RedFame

Journal of Education and Training Studies
Vol. 3, No. 5; September 2015
ISSN 2324-805X E-ISSN 2324-8068
Published by Redfame Publishing
URL: http://jets.redfame.com

Preference of Strategy for Learning Vocabulary of Middle School Students While Learning a Foreign Language

Hasan Huseyin Kilinc

Correspondence: Curriculum and Instruction Department, College of Education, Nevsehir Haci Bektas Veli University, Nevsehir, Turkey

Received: July 6, 2015 Accepted: July 30, 2015 Online Published: August 7, 2015

doi:10.11114/jets.v3i5.932 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.11114/jets.v3i5.932

Abstract

This study is a descriptive style in scanning model and it is about determining the strategy the students in middle school use for learning vocabulary while they are learning a foreign language (English). The population of the study consists of middle school students in the city center of Kayseri. Stratified Sampling was chosen as a sample choice. Accordingly, while the sample was being chosen, the school type was first considered and 1 private school, 1 high-level 2 middle and 2 low socio economical schools were preferred. In the study, Foreign language word learning strategy was used, which consists of 6 factors and 32 codes and developed by Kocaman ve Cumaoglu (2014) who based the subscales of the strategies in language learning of Oxford (1990). The data obtained was analyzed in SPSS Statistics programme. According to the findings of the study, it was concluded that about learning word strategies, students expressed their opinions as using memory, cognitive, complementary and social strategies in the level of "I seldom use", and metacognitional and affective strategies in the level of "I often use". As a result of the study, statistically, in terms of gender variables there was significant difference for girls who preferred to use memory, cognitive, meta-cognitive, affective and social strategies while learning vocabulary. There was no significant difference about using complementary strategy as statistically. Also, the students in high-socio economical schools used the strategies in learning vocabulary more extensively than other students in middle and low socio economical schools.

Keywords: Foreign language, strategy, learning vocabulary, middle school

1. Introduction

In language learning, 'the word' accepted as a sub-capability could be defined in general meaning as the object, action or the label of ideas that people cannot change their meaning deliberately. It is a basic element for the other language skills, reading, writing, listening and speaking. Because word has two forms; either oral or verbal. Accordingly, word information has two forms as well; either perceptive or productive. This results in the relation between the word and other skills. Reading skill is to read and recognize a written word, writing skill is to perceive a word that is heard, speaking and listening skill is to use a word in mind as an output. A word is directly related of all these skills.

Knowing a word can be defined as knowing its meaning, structural features and usage, but an important factor that interferes with the process of learning a word cannot be ignored. This factor is the learning strategies which Ellis (1985) defines this factor as how students learn the rules of target language and how they make automation these rules. This process could be conscious or unconscious. Even he explains it as a memory process to acquire and use target language. These include students' deliberate actions, techniques, approaches and methods in order to acquire target language (Ellis, 1985).

Rubin (1987), divides these strategies into three categories; learning, communication and social due to their contribution to acquire a language. Learning strategy contributes acquiring a language directly, while communication and social strategies do it indirectly. Recently, two main strategies, cognitive and meta-cognitive have been discussed. Cognitive learning strategies focus on direct analysis, translation or learning materials which are indispensable in the process of problem solving and acquiring a language. Meta-cognitive strategies focus on the knowledge of cognitive process, the order and function of the knowledge through planning, observation and assessment process (Wenden & Rubin, 1987). Rubin divides cognitive learning strategies into 6 basic categories (Wenden & Rubin, 1987).

- *Making it clear / Verification*: It is the strategy that students use to verify the new language.
- *Prediction / Inductive Outcome:* It is the strategy that students use their knowledge and concepts in order to acquire a new grammar.

- *Deductive Logical Reasoning:* This is a problem solving strategy and students use general rules in approach to target language.
- *Practice:* It is the strategy that contributes the storage and recollection of language while focusing its proper usage.
- *Memorization*: It is the strategy that is used to store the grammar of the target language.
- *Observation:* This is the strategy by which students notice and correct their mistakes.

Numerous strategies could be mentioned besides the strategies above. However, students don't need to know all of these strategies. They just need to improve themselves in specific strategies. Apart from the learning strategies, some special ones could be regarded as word learning strategies which are used for learning the words in target language. Nation (2001), claims that it is difficult to define a strategy thoroughly but a strategy should have the features below.

- *The choice includes there are many strategies to prefer.*
- *It is sophisticated, so there are many stages to learn.*
- *It demands knowledge and benefit from education.*
- *It increases learning words and the proficiency in using words.*

Nation (2001) developed a classification about learning words. The first strategy of this classification is to plan the learning words, that is, the word choice. Students should know which words to focus on according to the target. Also they need to know where they could find these words and which aspects (semantics, form- oral/verbal) they will choose of the words. The second strategy is the source; students should get information to cope with new words when they encounter unfamiliar words. Word analysis could be beneficial about this, because knowing the root of the words and their affixes helps them make semantic connections. Additionally, using reference sources as parallel and in proper might be beneficial to learn words. The third strategy is the process in which the word information is tested. It includes recollection the word and making the word ready to use. The words which are recalled in necessary situations or used in the process are easy to learn. Further, the semantic relationships between the word recollected and the hint referring it become stronger.

It is a known fact that students have some difficulties while learning a foreign language. Some problems result from the facilities of schools and teachers, while others are caused by directly the issues about students. In order to be successful in a foreign language, it is crucially important that students need to know learning methods and accordingly they should arrange the process of learning. Additionally, it will be considerably beneficial to inform students about language strategies, determine the strategies they use and organize teaching process to make this process effective and productive (Tok, 2007). In various studies, all language learners are somehow known to use language learning strategies. However, the frequency and variance of usage range from students to students and various variables as well (Chamot & Kupper, 1989). This study will give a chance to know how teachers use the knowledge while students are learning vocabulary and which strategies teachers use because the study will give information about the strategies students use and their level of usage. Also, the results obtained from the study will contribute to understand the information and the strategies students use since it gives information about how they use the strategies.

2. Methodology

This study is a descriptive model in visual scanning about determining the word learning strategies the students in middle schools in Kayseri city use while they are learning foreign language. In the study, the available situation is reflected as it is and the students' opinions are described.

2.1 The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to determine the opinions of the students in middle schools about the strategies they use while learning vocabulary in a foreign language. In accordance with this purpose the sub-goals determined are those:

1- What are the opinions of the students about memory, cognitive, complementary, metacognitive, affective and social strategies they use while learning words in a foreign language?

2- Do the opinions of the students about memory, cognitive, complementary, metacognitive, affective and social strategies change according to sex and socio-economical level of schools while they are learning a foreign language?

2.2 Population and Sample

The population of the study consists of middle school students in the city of Kayseri. Stratified Sampling was chosen as a sample choice. Stratified Sampling is a sampling technique in which the subgroups in the population are ensured to be represented in the sample and the population is divided into two or more separate groups (Balcı, 2001). Accordingly, while the sample was being chosen, the school type was first considered and 1 private school, 1 high-level 2 middle and 2 low socio economical schools were preferred. Personal data are shown about the students participating in the study in the table below.

Table 1. Personal Data about Students

Socio-economic Status	**f**	**%**
High	234	37.3
Middle	254	40.4
Low	140	22.3
Gender		
Male	325	51.8
Female	303	48.2
Grade of Class		
5. grade	148	23.6
6. grade	178	28.3
7. grade	149	23.7
8. grade	153	24.4
Total	**628**	**100**

When the table is studied, in terms of school types, from the school with high socioeconomic status 234 students (%37.3), from the school with middle socioeconomic status 254 students (%40.4) and from the low socioeconomic status 140 students (%22.3) participated in the study. Of all the students, 325 of them are males (%51.8) and 303 of them are females (%48.2). Among these students, 148 of them (%23.6) are in 5^{th} grade, 178 of them (%28.3) are in 6^{th} grade, 149 of them (%23.7) are in 7^{th} grade and 153 of them (%24.4) are in the 8^{th} grade.

2.3 Data Collecting Tool

In the study**,** word learning scales strategy was used, which consists of 6 factors and 32 codes and developed by Kocaman and Cumaoğlu (2014) who based the subscales of the strategies in language learning of Oxford (1990). KMO value of the study is .946. There is a significant difference in Barlett Test $p<.01$. The scale comprises of the subgroups of memory, cognitive, complementary, metacognitive, affective and social strategies. The total variance of the scale is estimated as %41.02. Cronbach Alpha internal consistency of the scale is .89. The sub-dimension of the memory strategies is .74, that of cognitive is .67, that of complementary is .71, that of meta-cognitive is .72, that of affective is .64 and that of social is .62. As a result of the correction factor analysis of the scale, the variance is estimated as: chi-squre value (1055.21/ 447= 2.36) RMSEA= 0.052, SRMS= 0.054, CFI=.96, GFI=.88.

2.4 Collecting Data and Analysis

Necessary permissions were taken for the research and the scale was practiced with the students in the study-group and collected. Some information was given to students about how they should fill in the forms and they were required to fill the forms in sincerity. The data obtained were uploaded to SPSS and data analysis was practiced. In the analysis of personal data, frequency and percentage techniques were used. Variance homogeneity was tested in the matchings about gender variables and it was observed that the distribution was normal, so independent groups test was used. In the matchings of socio-economical levels of schools, the compatibility test was practiced to see if the distribution is normal. In the situations in which the distribution is normal, single variable analysis was used and in the situations in which the distribution is not normal, Kruskall Wallis H test was carried out. As a result of Kruskall Wallis H test, Mann Whitney U test was practiced to determine the significant differences.

In the scale, to determine the level of scale of each code, Always (5), Often (4) Occasionally (3), Rarely (2), Never (1) grades were used. In the interpretation of arithmetical mean; the average value between 1.00-5.00 is for always: 4.21-5.00; often: 3.41-4.20; occasionally: 2.61-3.40; Rarely: 1.81-2.60; Never 1.00-1.80. In the statistical analysis used in the study, the significant level is regarded as .05.

3. Findings and Interpretations

In this section, the strategies the students use while learning a foreign language, the matchings in terms of school types, gender and grade variables are presented as findings and interpreted. The frequencies of standard deviation and mean about the strategies that the students use are shown in the table below.

Table 2. The frequencies of arithmetical mean and standard deviation about the strategies used while learning English

Sub-dimension	$\overline{X}$	**sd**
Memory Strategies	3.31	0.85
Cognitive Strategies	2.94	0.97
Complementary Strategies	2.92	0.97
Meta-cognitive Strategies	3.72	0.89
Affective Strategies	3.50	0.84
Social Strategies	3.07	0.86

When the table is studied, it is observed that the high level of view of students are in the sub-dimensions of meta-cognitive ($\overline{X}$ =3.72) and affective strategies ($\overline{X}$ =3.50). The students chose the view that "I often use" in these strategies. These sub-dimensions are subsequently followed by memory strategies ($\overline{X}$ =3.31), social strategies ($\overline{X}$ =3.07), cognitive strategies ($\overline{X}$ =2.94) and complementary strategies ($\overline{X}$ =2.92). The students chose the view that "I rarely use" for these strategies. Accordingly, it could be stated that the students prefer to use mostly meta-cognitive and affective strategies while learning vocabulary, but they don't use word learning strategies at the high level. The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean about the memory strategies that the students use while learning vocabulary are shown in the table below.

Table 3. The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean of the Memory Strategy

Items	**Memory Strategies**	$\overline{X}$	sd
1	I try to remember its synonym when I forget a word in English.	2.82	1.27
2	I make associations between the word I learnt before and the word I just learnt.	3.40	1.26
3	I visualize the word in order to remember it in English.	3.59	1.36
4	I match the pronunciation of the word I learnt before and the word I just learnt.	3.05	1.39
5	I always repeat the words lest I forget them.	3.47	1.30
6	I try to remember the meaning of an English word by visualizing it.	3.84	1.24
7	While I am studying vocabulary, I try to learn them according to their types (noun, adjective, verb..etc.).	3.00	1.40
	Total	**3.31**	**0.85**

When the students' opinions about the memory strategies are studied in table 2, it is observed that the high levels of view of students are those codes: "I try to remember the meaning of an English word by visualizing it." ($\overline{X}$ =3.84), "I visualize the word in order to remember it in English." ($\overline{X}$ =3.59) and "I always repeat the words lest I forget them." ($\overline{X}$ =3.47). The students chose "often" grade for these codes. The low level code is that "I try to remember its synonym when I forget a word in English." ($\overline{X}$ =2.82). When the total arithmetic mean about using memory strategy is studied, it is observed that the students preferred "occasionally" grade ($\overline{X}$ =3.31). According to this result, it could be said that the students don't use the memory strategy in high level, thus they are lack of this strategy. The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean about the cognitive strategies that the students use while learning vocabulary.are shown in the table below

Table 4. The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean about the cognitive strategy

Items	Cognitive Strategies	$\overline{X}$	sd
1	I try to learn English words from the cards on which I write those words.	2.09	1.32
2	I label the word cards on the places that I can see in order to remember them.	2.58	1.47
3	I learn the pronounciation of English words by listening a few times.	2.83	1.45
4	I use notebook while learning English words.	3.50	1.47
5	I write down the words that I want to learn.	3.69	1.34
	Total	**2.94**	**0.97**

When the students' opinions about the cognitive strategies are studied in table 3, it is observed that the high levels of view of students are those codes: "I write down the words that I want to learn." ($\overline{X}$ =3.69), and "I use notebook while learning English words." ($\overline{X}$ =3.50). The students chose "often" for these codes. The low level level code is that "I try to learn English words from the cards on which I write those words." ($\overline{X}$ =2.09). When the total arithmetic mean about using cognitive strategy is studied, it is observed that the students preferred "occasionally" grade ($\overline{X}$ =2.94). According to the result, it could be said that the students don't prefer cognitive strategies while learning vocabulary. The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean about the complementary strategies that the students use while learning vocabulary are shown in the table below.

Table 5. The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean about the complementary strategy

Items	Complementary Strategies	$\overline{X}$	sd
1	I learn English words with their antonyms and synonyms.	2.65	1.32
2	I solve various English tests, while learning English.	3.40	1.39
3	I prefer to learn English words with technological help, which are necessary for my lesson.	2.96	1.44
4	I prefer to learn English words with videos, which are necessary for my lesson.	2.64	1.42
	Total	**2.92**	**0.97**

In table 4, the students' opinions about the complementary strategies are included. When the table is studied, it is observed that the high level of view of students is the code that "I solve various English tests, while learning English" ($\overline{X}$ =3.40). The low level level codes are those "I prefer to learn English words with videos, which are necessary for my lesson." ($\overline{X}$ =2.64) and "I learn English words with their antonyms and synonyms." ($\overline{X}$ =2.65). The students chose "occasionaly" grade for the all sub-dimension codes. Accordingly, it could be stated that the students don't prefer the codes "I learn English words with their antonyms and synonyms", "I solve various English tests, while learning English." and "I prefer to learn English words with technological help, which are necessary for my lesson." The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean about the meta-cognitive strategies that the students use while learning vocabulary are shown in the table below.

Table 6. The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean about the meta-cognitive strategy

Items	Meta-cognitive strategy	$\overline{X}$	sd
1	I try to learn English words with the help of technological games.	3.10	1.51
2	I try to learn the English words with their pronounciation and meaning.	4.18	1.14
3	I try to find the best method while learning English.	4.11	1.22
4	I study as planned while learning vocabulary.	3.51	1.33
	Total	**3.72**	**0.89**

In table 5, the students' opinions about the meta-cognitive strategies are included. When the table is studied, it is observed that the high levels of view of students are the codes that "I try to learn the English words with their pronunciation and meaning." ($\overline{X}$ =4.18) and "I try to find the best method while learning English." ($\overline{X}$ =4.11). The low level frequency is that lowest participated "I try to learn English words with the help of technological games." ($\overline{X}$ =3.10). The students chose "often" grade for this sub-dimension code according to the arithmetic mean. Accordingly, it could be said that the students use meta-cognitive strategies adequately, but they don't often prefer to use technological games while learning vocabulary. The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean about the affective strategies that the students use while learning vocabulary are shown in the table below.

Table 7. The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean about the affective strategies

Items	Affective strategies	$\overline{X}$	sd
1	Listening to music in background while learning English makes me relax.	2.65	1.63
2	I reward myself when I learn new words.	2.54	1.48
3	I feel happy when I learn new words.	3.91	1.34
4	I feel relax in lessons when I enhance my vocabulary.	4.16	1.27
5	Our teacher encourages us to learn English words out of the lesson.	3.74	1.46
6	While watching a video or movie in English, I instantly notice the words I have learnt.	4.00	1.30
	Total	**3.50**	**0.84**

In table 6, the students' opinions about the affective strategies are included. When the table is studied, it is observed that the high level of view of students are the codes "I feel relax in lessons when I enhance my vocabulary." ($\overline{X}$ =4.16) and "While watching a video or movie in English, I instantly notice the words I have learnt." ($\overline{X}$ =4.00). The low level code is that "I reward myself when I learn new words." ($\overline{X}$ =2.54). The students chose "often" grade for this sub-dimension code according to the arithmetic mean. Accordingly, the students are said to use the affective strategies adequately. The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean about the social strategies that the students use while learning vocabulary are shown in the table below

Table 8. The frequencies of Standard deviation and arithmetic mean about the social strategies

Items	Social Strategies	$\overline{X}$	sd
1	I ask my friends the words I learnt Whether I pronounciate them right or wrong.	3.10	1.39
2	When I pronounciate the words wrongly, I want my friends to correct them.	3.00	1.47
3	I prefer group-works while I try to learn English words.	2.61	1.49
4	I need help from my teacher while learning English words.	3.47	1.40
5	I prefer studying with the class to study as individual while learning English words.	3.23	1.49
6	I learn English words better when I compete with my friends.	2.99	1.48
	Total	**3.07**	**0.86**

In table 7, the students' opinions about the social strategies are included. When the table is studied, it is observed that the high levels of view of students are the codes "I need help from my teacher while learning English words." ($\overline{X}$ =3.47), and "I prefer to study with the class to study as individual while learning English words." ($\overline{X}$ =3.23). The low level frequency code is that "I prefer group-works while I try to learn English words." ($\overline{X}$ =2.61). The students chose "rarely" ($\overline{X}$ =3.07) grade about using social strategies code according to the total arithmetic mean. According to the result, it could be said that the students don't prefer the social strategies mostly and they prefer learning words with individual study rather than studying with class. T-test results about the strategies the students use according to gender variables are shown in the table below.

Table 9. T-test results about gender variables

Sub Dimension	Gender	n	$\overline{X}$	sd	sd	Levene F	Levene p	t	p
Memory	Male	325	3.16	0.89	429	3.355	0.068	-3.933*	0.000
	Female	303	3.48	0.77					
Cognitive	Male	325	2.73	0.97	429	0.615	0.433	-4.826*	0.000
	Female	303	3.17	0.91					
Complementary	Male	325	2.89	0.99	429	0.276	0.600	-0.638	0.524
	Female	303	2.95	0.95					
Meta-cognitive	Male	325	3.64	0.99	429	8.163	0.059	-2.063*	0.040
	Female	303	3.82	0.85					
Affective	Male	325	3.33	0.89	429	5.329	0.062	-4.520*	0.000
	Female	303	3.69	0.75					
Social	Male	325	3.04	0.92	429	6.734	0.052	-0.774*	0.010
	Female	303	3.10	0.79					

*p<0.05

According to the findings in table 8, Memory, cognitive, complementary, metacognitive, affective and social strategies the students use while learning words in English have significant difference in terms of gender variables (p<0.05). The differences are determined for female students. Statistically there is no significant difference about using complementary strategies. The females are determined to have higher level of view than males about all sub-dimensions. The females are stated to use the strategies more effective than males according to the data obtained. The results of Analysis of Variance about socio-economical level of the schools are included in the table below.

Table 10. The results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) about socio-economical level of the schools

Sub- Dimensions	Socio-economical Level	n	$\overline{X}$	sd	F	p
Meta-cognitive	High	234	3.78	0.89	2.255	0.106
	Middle	254	3.73	0.83		
	Low	140	3.53	0.98		
Levene=1.592			p=0.205			
Social	High	234	3.66	0.63	0.234	0.792
	Middle	254	3.33	0.80		
	Low	140	3.27	0.68		
Levene=2.758	p=0.065					

According to the findings in table 9, statistically there is no significant difference in meta-cognitive and social strategies the students use while learning English words in terms of socio-economical level of the schools (p>0.05). However, when the arithmetic mean of the groups is studied, the students in high socio-economical schools ($\overline{X}$ =3.78; 3.66) chose higher level of views than those of middle ($\overline{X}$ =3.73; 3.33) and low ($\overline{X}$ =3.53; 3.27) level schools. According to the results obtained, it could be stated that the students in high socio-economical schools used more effective than the students in middle and low level schools in terms of social and meta-cognitive strategies.

Table 11. KWH test results about socio-economical level of the schools

Sub- dimension	Socio-economical Level	n	Mean rank	sd	KWH	p	MWU
Memory	high	234	226.11	2	3.877	0.144	-
	middle	254	199.37				
	low	140	212.38				
	Levene=5.808		p=0.003				
Cognitive	high	234	218.82	2	0.254	0.881	-
	middle	254	216.19				
	low	140	209.28				
	Levene=8.502		p=0.000				
Complementary	high	234	223.25	2	2.766	0.251	-
	middle	254	200.75				
	low	140	219.41				
	Levene=3.631		p=0.027				
Affective	high	234	233.22	2	9.883	0.007*	1-2,3
	middle	254	197.11				
	low	140	192.69				
	Levene=3.676		p=0.026				

According to the table 10, as a result of KWH test, there is no significant difference about using memory, cognitive, complementary, metacognitive, affective and social strategies. In affective strategies, there is a significant difference and this difference is for the socio-economically high level schools. Also when the arithmetic mean of the groups is studied, it is determined that the students in socio-economically high level schools stated their view with higher level than other students in low and middle level schools.

4. Results and Discussion

According to the findings of the study, it is clearly seen that the students expressing their view as "I occasionally use" are using memory strategies, cognitive strategies, complementary strategies and social strategies in the scale; and the students stating their view as "I often use" are generally using meta-cognitive and affective strategies. In the studies of Riazi and Rahimi (2003), it is concluded that students use memory and social strategies the least among the language learning strategies. According to the study results of Yalçin (2006) it was determined that students use compensation strategies as the most and subsequently meta-cognitive, social, memory, affective and cognitive strategies follow. In the study titled as "the language learning strategy preferences for university preparation students" of Hamamcı (2012) it is seen that they choose meta-cognitive, cognitive, social and complementary strategies as the most. On the other hand, emotional strategies are preferred as the lowest level by students. In the study of Tok (2007) for candidate teachers, it is realized that the students use some of the strategies in a high level and some in low. In the study of Tercanlioglu (2004) it is determined that the university students use language learning strategies with low frequencies. Oxford (1990) stated that affective and social strategies are not used in a foreign language since the language researchers haven't searched on these strategies sufficiently. It is true that language learning strategies facilitate learning and while learning a foreign language, using strategy in enhancing vocabulary influences the success and language proficiency. Under these circumstances, it could be said that the students don't use the strategies in a high and effective level and this situation could influence on students' learning a foreign language in a negative way.

According to another result of the study, the lowest frequency views are such as "I try to remember its synonym when I forget a word in English.", "I try to learn English words from the cards on which I write those words.", "I prefer to learn English words with videos, which are necessary for my lesson." , "I try to learn English words with the help of technological games.", "I reward myself when I learn new words.", I prefer group-works while I try to learn English words. Accordingly the students should be directed to the best strategy while preparing language curricula.

At the end of the research, there is a significant difference in terms of gender variables for females about the memory, cognitive, mega-cognitive, affective and social strategies among the language learning strategies. About using the

complementary strategy, there is no a significant difference statistically. It is determined that female students stated higher level frequencies than male students in all dub-dimensions of the strategies. Therefore, when compared with males, female students use the strategies more effective while learning English words. When the literature is studied it is concluded that female students use more language learning strategies than males in the studies of Tok (2007) and Cesur (2008). In the study of Green ve Oxford, (1993) and Oxford (1993) females used the strategies more than males. In the studies of Ay (2006), Aydın (2003), Ertekin (2006) and Tabanlıoğlu (2003) the results contradict with others because they conclude that the gender difference doesn't effect using the strategies.

As another result of the study, statistically, it cannot be determined any significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the strategies in terms of socio-economic variables of the schools related with the memory, cognitive, mega-cognitive, affective and social strategies. However, when the arithmetic mean of the groups is studied, the students in high socio-economical schools have higher frequencies with their opinion to the questions compared with the students in low and middle socio-economical schools. Additionally, it is determined that there is significant difference in the sub-dimension of affective strategy and this difference is for the high socio-economical schools. Therefore, it could be stated that the students in high socio-economical schools use the strategies more effective than the students in low and middle socio-economical schools in learning English words.

In his study Guven (2004) stated that there is no significant difference in terms of students' socio-economical levels in learning strategies they used. From the results of study, these suggestions could be proposed as follows:

- It is important students should have information about strategies of word learning during the teaching process. When these strategies are taught to the students, it will contribute to students' success in many ways. Therefore, necessary consultation should be provided for students and their learning process should be promoted in the best way.
- While a language curriculum is being prepared, it is important that the activities to increase students' success of word learning should be included in it.
- Educations should be given to teachers about the strategies for learning words in a foreign language and they should be educated about how they can teach these strategies to students in class atmosphere and in daily life.
- Studies should be conducted on the factor that hampers students about word learning strategies and solution proposals should be brought into for preventing the problems.
- Different word learning strategies should be taught to students and it should be checked whether students use these strategies or not.

References

Ay, A. (2006). *The Vocabulary Learning Strategies Employed by Ninth Graders and Relations with Their Personal Characteristics*. Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences.

Aydın, T. (2003). *Language Learning Strategies Used By Turkish High School Students Learning English*. Post-graduate Thesis, İstanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences

Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals, 22*, 13-24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1989.tb03138.x

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ertekin, S. Z. (2006). *A Study on Correlation Betwee the Learning Strategies of the 4th and 5th Graders and Those in the Textbook*. Post-graduate Thesis. Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences.

Green, J., & Oxford, R. (1993). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 Proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 261-297. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587625

Güven, M. (2004). *The Relationship Between Learning Styles And Learning Strategies Of Turkish Teacher Candidates*. Doctoral Thesis. Anadolu University, Institute of Educational Sciences Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Hamamcı, Z. (2012). Language Learning Strategy Preferences of Universıty Preparatory Class Students. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching, 1*(3), 314-323.

Kocaman, O., & Cumaoğlu, G., K. (2014). Developing a Scale for Vocabulary Learning Strategies in Foreign Languages. *Education and Science, 39*(176), 293-303. http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/eb.2014.3611

Nation, P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524759

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

Publishers.

Oxford, R. L. (1993). Instructional implications of gender differences in language learning styles and strategies. *Applied Language Learning*, *4*, 65-94.

Riazi, A., & Mohammad, R. (2003). Iranian EFL Learners' Pattern of Language Learning Strategy Use. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*. c. 2. s. 1, 103-129.

Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history and typology*. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategies in language learning (pp. 15-30). Englewood, NJ: Prentice/Hall International.

Tabanlıoğlu, S. (2003). *The Relationship Between Learning Styles And Language Learning Strategies of Pre-intermediate EAP Students*. Post-graduate Thesis. Middle East Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Tok, H. (2007). Language Learning Stratigies Used by Teacher Candidates. *Journal of Eastern Anatolian Region Studies*, *5*(3), 191-197.

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

Yalçın, M. (2006). *Differences In The Perceptions On Language Learning Strategies Of Preparatory Class Students Studying At Gazi University*. Post-graduate Thesis, Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences.