

A Study on School Type and Learning Strategies among Iranian EFL learners

İran EFL öğrenciler arasında Okul Türü ve Öğrenme Stratejileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma

Leyla Vakili Samiyan

Safir Danesh and Sama Foreign Language Institute Mashhad, Iran

Abstract

This study intended to investigate the strategies used by EFL learners with the purpose of finding the degree and the domain of differences of the strategies used by different school types and disclosing the extent to which strategy use and achievement are interrelated. To this end, a related questionnaire as well as an S-test was distributed among 445 first grader - senior high school learners from 17 high schools in Mashhad. The findings of the study indicated that there is a significant difference in strategies used by the learners of different school types. It was furthermore revealed that there is a significant difference between State-Private and State-SAMPAD school regarding using Memory and Social Strategies. State-Private, State-SAMPAD and SAMPAD-Private schools also differ with each other in using of Compensation Strategy. Moreover, the study displayed that SAMPAD school learners are more successful in the achievement test than State and Private schools. Finally, Memory, Cognitive, Metacognitive, Affective, and Social strategies were found to be predictor of achievement in State school. However, Predictors of achievement in Private schools were Compensation, Metacognitive and Affective, while they were Compensation and Social for SAMPAD schools. Consequently, teachers, according to the research findings, are recommended to apply the best learning strategies for better achievement.

Keywords: Learning strategies, School types, SAMPAD

1. Introduction

Language teaching and learning have received considerable attention in developing countries, especially with the increasing need for global communication. Learners decide to learn and speak English as a foreign language (EFL), because of personal interests, social needs, professional goals, or academic requirements. However, many beginner EFL learners do poorly and end up dropping out of their classes no matter how hard EFL teachers try to help them succeed. It seems that, the reason can be explained that, they don't employ appropriate learning strategies.

Researchers have shown that there are many factors involved when trying to understand what makes a person learn a foreign language successfully (e.g., Wenden & Rubin, 1987; Chamot, & O'Malley, 1994). Some of these factors (school type and learning strategies) will be considered and explored as variables in this study.

Oxford (1990) divided the learning strategies into two main categories – direct and indirect learning strategies- each of which includes three subcategories. The direct strategies include: 1) Memory Strategy, 2) Cognitive Strategy and 3) Compensation Strategy. Indirect strategies are: 1) Metacognitive Strategy, 2) Affective Strategy and 3) Social Strategy. Six major groups of L2 learning strategies have been identified by Oxford (1990). These categories are as follow:

- **Memory strategies** such as grouping, imagery, rhyming, moving physically and reviewing in a structured way
- **Cognitive strategies** such as reasoning, analyzing, summarizing and practicing (including but not limited to “active use of the language)
- **Compensatory strategies** (to make up for limited knowledge) such as guessing meanings from context and using synonyms and gestures to convey meaning
- **Metacognitive strategies:** for evaluating one's progress, planning for language tasks, consciously searching for practice opportunities, paying attention and monitoring errors
- **Affective strategies:** for anxiety reduction, self-encouragement and self-reward
- **Social strategies** such as asking questions, cooperating with native speakers, and becoming culturally aware (Green & Oxford, 1995, pp. 264-265).

The main goal of this study was to explore the learning strategies of the learners, among three different types of schools. In addition, in this study the three school types were compared in order to shed light on the fact that whether SAMPAD students are more successful in S-test and have more achievement in learning English? And the final goal of the current study is exploring the learning strategy which is the best predictor of achievement among students in State, Private and SAMPAD schools.

In Iran, there are three different types of schools, i.e. state school, private school and SAMPAD (سمپاد) schools respectively.

- **State Schools:** In most countries, as well as Iran, State schools, are considered as the least expensive schools of all, because they are dependent on government. Generally they are different in a number of factors with Private and SAMPAD schools, such as, the number of students in each class, the quality of education, the teachers and other personnel, etc.
- **Private Schools:** The second type is Private school which is known as non-profit schools. Contrary to state schools, it's more expensive to study in Private schools, consistent application of the standards and general guidelines established by the supervision of the Ministry of Education. In other words, it is a school that receives no money from the government and where the education of the students is paid for by their parents, (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2005). Extra-curricular courses, after school activities and make up sessions are the special features of these schools.
- **SAMPAD Schools:** is known as National Organization for Development of Exceptional Talents (NODET, also known as SAMPAD: سمپاد, which stands for *پرورش استعدادهای درخشان* Persian, *Sazman-e Melli-e Parvaresh-e Estedadha-ye Derakhshan*) are national secondary and high schools in Iran developed specifically for training of talented students. NODET was first established in 1976, and then re-established in 1987. It focuses on the education of gifted students with high IQ quotient.

The current study tends to answer the following questions:

RQ1. Are the learners of State, Private and SAMPAD schools different from each other regarding the learning strategies they use?

RQ2. Is there any significant difference between students' achievement in State, Private and SAMPAD schools?

RQ3. Is there any certain learning strategy as the best predictor of achievement among the learners in state, Private and SAMPAD schools?"

Many research studies on school type represented a significant difference between students attending different school types (Kılıç, 2010; Ağlamaz, 2006; Newhouse & Beegle, 2005; Kalender, 2004; Birch & Miller, 2007); on the other hand there are some studies which found no significant different relationship between school type and learners' achievement (Rençber, 2011; Casteel & Isom, 1989).

A study conducted by Birch and Miller (2007) found that non-Government school students are found to have lower marks at university than Government school students. The main factors influencing the size of the gap between the university marks of students from Government and non-Government schools are university entrance exam results. In other words, the students who attended Non-Government schools were more successful language learners than those who attended Government schools. Also, the effect of school type on academic achievement has been investigated in a research by Newhouse and Beegle (2005), in which junior secondary school students were attended. Findings of their research revealed that students who attended public junior secondary schools, controlling for other characteristics, have higher test scores upon completion than those who attended private school.

2. Methodology

2.1. Participants:

Sample of the study consisted of 445 first grade-senior high school students from 17 high schools, five State (3 all-girls and 2 all-boys), seven Private (4 all-girls and 3 all-boys) and five SAMPAD (3 all-girls and 2 all-boys) schools in Mashhad, Iran. Their ages ranged between 12 to 14 years old.

2.2. Instruments:

To find out the learning strategy of the learners and to figure out the relationship between strategy use and English Language achievement of the students, two research instruments were used: A) a scale for language learning strategy (SILL) survey and B) a test to measure the achievement in language learning (S-Test).

3. Results

3.1. Reliability of inventories and Normality of the data

The reliability of the language learning strategies subscales and also the schema test was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. The results can be seen in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1. Reliability and Normality of the Data

Variable	Cronbach's alpha
S-test	.84
Memory	.79
Cognitive	.81
Compensation	.84
Meta-Cognitive	.78
Affective	.86
Social	.82

Oxford and Nyikos (1993) reported Cronbach's alpha of 0.96 for SILL. Tahmasebi (1999) also found Cronbach's alpha of 0.77 for Persian version of SILL. In the current study an acceptable reliability was obtained reporting alpha value of 0.81 for Persian version of SILL.

3.2. Results of Data Analysis Regarding Research Question 1

The first question of the current research was "Are the learners of State, Private and SAMPAD schools different with each other regarding the learning strategies they use?" To this end, all six learning strategies were investigated in the three various school types separately.

3.2.1. Memory and school types

First, memory strategy was compared among the three groups. Descriptive statistics for the three groups can be seen in table 3.2.

Table 3.2. Descriptive Statistics of Memory Strategy use among Three School Types

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		F	sig
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
State	160	21.24	5.330	.421	20.41	22.07	8.741	.000
Private	132	18.97	5.441	.474	18.03	19.91		
SAMPAD	154	19.06	5.360	.432	18.21	19.92		
Total	446	19.82	5.466	.259	19.31	20.32		

As Table 3.2 shows, there is a statistically significant difference among the three groups with regard to memory strategy [$F(443,2)= 8.74, p<.05$]. To locate the exact place of difference, post-hoc analysis with Tukey was run.

Table 3.3. Post-hoc Analysis of Multiple Comparisons with Tukey for Memory Strategy

(I) Private(P)/E) school	State(S)/E) school	(J) State(S)/ Private(P)/E) school	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
dimension2	State	dimension3 Private	2.268*	.632	.001	.78	3.75
		SAMPAD	2.173*	.607	.001	.75	3.60
	Private	dimension3 State	-2.268*	.632	.001	-3.75	-.78
		SAMPAD	-.095	.637	.988	-1.59	1.40
	SAMPAD	dimension3 State	-2.173*	.607	.001	-3.60	-.75
		Private	.095	.637	.988	-1.40	1.59

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

As Table 3.3 indicates, there is a statistically significant difference between state and private (mean difference= 2.26, $p<.05$), and state and SAMPAD schools (mean difference= 2.17, $p<.05$) with regard to memory strategy. As the mean of the state school students is higher than that of the private and SAMPAD school students, it can be implied that state school students use memory strategy more than private and SAMPAD students

3.2.2. Cognitive and School Type

Then, cognitive strategy was compared among the three groups. Descriptive statistics for the three groups can be seen in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4. Descriptive Statistics of Cognitive Strategy use Among Three School Types

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		F	Sig.
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
State	160	24.01	5.886	.465	23.09	24.93	2.482	.085
Private	132	22.98	6.477	.564	21.86	24.09		
SAMPAD	154	22.52	5.844	.471	21.59	23.45		
Total	446	23.19	6.073	.288	22.62	23.75		

As Table 3.4 shows, there is no statistically significant difference among the three groups with regard to cognitive strategy [F (443, 2) = 2.48, p>.05].

3.2.3. Compensation and School Type

Then, compensation strategy was compared among the three groups. Descriptive statistics for the three groups can be seen in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5. Descriptive Statistics of Compensation Strategy use Among Three School Types

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		F	Sig.
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
State	160	18.53	4.842	.383	17.78	19.29	22.373	.000
private	132	16.69	5.010	.436	15.83	17.55		
SAMPAD	154	20.59	4.959	.400	19.80	21.38		
Total	446	18.70	5.164	.245	18.22	19.18		

As Table 3.5 shows, there is a statistically significant difference among the three groups with regard to compensation strategy [F(443,2)= 22.37, p<.05]. To locate the exact place of difference, post-hoc analysis with Tukey was run.

Table 3.6. Post-hoc Analysis of Multiple Comparisons with Tukey for Compensation Strategy

(I) Private(P)/ E) school	State(S)/ Estedad(E) school	(J) Private(P)/ E) school	State(S)/ Estedad(E) school	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
dimension2	State	dimension3	Private	1.842*	.580	.005	.48	3.21
			SAMPAD	-2.060*	.557	.001	-3.37	-.75
	Private	dimension3	State	-1.842*	.580	.005	-3.21	-.48
			SAMPAD	-3.902*	.585	.000	-5.28	-2.53
	SAMPAD	dimension3	State	2.060*	.557	.001	.75	3.37
			Private	3.902*	.585	.000	2.53	5.28

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

As Table 3.6 indicates, there is a statistically significant difference between state and private (mean difference= 1.84, p<.05), state and SAMPAD schools (mean difference= 2.06, p<.05), and SAMPAD and private school students (mean difference= 3.90, p<.05) with regard to compensation strategy. As the mean of the SAMPAD school students is higher than that of the private and state school students, it can be implied that SAMPAD school students use compensation strategy more than private and state school students. Moreover, state school students use more compensation strategy than private school students.

3.2.4. Metacognitive and School Type

Then, metacognitive strategy was compared among the three groups. Descriptive statistics for the three groups can be seen in 3.7.

Table 3.7. Descriptive Statistics of Metacognitive Strategy use Among Three School Types

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		F	Sig.
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
State	160	25.22	5.664	.448	24.33	26.10	2.775	.071
Private	132	24.79	5.058	.440	23.92	25.66		
SAMPAD	154	23.81	5.389	.434	22.95	24.67		
Total	446	24.61	5.417	.257	24.10	25.11		

As Table 3.7 shows, there is no statistically significant difference among the three groups with regard to metacognitive strategy [F (443, 2) = 2.77, p>.05].

3.2.5. Affective and School Type

Then, affective strategy was compared among the three groups. Descriptive statistics for the three groups can be seen in Table 3.8.

Table 3.8. Descriptive Statistics of Affective Strategy use Among Three School Types

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		F	Sig.
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
State	160	15.98	4.736	.374	15.24	16.72	.500	.607
private	132	16.44	4.912	.428	15.59	17.29		
SAMPAD	154	15.91	4.777	.385	15.15	16.67		
Total	446	16.09	4.797	.227	15.65	16.54		

As Table 3.8 shows, there is no statistically significant difference among the three groups with regard to affective strategy [F (443, 2) = .50, p>.05].

3.2.6. Social and School Type

Finally, social strategy was compared among the three groups. Descriptive statistics for the three groups can be seen in Table 3.9.

Table 3.9. Descriptive Statistics of Social Strategy use Among Three School Types

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		F	Sig.
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
State	160	19.73	5.908	.467	18.80	20.65	8.451	.000
Private	132	17.82	5.853	.509	16.81	18.83		
SAMPAD	154	17.03	6.109	.492	16.06	18.01		
Total	446	18.23	6.061	.287	17.67	18.80		

As Table 3.9 shows, there is a statistically significant difference among the three groups with regard to social strategy [F(443,2)= 8.45, p<.05]. To locate the exact place of difference, post-hoc analysis with Tukey was run.

Table 3.10. Post-hoc Analysis of Multiple Comparisons with Tukey for Social Strategies

(I) Private(P)/ E) school	State(S)/ E) school	(J) Private(P)/ E) school	State(S)/ E) school	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
dimension2	State	dimension3	Private	1.907*	.701	.019	.26	3.56
			SAMPAD	2.693*	.673	.000	1.11	4.28
	Private	dimension3	State	-1.907*	.701	.019	-3.56	-.26
			SAMPAD	.786	.707	.508	-.88	2.45
SAMPAD	dimension3	State	-2.693*	.673	.000	-4.28	-1.11	
		Private	-.786	.707	.508	-2.45	.88	

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

As Table 3.10 indicates, there is a statistically significant difference between state and private (mean difference= 1.90, p<.05), and state and SAMPAD schools (mean difference= 2.69, p<.05) with regard to social

strategy. As the mean of the state school students is higher than that of the private and SAMPAD school students, it can be implied that state school students use more social strategies than SAMPAD and private students. No significant difference was found between SAMPAD and private school students.

3.3. Results of the Data Analyses Concerning Research Question 2

The second research question of the current study sought answer as to if there is any significant difference between students' achievement in State, Private and SAMPAD schools?

To see whether students of state, private, and SAMPAD schools differ in their foreign language achievement, a one-way ANOVA was run. Descriptive statistics for the three schools can be seen in Table 3.11.

Table 3.11. Descriptive Statistics of State, Private and SAMPAD schools for S-test Mean Scores

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		F	Sig.
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
State	160	47.45	11.158	.882	45.71	49.19	25.556	.000
Private	132	54.86	13.335	1.161	52.57	57.16		
SAMPAD	154	58.03	15.563	1.254	55.55	60.51		
Total	446	53.30	14.174	.671	51.98	54.62		

As Table 3.11 shows, there is a statistically significant difference among the three groups with regard to social strategy [F(443,2)= 25.556, p<.05]. To locate the exact place of difference, post-hoc analysis with Tukey was run.

Table 3.12. Post-hoc Analysis of Multiple Comparisons with Tukey for S-test

(I) Private(P)/E) school	State(S)/ (J) Estadad(Private(P)/ E) school	State(S)/ Estadad(Private(P)/ E) school	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
dimension2	State	Private	-7.414*	1.582	.000	-11.13	-3.69
		SAMPAD	-10.582*	1.518	.000	-14.15	-7.01
	Private	State	7.414*	1.582	.000	3.69	11.13
		SAMPAD	-3.169	1.595	.117	-6.92	.58
	SAMPAD	State	10.582*	1.518	.000	7.01	14.15
		Private	3.169	1.595	.117	-.58	6.92

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

As Table 3.12 reveals, there is a statistically significant difference between state and private school (mean difference= 7.41, p<.05), and state and SAMPAD school (mean difference= 10.58, p<.05). However no significant difference was found between private and SAMPAD schools. As the mean of the state school (M=47.45) is less than that of the private school (54.86) and SAMPAD school (M= 58.03), it can be inferred that those students who study at private and SAMPAD schools have a better English language achievement than those who study at state schools.

3.4. Results of the Data Analyses Concerning Research Question 3

The last question of this study was "Is there any certain learning strategy as the best predictor of achievement in state, Private and SAMPAD schools?"

Multiple regression analysis was run to see the predictability of s-test by language learning strategies for state, private, and SAMPAD schools respectively.

Table 3.13. Regression ANOVA Test for Predictability of Learning Strategies in State Schools

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2255.110	6	375.852	3.278	.005 ^a
	Residual	17540.490	153	114.644		
	Total	19795.600	159			

As table 3.13 represent weather the learning strategies affect on, and predict the achievement of the learners. According to the table 4.13, F. value is 3.27 which is greater than 2, and sig. value is lower than .05 that show the existence of statistically significance relationship between learning strategies and achievement. Then to see which strategy predicts s-test better among state school students, coefficients Table was checked for each strategy separately.

Table 3.14. Correlation Coefficients Test of Predictability for Learning Strategies in State School

State School		S- test/83	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Meta- Cognitive	Affective	Social
S- test/83	Pearson	1	.185*	.317**	.136	.222**	.204**	.184*
	Correlation		.019	.000	.086	.005	.009	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)							

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 3.14 indicates, there was a significant relationship between s-test and different strategies among state school students. S-test is positively and significantly correlated with memory ($r = .18, p < .05$), cognitive ($r = .31, p < .05$), metacognitive ($r = .22, p < .05$), affective ($r = .20, p < .05$), and social strategies ($r = .18, p < .05$) among state school students. As can be seen, there is no significant correlation between s-test and compensation strategies ($r = .13, p > .05$). S-test has the highest correlation with cognitive strategies, and the lowest correlation with memory and social strategies among state school students.

Then to analyze the predictability of learning strategies in Private schools and to see if it is significant, Regression ANOVA test was run.

Table 3.15. Regression ANOVA Test for Predictability of Learning Strategies in Private Schools

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1938.405	6	323.068	2.291	.037 ^a
	Residual	21357.140	125	170.857		
	Total	23295.545	131			

According to Regression Analysis test in table 3.15, F. value is 2.29 which is greater than 2, and sig. value is lower than .05 that show the existence of statistically significance relationship between learning strategies and achievement. Then to see which variables predict achievement in s-test better among Private school students, Correlation Coefficients Table was checked.

Table 3.16. Correlation Coefficients Test of Predictability for Learning Strategies in Private Schools

Private School		S- test/83	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Meta- Cognitive	Affective	Social
S- test/83	Pearson	1	.079	.147	.183*	.238**	.170	.098
	Correlation		.367	.093	.036	.006	.048	.266
	Sig. (2-tailed)							

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 3.16 indicates, there was a significant relationship between s-test and different strategies among private school students. S-test is positively and significantly correlated with compensation ($r = .18, p < .05$), metacognitive ($r = .23, p < .05$), and affective strategies ($r = .17, p < .05$). As can be seen, there is no significant correlation between s-test and memory ($r = .07, p > .05$), cognitive ($r = .14, p > .05$), and social strategies ($r = .09, p > .05$). S-test has the highest correlation with metacognitive strategies and lowest correlation with affective strategies among private school students. Finally to analyze the predictability of learning strategies in Private schools and to see if it is significant, Regression ANOVA test was run.

Table 3.17. Regression ANOVA test for Predictability of Learning Strategies in SAMPAD Schools

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2994.169	6	499.028	2.454	.021 ^a
	Residual	34062.668	147	231.719		
	Total	37056.838	153			

According to Regression Analysis test in table 3.17, F. value is 2.45 which is greater than 2, and sig. value is lower than .05 that show the existence of statistically significance relationship between learning strategies and achievement. Then to see which variables predict achievement in s-test better among SAMPAD school students, Correlation Coefficients Table was checked.

Table 3.18. Correlation Coefficients Test for Predictability of Learning Strategies in SAMPAD Schools

	SAMPAD School	S-test/83	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Meta-Cognitive	Affective	Social
S-test/83 Pearson Correlation		1	.028	.089	.193*	.010	.046	.191*
S-test/83 Sig. (2-tailed)			.729	.270	.017	.902	.567	.018

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 4.18 indicates, there was a significant relationship between s-test and different strategies among SAMPAD school students. S-test is positively and significantly correlated with compensation ($r = .19$, $p < .05$) and social strategies ($r = .19$, $p < .05$). No significant correlation was found between s-test and memory ($r = .02$, $p > .05$), cognitive ($r = .08$, $p > .05$), metacognitive ($r = .01$, $p > .05$), and affective strategies ($r = .04$, $p > .05$). S-test was equally correlated with compensation and social strategies.

4. REFERENCES

- Ağlamaz, T. (2006). *High school students' aggression point in terms of examining self-disclosure, school type, sex, class level, parent's education level and families monthly income level*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Education and Social Sciences, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Turkey.
- Birch, E. R. & Miller, P. W. (2007). *The influence of type of high school attended on university performance*, Authors Journal Compilation, Blackwell Publishing Ltd University of Adelaide and Flinders University, Western Australia.
- Casteel, C. & Isom, B. (1989). *The effect of school type on pre-readers' acquisition of print concepts*, Journal of Research on Reading, 12(2), 131-145.
- Chamot, A.U., & O'Malley, J.M. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*, Retrieved from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej07/r5.html>
- Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). *A closer look at learning strategies, L2 Proficiency and Gender*. TESOL Quarterly, 29/2, 261-297.
- Kalender, I. (2004). *A structural equation modeling study; factors affecting science achievement based on OBBS-2002 across grade levels and school types*, unpublished Master Thesis to the Graduate School of Natural and applied Sciences of Middle East Technical University, Turkey
- Kılıç, D. & Sağlam, N. (2010). *Investigating the effects of gender and school type on students' learning orientations*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 2 (2010). 3378–3382. Newhouse, D. & Beegle, K.
- (2005). *The Effect of School Type on Academic Achievement: Evidence from Indonesia*, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, Minnesota Development Economics Conference
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2005). 7th ed, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Oxford dictionaries, language matters (2014). Oxford University Press, New York.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Rençber, Ş. (2011). *An Investigation of the Relationship among the Seventh Grade Students' Mathematics Self-efficacy, Mathematics Anxiety, Attitude Toward Mathematics and Mathematics Achievement Regarding Gender and School Type*. Unpublished Thesis Submitted to Graduate School of Social Sciences, Middle East Technical University, Turkey.
- Wenden, A., & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Uzun Özet

Yabancı dil öğrenmekte başarılı olmak, stres, cinsiyet, öğrenme stratejileri, okul türü gibi faktörlere büyük bir sayısına bağlıdır. Bu yüzden, bu araştırma iki faktörü (okul türü ve öğrenme stratejileri) göze alarak öğrencilerin İngilizce öğrenmekte başarılı olup olmadıklarını incelemektedir. Oxford (1990), öğrenme stratejilerinin her birisini üç alt kategoriden oluşan iki ana kategoriye bölmüş; direkt ve dolaylı stratejiler. Direkt stratejiler 1) Bellek Stratejisi, 2) Bilişsel Stratejisi ve 3) Tazminat Stratejisi; Dolaylı stratejiler ise 1) Üstbiliş Stratejisi, 2) Duyuşsal Stratejisi ve 3) Sosyal Stratejilerden ibarettir. Bu araştırma, farklı okullar tarafından kullanılan öğrenme stratejilerinin farklılıkların alanını bulma ve strateji kullanımı ile başarı arasında olan ilişkiyi gösterme amacıyla EFL öğrenciler tarafından kullanılan stratejileri üzerinde yapılmıştır. Ayrıca, bu çalışma dil öğrenmede, okul türü ve başarı düzeyi arasındaki ilişkinin varlığını öğrenmek için yapılmıştır. Başka bir deyişle, bu araştırmaya üç

soruyu yanıtlamaktadır: 1. Devlet, Özel ve SAMPAD okulların öğrencileri kullandıkları öğrenme stratejileri ile ilgili birbirinden farklı mıdır?, 2. Devlet, Özel ve SAMPAD okullarda öğrencilerin başarıları arasında anlamlı bir fark var mıdır?, 3. Devlet, Özel ve SAMPAD okullarda öğrenciler arasında başarının en iyi belirleyicisi olarak herhangi belirli bir öğrenme stratejisi var mı?

Bu amaçla, ilgili anket yanı sıra S-testi Meşhed'in toplam 445 öğrenci arasında dağıtıldı. Bu Araştırmada katılan öğrenciler 17 yüksek okul, beş Devlet (3 tüm kız ve 2 tüm erkek), yedi özel (4 tüm kız ve 3 tüm erkek) ve beş SAMPAD (3 tüm kız ve 2 tüm erkek) birinci sınıf-lise öğrencisinden oluşturmuştur. Yaşları 12 ila 14 yaş arasında değişmekteydi.

İlk önce, Çalışmanın bulguları, farklı okul türlerin öğrencileri tarafından kullanılan stratejiler arasında önemli bir fark olduğunu belirtti. Kisacasi, Bellek, Tezminat, ve Sosyal Stratejilerle ilgili Devlet-Özel ve Devlet-SAMPAD okul arasında anlamlı bir fark olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu farkı daha detayli açıklarsak; Bellek strateji ile ilgili Devlet okulu öğrencilerinin ortalaması, özel ve SAMPAD okul öğrencilerinden daha yüksek olduğu için, devlet okulu öğrencileri, özel ve SAMPAD öğrencilere göre daha fazla bellek stratejisini kullandıklarını ima edilebilir.

Tazminat strateji ise, SAMPAD okul öğrencilerinin ortalaması, özel ve devlet okulu öğrencilerinden daha yüksek olduğu için, SAMPAD okul öğrencileri özel ve devlet okul öğrencilerinden daha fazla tazminat stratejisi kullandıklarını ima edilebilir. Ayrıca, devlet okulu öğrencileri özel okul öğrencilerinden daha fazla tazminat stratejisini kullanıyorlar diye sonuçlandırabiliriz.

Son olarak Sosyal stratejilerde de, Devlet okulu öğrencilerinin ortalaması özel ve SAMPAD okul öğrencilerinden daha yüksek olduğu gibi devlet okulu öğrencileri SAMPAD ve özel öğrencilerinden daha fazla sosyal stratejileri kullandıkları anlaşılmaktadır, gerçi SAMPAD ve özel okul öğrencileri arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır. Diğer stratejiler'de de - Bilişsel Stratejisi, Üstbiliş Stratejisi ve Duyuşsal Stratejisi – üç okul türü arasında hiç bir fark görülmemiştir.

İlaveten, SAMPAD ve özel okulların Devlet okullarına göre, s-test sınavında daha başarılı olduklarını açıklamaktadır. Bu çalışma SAMPAD ve Özel okul öğrencilerin arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığına rağmen, SAMPAD - devlet ve özel - devlet okulları arasında olan farkı anlamlı olduğunu belirlemiştir. Bundan dolayı, SAMPAD okulu öğrencilerini yabancı dil öğrenmekte devlet ve özel okullara göre daha çok başarılı oldukları anlaşılmaktadır. Son olarak, Bellek, Bilişsel, Üstbilişsel, Duyuşsal ve Sosyal stratejiler, Devlet okulunda başarı belirleyicisi olarak bulunmuştur. Ancak, başarı belirleyicisi, SAMPAD okullar için Tazminat ve Sosyal iken, Özel okullarda başarı Tazminat, Üstbilişsel ve Duyuşsal stratejileriydi. Sonuç olarak, öğretmenler, araştırma bulgularına göre, öğrencilerin daha başarılı olması için en iyi öğrenme stratejilerini uygulamaları tavsiye edilir.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

