major problem. Typically, textbooks introduce new vocabulary either with illustrations depicting the concept or through the more traditional listing of new words accompanied by the English equivalents. Words are generally pronounced by the teacher and repeated by the students. As such, students begin to acquire a listening and speaking vocabulary in the target language. Initial reading and writing experiences are constrained by the limited L2 vocabulary that the student has acquired (Hague, 1987).

In L1, one's listening, speaking, reading, and writing vocabularies are vastly different, and in L2, learning a new word often involves learning a new concept. Hence, learning a second language may, at first, appear deceptively simple. In fact, many mistakenly assume that the new language is like a mirror image of the native language, only with a new set of symbols (Wallace, 1982). Such thinking may work well at first, but may also be the source of problems that arise as students move into the intermediate and advanced levels of language learning.

According to Wallace (1982, p. 9-13), there are some symptoms of bad vocabulary learning and/or teaching:

1. Inability to retrieve vocabulary that has been thought.
2. Use of vocabulary inappropriate to the given situation.
3. Use of vocabulary at the wrong level of formality.
4. Possessing the wrong kind of vocabulary for one's needs.
5. Using vocabulary in an unidiomatic way.
6. Using vocabulary in a meaningless way.
7. Incorrect use of dictionary.
8. Use of incorrect grammatical form, spelling, pronunciation, or stress.

The first symptom, inability to retrieve vocabulary, is the most basic kind of vocabulary fault. In this situation the student has learnt a word but cannot bring it to mind when he needs it. Consequently, either communication breaks down or else the student has to use some repair strategies, such as expressing his meaning in a different way. In the second symptom, the student knows a word which has a particular meaning, but somehow does not fit into the language situation in which he is operating. Using

vocabulary at the wrong level of formality is rather similar with the previous symptom. The words we use have to relate to the formality of the situation in which the student is speaking, and the relationship between the speakers. The fourth symptom shows that one should learn the vocabulary that is appropriate to the needs, such as the vocabulary for reading only, or the vocabulary for the conversational language. The student may also know the right kind of vocabulary he may, however, use it in an unidiomatic way. Usage of vocabulary in a meaningless way occurs when the student is mostly exposed to the structure of the language rather than the vocabulary. In this case, the student can answer questions related to the text. However, there would not be any concern about the words used in the text. Another point is that the students do not use dictionaries appropriately while reading. This, of course, results in slow and inefficient reading. Finally, incorrect uses of grammatical form, spelling, pronunciation, or stress can be said to be the most essential aspect in vocabulary learning. Thus, students should also be familiar with the use of words in context.

Other factors influencing vocabulary learning are mentioned by Laufer (1990). Laufer listed some components of word knowledge and the factors interfering with their acquisition. The knowledge of a word was taken to be the knowledge of its form, structure, syntactic behavior, meaning (referential, affective, pragmatic), and its relation with other words. The factors that interfere with learning a word were claimed to be the following: difficult pronouncability; similarity of form between the word and other words; similarity of morphology between the word and other words; deceptive morphology structure; different syntactic patterning in L1; difference in lexical gridding between L1 and L2 (one-to-many correspondence, partial overlap in meaning; multiplicity of meaning and metaphors/idioms non-existence in L1; lexical voids;

connotations non-existent in L1; differences in the pragmatic meaning of near synonyms and of L1 translation equivalents; partial synonyms; and apparent rulelessness of collocation.

Oxford and Scarcella (1994) have mentioned nearly the same as the above complexities of knowing a word. However, some more can be added to these features, such as *collocations*, which are words that often occur together in a specific order. Knowledge of collocations enables learners to anticipate the words, which surround a specific word. Another feature is *function*; L2 learners need to know how frequently words are used in specific situations. Nation (1990) states that overusing low-frequency words has a comical effect and suggests that teachers apportion time to words according to their usefulness in authentic communication. However, academic words are particularly important for learners with advanced L2 proficiency who intend to enroll in a university or college. Such words do not usually occur in casual conversation.

To narrow down, it can be said that knowing an L2 word involves not just the ability to recognize it when it is heard and seen, or to match it with its native language counterpart. Knowing an L2 word also involves being able to use the word communicatively in the context of purposeful interaction. Just like grammar, vocabulary is not particularly useful when isolated and taken out of context; it is only useful when applied in real communication. In short, Lexical knowledge includes knowledge of form, position in grammatical constructions, collocations, functions, and associations in meaning (Nation, 1990).

## 1.2. Aim and Scope of the Study

While much research on vocabulary teaching is available in the literature regarding different individual techniques and strategies, particularly memory strategies, little has been done for investigating the use of strategies in a combined way. In reality, however, learners tend to use a variety of strategies in combination (Sanaoui, 1995). Moreover, learners also tend to adopt types of strategies based either on their beliefs about vocabulary and vocabulary learning (Abraham and Vann, 1987; Horwitz, 1987) or on other preexisting cognitive or social factors. The present study is a replication of the study by Gu and Johnson (1996) who designed a vocabulary learning strategies questionnaire reflecting previous quantitative and qualitative research. Only two of the three research questions Gu and Johnson investigated were adopted in this study. Thus, the aim of the study is to establish the vocabulary learning strategies used by Turkish University students of the department of English Language Teaching at Anadolu University, and the relationship between their strategies and language learning outcomes.

## 1.3. Research Questions

The following research questions were asked in the study:

1. Which of the vocabulary learning strategies do Turkish EFL learners tend to employ?

2. Which of the vocabulary learning strategies used by EFL students affect their learning outcomes?

# CHAPTER II

# VOCABULARY LEARNING STRATEGIES

All the strategies identified for either low or high achievers, observed in language learning situations, appear to contribute to learning. These efforts demonstrate that in literature several types of learning strategy taxonomies have been suggested and that these strategies can be classified. However, they have more or less the same components and divisions (Oxford, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1989; O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Russo and Küpper, 1985). Since these taxonomies are concerned with the whole body of language learning strategies, and this study is to deal with vocabulary learning strategies, only those types of strategies used for vocabulary learning will be explained.

## 2.1. Types of Vocabulary Learning Strategies

Before examining the studies conducted on vocabulary learning and vocabulary learning strategies, it seems necessary to present the characteristics of the strategies.

For most learning purposes, vocabulary needs to be taught for comprehension and for production. Comprehension relies on strategies, which help learners to understand lexical items and to store them in memory. Production relies on strategies, which help learners to activate their lexical store. Retrieve items from memory and use them in contextually appropriate ways. Some teaching techniques are better suited for comprehension than for production, and vice versa (Carter, 1987).

There are two approaches to learning a second language (L2) vocabulary: i.e., learning words in context and learning words out of context (Qian, 1996). Oxford and Scarcella (1994), similarly, categorized the different techniques of teaching or learning vocabulary into types for handling vocabulary instruction. These types are: *decontextualized, partially contextualized,* and *fully contextualized* .

### 2.1.1. Decontextualized Types

Decontextualized activities are those that remove the word as completely as possible from any communicative, meaningful context that might help the learner remember the word. They do not involve any direct instruction by the teacher. The activities that could be included under this type are *Word Lists, Note-taking, Dictionary use, Flashcards.*

**2.1.1.1. Word Lists:** Human cognitive facilities include an application that is the most inefficient one, namely rote learning (Carter, 1987). Rote learning involves the mental storage of items having little or no association with existing cognitive structure (Brown, 1987). However, although it has been proofed that rote learning is of no use in learning , the most work that has been done in the area of vocabulary instruction is based on a word list approach (Crow, 1986). These lists have by no means any meaningful context. They typically organize words by parts of speech or in alphabetical order. L2 teachers sometimes tell students to learn the word lists but provide no training on how to do this.

**2.1.1.2. Note-Taking:** Note-taking involves noting a new vocabulary item while reading and trying to learn its meaning by looking it up and/or by asking for its meaning and

trying to use it two-three times as well as keeping a notebook of new words. Oxford (1990) claims that the very act of writing a word down often helps to memorize it.

**2.1.1.3. Dictionary Use:** Students tend to consult dictionaries more often than they do pick up the meaning from immediate or wider context. However, some research note that relying on a dictionary as the primary way to increase vocabulary does not work, because good learners do not think about the definition of individual words as they read (Hague, 1987). The use of bilingual dictionaries is most favored by the beginning and intermediate students, but dependence may cause trouble. Monolingual dictionaries, on the other hand, were designed for the native users of the language. However, publishers also developed monolingual dictionaries for the ESL students. These dictionaries give detailed guidance on grammar, pronunciation and usage; have definitions written in a controlled, simplified vocabulary; and even provide examples of words in context (Carter, 1987).

**2.1.1.4. Flash Cards:** Inherent in the learning of a foreign language is the learning of a large number of words. Learning words, however, is a time-consuming activity. Moreover, some or most of the words are forgotten relatively quickly. In the traditional way of memorizing vocabulary, repetition of words continuously is an efficient process.

**2.1.2. Partially Contextualized.**

Such activities provide some degree of context. The activities under this heading are *the Encoding Strategies* as Gu and Johnson (1996) defined them. Encoding Strategies

are *word groupings, word or concept association,, keyword (mnemonic), physical response,* and *semantic mapping.*

**2.1.2.1. Word Groupings:** It is well known in psychology that if the material to be memorized is organized in some fashion, people can use this organization to their benefits. This happens because organized material is easier to store in and retrieve from long- term memory. Organizations can be imposed by making the items to be learned fit into a pre-existing framework, or by creating some new cognitive framework that would bind the items to be learned into a unit. Word grouping involves dividing a longer word lists into shorter lists by classifying words according to a given attribute: for example, parts of speech (all nouns or adjectives), topic (health words), language function, and feelings. Semantic fields (Crow and Quigley, 1985) and semantic grids or semantic features analysis (Hague, 1987, Stieglitz, 1983).

**2.1.2.2. Word Association/Elaboration:** It involves making associations between the new word and any words already in the learner's memory. As long as associations are meaningful to the student, they can be complex or simple. Therefore, they provide a meaningful context, although they are limited and not fully communicative one. It is up to the learner to generate his/her own associations. For example, *knowledge* as a new word can be associated with the words such as *books, school,* and *thinking* (Oxford and Scarcella, 1994).

**2.1.2.3. Keyword/ Mnemonic:** The keyword method was first described by Atkinson (1975, cited in Brown, Perry, 1991). It is a two-way mnemonic procedure for improving

one's memory of vocabulary-definition linkages. The keyword learner first acquires an association between the unfamiliar vocabulary item and a familiar English word that sounds like a salient part of the to-be-learnt item. This acoustically similar word is the keyword. In the second stage, the learner encodes a meaningful interaction between the keyword and the vocabulary word's definition (Hall, 1988). Thus, for example, to remember that CARLIN means "old woman", a subject might use the keyword *car* and imagine an old woman driving a car (McDaniel, Pressley, 1984).

Nation (1990) gives the conclusions that Pressley et al. (1982, cited in Nation, 1990) reached in a comprehensive survey of almost 50 studies of the keyword technique:

1. The keyword technique is a good way of learning foreign vocabulary, and is better than the other techniques, such as rote learning, placing vocabulary in a meaningful sentence, and using pictures or synonyms.

2. It is not restricted to concrete nouns, but can be used with verbs, abstract nouns, and adjectives.

3. It can not only with adults, but also with children as young as three years be used.

4. It is still not clear if it is best for the teacher to provide the keywords or for learners to make their own. However, teachers should provide help if the learner needs it.

5. It does not slow down recall of the meaning of foreign words.

6. Most of the studies with the keyword technique have looked at receptive vocabulary learning (being able to recall the meaning when the foreign word is supplied). To use the keyword technique for productive vocabulary learning (being able to recall the meaning when the meaning is supplied), the form of the keyword must have a close

connection with the form of the foreign words. If this is done, the keyword technique can also be used for the productive vocabulary learning.

7. One needs imagination to use the technique, because it is difficult to think of keywords that sound like the foreign word.

To sum up, it can be said that there are benefits of mnemonic techniques, such that for less experienced language learners, learning how to construct and use various mnemonic devices may provide an opportunity to discover how their own minds work and how creativity with language pays off. At the same time it can teach beginners that language learning is not all grim and that having fun may also be beneficial.

**2.1.2.4. Physical Response:** This is a method in which students enact physically the information in a sentence. This results in a better recall than in simple repetition (Thompson, 1987; Oxford, 1990). Moreover, it also provides a certain measure of context. This technique is appropriate for teaching concrete nouns and action verbs but is more problematic for teaching abstract expressions. Kinesthetic (movement-oriented) learners enjoy physical response activities for vocabulary learning.

**2.1.2.5. Semantic Mapping:** Semantic mapping is a technique that was developed by Johnson and Pearson (1978, cited in Hague, 1987). It is a graphic arrangement of words, in which links are drawn between a central concept and a surrounding network of related elements. The purpose is to visually represent how new words fit into a reader's already existing background knowledge or to show how ideas are related to each other within a text. This procedure is believed to be useful for vocabulary learning, especially, for teachers of foreign languages. Since it can tell the teacher about students' current level of

information on a particular topic or the lack of vocabulary that the student possesses on the topic in question (Harley, Howard, and Roberge, 1996; Hague, 1987, Stieglitz, 1983).

In order to create a semantic map, there are six steps for the teacher to follow:

1. Write the target word on the chalkboard or transparency.
2. Have the class members brainstorm words related to the topic.
3. Write/list the words by categories in the form of a map.
4. Have the students provide labels for each category (optional).
5. Discuss the words on the semantic map. Students should be encouraged to discover how the concepts are related to each other.
6. Revise the map after discussion. (Hague, 1987, p. 221)

*Semantic Feature Analysis* is another technique. This strategy is rooted in schema theory and the knowledge hypothesis. It is nearly the same as semantic mapping. This procedure helps learners better understand the similar and different meanings of words, and focuses on the hierarchical organization of words, teaching students to see semantic relationships between and among words as well as relationships between their own background knowledge and the new concepts being learned (Hague, 1987; Stieglitz, 1983).

### 2.1.3. Fully Contextualized.

The four language skills of reading, listening, speaking, and writing all include communication activities which are authentic and also which provide full context. Consequently, when learners participate in conversations, read or listen to real texts, and write purposeful messages or essays, what they are doing is completely meaningful and fully contextualized. Frequently and regularly reading, for example, enables learners to

acquire a large number of new words. This is incidental (indirect) learning of vocabulary. Contexts serve to illuminate the meanings of unfamiliar words, and learners should be taught how to guess the meanings of these words.

Guessing strategies are also known as *inferencing* in most of the studies (Mondria, Wit-De Boer, 1991; Morrison, 1996; Rubin, 1987; Oxford, 1990; Arden-Close, 1993). The act of guessing involves variety of clues- linguistic and non-linguistic- to guess the meaning from the context when the learner does not know all the words. As vocabulary is an open set and not a closed system with a limited number of rules, learning all the rules is an impossible task. Therefore, guessing strategies are important skills for the learners' future comprehension tasks for unknown words in context. The following clues suggested by Laufer (1990) could be helpful in guessing:

a) Clues in the word itself, such as morphology or resemblance to words in familiar languages;
b) Clues in the word's immediate context: what part of speech it is in the sentence, what words it collocates with, whether the sentence contains a description or a definition of the word;
c) Clues in wider context: the general meaning of the paragraph, the relationship between the clause/sentence with the unknown word and the other sentences in the paragraph, such as cause and effect, contrast, inclusion, etc., and also other words which, though remote from the unknown word, may nevertheless, be its synonyms or paraphrase;
d) Extratextual knowledge, i.e. topic familiarity. (Laufer, 1990)

Hosenfeld (1977, cited in Rubin, 1987) identified a number of guessing (inferencing) strategies used by successful second language readers: "(1) keep the meaning of a passage in mind while reading, and use it to predict meaning; (2) keep

unfamiliar words and guess the meaning from remaining words in a sentence or later sentences; (3) circle back in the text to bring to mind previous context to decode an unfamiliar word; (4) identify the grammatical function of an unfamiliar word before guessing its meaning;... (6) Examine the illustration and use information contained in it in decoding; ... (7) Read the title and draw inferences from it; (8) refer to the side gloss; ... (12) recognize cognates; (13) use knowledge of the world to decode an unfamiliar word; (14) skip words that may add relatively little to the total meaning..." (p. 29)

# CHAPTER III

# REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## 3.1. Research on Language Learning Strategies

As researchers and teachers' knowledge of second language acquisition increased considerably during the 1970's, they came to realize that some learners seemed to acquire the target language much more easily and competently than others in spite of methods or techniques of teaching. Others lacked the abilities to succeed while they appeared to have certain abilities (Brown, 1987). The realization of such a phenomenon motivated some researchers to look at those learners more closely in order to determine their abilities that led them to success.

Rubin (cited in Wenden and Rubin, 1987, p. 20) was one of the pioneers who focused on the strategies of good language learners. Her rationale was that once the strategies of successful language learners were identified, these strategies could be taught to poorer language learners. She suggested that good language learners:

1. guess willingly and accurately,
2. have a strong desire to communicate,
3. are uninhibited about mistakes,
4. seek out opportunities to use language,
5. attend to form by analyzing, categorizing and synthesizing,
6. monitor their own speech and the speech of others,
7. pay attention to meaning.

Rubin (cited in Carver, 1984, p. 124) also revised her list and classified learning strategies in the following manner:

A. *Process which may directly contribute to learning*

1. Classification/verification: Asking for examples of how to use a word or expression, putting words in sentences to check understanding, looking up words in the dictionary, and paraphrasing sentences to check understanding.
2. Monitoring: Correcting one's own or other's pronunciation, vocabulary, spelling, grammar, and style, and noting sources of errors.
3. Memorization: Trying to acquire words or other language elements through associations.
4. Guessing/inductive inferencing: Using clues from the surrounding language context to guess meaning or to guess general rules.
5. Deductive reasoning: Looking for and using general rules, comparing native and target language to identify similarities and differences, inferring grammatical rules by analogy, noting exceptions to rules, and finding meaning by breaking down words into parts.
6. Practice: Experimenting with new sounds in isolation and in context, using a mirror for practice, talking to oneself in the target language, and drilling oneself on words in different forms.

B. *Processes which may contribute indirectly to learning*

1. Creating opportunities for practice: Creating situations with native speakers to practice, spending extra time in the language lab, etc.
2. Production tricks: Using communication strategies, such as circumlocution, a synonym, gestures, or speaking more slowly.

Much like Rubin's study, Stern (cited in Stern 1983, pp. 414-415) also developed a list of strategies used by good language learners. The ten strategies identified by Stern are:

1. Planning strategy: a personal learning style or positive learning strategy.
2. Active strategy: an active approach to the learning task.
3. Emphatic strategy: a tolerant and outgoing approach to the target language and its speakers.
4. Formal strategy: technical know-how of how to tackle a language.
5. Experimental strategy: a methodical but flexible approach, developing the new language into an ordered system and constantly revising it.
6. Semantic strategy: constant searching for meaning.
7. Practice strategy: willingness to practice.
8. Communication strategy: willingness to use the language in real communication.
9. Monitoring strategy: self-monitoring and critical sensitivity to language users.
10. Internalization strategy: developing second language more and more as a separate reference system and learning to think in it.

The current explosion of research in second language reading has begun to focus on, among other things, readers' strategies. Strategy research, in general, suggests that less competent learners are to improve their skills through training in strategies evidenced by more successful learners. The same is true of reading strategies: Less competent readers are able to improve through training in strategies evidenced by more successful readers.

The study of Wenden (1986) has added an important new dimension to our understanding of learner strategies. This is the importance of *Metacognitive* knowledge in second language learning. Wenden identified 5 areas of Metacognitive knowledge: (1) the language, (2) student proficiency, (3) outcome of students' learning endeavors, (4) the student's role in the language learning process, and (5) how best to approach the task of language learning. Wenden's research has contributed important insights on metacognition in second language learning, namely what, what learners know about their L2 learning and how they plan it.

The understanding that we possess about our own knowledge has been referred to since the late 1970's as *metacognition.* Admitting that it is a fuzzy concept, Flavel (1981, cited in Casanave, 1988) defines *metacognition* as "knowledge or cognition that takes as its object or regulates any aspect of cognitive endeavor" (p. 37) This definition is intended to refer to *cognition about cognition.*

Baker and Brown (1984) clarify and extend Flavel's (1981) definition, pointing out that metacognition involves two clusters of activities: (a) those that concern people's knowledge about their own cognitive resources, such as knowing what skills we need to study for a test and knowing when we are ready to be tested, and (b) those that regulate learning activities, such as checking comprehension and deciding what kind of strategic action to take and when to take it if comprehension is faulty. These skills, within the above-mentioned two broad categories of knowledge about cognition and regulation of learning activities, include the following abilities, according to Baker and Brown:

(a) Clarifying the purposes of reading, that is, understanding both the explicit and implicit task demands; (b) identifying the important aspects of a message; (c) focusing attention on the major content rather than trivia; (d) monitoring ongoing activities to determine whether comprehension is occurring; (e) engaging in self-questioning to determine whether goals are being achieved; and (f) taking corrective action when failures in comprehension are detected. (p. 354)

Good readers then are aware of and able to manipulate these skills for the purpose of regulating what and how they understand from text.

In a study of foreign language reading, Barnett (1988) investigated the relationships among reading comprehension, strategy use, and perceived strategy use. She found that all three were significantly correlated for cognitively mature university level readers of French as a foreign languages She concluded: "students who effectively consider and remember context as they read (i.e., strategy use) understand more of what they read than students who employ this strategy less or less well. Moreover, students who think they use those strategies considered more productive (i.e., perceived strategy use) actually do read through context better and understand more than do those who do not think they use such strategies." (p. 156).

### 3.2. Research on Vocabulary Learning Strategies

Researchers have always been interested in how learners go about learning vocabulary. It is known that if teachers know more about learner strategies and what works and what does not work well, we can help learners acquire more profitable strategies. Research on vocabulary learning has either investigated a single type of

strategy or different types of strategies have been compared to reveal the effectiveness of the strategies. Moreover, there are also some studies that have tried to establish the overall strategy use of learners.

### 3.2.1. Research on Metacognitive Strategies in Learning Vocabulary

In recent years much research is available in the literature regarding metacognitive abilities in reading comprehension. However, little has been done at the word-level, which is also a significant explanatory factor for variations in reading comprehension.

The study, conducted by Spedding and Chan (1993), reports on a study which examined the relationship among metacognitive abilities at the word-level, word identification skills, and reading comprehension competence in a group of Year 5 students. The results of the study indicate that metacognitive abilities at the word-level were directly related to reading comprehension performance. Spadding and Chan (1993) identify metacognitive abilities at the word-level as "having the awareness and regulation of strategies that one can employ to recognize the available clues in unfamiliar words to allow these words to be identified" (p. 92). An example given for metacognitive ability is: If one comes across with an unknown word, he may initially decide whether it is necessary to work out what the word is or whether to ignore it and continue reading. If he decides to learn it, he makes an attempt to make use of the visual configuration of the word or context. If not successful, the reader will break the word in syllables and sound these out. If still unsuccessful, the reader may look for prefixes, suffixes, or endings and separate these from the root word. The last step he can accomplish is the use of a dictionary. Such a process indicates that the reader is aware of different strategies for

word identification, is able to monitor their application, and is able to take remedial action whenever necessary in order to identify the word.

### 3.2.2. Research on Single or Compared Cognitive Strategies

It is known that dictionaries are designed to help readers read more efficiently, however, the use of dictionaries by the non-native speakers is a problem in itself. Looking up words while reading sometimes helps improve comprehension, but some learners tent to look up every word and avoid guessing based on the context. A study depending on this problem by Nesi and Meara (1991) reported the relationship between students' performance in reading tests and their use of dictionaries during the test based on the study by Bensoussan et al (1984, cited in Nesi and Meara, 1991). According to Bensoussan et al. examination administrators were against the use of dictionaries in the examination room because they thought that dictionaries might help the students too much, whilst also wasting precious working time. In contrast, however, many EFL teachers wanted students to be able to use dictionaries in examinations. In their study students answered multiple questions using monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. They conducted three pilot studies. The scores in these test were compared with the type of dictionary consulted and in studies 2 and 3 the length of time taken to complete the test was also noted. In study one the type of dictionary consulted was also compared with the number of words students had originally stated that they intended to look up and the number of words they in fact looked up. The findings of the studies indicated that scores were not significantly effected by dictionary use and dictionaries were not popular with all subjects. Dictionary users took considerably longer to complete the test.

In an other study, Nesi and Meara (1994) deal with the effectiveness of the definitions in EFL dictionaries. Every teacher knows that when non-native speakers of English look up words in learners' dictionaries, they sometimes misinterpret what they read. Thus, the study describes some of the errors produced by learners when they are asked to use dictionaries to help them write sentences containing unfamiliar words. The data strongly suggests that many adult language learners systematically misinterpreted dictionary entries.

Laufer (1990) discusses in her study that some problematic pseudofamiliar words (words that look familiar) suggest that dictionaries, both bilingual and monolingual, should be used more widely than is often advocated. Laufer notes that "If a word looks familiar but the sentence in which it is found or its wider context makes strange sense, or no sense at all, the learners should be encouraged to consult a dictionary." (p.154).

Semantic mapping is currently a popular technique which is advocated in recent studies. One of those studies claims that they do not work alone, but with the use of discussion. In the study of Stahl and Vancil (1986) the reasons of what makes semantic mapping effective –the visual display, the discussion, or the combination- were investigated. Three classes were assigned for three different treatments: one class received full treatment with semantic mapping using both the physical map and the extensive class discussion; another class received only the discussion approach, but not the physical map; in the third class only the map was used and without any discussion. The results indicate that discussion of vocabulary is more effective than the physical map.

The effective use of semantic mapping can also be seen in the study of Harley, Howard and Roberge (1996). Their aim was to explore the role of direct vocabulary

teaching among English-speaking secondary school students learning French as a second language. In their study they used the technique of semantic mapping because they wanted to draw attention to meaning connections between thematically related words. Finally, they admitted that semantic mapping proved to be a motivating approach. In their initial questionnaire responses, students reported that they were learning words in lists, however, after the treatment their opinion changed. They now perceived the semantic networks as a valuable and interesting alternative in learning vocabulary.

In an other study, traditional approach to vocabulary instruction was compared with an approach based on the semantic fields of words that appeared in college level reading texts (Crow and Quigley, 1985). One experimental group and a control group were used for the study. The experimental group received the semantic field approach and the other group received the traditional approach. As a result the experimental group was exposed to twice as many words in the same amount of time as the control group. This, of course, lend support to the use of the semantic field approach.

On the other hand, the findings of a study conducted by Tinkham (1993), are not consistent with these findings. Tinkham investigated whether subjects learning semantically related new L2 words performed better than the subjects learning semantically unrelated new words. Interestingly, the findings strongly suggested that subjects have more difficulty learning new words presented to them in semantic clusters than they do in learning semantically unrelated words.

A further type of strategy taken into consideration by researchers was the use of associations. Cohen and Aphek (1980, cited in Rubin,1987) investigated if learners of Hebrew could recall words that were learned through association. The findings were

positive in that the learners indicated high success. However, there were also learners who could successfully recall the words although they learned some words without associations. This conclusion raised a question whether there is a special type of learner who benefits from learning vocabulary from association. So, Cohen and Aphek (1980, cited in Rubin,1987) came to the conclusion that there was the need for more research to enable to understand how association promotes memory in second language.

The role of vocabulary in reading has long been neglected in the field of second language acquisition (Crow, 1986; Beheydt, 1987; Cohen, 1987). Neglect of vocabulary learning in reading appears to be connected to, and perhaps rooted in, the hypothesis that L2 vocabulary is best acquired incidentally through the act of reading itself (Krashen, 1989). Krashen (1989) also proposed the hypothesis that vocabulary is best acquired by guessing from context through the act of reading. The hypothesis mentioned is the Input Hypothesis which assumes that learners acquire language by understanding messages. To be more precise, comprehensibility is an environmental ingredient that is essential. Krashen argues that "the best hypothesis is that competence in spelling and vocabulary is most efficiently attained by comprehensible input in the form of reading" (p. 440).

Mondria and Wit-De Boer (1991) mention about the theory of Shouten-van Parreren (1985) who in a research found that the learning of words can best be achieved by reading. According to him the learning of words through bilingual word-lists should be rejected for the following reasons:

1. Words that have been learned from a list are easily mixed up (so-called 'lumping').
2. Words that have been learned from a list are easily forgotten because of the lack of any cognitive foothold.

3. Words that are known within the list may not be known outside the list (as a result of 'system separation').
4. The meaning(s) of a word as learned in a list is (are) often not appropriate in the context encountered by the pupils.
5. The learning motivation of the pupil will be slight because he has not yet felt the need to find out the meaning of a particular word.

Schouten-van Parreren (1985, cited in Mondria and Wit-De Boer, 1991)

With the view that inferring meaning of a word from its context makes an important contribution towards the retention of the word in question, Mondria and Wit-De Boer (1991) also contribute that the meaning of the word can be guessed correctly. In their study they investigated 1) which contextual factors influence the guessability of words, 2) how these factors influence receptive retention (after guessing and memorizing), and 3) what the relationship between correctly or incorrectly guessing and retention (after a learning stage) is. The obvious importance of learning from context has led to numerous experimental investigations aimed at understanding the process that might be involved.

In a study by Duquette and Painchaud (1996) not reading but listening through watching (video) was used as the context. The aim was to compare the acquisition and retention of L2 vocabulary through listening to a scripted dialogue under two conditions. In the first condition, the subjects, English-speaking university students at a high elementary level in French, listened to a dialogue with a visual aid (video tape) of a familiar situation: learning how to drive a car. In the second condition, the students

listened to the same dialogue without the support of visuals (audio tape). Before listening to the tape in the second condition , subjects' prior knowledge was activated through an oral narration in the L2 which presented the situation of the dialogue. It was hypothesized that viewing a familiar language situation, namely learning to drive a car, would have a positive effect on the comprehension level and on the ability to discover the meaning of unfamiliar words since it dealt with known concepts activated by the video. The results of the study showed that the strategies developed by the students are different depending on whether the dialogue is accompanied by visuals or not. The video group showed that less attention is focused on purely linguistic cues when learners can both see and hear. The audio group concluded that internal linguistic cues facilitate the inference of words that are not specific to the dialogue's theme and that have a more general meaning.

Another study about the relationship between word knowledge and guessing from context was conducted by Shefelbine (1990). He examined how vocabulary knowledge and other subject and text variables are related to individual variability in learning from context. His hypothesis was that, in natural text, students with lower levels of general vocabulary experience difficulty learning word meanings at least partly because they know words less well, encounter more unknown words, and hence have less contextual information available to them. The study suggested that general and passage specific vocabulary knowledge are important variables influencing learning from context.

Parry (1991), in her longitudinal case studies, tries to find an answer to the question of how language learners build their vocabularies. The study was conducted in the field of academic reading, and the students were enrolled in anthropology class. During the study the students were asked to read and record the words that caused them

difficulty. Data were collected through protocols and a translation task. The results showed that students who read extensively are able to know a large proportion of words. While reading they stop for few words, it is relatively easy for them to infer their meanings. So, he can read more quickly and encounter more new words. Others, by contrast, read little, thus, they come across with more unknown words, and is slowed down in her reading. Parry concludes that teachers should encourage their students to read as much as they can before they leave school.

Horst, Cobb, Meara (1998) also conducted a study to analyze besides others if learners with larger vocabulary sizes learn more words or not. The main aim of the study was to demonstrate that second language learners recognized the meanings of new words and built associations between them as a result of comprehension-focused extensive reading. The findings also suggest that subjects with larger vocabulary sizes had greater incidental word learning gains.

Although it may be true that the learning of some new words is facilitated by some contexts, it has been suggested that reading passages do not always provide sufficient context clues in order for one to infer word meanings. In a study by Beck, McKeown, and McCaslin (1983), stories used in two school programs were examined and it was found that passages could be placed onto a continuum depending on their effectiveness to illuminate word meanings. The range included misdirective, nondirective, general context, and directive. The adults who participated in the study were able to define 86% of the words in the directive context, 49% of the general context words, 27% of the nondirective context words and only 3% in the misdirective category. The researchers conclude that '... it is precarious to believe that naturally occurring

contexts are sufficient, or even generally helpful, in providing clues to promote initial acquisition of a word's meaning' (p.179).

In another study by Schatz and Baldwin (1986), the same results have been found. Their aim was to determine the extent to which context helps students infer the meanings of unknown words. They conducted three studies, however, as a result there were no statistical significant effect due to the context. The conclusion is drawn that instructional strategies that prioritize context clues should be reexamined.

Comparisons of different instructional conditions, such as keyword versus context methods, are also very popular. The aim is usually to identify which of the methods are better in retention of vocabulary. In one of those studies (McDaniel, Pressley, Dunay, 1987), context was compared with the use of keyword methods. McDaniel et al. (1987) assessed in two experiments the long-term retention of new vocabulary meanings acquired through keyword or semantic-context methods. College students learned a list of 30 English vocabulary-meaning pairs until all meanings could be correctly recalled when they were given the words. One week later students were again tested on cued-recall performance. The results converged with earlier findings (e.g., McDaniel , Pressley, 1984) that showed that the semantic context method of learning new vocabulary produces less efficient acquisition than does the keyword method.

### 3.2.3. Research on Overall Strategy Use

A study by Arden-Close (1993) investigated the vocabulary learning strategies used by nonnative students of English while they were reading. Subjects were three altogether, however differing in their reading ability- a 'good' reader, an 'average' reader, and a 'poor' reader. The study asked whether there were differences in the

strategies used by successful and unsuccessful readers. The results lead to the conclusion that only the successful student used a wider range of strategies. For example, all the students were able to make use of their world knowledge, with a minimal reference to the context surrounding the word. Only the stronger students made use of wider context, but the weaker students made use only of the immediate context. The weaker students also needed to look up words more often then the stronger students.

Another study on vocabulary learning strategies was conducted by Payne (1988, cited in Hatch and Brown, 1995). Her aim was to establish the strategies of 17 ESL students randomly selected from an intensive English program. She interviewed the students in their native language in order to be sure that they could explain their strategies as they desired. The question she asked was open-ended, and the answers to this question were transcribed. As a further step, out of all the answers, Pane devised a questionnaire containing thirty-two statements, each of which described the strategy mentioned by the students who had been interviewed. This questionnaire was then administered to more than 100 ESL students asking them to rate how effective they thought each described strategy was for them.

Training in the use of learning strategies have also been investigated. Research strongly suggests that good language learners use a variety of strategies to assist them in gaining command over new language skills. So, less competent students should be trained on strategies evidenced among more successful language learners. In O'Malley's(1987) study students received training on the use of learning strategies with three language tasks: vocabulary, listening skills and speaking. His major conclusion was that strategy training was effective for listening and speaking but not for vocabulary. They received an instruction on the use of self-evaluation (metacognitive) and grouping and imagery

(cognitive)which proved to be difficult to implement. Observations also indicate that Asian students, who were highly efficient rote learners of vocabulary lists, were negatively affected by the introduction of grouping and imagery.

The present study which is a replication of a previous study administered by Gu and Johnson (1996) as mentioned before is consistent with the results of the previous study in some aspects (these will be discussed in Chapter 6). Gu and Johnson claim that although each strategy contributes to success or failure, employment of these consistently may influence the outcomes of L2 learning. Therefore, they think that not the individual strategy but the combined way of employing strategies should be studied and see how much it affects the outcomes of students. Thus they conducted an exploratory study to establish the vocabulary learning strategies used by Chinese university learners of English, and the relationship between their strategies and outcomes in learning English. The instruments they used were: 1) a vocabulary learning strategies questionnaire which they established by combining the elements of some other research and suggestions. 2) Vocabulary size test which was a combination of two vocabulary size tests (an adaptation of the first test from Goulden, Nation, and Read (1990) and Nation (1990)). 3) and a CETBAND as the proficiency measures (a band consisting of listening, vocabulary, structure, reading, cloze, and sentence translation sections , 85%, plus 10 quizzes taken throughout the year, 10%, and the teacher's overall rating, 5%). Data was collected by the performance of descriptive statistics to profile the beliefs and strategies of adult Chinese learners, a correlation analysis to see how various strategies related to vocabulary size and general proficiency, a multiple regression analysis to identify the best predictors from all variables considered together and a cluster analysis to identify the strategy profiles of different types of learners. As a result, the subjects reported using more meaning-oriented

strategies than rote-learning strategies in vocabulary learning. Strategies aiming at vocabulary retention only correlated more with vocabulary size than with English proficiency in general. Finally the cluster analysis identified five approaches to learning. To be concluded, the study suggests that vocabulary should become integrated into discourse. Therefor, skill learning is beneficial in activating the vocabulary items. Decontextualized strategies that aim for retention should be complemented with other contextualized strategies.

# CHAPTER IV

# METHODOLOGY

## 4.1. Subjects

The subjects for the study were all freshman (between the ages of 17-21) in English Language Teaching Department at Anadolu University. By the time of the study, these subjects had all had 6-8 years of English learning experience in secondary and High Schools. To continue the first year of the university, some of the students had to accomplish preparation classes and were admitted to the first year after a series of exams and lastly they took the practice TOEFL exam in order to determine their level and whether they are ready to be admitted to the first year. Other students were admitted to the first year directly after the university exam. However, they still had to be successful in a series of exams such as a proficiency exam, TOEFL exam, writing and finally speaking exams. Thus, the level of both groups is being considered as equal. After initial elimination of data, 120 of these students formed the final pool of participants.

## 4.2. Materials

The materials used in this study were a vocabulary learning questionnaire (VLQ, see Appendix B) (Gu and Johnson, 1996) to elicit students' beliefs about vocabulary learning and their self-reported vocabulary learning strategies; the vocabulary size test (VOCSIZE) (Nation, 1990) (see Appendix E); and finally the practice TOEFL exam to determine their proficiency level.

### 4.2.1. Vocabulary Learning Questionnaire (VLQ)

The questionnaire that was used in this study was taken from Gu and Johnson (1996). In this questionnaire while they were preparing it, they reflected previous quantitative and qualitative research (e.g., Ahmed,1989; Gu,1994; Oxford,1990; Politzer and McGroarty,1985, cited in Gu and Johnson,1996). The questionnaire included two sections. The first section was Beliefs About Vocabulary Learning and included 17 statements representing three dimensions of beliefs. These are: Vocabulary should be memorized; Vocabulary should be picked up naturally; and Vocabulary should be studied and used. The subjects were asked to rate each statement on a 7-point scale from 'Absolutely disagree (1)' to 'Absolutely agree (7)'. The second section of the questionnaire is about the Vocabulary Learning Strategies, which contains 91 vocabulary learning behaviors divided into two major parts: Metacognitive Regulation and Cognitive Strategies. Again the subjects were asked to rate each statement on a 7-point scale, ranging from 'Extremely Untrue of Me (1)' to "Extremely True of Me (7)'. The questionnaire was administered in Turkish (see Appendix A) in order to maximize ease of administration and ensure greater accuracy of results. The items in the English version (Appendix B) are organized under category headings. However, these items were randomly ordered in the Turkish version during administration.

Table 4.1. outlines the major dimensions in the questionnaire, the categories under each dimension, the number of items under each category, and finally the acronyms for the independent variables that will appear in the later chapters.

*Table 4.1.*

*Dimensions and Categories (VLQ: 108 items)*

| Dimensions and Categories | No. of Items | Variable Labels |
|---|---|---|
| Beliefs about vocabulary Learning | 17 | |
| Words Should Be Memorized | 8 | MEMORIZ |
| Words Should Be Acquired in Context: Bottom-Up | 4 | ACQUIRE |
| Words Should Be Studied and Put to Use: Top-Down | 5 | LEARN |
| Metacognitive Regulation | 12 | |
| Selective Attention | 7 | ATTEND |
| Self-Initiation | 5 | SELFINI |
| Guessing Strategies | 12 | |
| Using Background Knowledge/Wider Context | 7 | WIDECUE |
| Using Linguistic Cues/Immediate Context | 5 | LOCOCUE |
| Dictionary Strategies | 17 | |
| Dictionary Strategies for Comprehension | 4 | DICOMPR |
| Extended Dictionary Strategies | 8 | DICEXTN |
| Looking-Up Strategies | 5 | DICLOOK |
| Note-Taking Strategies | 9 | |
| Meaning-Oriented Note-Taking Strategies | 5 | NOTEMNG |
| Usage-Oriented Note-Taking | 4 | NOTEUSE |
| Rehearsal Strategies | 12 | |
| Using Word Lists | 6 | VOCLIST |
| Oral Repetition | 3 | ORALREP |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Visual Repetition | 3 | VISUREP |
| Encoding Strategies | 24 | |
| Association/Elaboration | 4 | ASSOCIA |
| Imagery | 4 | IMAGERY |
| Visual Encoding | 3 | VISUCOD |
| Auditory Encoding | 3 | AUDICOD |
| Using Word-Structure | 3 | WDFORM |
| Semantic Encoding | 3 | SEMANET |
| Contextual Encoding | 4 | CONTEXT |
| Activation Strategies | 5 | ACTIVAT |

### 4.2.2. Vocabulary Size Test (VOCSIZE)

The Vocabulary Levels Test (see Appendix E) was adapted from Nation (1990) as the vocabulary size indicator. The test is divided into five levels. The 2000- and 3000-word levels contain high-frequency words. It means that each of the words at this level occurs frequently. The university word level represents one type of specialized vocabulary. The 5000-word level is on the boundary of high and low-frequency words. The 10000-word level contains low-frequency words.

Each section of the test consists of six words and three definitions, as in the example below:

1. business
2. clock _____ part of a house
3. horse _____ animal with four legs
4. pencil _____ something used for writing
5. shoe
6. wall

This type of item was chosen because it is easy to make and easy to mark, provided low chances of guessing correctly, tested a large number of words in a short time, and allowed the learners to make use of whatever knowledge they had of the meaning of a word. The words in each section of the test were chosen so that they would be representative of all the words at that level. There are six parts in each level testing 18 words. In fact 36 words at that level are tested. This is because the distractors in the test are not meanings but words. The sum of all the words that are matched in all the levels is 90. Scores summed the number of correct responses.

### 4.2.3. The Practice TOEFL Exam

TOEFL was used to determine the subjects proficiency level. It was chosen because it is accepted as a standardized proficiency test, and it is used by nearly 1000 institutions of higher education in the United States as an indicator of a prospective student's ability to undertake academic work in an English medium.

## 4.3. Procedure

All data were collected during the first semester, Fall 1998. 140 freshmen were given the Vocabulary Learning Questionnaire to determine their frequent use of strategies and beliefs about vocabulary learning. They were informed in advance that they would take the questionnaire, and were told that their responses would not affect their course grades. The students were also informed that the questionnaire was designed to help students and researchers to understand better, how they learn vocabulary and that the information helps them become better learners. Therefore, they were recommended to give their responses to the statements as sincerely as possible since there were no right or

wrong answers. They were given approximately 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Right after a week, the vocabulary levels test was administered to the students, again telling them that the scores would not affect their course grades. Finally, after a few weeks they were given the practice TOEFL exam, in order to determine their proficiency levels.

**4.4. Data Analysis**

Students' responses (ranging from 1 to 7) to the VLQ items were scored on the VLQ answer sheet. Since the responses of the students on the VLQ answer sheet (Appendix C ) were not in the right order as in the categorized VLQ (Appendix B), the answers were put again in order so that the average of each category could be provided.

As mentioned before, the vocabulary levels test had 90 items to be evaluated. '1 point' was given for each correct answer. For the proficiency scores, TOEFL scores were used.

The analyses to be obtained for the study were three altogether. The first one was descriptive statistics to see the overall patterns of vocabulary learning strategies used by the subjects. Secondly, a correlation analysis between all independent variables and the two variables-vocabulary size and general proficiency- was performed to see how various strategies related to vocabulary size and general proficiency. Finally a multiple regression was done on the two dependent variables to identify the best predictors from all variables considered together.

# CHAPTERV

# RESULTS

The aim of this study was to determine the vocabulary strategies used by Turkish University students, and the relationship between their strategies and outcomes in learning English.

## 5.1. Results of the Descriptive Statistics of Vocabulary Learning Strategies

Table 5.1. presents descriptive statistics on each category of beliefs and strategies. Looking at each of the categories, the overall patterns of vocabulary learning strategies used by students can be encountered easily. The three types of beliefs tell us that the belief that vocabulary should be memorized (MEMORIZ) (M=2.95, SD=0.74) was less emphasized by the students than the other two belief categories. The predominance of the belief that vocabulary can be acquired in context (ACQUIRE) (M=5.58, SD=0.86) is closely followed by that of vocabulary should be carefully studied and put to use (LEARN) (M=5.49, SD=0.86).

In the category of Metacognitive regulation (regulating their own vocabulary learning), Selective Attention (ATTEND) (M=4.98, SD=0.73) received a relatively higher rank than Self Initiation (SELFINI) (M=3.46, SD=0.73).

The students reported extensive use of Guessing Strategies when reading. They employed wider cues (WIDECUE) (M=5.23, SD=1.14) more than local cues (LOCOCUE) (M=4.70, SD=0.97). A look at the Dictionary Strategies tells us, overall, that the students tend to use dictionary more often than the other strategies. They seemed

to use dictionary strategies widely, both for comprehension (DICOMPR) (M=5.71, SD=1.00), and for vocabulary learning (DICEXTN) (M=5.43, SD=1.02) followed by a variety of looking-up strategies (DICLOOK) (M=4.78, SD=1.10).

Among the Note-taking Strategies the meaning related strategies (NOTEMNG) (M=4.65, SD=1.11) ranked higher than usage related information (NOTEUSE) (M=3.98, SD=1.31). They were generally less likely to use rehearsal (often associated with rote learning) and Encoding Strategies than other strategies.

Oral Repetition (ORALREP) (M=3.99, SD=1.10), of the rehearsal strategies, was followed closely in rank by the use of vocabulary lists (VOCLIST) (M=3.96, SD=1.38), and as the lowest by Visual Repetition (VISUREP) (M=3.87, SD=1.35). Among Encoding Strategies, Contextual Encoding ranked highest (CONTEXT) (M=4.77, SD=1.35) followed by Auditory encoding (AUDICOD) (M=4.22, SD=1.07), Visual encoding (VISUCOD) (M=4.09, SD=1.02), Semantic encoding (SEMANET) (M=4.08, SD=1.04), Imagery (IMAGERY) (M=3.95, SD=1.15), Association (ASSOCIA) (M=3.81, SD=1.13), and, finally, using word-structure (WDFORM) (M=3.79, SD=1.39). Activation Strategies ranked higher (ACTIVAT) (M=4.87, SD=1.02) than the Encoding Strategies.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Visual Repetition | 3.87 | 1.35 |
| Encoding Strategies | | |
| Association/Elaboration | 3.81 | 1.13 |
| Imagery | 3.95 | 1.15 |
| Visual Encoding | 4.09 | 1.02 |
| Auditory Encoding | 4.22 | 1.07 |
| Using Word-Structure | 3.79 | 1.39 |
| Semantic Encoding | 4.08 | 1.04 |
| Contextual Encoding | 4.77 | 0.97 |
| Activation Strategies | 4.87 | 1.07 |

n 120

### 5.2. Vocabulary Learning Strategies and English Learning Outcomes

In order to see the relation between the strategies and the learning outcomes of the subjects, simple correlation was obtained. Two dependent variables (English proficiency and vocabulary size) were correlated with all the independent variables (three belief variables, two metacognitive regulation variables, 18 cognitive strategy variables covering the whole process of vocabulary learning). Table 5.2. shows the results of the correlation.

The results on Table 5.2. indicate that there was less correlation of the independent variables with the English proficiency (TOEFL) than with vocabulary size (VOCSIZE). Only one of the Rehearsal Strategies, namely Visual Repetition (VISUREP) ($r = -0.28$, $p < 0.01$), and one of the Encoding Strategies, that is Association (ASSOCIA) ($r = -0.18$, $p < 0.05$) correlated with English Proficiency negatively.

All the other strategies that correlated with vocabulary size were positive. Among the Beliefs variables, none of them revealed a significant correlation with TOEFL or VOCSIZE. One of the two metacognitive regulations, that is Selective Attention (ATTEND) ($r= 0.36$, $p<0.01$) correlated positively only with VOCSIZE. Among the three dictionary variables, only looking up words for comprehension (DICOMPR) did not reveal a significant correlation, but the looking-up strategies (DICLOOK) ($r= 0.20$, $p< 0.05$) and extended dictionary strategies (DICEXTN) ($r= 0.26$, $p< 0.01$) revealed a positive correlation with the vocabulary size. Both Note-Taking variables- Meaning-Oriented Note-Taking (NOTEMNG) ($r= 0.22$, $p<0.05$) and Usage-Oriented Note-Taking (NOTEUSE) ($r= 0.18$, $p<0.05$)- positively correlated only with the vocabulary size. Using Word-Lists (VOCLIST) ($r= 0.25$, $p< 0.01$) also correlated positively with vocabulary size. Although, as mentioned before, Association of the Encoding strategies correlated negatively with TOEFL, but it correlated with VOCSIZE positively, ($r= 0.18$, $p< 0.05$).

Interestingly using Word-Structure (WDFORM) seems to be favored by the subjects, because it correlated positively with both the English Proficiency ($r= 0.18$, $p<0.05$) and the vocabulary size ($r= 0.24$, $p< 0.01$). Finally, Contextual Encoding (CONTEXT) ($r= 0.21$, $p< 0.05$) correlated significantly positively with vocabulary size.

*Table 5.2.*
*Correlation Among 23 Independent Variables and 2 Dependent Variables*

| | MEMORIZ | | ACQUIRE | | LEARN | | ATTEND | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | r | p | r | p | r | p | r | p |
| TOEFL | -0.13 | 0.15 | -0.13 | 0.16 | -0.14 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.17 |
| VOCSIZE | -0.05 | 0.56 | 0.14 | 0.12 | -0.12 | 0.18 | 0.36 | 0.00* |
| | SELFINI | | WIDECUE | | LOCOCUE | | DICOMPR | |
| TOEFL | 0.04 | 0.64 | -0.02 | 0.80 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.98 |
| VOCSIZE | -0.06 | 0.51 | 0.09 | 0.32 | 0.18 | 0.06 | 0.13 | 0.17 |
| | DICEXTN | | DICLOOK | | NOTEMNG | | NOTEUSE | |
| TOEFL | -0.02 | 0.85 | -0.04 | 0.64 | 0.10 | 0.26 | -0.03 | 0.79 |
| VOCSIZE | -0.26 | 0.01* | 0.20 | 0.03** | 0.22 | 0.02** | 0.18 | 0.05** |
| | VOCLIST | | ORALREP | | VISUREP | | ASSOCIA | |
| TOEFL | -0.10 | 0.28 | -0.16 | 0.10 | -0.28 | 0.00* | -0.18 | 0.04** |
| VOCSIZE | -0.25 | 0.01* | 0.09 | 0.36 | 0.11 | 0.25 | 0.18 | 0.05** |
| | IMAGERY | | VISUCOD | | AUDICOD | | WDFORM | |
| TOEFL | -0.13 | 0.17 | -0.12 | 0.19 | -0.06 | 0.54 | 0.18 | 0.05** |
| VOCSIZE | 0.10 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.39 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.00* |
| | SEMANET | | CONTEXT | | ACTIVAT | | | |
| TOEFL | -0.04 | 0.65 | 0.05 | 0.58 | -0.16 | 0.08 | | |
| VOCSIZE | 0.17 | 0.07 | 0.21 | 0.02** | 0.15 | 0.11 | | |

n= 120. *p< .01, **p< .05.

Another analysis was performed in order to get a better insight of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. With the use of *multiple regression analyses* , it is possible to examine the relationship and predictive power of one or more independent variables simultaneously with the dependent variable.

When predicting the TOEFL (proficiency) (Table 5.3.), only three variables were found to predict significantly. Only one variable- Using Word-Structure (WDFORM)- was the significant positive predictor which shows that English proficiency is very much related to the analysis of word formation (i.e. prefix, suffix, etc.). On the other hand, Visual Repetition and Activation emerged as significant, however, negative predictors of English proficiency.

*Table 5.3.*

*Multiple Regression: Predictors of TOEFL exam (proficiency)*

| | Step | Variables Entered | Beta | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Block 1 | 1 | LEARN | - 0.18 | - 1.86 | 0.07 |
| | 2 | MEMORIZ | - 0.06 | - 0.63 | 0.53 |
| | 3 | ACQUIRE | - 0.05 | - 0.54 | 0.59 |
| Block 2 | 4 | ATTEND | 0.11 | 1.07 | 0.29 |
| | 5 | SELFINI | 0.12 | 1.26 | 0.21 |
| Block 3 | 6 | LOCOCUE | 0.10 | 0.75 | 0.46 |
| | 7 | WIDECUE | - 0.03 | - 0.24 | 0.81 |
| Block 4 | 8 | DICOMPR | 0.04 | 0.37 | 0.72 |
| | 9 | DICLOOK | - 0.10 | - 0.71 | 0.48 |
| | 10 | DICEXTN | 0.04 | 0.31 | 0.76 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Block 5 | 11 | NOTEUSE | - 0.11 | - 0.80 | 0.43 |
| | 12 | NOTEMNG | 0.21 | 1.53 | 0.13 |
| Block 6 | 13 | VISUREP | - 0.26 | - 2.03 | 0.05* |
| | 14 | ORALREP | - 0.03 | - 0.21 | 0.83 |
| | 15 | VOCLIST | - 0.02 | - 0.16 | 0.87 |
| Block 7 | 16 | IMAGERY | 0.15 | 1.14 | 0.26 |
| | 17 | AUDICOD | - 0.03 | - 0.26 | 0.79 |
| | 18 | WDFORM | 0.28 | 2.26 | 0.03* |
| | 19 | VISUCOD | - 0.08 | - 0.56 | 0.58 |
| | 20 | CONTEXT | 0.16 | 1.30 | 0.20 |
| | 21 | SEMANET | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.93 |
| | 22 | ASSOCIA | - 0.23 | - 1.80 | 0.08 |
| Block 8 | 23 | ACTIVAT | - 0.30 | - 2.25 | 0.03* |

*P< 0.05

The same group of independent variables were used again in multiple regression analysis against vocabulary size (VOCSIZE) as the dependents variable (Table 5.4.). The conducted correlation analysis indicated more significant positive relations with the VOCSIZE than the TOEFL (proficiency). However, multiple regression analysis against vocabulary size reveals that only one variable emerged as a predictor. This variable belonging to the metacognitive regulation is Selective Attention. There is a positive prediction of VOCSIZE.

*Table 5.4.*

*Multiple Regression: Predictors of VOCSIZE*

| | Step | Variables Entered | Beta | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Block 1 | 1 | LEARN | - 0.12 | - 1.16 | 0.25 |
| | 2 | MEMORIZ | - 0.02 | - 0.20 | 0.85 |
| | 3 | ACQUIRE | 0.16 | 1.59 | 0.12 |
| Block 2 | 4 | ATTEND | 0.24 | 2.13 | 0.04* |
| | 5 | SELFINI | - 0.04 | - 0.42 | 0.67 |
| Block 3 | 6 | LOCOCUE | - 0.01 | - 0.05 | 0.96 |
| | 7 | WIDECUE | - 0.07 | - 0.56 | 0.58 |
| Block 4 | 8 | DICOMPR | 0.04 | 0.33 | 0.74 |
| | 9 | DICLOOK | - 0.00 | - 0.01 | 1.00 |
| | 10 | DICEXTN | 0.12 | 0.78 | 0.44 |
| Block 5 | 11 | NOTEUSE | - 0.03 | - 0.22 | 0.83 |
| | 12 | NOTEMNG | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.89 |
| Block 6 | 13 | VISUREP | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.97 |
| | 14 | ORALREP | - 0.15 | - 1.13 | 0.26 |
| | 15 | VOCLIST | 0.10 | 0.64 | 0.53 |
| Block 7 | 16 | IMAGERY | - 0.01 | - 0.08 | 0.94 |
| | 17 | AUDICOD | 0.02 | 0.19 | 0.85 |
| | 18 | WDFORM | 0.15 | 1.18 | 0.24 |
| | 19 | VISUCOD | - 0.17 | - 1.05 | 0.30 |
| | 20 | CONTEXT | 0.10 | 0.75 | 0.45 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 21 | SEMANET | - 0.03 | - 0.20 | 0.84 |
| | 22 | ASSOCIA | 0.11 | 0.84 | 0.40 |
| Block 8 | 23 | ACTIVAT | - 0.01 | - 0.04 | 0.97 |

$P < 0.05$

The next chapter presents the discussion of the statistical analysis of the results.

# CHAPTER VI

# DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to determine whether vocabulary learning strategies of Turkish EFL students had an effect on their performance of language and vocabulary learning. To take the study of Gu and Johnson (1996) into account, the results seem to be consistent with the first research question. Chinese and Turkish University students tend to prefer using the same strategies. However, the effects of their strategies on their outcomes differ enormously. The strategies of the Chinese seem to affect their outcomes more than the ones of the Turkish students.

If the favored strategies of the Turkish and Chinese students are to be considered relatively, using background knowledge (wider context), dictionary strategies for comprehension, oral repetition of the rehearsal strategies, and contextual encoding strategies were preferred by both of the student groups (i.e., Turkish and Chinese). However, the range between the mentioned strategies of the students differed to some extent. Only the use of oral repetition of the Turkish students was encountered highly low in range from the Chinese students. The use of the other strategies by the Turkish students were higher in range than the Chinese. However, Turkish students reported that they use selective attention as the metacognitive regulation whereas the Chinese students preferred self initiation. They also differed in the use of note-taking strategies. Turkish students used meaning-oriented note-taking whereas the Chinese preferred usage-oriented note-taking strategies. Activation strategies of the Chinese is highly low in range than of the Turkish students.

Interestingly, however, both groups did not report on the belief that vocabulary should be memorized. It is always suggested that Asian students tend to memorize all vocabulary or information. In Turkey it is the same as with the Asian students. The educational system of Turkey is mostly based on rote learning since the entrance of the university exam requires students to learn everything by heart and enter an exam that consists of multiple choice questions. Furthermore, Chastain (1988) mentions about a study administered by Horwitz (1985) who developed an inventory called *Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory* (BALI). One of general opinions given by students was that regarding the nature of language learning, learning a language is merely a matter of translation, learning the grammar, or memorizing the new vocabulary. The results of the present study indicates no consistency with the study of Horwitz. Instead, the Turkish students report that words should be acquired in context. The reason why they are for the use of context when trying to identify the word meaning, could be the result of their reading courses, in which they had already had an instruction on the guessing of the meaning from context, but not on mnemonic devices that are so much valued by some researchers (Hall, 1988; Pressley et al., 1983; Brown and Perry, 1991).

The correlation analysis, on the other hand, indicates that not many strategies are related with the proficiency level. Only the word formation, such as analyzing words in terms of prefixes, stems, and suffixes and studying the formation rules in order to remember the words had a significantly positive relation with the proficiency level. There is, however, a contradiction between their favoring of strategies and their outcomes in terms of proficiency. The subjects reported that they believed and used all meaning-oriented learning strategies, such as guessing from context. But, the use of context had no influence on their proficiency which was determined by the practice TOEFL exam. The

TOEFL exam, however, is a test which includes contextual situations and enables the students to infer or guess the meanings from context. In the study by Mondria and Wit-De Boer, they investigated the influence of guessing on retention of the words, and concluded that guessing is conducive to retention. As an explanation, they say that in the process of guessing, the reader performs a mental action on the word-form, making associations between the context and his own personal knowledge, and so he establishes a cognitive foothold. In the situation of the Turkish subjects, it can be concluded that they use word-form in order to reach their aim of guessing. The subjects should not, on the other hand, depend on visual repetition and association techniques. They also significantly correlate with the proficiency, but negatively. These techniques tend to take time because subjects spend too much time on them.

The strategies highly correlated with the size of vocabulary, on the other hand, does not demonstrate a similar relationship with the proficiency. This is due to the fact that vocabulary size forms only a part of living language (Gu and Johnson, 1996; Nation, 1990). The positive effect of some strategies on vocabulary size in the correlation analysis is consistent with the results of Gu and Johnson. They reflected more strategies related to vocabulary size positively than the present study. Knowing how to look up words in the dictionary, such as removing the inflections to recover the form, looking up the stem of the word with suffixes or prefixes, using various information (e.g., part of speech, pronunciation, style, collocation, etc.) to reduce the multiple senses or homographic entries; taking notes that are meaning oriented and usage oriented while looking up; and studying the word-structure deliberately after having looked it up and note-taking, all are significantly positive correlated with the vocabulary size. Since all these are decontextualized techniques, it is relevant that subjects' use of these strategies

correlated with the vocabulary size and not with proficiency. Regulating their metacognitive skills such as selective attention and contextual encoding, remembering the sentence or the context the word was used in, putting the new word into context are also positive correlations of vocabulary size.

As mentioned before, the multiple regression analysis was performed to get a better picture of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables when considering all independent variables simultaneously. The significant predictor of proficiency was only using word-structure, which also correlated positively with proficiency. On the other hand, visual repetition and activation of the learned vocabulary through reading, using it in real situations, and imagery situations emerged as significant but negative predictors of proficiency.

The same moderate results occurred in predicting the vocabulary size. The best and the only positive predictor of vocabulary size was the Metacognitive Regulation, Selective Attention. No other cognitive strategy predicted the vocabulary size significantly which is not consistent with the results of Gu and Johnson. They reported that seven variables- the two Metacognitive variables, Contextual Encoding, Oral Repetition, Visual Repetition, Imagery Mnemonics, Believing in Memorization- were significant predictors of proficiency. And significant predictors of vocabulary size were Self-initiation, Dictionary Looking-up strategies, Activation and Semantic Encoding, negative predictors, however, were again Visual Repetition and Visual Encoding. Gu and Johnson discussed that students would benefit more if they aimed at learning the language skills rather than at just remembering English equivalents of Chinese words.

The usage of wide range of vocabulary strategies reported by the Turkish subjects indicated no significance although they were efficient in learning and retaining

vocabulary. This could be due to the fact that they only believe in learning vocabulary in context, but not have efficient instruction on it or the other mnemonic devices that are favored by some researchers. Moreover, another reason could be that they are not encouraged by the teachers to develop independence in their learning (Bonds, Bonds, Peach, 1992). Although the students know the benefits of guessing from context, memorizing the vocabulary in contexts, activating their knowledge of the vocabulary by reading different contexts, they still tend to apply the rote learning strategies. From this, the conclusion that students look for the easiest way in learning vocabulary can be drawn. That is, the students while trying to find out the meaning of a word in the context or looking for the word in different contexts has to think more than the students using dictionaries and lists of vocabulary that is taken down while reading. However, as the findings of Nesi and Meara's (1991) study discussed that subjects did not rely much on dictionaries because it took them considerably longer to complete the test, the present study indicates that time consuming is not an obstacle for the Turkish students.

As Gu and Johnson also discuss, learning a word includes much more than remembering the orthographic (spelling) and phonological forms and their corresponding meanings. The aim of learning vocabulary should be directed to the use of vocabulary in action. As Nation states it is easier to learn to recognize a word-form and recall its meaning than it is to learn to produce the word at suitable times. He also gives some rough estimations that learning a word productively is 50 to 100 percent more difficult than learning it receptively. The Turkish subjects of this study seemed to be placed under the category of learning words receptively. They are not aware of the fact that there is the advantage of using any words they wish to use in producing vocabulary instead handling of whatever language the native speaker may throw at him (Wallace, 1988).

The results of the study also indicate that vocabulary should not be seen as items in isolation, but a skill to be developed like the other language skills. The purpose of vocabulary learning should be in addition to remembering the form associations, learning the skill of guessing what the word means.

# CHAPTER VII

# CONCLUSIONS

## 7.1 Summary of the Study

Although the focus in L2 teaching in recent years has been on the acquisition of grammar, it cannot be overlooked that learners must also remember a great deal of vocabulary. Learners need to master a sizeable amount of vocabulary before they can start to read authentic English texts. In addition, while active manipulation of structure is usually heavily emphasized in the classroom, vocabulary memorization is often left to the individual learner. However, if the learner is not able to memorize the words, there will be no process in language learning. Since not knowing the meanings of words, learners fail to understand the general meaning of what they read or listen to. Therefore, teachers should be aware of the fact that these learners need help with strategies they can use independently of a teacher when he is not around.

Research in literature on vocabulary learning has focused on single strategies, such as context clues, semantic mapping, mnemonics, etc. However, only a few studies report on the overall strategies learners intent to use. One of these studies of which this present study is a replication was conducted by Gu and Johnson (1996. Their aim was to identify the overall strategies of Chinese university students and the effects of their strategies on their language proficiency and vocabulary size.

As a replication, the present study also attempted to identify the vocabulary learning strategies used by the Turkish university students at Anadolu University, Education Faculty, English Language Teaching Department. It also examined the

vocabulary learning strategies in relation to their language proficiency level and vocabulary size.

In order to reach the goals stated above, the answers to the following research questions were sought:

1. Which of the vocabulary learning strategies do Turkish EFL learners tend to employ?

2. Which of the vocabulary learning strategies used by EFL students affect their learning outcomes?

A total of 120 freshmen participated in the study. At the time of the study, they all had nearly completed the first term of their first year at university. In order to determine their proficiency level the practice TOEFL exam was used. Their scores ranged from 397 to 600. And their vocabulary size was determined by the vocabulary levels test by Nation (1990). The test consisted of 90 items, and the subjects' scores ranged from 28 to 71. Both in the TOEFL scores and the vocabulary levels test scores show that there is a great distance between students outcomes. Then a Turkish translation of the Vocabulary Learning Strategies Questionnaire (VLQ) adapted from Gu and Johnson (1996) was used to identify the type and frequency of the vocabulary learning strategies used by the subjects.

All data were collected during the last weeks of the Fall 1998/1999 term. Subjects were informed that they would take the same TOEFL exam which they took before they started the first year of university. They were also told to answer the VLQ and that their responses would not affect their course grades and were recommended to give their responses to the statements as sincerely as possible. They were also informed that the

VLQ was designed to help students understand better how they learn vocabulary and that the information helps them to become better learners of vocabulary in English. The subject were told to answer the items in terms of what they typically do to learn and memorize vocabulary and also were reminded that there were no right or wrong answers.

Subjects responses ranged from 1 to 7 and were scored by putting the items under the categories of the English version of VLQ. To find an answer to the first research question Descriptive statistics were conducted in order to find the average of the categories and determine most frequent use of strategies subjects employed. Correlation analysis and multiple regression was used to answer the second research question which aimed at finding the relation between the strategies and the outcomes of the subjects. The results of the correlation and multiple regression analysis were considered significant if they reached the level .05 or below.

All the results were analyzed assuming that the subjects participated in the study had sincerely answered the items in the VLQ, the TOEFL exam, and the vocabulary size test. The results of the descriptive statistics were examined according to the categories and only the most frequently used subcategory was determined. Although subjects reported highly (above the medium use range) on the believe that vocabulary should be acquired in context and stated that they use guessing strategies in wider-context, they also reported highly on dictionary strategies. Both favored strategies are known to be totally far from each other in that one is fully contextualized and the other decontextualized. Interestingly, however, is the low use range of the belief that vocabulary should be memorized. Parallel to this, the encoding strategies (including the mnemonic devices that are favored by researchers) were also low in preference.

The results for the correlation analysis showed that there were no significant relations between the independent variables and the dependent variables. Only vocabulary size correlated significantly with more strategies than the proficiency. For example, there was positive correlation with Selective Attention, of the Dictionary Strategies (Looking-up Strategies), both Note-Taking Strategies (Meaning and Usage oriented Note-Taking Strategies), and from the Encoding Strategies the Association and Using Word-Structure Strategies. Extended Dictionary Strategies and Using Word Lists, on the other hand, correlated negatively with the vocabulary size. There were also strategies that significantly correlated with the proficiency level, however, two were negative correlations (visual repetition and association) and one, Using Word-Structure, positive.

A better insight to the relation of the independent and dependent variables was found in the multiple regression analysis. The results indicated that different strategies predicted proficiency level and vocabulary size. Only Using Word-Structure significantly predicted proficiency level. On the other hand, Activation and Visual Repetition emerged as negative predictors of proficiency level. Interestingly, only the Metacognitive Regulation Strategy, Selective Attention, significantly predicted vocabulary size.

It was concluded that, although there were more non-significant results in the present study than in the study conducted by Gu and Johnson (1996), the findings of the descriptive statistics seemed to mostly support the results of Gu and Johnson. As they concluded that students would benefit more if they aimed at learning the language skills rather than at just remembering English equivalents of all Turkish words, this study agrees with their conclusion.

## 7.2. Pedagogical Implications

The traditional approach of vocabulary teaching in second/ foreign language setting is to concentrate on decontextualized units of vocabulary. Teachers do not give enough importance to the teaching of vocabulary in their classrooms, instead they leave it to the students to memorize the unknown words in lists. However, all the studies mentioned in Chapter 3 and many books on learning strategies give a light to the importance of vocabulary learning strategies that should be taught in the classroom. This will enable the students to develop their word knowledge with the use of strategies despite the absence of the teacher. There are some textbooks and course-books that have been written to help students of English to develop and improve their strategies for learning English vocabulary.

One of these textbooks is written by A. Cunningsworth and P. Ferst (1992), and its tittle is *Word Power* which is recommended to be used wherever possible together with a dictionary and the writers encourage students to develop their skills in using a dictionary in order to find out the meanings of words which are new to them. One of the aims of this book is to encourage students to develop strategies for learning the words that are unknown in every context. The students should achieve a degree of independence and autonomy in handling unfamiliar words, because it is impossible to predict which items of vocabulary they need. Finally, it can be said that this book tries to assist them in developing strategies for deducing meanings, using contextual or linguistic cues (e.g., surrounding words, visual information, cognates) as well as in developing sound techniques for dictionary use.

*English Vocabulary in Use* by M. McCarthy and F. O'Dell (1994) is another example for this type of textbook. Its aim is to give hints or self-strategies to learn vocabulary items and it introduces more specific ways to improve one's self-strategies.

A third example is *Learning to Learn English* by G. Ellis and B. Sinclair (1989) which is a student textbook that gives some advice. It suggests that extending vocabulary with the help of some strategies starts with the assessment of oneself. To do this, first the student should decide the points related to the meaning of 'knowing a word' and then he/she should answer the question. Then the book presents some techniques to test oneself (e.g., using flash cards, making word networks, using word bags. Finally, the book asks students to choose the way or ways they prefer to learn new words among a list of self-strategies:

- Seeing the word written down
- Remembering words best by listening and repeating them aloud
- Trying to learn new words together with their translations
- Needing to write the word several times before remembering it
- Learning vocabulary by topic, for example, types of furniture, parts of the car, because if you think back, some of them remind you the others
  (p. 31-38)

All these examples show that the writers and the teachers are now aware of the importance of learner autonomy and independence as well as the necessity of strategy training, especially in vocabulary learning in ELT. As a conclusion, most of the studies in literature on language learning strategies are well-though-out and are worth paying attention to.

## 7.3. Suggestions for further research

This study opens a number of avenues for further research. As discussed in Chapter 6, the language proficiency of the students were obtained through the administration of the practice TOEFL exam. Although this exam would be enough to determine the level of proficiency, there is also the question if the students really were concentrated and answered the questions sincerely. Maybe the results would be different if the proficiency measures were made up of composite scores, such as the average scores of the students' subjects' (reading, speaking, writing, listening skills) mid-term and final exams. They would, as Gu and Johnson argue, provide a better insight to their proficiency. It is also essential to know the extent to which the specific patterns of strategy use that were found in Turkey would occur in other geographical and cultural settings.

Related to proficiency, the subjects also could be classified according to their language level. Thus, the effect of strategies on the different levels could be analyzed, and determined if higher levels performed more strategies than the lower levels.

Also worthy of further investigation is the relationship of gender and potentially gender-related factors such as learning styles, motivation, and attitude to the choice of individual strategies and combinations of strategies.

Finally, it should be stressed that besides only establishing the vocabulary learning strategies of students, these strategies should also be taught to students comparatively, and find out which of the strategies are more useful than the others.

## 7.4. Conclusion

This study was conducted to research the vocabulary learning strategies Turkish adult learners of English tend to employ and to what extend they use them.The study seems to have obtained enough evidence to warn instructors and teachers to be careful in teaching vocabulary. Although the learners reported that they believed and employed various vocabulary learning strategies, such as the belief that vocabulary should be acquired in context and that they use guessing strategies in wider-context, they also reported highly on dictionary strategies. Contrary to this result, the learners stated that they did not believe that vocabulary should be memorized. Parallel to this the Encoding Strategies (including the mnemonic devices) were also low in preference.

The relation of the independent variables with the dependent variables (proficiency and vocabulary size) indicated not much significance. However, vocabulary size correlated with more strategies than the proficiency results. The ones vocabulary size correlated positively with were Selective Attention, Dictionary Looking-Up Strategies, meaning and usage oriented note-taking strategies and from the Encoding Strategies the Association and Using Word-Structure Strategies. Proficiency levels, however, correlated positively only with the Using Word-Structure Encoding Strategy. The results show that although the learners reported highly on the contextual strategies and believed that vocabulary should be acquired in context, the relation of their outcomes were significant with the decontextualized strategies. So, their belief and their attitude are not consistent with each other. The crucial finding of this study is that the learners are only told to employ the strategies. However, the instruction of vocabulary in the classroom should be dealt with more systematically. There is a wide variety of ways for dealing with

vocabulary in foreign and second language learning. If one way of instruction is not sufficient, teachers should then try another way and not ignore them at all.

As a conclusion it can be said that vocabulary should not be seen as an isolated part of language, since it is existing in every part of language and communication and is always a handicap if unknown. Therefore, a large part of EFL vocabulary learning necessarily involves strategy learning. Dealing with words individually will not help students to progress in their language learning, especially for foreign language learners in input-poor environments.

# APPENDICES

Appendix A:

Vocabulary Learning Questionnaire (Turkish Version)

Appendix B:

Vocabulary Learning Questionnaire (VLQ) Dimensions, Variables, and Items (English Version)

Appendix C:

Answer Sheet for the Vocabulary Learning Questionnaire (VLQ)

Appendix D:

Key to the Averages

Appendix E:

Vocabulary Size Test

# APPENDIX A

## VOCABULARY LEARNING STRATEGIES QUESTIONNAIRE (TURKISH VERSION)

## KELİME ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ ANKETİ

Yönergeler

Bu liste İngilizce'de kelime öğrenme şekliniz hakkında bilgi toplamak amacı ile düzenlenmiştir ve 108 cümleden oluşmaktadır. İlk 17 cümle sizin kelime öğrenme hakkındaki düşüncelerinizi veya inançlarınızı belirtmektedir. Lütfen her cümleyi okuyunuz ve **cümlenin size ne kadar uygun olduğunu gösteren rakamı** (1,2,3,4,5,6,veya 7) size verilecek cevap kağıdı üzerine işaretleyiniz. İlk 17 cümle için rakamların ne anlama geldiği aşağıda açıklanmaktadır.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Kesinlikle karşıyım** | **2.Genellikle karşıyım** | **3. Çoğunlukla karşıyım** |
| **4. Az çok katılıyorum** | **5. Çoğunlukla katılıyorum** | **6. Genellikle katılıyorum** |
| **7. Kesinlikle katılıyorum** | | |

1. Bütün türkçe kelimelerin ingilizce karşılıkları hatırlandığında, ingilizce öğrenilmiştir demektir.
2. Kelime öğrenmenin en iyi yolu kelime listelerini veya sözlük ezberlemektir.
3. Kelimelerin anlamlarını öğrenmek yeterlidir.
4. İngilizce kelimelerin sabit (tek) anlamları vardır.
5. Kelimenin sadece tek bir sözlük anlamını öğrenmek yeterlidir.
6. İyi bir hafıza yabancı bir dili en iyi şekilde öğrenmenin tek yoludur.
7. Kelimeleri öğrenmek için tekrar etmek en iyi yoldur.
8. Ancak her bir kelimenin anlamını ezberleyerek kelime dağarcığını büyütebilirsiniz.
9. Kelimelerin büyük bir kısmının anlamı okuma sayesinde çıkartılabilir.
10. Sadece çok okuyarak kelime dağarcığı genişletilebilir.
11. Kelime öğrenmenin en iyi yollarından biri bağlam içinde tahmin etmektir.
12. Farklı bağlamlar içinde bir kelimeye sık sık rastlıyorsanız, o kelimeyi daha iyi anlarsınız.
13. Kelime ile birlikte kullanılan bazı deyim ve sözdizimlerine dikkat etmek gerekir.
14. Üzerinde çalışılan kelimeler tamamen öğrenilmeden önce kullanılmalıdır.
15. Dili (dinleme, konuşma, okuma ve yazma) kullanmak kelimeleri ezberlemekten daha önemlidir.
16. Öğrenen kişi en azından kelimenin anlamını, biçimini, ve en basit kullanımını bilmelidir.
17. Kelimeler kullanıldıktan sonra öğrenilir.

**Kalan cümleler için rakamların ne anlama geldiği aşağıda açıklanmaktadır:**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Kesinlikle yapmam** | **2. Genellikle yapmam** | **3. Çoğunlukla yapmam** |
| **4. Az çok yaparım** | **5. Çoğunlukla yaparım** | **6. Genellikle yaparım** |
| **7. Her zaman yaparım** | | |

18. Bir okuma parçasını yeterli bir biçimde anlayabilmem için parçanın içinde geçen yeni bir kelimenin veya deyimin ne zaman öğrenilmesi gerektiğini bilirim.
19. Belirli bir kelimenin anlamını tahmin ederken hangi ipuçlarını kullanmam gerektiğini bilirim.
20. Hangi kelimeyi tahmin edip edemeyeceğime karar verebilirim.
21. Merak ettiğim kelimerin anlamını öğrenmek için sözlük kullanırım.
22. Sadece sınava yönelik olan şeyleri öğrenirim.
23. Sınıf içinde öğretmenimin açıklamadığı kelimer beni ilgilendirmez.
24. Tam olarak anlayamadığım kelimelerin anlamlarının daha açık olması için değişik yollar denerim.
25. Bir kelimenin anlamını tahmin edemediğim zaman alternatif ipuçları kullanır ve tekrar ederim.
26. Önemli olduğunu düşündüğüm kelimeleri not ederim.
27. Okuma parçasında yeni bir kelimenin tahmin ettiğim anlamını destekleyen tanımlar veya başka kelimelerin kullanıldığı açıklamalar ararım.
28. Bir kelimenin anlamını tahmin ederken bağlam içindeki mantıksal gelişmeden (neden ve sonuç ilişkisi gibi) yararlanırım.
29. Bir kelimenin anlamını tahmin ederken bağlam içinde varolan örnekleri kullanırım.
30. Ders kitapları dışında ilgimi çeken başka kitaplar da okurum.
31. Bir kelimenin anlamını tahmin ederken sağduyu ve genel dünya bilgimi kullanırım.
32. Hangi kelimenin öğrenilmesi gerektiğini çok iyi bilirim.
33. Tahmin ettiğim anlamın, o an bağlam içine uyup uymadığını tekrar kontrol ederim.
34. Yeni bir kelimeye veya deyime rastladığımda, hatırlamaya değer olup olmadığına karar verebilirim.
35. Tahmin ettiğim anlamın doğruluğuna genel olarak bağlam içine uyup uymadığına göre karar veririm.
36. Tahmin ettiğim kelimenin doğruluğunu öğrenmek istediğim zaman sözlük kullanırım.
37. Yeni bir kelimenin tahmin ettiğim anlamını destekleyen başka kelime veya yapılar ararım.
38. Bir kelimenin anlamını tahmin ederken cümlenin dil bilgisi yapılarını kullanırım.
39. Öğretmenimin öğretmediği kelimeleri öğrenmek için çaba harcamam.
40. Bir kelimenin anlamını tahmin ederken o kelimenin hangi cümle ögelerine ait olduğuna bakarım.
41. Bir kelimenin anlamını tahmin ederken kelimenin yapısını (önek, kök, ve sonek) incelerim.
42. Yabancı bir kelime ile birkaç defa tekrar tekrar karşılaşırsam sözlük kullanırım.
43. Bir kelimenin anlamını bilmemem bir cümleyi hatta bir paragrafı anlamamı zorlaştırıyorsa sözlük kullanırım
44. Cümle veya paragraf içinde geçen ve anlamayı kolaylaştıracak olan kelimeleri sözlükten bulurum.

45. Eğer bilinmeyen kelimenin düzensiz ekleri veya imla değişkenleri varsa, o kelimeye yakın kelimelere bakarım.
46. Sözlükte bir kelimenin anlamını bulduğumda kullanım örneklerine de dikkat ederim.
47. İngilizce kelimelerin anlamları arasındaki küçük farkları bulmak için sözlüğe başvururum.
48. Bildiğim bir kelime hakkında daha fazla bilgi edinmek istediğimde sözlük kullanırım.
49. İki veya daha fazla kelime arasındaki farkı anlamamı kolaylaştırmak istediğim zaman not alırım.
50. Aradığm kelimenin tanımı içinde ilgimi çeken başka bir kelimeye rastlarsam o kelimenin anlamına da bakarım.
51. Sözlükte bulduğum kelime ile birlikte kullanılan diğer yapılara da dikkat ederim.
52. Eğer kelimenin çekim eki varsa, bu eki çıkartır ve kelimenin çekimsiz halini sözlükten ararım.
53. Eğer aradığım kelimenin öneki veya soneki varsa, o kelimenin kökünü sözlükten ararım.
54. Sözlükte bir kelime baktığım zaman kelimenin farklı anlamlarını gösteren örnek cümleleri okurum.
55. Bir kelimenin anlamını tahmin ederken konu hakkındaki bilgimi kullanırım.
56. Eğer yazılışı aynı fakat anlam veya telafuzu farklı kelimeler varsa, birçok bilgiyi (ögesine , telafuza, uslubuna, sözdizimine, anlamına göre) eleyerek ederek daraltırım.
57. Ezberlediğim kelimeri düzenli ve planlı bir şekilde tekrar gözden geçiririm.
58. Aradığım kelimenin yaygın olarak kullanıldığını düşündüğümde o kelimenin anlamını not ederim.
59. Aradığım kelimenin kendi kişisel ilgim ile alakalı olduğunu düşündüğüm zaman not alırım.
60. Aradığım kelimenin, ingilizce eşanlamlarını ve açıklamalarını da yazarım.
61. Aradığım kelimenin, hem türkçe karşılığını hemde İngilizce eş anlamlarını yazarım.
62. Kullanılabilecek yapıları veya ifadeleri gördüğümde not alırım.
63. Aradığım kelimenin sözdizimindeki yerini de not alırım.
64. Kelimeyi sözlükten aradığımda kelime ile ilgili gramer bilgilerini de not ederim.
65. Aradığım kelimenin kullanım şekillerini gösteren örneklerini not ederim.
66. Daha iyi hatırlamak için kelimeleri rol yaparak öğrenmeye çalışırım.
67. Hatırlayabilmek için, kelimenin hem türkçe karşılığını hemde kendisini tekrar tekrar yazarım.
68. Yeni kelimelerden oluşan listeler hazırlarım.
69. Bildiğim bir kelimenin kullanım şeklini bilmediğim zaman sözlük kullanırım.
70. Not defterime hem eş anlamlarını hemde zıt anlamlarını not ederim.
71. Listemdeki kelimeleri hepsini anladığımdan emin olana kadar tekrar tekrar gözden geçiririm.
72. Kelimelerden oluşan küçük kartlar hazırlar ve onları hep yanımda taşırım.
73. Kelimeyi hatırlamam için sesleri tekrar etmem yeterli olacaktır.
74. Bir kelimeyi hatırlamaya çalıştığım zaman telafuzunu zihnimde tekrarlarım.
75. Bir kelimeyi hatırlamaya çalıştığım zaman tekrar tekrar yazarım.
76. Bir kelimeyi hatırlamaya çalıştığım zaman kendi kendime sesli bir biçimde tekrarlarım.

77. Sözlük tanımlarını kelimenin geçtiği bağlam içinde bağdaştırmaya çalışırım ve tümleç, sözdizimi, cümle ögelerini uydurarak bağlamsal anlam sonucuna varırım.
78. Kelimelerden oluşan listelerimi saklarım.
79. Kelimenin yazılışını harfi harfine hatırlamaya çalışırım.
80. Yeni öğrenilen kelimeleri zihnimde hayali durumlar yaratarak kullanmaya çalışırım.
81. İmla yönünden birbirine yakın olan kelimeleri gruplar halinde hatırlamaya çalışırım.
82. İmla yönünden birbirine yakın olan kelime gruplarını ortak bölümleri aynı görünüm ve sese sahip olan başka bilinen bir kelime ile ilişkilendiririm
83. Yeni kelimeyi bilinen bir ingilizce kelime ile çağrışım yaparak ilişkilendiriyorum.
84. Yeni öğrenilen kelimeyi bilinen bir kelime ile ilişkilendirirken türkçede bir cümle kurarım.
85. Hatırlamama yardımcı olması açısından kelimeyi zihnimde canlandırırım.
86. Hatırlamama yardımcı olması için kelime içindeki bazı harfleri kelimenin anlamı ile ilişkilendiriyorum (*look* kelimesinin içinde iki göz var gibi).
87. Yeni bir kelimeyi bilinen bir kelime ile ilişkilendirirken çağrışım yaparak zihnimde canlandırıyorum.
88. Hatırlamama yardımcı olması için kelimeyi gözümde canlandırıyorum.
89. Aynı sesden oluşan kelimeleri hatırlarım.
90. Aynı imlaya sahip olan kelimeleri hatırlarım.
91. Listenin bir tarafına yeni kelimeyi yazarım diğer tarafına ise açıklamalarını yazarım.
92. Yeni kelimeyi bilinen ve aynı sese sahip olan başka bir ingilizce kelime ile çağrıştırırım.
93. Kelimeleri önek, kök, ve sonek açısından incelerim.
94. Bir kelimeyi hatırlarken o kelimenin geçtiği cümleyi hatırlamaya çalışırım.
95. Hatırlamaya çalıştığım bazı kelimelere (örn. *Stinking*) fiziksel duygular katarım
96. Özellikle kelime-oluşumu kurallarını çalışarak daha fazla kelime hatırlarım.
97. Yaygın olarak kullanılan kökleri ve önekleri ezberlerim.
98. Zihnimde anlamsal örgüler yaratarak kelimeleri anlamlı gruplar halinde hatırlarım.
99. Hatırlamaya çalıştığım kelimeleri tekrar kullanabilmek için mümkün olduğunca çok okumaya çalışırım.
100. Yeni bir kelime ile karşılaştığımda hafızamı yoklarım ve kelime dağarcığımda eş anlamların veya zıt anlamların olup olmadığına bakarım.
101. Kelimeleri kategoriler altında gruplandırırım ( hayvanlar, eşyalar, sebzeler gibi)
102. Türkçede çok iyi bildiğim özel terminolojiyi hatırlamak ve çıkarabilmek için özellikle ilgi alanıma giren kitapları okurum.
103. Kelimenin imlasını birkaç görsel parçalara ayırarak hatırlıyorum.
104. Yeni kelimeyi geçtiği bağlam ile birlikte hatırlarım.
105. Kelimeleri bağlam içinde (veya deyimler, cümleler içinde) kullanarak daha iyi öğreniyorum.
106. Daha yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri kendi kurduğum cümleler içinde kullanırım.
107. Konuşma ve yazma esnasında yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri mümkün olduğunca çok kullanmaya çalışırım.
108. Yeni öğrenilen kelimeleri gerçek durumlar içersinde kullanırım.

# APPENDIX B

## *Vocabulary Learning Questionnaire (VLQ)*

## *Dimensions, Variables, and Items*

*Beliefs about Vocabulary Learning: (17 items)*

1. Words should be memorised (8)
   Once the English equivalents of all Chinese words have been remembered, English is learned.
   The best way to remember words is to memorise word lists or dictionaries.
   Remembering the meanings of a word is an end in itself.
   English words have fixed meanings.
   It is only necessary to remember one dictionary definition.
   A good memory is all you need to learn a foreign language well.
   Repetition is the best way to remember words.
   You can only acquire a large vocabulary by memory of individual words.

2. Words should be acquired in context: bottom-up (4)
   The meanings of a considerable amount of words can be picked up through reading.
   One can expand his vocabulary simply through reading a lot.
   Guessing words in context is one of the best ways to learn vocabulary.
   When you come across a word several times in different contexts, you will know what it means.

3. Words should be studied and put to use: top-down (5)
   One should pay attention to set phrases and collocations that go with a word.
   Words studied should be put to use before they are finally learned.
   Using the language (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) is more important than memorising words.
   The least a learner should know about a word is its form, its meaning, and its basic usage.
   Words are used after you use them.

*Metacognitive Regulation: (12)*

1. Selective attention (7)
   I know when a new word or phrase is essential for adequate comprehension of a passage.
   I know which words are important for me to learn.
   I have a sense of which word I can guess and which word I can't.
   I look up words that I'm interested in.

When I meet a new word or phrase, I have a clear sense of whether I need to remember it.
I know what cues I should use in guessing the meaning of a particular word.
I make a note of words that seem important to me.

2. Self-initiation (5)
Besides textbooks, I look for other readings that fall under my interest.
I wouldn't learn what my English teacher doesn't tell us to learn. (Reversed value)
I only focus on things that are directly related to examination. (Reversed value)
I wouldn't care much about vocabulary items that my teacher does not explain in class. (Reversed value)
I use various means to make clear vocabulary items that I am not quite clear of.

*Guessing Strategies (12 items)*

1. Using background knowledge/wider context (7)
I use alternative cues and try again if I fail to guess the meaning of a word.
I make use of the logical development in the context (e.g., cause and effect) when guessing the meaning of a word.
I make use of my common sense and knowledge of the world when guessing the meaning of a word.
I check my guessed meaning against the wider context to see if it fits in.
I make use of my knowledge of the topic when guessing the meaning of a word.
I look for other words or expressions in the passage that support my guess about the meaning of a new word.
I look for any definitions or paraphrases in the passage that support my guess about the meaning of a new word.

2. Using linguistic cues/immediate context (5)
I make use of the grammatical structure of a sentence when guessing the meaning of a word.
I look for any examples provided in the context when guessing the meaning of a new word.
I make use of the part of speech of a new word when guessing its meaning.
I check my guessed meaning against the immediate context to see if it fits in.
I analyse the word structure (prefix, root, and suffix) when guessing the meaning of a word.

*Dictionary Strategies (17 items)*

1. Dictionary strategies for comprehension (4)
When I see an unfamiliar word again and again, I look it up.
When I want to confirm my guess about a word, I look it up.
When not knowing a word prevents me from understanding of the sentence or even a whole paragraph, I look it up.

I look up words that are crucial to the understanding of the sentence or paragraph in which it appears.

2. Extended dictionary strategies (8)
   I pay attention to the examples of use when I look up a word in a dictionary.
   I look for phrases or set expressions that go with the word I look up.
   I consult a dictionary to find out about the subtle differences in the meanings of English words.
   When I want to know more about a word that I already have some knowledge of, I look it up.
   When I don't know the usage of a word I already have some knowledge of , I look it up.
   I make a note when I want to help myself distinguish between the meanings of the word.
   When looking up a word in the dictionary, I read sample sentences illustrating various meanings of the word.
   When I get interested in another new word in the definitions of the word I look up, I look up this word as well.

3. Looking-up strategies (5)
   If the new word is inflected, I remove the inflections to recover the form to look up (e.g., for *created*, look for *create*).
   If the new word I try to look up seems to have a prefix or suffix, I will try the entry for the stem.
   If the unknown appears to be an irregularly inflected form or a spelling variant, I will scan nearby entries.
   If there are multiple senses or homographic entries, I use various information (e.g. part of speech, pronunciation style, collocation, meaning, etc.) to reduce them by elimination.
   I try to integrate dictionary definitions into the context where the unknown was met and arrive at a contextual meaning by adjusting for complementation and collocation, part of speech, and breadth of meaning.

*Note-Taking strategies (9)*

1. Meaning-oriented note-taking strategies (5)
   I make a note of the meaning of a new word when I think the word I'm looking up is commonly used.
   I make a note when I think the word I'm looking up is relevant to my personal interest.
   I put synonyms or antonyms together in my notebook.
   I write down the English synonym(s) or explanations of the word I look up.
   I write down both the Turkish equivalent and the English synonyms of the word I look up.

2. Usage-oriented note-taking strategies (4)
   I make a note when I see a useful expression or phrase.
   I take down the collocations of the word I look up.
   I take down grammatical information about a word when I look it up.
   I note down examples showing the usages of the word I look up.

*Memory Strategies: Rehearsal: (12 items)*

1. Using word lists (6)
   I make vocabulary lists of new words that I meet.
   I write the new words on one side of a card and their explanations on the other side.
   I keep the vocabulary lists of new words that I make.
   I go through my vocabulary list several times until I am sure that I do not have any words on that list that I still don't understand.
   I make vocabulary cards and take them with me wherever I go.
   I make regular and structured reviews of new words I have memorised.

2. Oral repetition (3)
   When I try to remember a word, I repeat it aloud to myself.
   Repeating the sound of a new word to myself would be enough for me to remember the word.
   When I try to remember a word, I repeat its pronunciation in my mind.

3. Visual repetition (3)
   When I try to remember a word, I write it repeatedly.
   I memorise the spelling of a word letter by letter.
   I write both the new words and their Turkish equivalents repeatedly in order to remember them.

*Memory Strategies: Encoding (24 items)*

1. Association/elaboration (4)
   I remember a group of new words that share a similar part in spelling.
   I associate a group of words that share a similar part in spelling with a known word that looks or sounds similar to the shared part.
   I create a sentence in Turkish when I link a new word to a known word.
   I attach physical sensation to certain words (e.g., stinking) when I try to remember them.

2. Imagery (4)
   I act out a word in order to remember it better.
   I create a mental image of the new word to help me remember it.
   I associate one or more letters in a word with the word meaning to help me remember it (*look* has two 'eyes' in the middle).
   I create mental images of association when I link a new word to a known word.

1. annual
2. blank _____ happening once a year
3. brilliant _____ certain
4. concealed _____ wild
5. definite
6. savage

**The 5000-word Level**

1. alcohol
2. apron _____ cloth word in front to protect your
3. lure clothes
4. mess _____ stage of development
5. phase _____ state of untidiness or dirtiness
6. plank

1. circus
2. jungle _____ speech given by a priest in a
3. nomination church
4. sermon _____ seat without a back or arms
5. stool _____ musical instrument
6. trumpet

1. apparatus
2. compliment _____ set of instruments or machinery
3. revenue _____ money received by the government
4. scrap _____ expression of admiration
5. tile
6. ward

1. bruise
2. exile _____aggreement using property as
3. ledge security for a debt
4. mortgage _____ narrow shelf
5. shovel _____ dark place on your body caused by
6. switch hitting

1. blend
2. devise _____ hold tightly in your arms
3. embroider _____ plan or invent
4. hug _____ mix
5. imply
6. paste

1. desolate
2. fragrant _____ good for your health
3. gloomy _____ sweet-smelling
4. profound _____ dark or sad
5. radical
6. wholesome

## The University Word List Level

1. affluence
2. axis _____ introduction of a new thing
3. episode _____ one event in a series
4. innovation _____ wealth
5. precision
6. tissue

1. deficiency
2. magnitude _____ swinging from side to side
3. oscillation _____ respect
4. prestige _____ lack
5. sanction
6. specification

1. configuration
2. discourse _____ shape
3. hypothesis _____ speech
4. intersection _____ theory
5. partisan
6. propensity

1. anonymous
2. indigenous _____ without the writer's name
3. maternal _____ least possible amount
4. minimum _____ native
5. nutrient
6. modification

1. elementary
2. negative _____ of the beginning stage
3. static _____ not moving or changing
4. random _____ final, furthest
5. reluctant
6. ultimate

1. coincide
2. coordinate _____ prevent people from doing something
3. expel they want to do
4. frustrate _____ add to
5. supplement _____ send out by force
6. transfer

## The 10 000-word Level

1. acquiesce
2. contaminate _____ work at something without serious
3. crease intentions
4. dabble _____ accept without protest
5. rape _____ make a fold on cloth or paper
6. squint

1. blaspheme
2. endorse _____ give care and food to
3. nurture _____ speak badly about God
4. overhaul _____ slip or slide

5. skid
6. straggle

1. auxiliary
2. candid _____ full of self-importance
3. dubious _____ helping, adding support
4. morose _____ bad-tempered
5. pompous
6. temporal

1. anterior
2. concave _____ small and weak
3. interminable _____ easily changing
4. puny _____ endless
5. volatile
6. wicker

1. dregs
2. flurry _____ worst and most useless parts of
3. hostage anything
4. jumble _____natural liquid present in the mouth
5. saliva _____ confused mixture
6. truce

1. auspices
2. casualty _____ being away from other people
3. froth _____ someone killed or injured
4. haunch _____ noisy and happy celebration
5. revelry
6. seclusion

# BIBLIOGRAPHY


Abraham,R.G.; Vann, R.J. : Strategies of two Language Learners: A Case Study. In Wenden, A.; Rubin, J. (eds.), **Learner Strategies in Language Learning.** (pp. 85-102) Prentice-Hall International. (1987)

Arden-Close, C. : NNS Readers' Strategies for Inferring the Meanings of Unknown Words. **Reading in a Foreign Language**, 9, 2, 867-893. (1993)

Baker, L; Brown, A. L. : Cognitive monitoring in reading. In J. Flood (Ed.), **Understanding Reading Comprehension**. (pp. 21-44) Newark, DE: International Reading Association. (1984)

Beck, I. L.; McKeown, M.G.; McCaslin, E. : Vocabulary Development: All Contexts are not Created Equal. **Elementary School Journal**, 83, 177-181. (1983)

Beheydt, L. : The Semantization of Vocabulary in Foreign Language Learning. **System**, 15, 55-67. (1987)

Bonds, C. W.; Bonds, L. G.; Peach, W. : Metacognition: Developing Independence in Learning. **The Clearing House**, 66, 1, 56-59. (1992)

Brown, Douglas,H : **Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.** Prentice Hall, Inc. (1987)

Brown, T. H.; Perry, F. L., Jr. : A Comparison of Three Learning Strategies for ESL Vocabulary Acquisition. **TESOL Quarterly**, 25, 4, 655-670. (1991)

Carter, R. : **Vocabulary: Applied Linguistic Perspective.** Allen and Unwin (Publishers) Ltd. (1987)

Carter,R.; McCarthy, M. : **Vocabulary and Language Teaching.** Longman Group UK Limited, New York. (1988)

Carver, D. : Plans, Learner Strategies and Self-Direction in Language Learning. **System**, 12, 123-131. (1984)

Casanave, C. P. : Comprehension Monitoring in ESL Reading: A Neglected Essential. **TESOL Quarterly.** Vol. 22, No. 2: 283-302. (1988)

Cohen, A. : The use of verbal and imagery mnemonics in Second Language Learning. **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, 9, 43-62. (1987)

Crow, J. T.; Quigley, J. R. : A Semantic Field Approach to Passive Vocabulary Acquisition for Reading Comprehension. **TESOL Quarterly**, 19, 3, 497-513. (1985)

Crow, J. : "Receptive Vocabulary Acquisition for reading comprehension" **Modern Language Journal**, 70, 242-250. (1986)

Cunningsworth, A.; Ferst, P. : **Word Power.** Prentice Hall. (1992)

Duquet, L.; Painchaud, G. : A Comparison of Vocabulary Acquisition in Audio and Video Contexts. **The Canadian Modern Language Review**, 53, 1, 143-172. (1996)

Ellis, G.; Sinclair, B. : **Learning to Learn English.** Cambridge University Press. (1989)

Gu, Y.; Johnson, R. K. : Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Language Learning Outcomes. **Language Learning**, Vol. 46, 4, 643-679. (1996)

Hague, S. A. : Vocabulary Instruction: What L2 Can Learn from L1. **Foreign Language Annals**, Vol. 20, 3, 217-225. (1987)

Hall, J. W. : On the Utility of the Keyword Mnemonic for Vocabulary Learning. **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 80, 4, 554-562. (1988)

Harley, B.; Howard, J.; Roberge, B. : Teaching Vocabulary: An Exploratory Study of Direct Techniques. **The Canadian Modern Language Review**, 53, 1, 281-304. (1996)

Harmer, J. : **The Practice of English Language Teaching.** Longman. (1991)

Harmon, J. M. : Vocabulary Teaching and Learning in a Seventh-Grade Literature-Based Classroom. **Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy**, Vol. 41, 7, 518-530. (1998)

Hatch, E.; Brown, C. : **Vocabulary, Semantics, and Language Education.** Cambridge University Press. (1995)

Horst, M.; Cobb, T.; Meara, P. : Beyond a Clockwork Orange: Acquiring Second Language Vocabulary through Reading. **Reading in a Foreign Language**, 11, 2, 207-223. (1998)

Horwitz, E.K. : Surveying Students Beliefs about Language Learning. In Wenden, A.; Rubin, J.(eds.) **Learner Strategies in Language Learning.** (pp. 119-129) Prentice-Hall International. (1987)

Krashen, S. : We Acquire Vocabulary and Spelling by Reading: Additional Evidence for the Input Hypothesis. **The Modern Language Journal**, 73,4,440-464. (1989)

Laufer, B. : Ease and Difficulty in Vocabulary Learning: Some Teaching Implications. **Foreign Language Annals**, Vol. 23, 2, 147-155. (1990)

McCarthy, M.; O'Dell, F. : **English Vocabulary in Use.** Cambridge University Press. (1994)

McDaniel, M. A.; Pressley, M. : Putting the Keyword Method in Context. **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 76, 4, 598-609. (1984)

McDaniel, M.A.; Pressley, M.; Dunay P.K. : Long-Term Retention of Vocabulary After Keyword and Context Learning. **Journal of Educational Psychology,** 79, 1, 87-89. (1987)

Mondria, J.; Wit-De Boer, M. : The Effects of Contextual Richness on the Guessability and the Retention of Words in a Foreign Language. **Applied Linguistics**, 12, 3, 249-267. (1991)

Morrison, L. : Talking about Words: A Study of French as a Second Language Learners' Lexical Inferencing Procedures. **The Canadian Modern Language Review**, 53, 1, 41-75. (1996)

Nation, I. S. P. : **Teaching and Learning Vocabulary.** Boston: Heinle and Heinle. (1990)

Nesi, H.; Meara, P. : How Using Dictionaries Affects Performance in Multiple-Choice EFL Tests. **Reading in a Foreign Language,** 8,1,631-643. (1991)

Nesi, H.; Meara, P. : Patterns of Misinterpretation in the Productive Use of EFL Dictionary Definitions. **System**, 22, 1, 1-15. (1994)

O'Malley, J. M. : The Effects of Training in the Use of Learning Strategies on Learning English as a second language. In Wenden, A.; Rubin, J.(eds.) **Learner Strategies in Language Learning.** (pp. 133-144) Prentice-Hall International. (1987)

O'Malley, J. M.; Chamot, A.U. : Listening Comprehension Strategies In Second Language Acquisition. **Applied Linguistics**, Vol. 10, 4, (1989)

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

Oxford, R. L. : **Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know.** Boston: Heinle and Heinle. (1990)

Oxford, R. L.; Scarcella, R. C. : Second Language Vocabulary Learning among Adults: State of the Art in Vocabulary Instruction. **System**, Vol.22, 2, 231-243. (1994)

Parry, K. : Building a Vocabulary Through Academic Reading, **TESOL Quarterly**, 25, 4, 629-653. (1991)

Qian, D. D. : ESL Vocabulary Acquisition: Contextualization and Decontextualization. **The Canadian Modern Language Review**, 53, 1, 120-142. (1996)

Rubin, J. : Learner Strategies: Theoretical Assumptions, Research History and Typology. In Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (eds) **Learner Strategies in Language Learning.** Prentice-Hall International. (1987)

Sanaoui,, R. : Adult Learners' Approaches to Learning Vocabulary in Second Languages. **Modern Language Journal**, 79, 15-28. (1995)

Schatz, E. K.; Baldwin, R. S. : Context clues are unreliable predictors of word meanings. **Reading Research Quarterly**, 21, 4, 439-453. (1986)

Shefelbine, J. L. : Student Factors Related to Variability in Learning Word Meanings From Context. **Journal of Reading Behavior**, 22, 1, 71-97. (1990)

Spedding, S.; Chan, L. K. S. : Metacognition, Word Identification, and Reading Competence. **Contemporary Educational Psychology**, 18, 91-100. (1993)

Stern, H. H. **Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (1983)

Stieglitz, E. L. : A practical Approach To Vocabulary Enforcement. **ELT Journal**, 37, 1, 71-75. (1983)

Thompson, I. : Memory in Language Learning. In Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (eds) **Learner Strategies in Language Learning.** Prentice-Hall International. (1987)

Tinkham, T. : The Effect of Semantic Clustering of the Learning of Second Language Vocabulary. **System**, 21,3, 371-380. (1993)

Wallace, M. J. :**Teaching Vocabulary.** Heinemann Educational Books.(1982)

Wenden, A.; Rubin, J. : **Learner Strategies in Language Learning.** Prentice-Hall International. (1987)

Wodinsky, M.; Nation, I. S. P. : Learning from Graded Readers. **Reading in a Foreign Language,** 5, 1, 155-161. (1988)