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ABSTRACT: The present study mainly explores the most and the least frequently used language learning strategies of ELT learners when learning German or French as their L3. Comparing independent samples t-test results and mean scores of the groups, it was investigated whether there is any difference in the use of language learning strategies of both groups. Moreover, the study aimed at finding out whether there is a correlation between the learners’ strategy use and their success. The quantitative results revealed that the participants from both groups employed parallel strategies; compensation strategies emerged as the most frequently used ones whereas affective strategies appeared as the least frequently used ones. Moreover, no positive significant correlation was found between the use of strategies and the participants’ success except for the memory strategies used by learners who were studying French. In addition that negative correlation was found between the learners’ affective strategy use and academic success when learning German. The results were discussed in the light of the interview results.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Individual plurilingualism is one of the most fundamental principles in the field of education to be able to communicate at international level (Bulajeva and Hogan-Brun, 2010). There are various factors to promote individual plurilingualism such as ‘the linguistic heterogeneity of a country or a region, specific social and religious attitudes or the desire to promote national identity’ (Tucker, 1998: 4), international contacts due to moving between countries (Hammarberg, 2009), greater exposure of languages through media (Hammarberg and Williams, 2009), and transculturation (Brady and Shinohara, 2000). With the proposal of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages which aims to achieve the standards of learners in different countries to create a close link between language, culture and the European identity to achieve a common communicative sphere (Council of Europe, 2001), individual plurilingualism and plurilingual competence have come forth as cornerstones for European integration (Breidbach, 2002). However, the Principle Law on Turkish National Education with regard to foreign language teaching aims at only communicating in the target language in addition to developing knowledge and positive attitudes towards other languages and cultures in the process of becoming a member of European Union (Çetintaş, 2009). In Turkey, a second foreign language has been taught either as a compulsory or an elective course from primary school onwards depending on school types as a result of the education reform carried out in 1997/1998 school year. Moreover, students at Turkish universities have opportunity to progress in a foreign
language and mostly prefer learning English 85%, then German 7-8%, and thirdly French 4-5%. On the other hand, they also need to learn a third language to be two jumps ahead of those with one foreign language in severe competition environment in Turkey (Darancık, 2008). As Demirel (1991) suggests, second foreign language has been an elective course in current foreign language teacher education programme since 2006-2007. Integrating a second foreign language into the foreign language teacher education programme enables prospective foreign language teachers to be more aware of the language learning process, as they could be exposed to additional language learning process which they could make use of already possessed language learning strategies.

In that, third language learning is influenced by the process and product of a second language acquisition due to having more strategies and a higher level of metalinguistic strategies (Jessner, 2008; Wei, 2003; Clyne et al., 2004; Cenoz and Jessner, 2000). In the process of a third language learning, cultural background and learners’ individual personality (Tucker, 1998), and linguistic distance either as a facilitator or a code-mixing when learning forms (Cenoz et al., 2001) account for various ways of children’s learning their second or later languages in order to develop language awareness and learning strategies. That is to say, making comparisons across languages, transferring knowledge of language structures, vocabulary and phonetics can both facilitate and hamper L3 learning process. English is typologically a Germanic language but historical events have resulted in a large number of loan words from Latin and Romance languages (mainly French) into English (Ibid). Therefore, people whose L1 or L2 is English might make use of linguistic distance as a facilitator when learning German or French. Learning a third language, particularly in institutional contexts, increases learners’ desire to learn another languages depending on the school’s curricular organization, language learning goals and language teaching methodology and whether the language is a compulsory or a chosen to be learnt (Bono and Stratilaki, 2009; Humphreys and Spratt, 2008; Jean-Claude and Micheal, 2002).

1.1. Language learning strategies

Language learning strategies have been described in general as steps taken by a learner to progress in his/her learning, as tools for active, self-directed involvement in order to develop communicative competence (Oxford, 1990); specific actions employed by a learner during learning (Griffiths, 2003); ‘a conscious technique used by a learner purposely assist the language learning process’ (Grainger, 2005: 328).

Since the late 1970’s, there has been a shift from the teaching methodology to learner characteristics and how the process of language learning is influenced by individual differences including the learners’ strategies, language proficiency, learning styles, aptitudes, attitudes, motivation, cultural and educational background etc. (Jing, 2010; Riazi, 2007). Individual learners’ variations should be taken into consideration when investigating language learning strategies due to having no fixed strategies to be used by all learners but an individual (Bull and Ma, 2001). Some experienced learners can adapt very useful learning strategies by means of which they can speed up the process or lessen the potential frustration of learning a language. Thus, this particular study aims to investigate learning strategies of adult learners who are candidates of foreign language teachers. In addition, individual awareness of their learning preferences and strategies and how they organize and use them efficiently in transferring to new language learning (Psaltou-Joycey, 2008) requires a close investigation. Language learning strategies help students direct their learning and language use (Hong-Nam and Leavell, 2006; Du Bois and Staley, 1997) and develop learner autonomy (Hsiao and Oxford, 2002), as long as these are effective strategies employed to facilitate learning.

Language learning strategies have been investigated in relation to different points in language learning such as different language skill areas (Tsai et al., 2010; Mcmulen, 2009; Santos et al., 2008; Walters, 2007; Phakiti, 2003; Segler et al. 2002), cultural issues (Sung, 2011; Jang and Jimenez, 2011; Psaltou-Joycey, 2008), affective factors (Gao, 2010; Chun-huan, 2010; Deniz, 2010), technology (Bull, 1997), and language proficiency (Park, 2010; Hong- Nam and Leavell, 2006; Anderson, 2005; Griffiths, 2003; Pintrich, 1999, Green and Oxford, 1995).
The findings of the studies above which were conducted to determine whether learners’ language learning strategy use correlates with learners’ language proficiency supported that more strategic learners were more successful than less strategic ones.

Another body of research on strategy use is comparing second language learners’ strategies with multilinguals’. The results revealed that multilinguals internalize grammatical systems in a new language more quickly than learners with one language or two due to having diverse experience of different grammatical forms (Kemp, 2007), wide range of metacognitive abilities possessed by multilinguals could be used as facilitators and potential resources for learning a new language (Moore, 2006), and multilinguals were better than monolinguals in choosing more appropriate strategies according to the language tasks given (Nayak et al., 1990).

1. 2. Aim of the study

This study aimed to explore firstly the most and the least frequently used third language learning strategies of ELT learners when learning German or French as their L3, secondly, whether there is any difference in the use of the third language learning strategies of both groups, and finally whether there is a correlation between learners’ L3 strategy use and their success.

2. METHODOLOGY

2. 1. The context and the participants of the study

This study was conducted with 111 third grade ELT student teachers enrolled in Uludag University Faculty of Education English Language Teaching Department. The participants of the study were already proficient in two languages, Turkish as a native language and English as a first foreign language which is also the language they are going to teach throughout their profession. In the third year of ELT teacher education programme in Turkey, there is a 2 credit elective second foreign language course lasting two academic terms. As this course was an elective course, among those prospective English teachers, 35 participants 7 of whom were male chose French and 76 participants 10 of whom were male chose German as a third language. 10 participants from each group (15 female and 5 male) were administered informal interviews. The participants were all volunteers to be a part of the study and share their ideas.

2. 2. Data collection tools and procedure

Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL): version 7.0 for speakers of other languages learning English which was used by various researchers in different language learning strategy studies (in more than 40 studies including 12 dissertations, Green and Oxford, 1995, p. 264) was administered in this study due to its high validity, reliability and utility results (Anderson, 2005). Based on the Cronbach's alpha, the internal consistency reliability of the SILL used in this study was 0.896 in general; 0, 90 for German and 0, 87 for French in particular. The inventory was adapted by changing only the word “English” into “German or French”. The participants were already at advanced level in English, so the inventory was administered in English rather than translating it into Turkish. The SILL inventory consists of six strategy types such as memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social ones to find out to what extent students use these strategy types (for further information see Oxford, 1990, pp. 18-21). Moreover, the participants’ first term German and French exam results were taken from their instructors to find out whether there is a correlation between learners’ strategy use and their grades. Finally, informal interviews were conducted in order to triangulate the results and to delve into the results obtained from the SILL. All the interviews were conducted by the researcher through tape-recording and in Turkish.

2. 3. Data analysis

The data obtained from the SILL were analyzed by the SPSS programme, mainly through mean reported frequencies of strategy use across all categories to identify the most and the least frequently used strategies in both groups. In order to investigate whether there was a difference in the use of the strategies between the two groups, independent samples t-test was used owing to the fact that the
participants in this study were different in numbers (76 learners with German and 35 learners with French as their L3). Moreover, mean results of both groups were compared based on each strategy category and individual item. Pearson correlation was used to find out whether there is a significant correlation between learners’ language learning strategy use and their success in the course. Finally, content analysis was used to analyze the answers of the interviewees.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Strategy use of learners with German as their L3

The results of the mean scores regarding the strategy categories revealed that the most frequently used strategy category is compensation strategy (mean=3.03), followed by memory strategy (mean=2.94), metacognitive strategy (mean =2.85), social strategy (mean=2.70), and cognitive strategy (mean =2.67). The least frequently used strategy is affective strategy (mean= 2.56).

Among 50 items in the SILL, the researcher decided to present and discuss extreme points, the first and the last five strategies, to compare the most frequently and the least frequently used strategies. The mostly used strategy was from the compensation category, namely, guessing strategy to understand unknown German words (mean= 3.95). Secondly, they thought of the relationships between what they already knew and new things when learning German (mean=3.86). Thirdly, they stated that they paid attention when someone was speaking German (mean= 3.67). Fourth one is from social category that the participants asked the other person to slow down or say it again when they did not understand something in German (mean= 3.67). Finally, they preferred remembering new German words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign (mean=3.57).

The results were not confusing when the data obtained from the interviews were analyzed. Regarding the guessing strategy and thinking of the relationships between known one and new one, among 10 interviewees, most of them (7) stated that they made use of their English knowledge (their L2) to guess and associate the meaning. S3 expressed; ‘I try to compare German with English; there are many similarities between these languages’. Moreover, S7 said; ‘I try to familiarize the words which I learned new with English words, then they remind me the words’ meaning’. Using paying attention when someone is speaking and asking someone to slow down when speaking could be explained by the students’ statements emerging from the interview data: S4 stated; ‘our class is a mixed ability one, there are some students who speak German better than the rest, so when they are speaking, we have to pay attention more and ask for slowing down’; and S9 said something about the methodology of the course; ‘….we have just two hours a week, so we mostly focus on grammar and vocabulary parts in the book by skipping speaking and listening activities’. With regard to the strategy concerning the remembering their location on the page or on the board, the statement of S10 could be explanatory; ‘I don’t have enough time to focus on studying another language, I mainly study for passing the exam. Knowing that the questions will be formed from the book, I try to memorize everything in the book or in my notebook. Keeping the location on the page with its pictures helps me to remember in the exam’. As is seen, language distance, how the language is thought, the time of exposure, and being evaluated by the exams are the reasons for using the most frequently used strategies in this study.

When the last five strategies are considered, the last fifth one was about physical movement that the learners rarely physically acted out new German words (mean =2.17). This result was not surprising when the participants’ ages were taken into account in that all of them were adult university learners. Secondly, they reported that they scarcely wrote notes, messages, letters, or reports in German (mean=1.91). Then, they rarely read for pleasure (mean=1.79), watched German language TV shows, or went to movies (mean=1.63) in German. The least frequently used strategy was diary writing that the participants rarely wrote down their feelings in a language learning diary (mean=1.55).

As the above statements showed, the least frequently used strategies are about using the language for real communication, which could be illuminated by the interview results. S8 explained;
‘We mostly focus on learning grammar rather than speaking or writing; we don’t have authentic tasks to use language communicatively’, and S2 said ‘time is too short to learn a new language and use it in a communicative setting. My learning is mostly at receptive level rather than productive one’. Owing to the fact that the learners were exposed to German in school context might explain the reasons for not using those strategies frequently.

3.2. Strategy use of learners with French as their L3

The mean scores of the frequency of strategy use based on the strategy categories indicated that the most frequently used category is compensation strategy (mean=3.16), followed by memory strategy (mean=3.07), cognitive strategy (mean=2.87), metacognitive strategy (mean=2.83), and social strategy (mean=2.67). The least frequently used one is affective strategy (mean=2.63).

Depending on the individual items, the results revealed that the participants mostly employed the strategy of paying attention when someone is speaking French (mean=3.89). Secondly, they used guessing strategy to understand unknown French words (mean=3.80). Thirdly, they thought of the relationships between what they already knew and new things they learnt in French (mean=3.77). Fourthly, they looked for words in their own language that were similar to new words in French (mean=3.77). The fifth frequently used strategy was relaxation strategy which were used whenever they were afraid of using French (mean=3.77).

The interview results revealed some reasons for the most frequently used strategies. Related to the strategy of paying attention, S6 explained; ‘I have positive attitudes towards French language, particularly the sounding of it, so I generally pay attention when the instructor is speaking in French’. Moreover, they reported that they mostly use English to compare French as S4 stated; ‘I try to find the similar words in French and in English, so it’s easier to learn new words’, and S9 expressed; ‘I try to find similarities between English and French, my first and second foreign language’. Although affective strategies appeared as the last place in the rank of the frequency order, the fifth most frequently used strategy is from affective category, namely relaxation strategy. S1 stated; ‘pronouncing French words is too difficult to feel relaxed, so I always remind myself to be comfortable when speaking’.

Regarding the least five frequently employed strategies, the learners reported that they rarely looked for people they could talk to in French (mean=2.26) and they asked for help from French speakers (mean=2.17). Then, they rarely read for pleasure (mean=2.14), watched TV shows, or went to movies (mean=1.97) in French. The least frequently used strategy was diary writing that the participants rarely wrote down their feelings in a language learning diary (mean=1.43).

As is seen, the least frequently used strategies are about using French in a real setting with native speakers. Most of the interviewees (90%) stated that they do not actively use French in their daily lives or study French except for passing exam. Only S8 expressed her individual endeavor and stated that; ‘I don’t know French very well, I try to play computer games which were prepared for children in French. Their language is very simple and while playing this game, not only I learn new words but also I try to use that game in my assignments as an idea’. In that, the participants were learning French in formal setting mainly by focusing on grammar and vocabulary.

3.3. The comparison of the strategy use of both groups

The learners who were learning German or French as their L3 employed parallel language learning strategies in terms of the individual items as is seen in figure 1.
Figure 1: The Comparison of the Groups’ Language Learning Strategy Use Depending on the Individual Items

With regard to the comparison between the groups’ language learning strategy use, it could be ascertained that using guessing strategy and associating known subjects with new ones were two frequently used strategies for both groups. Reading for pleasure in the target language, watching language TV shows or going to movies spoken in the target language and finally keeping a diary in L3 were reported as the last third strategies for both groups when learning their third language.

Table 1 indicates descriptive statistics of comparison between those learners’ strategy use according to the categories.

Table 1: Independent Samples T-test Results of the Groups’ Strategy Use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Categories</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiction Strategies (A)</td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>56.841</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Strategies (B)</td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td>-.1787</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>66.614</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Strategies (C)</td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td>-.749</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>-.727</td>
<td>61.703</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive Strategies (D)</td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>74.697</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Strategies (E)</td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td>-.473</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>-.458</td>
<td>61.459</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Strategies (F)</td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>62.683</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p > 0.05

As is presented in table 1, the t-test results also revealed no significant difference between the groups’ strategy use according to categories. The reason for using parallel strategies when learning their third language might be explained by having common language learning history (Turkish as L1 and English as L2), which could be supported by the interview results in that most of the interviewees (8 from German group and 7 from French group) stated that they mostly use English when learning their third language.

Table 2 presents the statistical results of both groups with the aim of comparing them in terms of the frequency of strategy use.

Table 2: the Results of the Groups’ Strategy Use with regard to Strategy Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Categories</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory Strategies (A)</td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.9357</td>
<td>.52814</td>
<td>.06058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.0667</td>
<td>.63039</td>
<td>.10655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Strategies (B)</td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.6729</td>
<td>.52815</td>
<td>.06058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.8653</td>
<td>.52425</td>
<td>.08861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Strategies (C)</td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.0504</td>
<td>.67988</td>
<td>.07799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.1571</td>
<td>.73536</td>
<td>.12430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the findings in table 2, compensation strategies were found to be the most frequently used strategies for both groups, which is not surprising when we consider the participants’ formal and exam oriented language learning context in that compensation strategy is the one which helps learners develop grammar and vocabulary. Memory strategies appeared as the secondly most frequently used ones whereas affective strategies were employed to be the least frequently used strategies for both groups. On the other hand, learners followed different order in the use of the other three strategy categories. The order of the strategy use frequency for German learners were respectively compensation, memory, metacognitive, social, cognitive and affective strategies whereas for French learners were compensation, memory, cognitive, metacognitive, social and affective strategies. Although the t-test results revealed no significant difference between the strategy uses of both groups, the descriptive statistics, mainly the mean scores, for the categories in the middle rank indicated noticeable difference.

3.4. Correlation between learners’ L3 strategy use and their success

3.4.1. The results of the group with German as L3

Table 3 indicates that there is no significant positive correlation between the learners’ strategy use when learning German and their success.

Table 3: The Correlation Results between Learners’ L3 Strategy Use and their Success When Learning German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Categories in the SILL</th>
<th>German (N= 75) Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory Strategies (A)</td>
<td>$r = 0.204$, $p &lt; 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Strategies (B)</td>
<td>$r = 0.214$, $p &lt; 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Strategies (C)</td>
<td>$r = 0.131$, $p &lt; 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive Strategies (D)</td>
<td>$r = 0.065$, $p &lt; 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Strategies (E)</td>
<td>$r = -0.057$, $p &gt; 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Strategies</td>
<td>$r = 0.020$, $p &lt; 0.05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there appears a negative correlation between learners’ affective strategies and success. That is to say, the less they use affective strategies, the higher grade they get from German exam.

3.4.2. The results of the group with French as L3

Among six categories of language learning strategies, only the learners’ memory strategies revealed a significant positive correlation between the learners’ strategy use and their success.

Table 4: The Correlation Results between Learners’ L3 Strategy Use and their Success When Learning German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Categories in the SILL</th>
<th>French (N= 35) Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory Strategies (A)</td>
<td>$r = 0.496^{**}$, $p &lt; 0.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Strategies (B)</td>
<td>$r = 0.247$, $p &lt; 0.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Strategies (C)</td>
<td>$r = 0.247$, $p &lt; 0.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive Strategies (D)</td>
<td>$r = 0.061$, $p &lt; 0.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Strategies (E)</td>
<td>$r = 0.087$, $p &lt; 0.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Strategies</td>
<td>$r = 0.202$, $p &lt; 0.01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results presented in table 4, it can be stated that the more learners use memory strategies when learning French, the higher grade they get from that course. Interview results also
support this finding as is seen in the statement of S5: ‘When learning grammar, I gave importance to memorizing the rules and practising them in every situation; it helps me to remember easily in the exam’. Oxford (1990: 38) stated that ‘memory strategies are clearly more effective when the learner simultaneously uses metacognitive strategies, like paying attention, and affective strategies, like reducing anxiety through deep breathing’. The results in 3.1 support the above quotation that the learners studying French used those strategies most frequently.

This study was designed mostly quantitatively in order to find out the strategy use of the participants studying either German or French as their L3. Thus, although the data obtained from informal interviews were valuable to clarify the results emerged from the quantitative results, the findings showing the effect of their L2 rather than their L1 on the use of third language learning strategies were confined to the interview data. Thus, this study signifies the necessity to conduct a further research to investigate the degree of learners’ L1 and/or L2 dominance in the use of their third language learning strategies.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed at investigating third language learning strategies of ELT learners when learning German or French. All of the participants in this study are going to be English teachers, so being aware of the strategies they are using or they need to use becomes more important for them than the other language learners. In that, they are those who are going to teach how to learn a foreign language to their students in addition to teaching language itself. Therefore, to be trained in terms of language learning strategies is the requirements for both language learners (Çalışkan and Sünbül, 2011) to have more positive results and strategic behaviors for the sake of teacher development in that teaching effective learning strategies is closely related to individual teacher characteristics and experiences (Uhl Chamot, 2001). In other words, the more strategies prospective teachers and teachers experience, the better they teach effective language learning strategies to their learners.

Another point emerging from this study is about language teaching methodology which is so efficient to learn a language, to have positive attitudes towards language learning (Humphreys and Spratt, 2008). Çetintaş (2009) attests that the reasons for not teaching a foreign language efficiently in Turkey is employing inefficient teaching methods and having inconsistent language teaching policies. The learners in this study are exposed to their third language (German or English) only in a formal situation just for two hours a week. Learning a language in school contexts revealed some limitations such as insufficient time and exposing to receptive tasks in the form of vocabulary and grammar exercises rather than productive tasks and exercises which aim to develop communicative abilities. Thus, language teachers should integrate the practice of all language skills, at least speaking, to let students use and develop social strategies when learning a language despite limited time. Furthermore, it is not surprising seeing social strategies as less frequently used ones due to the unauthentic input which focuses on forms of a language rather than communication.

The findings of this particular Turkish university case indicated that when learning their third languages, both group of learners employed parallel strategies. The fact that the learners in question were already aware of how they could learn another language, and they were already aware of some universal patterns helped them be autonomous in learning their third language. This finding was in line with Hammarberg and Hammarberg, (2009) and Sercu (2007) who reported that L2 is dominantly used rather than L1 in learning a later language.

As the findings revealed, the learners were high frequency users of the compensation strategies, which is in line with the study of Chun-huan (2010), and less frequency users of affective strategies, which was also found by Sarıçoban and Sarıcaoğlu (2008). Oxford (1990) states that learners get support from compensation strategies to overcome limitations in all four skills and to make use of their own language to obtain clues for better comprehension. However, the context in this study is related to third language learning strategies which are also affected by learners’ first foreign language. In their
answers throughout the interviews, most of the learners reported that they mainly made use of English when learning their third language, which indicates that language learning strategies are transferable and the strategies developed when learning a first foreign language have valuable contribution to learn a later one.

Affective strategies, the least frequently used ones in this study, refer to emotions, attitudes, motivations, and values (Oxford, 1990: 140) and the learners in the study did not feel necessity to gain control over these factors through using those strategies. The limited time which constrains students to be involved in the learning process deeply might be the reason for having low frequency in the use of those strategies. As Badea (2009) emphasized, young adults or adults learning a second/third language are already aware of the mainstream structure of every language due to the universal characteristics of human language. Therefore, the learners in this study might not have felt negative emotions or attitudes to consider those strategies consciously.

Furthermore, no significant correlation was found between learners’ strategy use and their success as opposed to the results obtained by Park, 2010; Hong- Nam and Leavell, 2006; Griffiths, 2003; Green and Oxford, 1995) except for memory strategies for French group, which could be explained by the fact that French and English had a lot of shared words to be memorized as the learners expressed in the interviews. On the other hand, negative correlation between the use of affective strategies and learners’ academic success when learning German, which was also reported by Sarıçoban and Sarıcaoğlu (2008) was interesting.

When learning a new language, a better understanding of the extent of the use of learning strategies is so crucial that language learners should be aware of their own strategies to get the highest benefit from language learning process. If we really expect our learners to have plurilingual competence in Turkey, every individual, particularly a language teacher, should understand how it is important to learn more than one foreign language and to develop effective language learning strategies in learning those languages.

Therefore, in an effort to have plurilingual competence, elective second foreign language course hour should be increased by redesigning its methodology in the way that it should integrate all components of language learning with the practice of four skills rather than only grammar and vocabulary and in the way that learners could employ all the strategies they already possess as a result of their first foreign language process.
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**GENİŞ ÖZET**

Eğitim alanındaki en temel ilkelardan biri olan biyresel çok dillilik, ortak iletişim alanı oluşturmada dil, kültür ve kimlik birleşimini sağlaymayı amaçlayan Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Başvuru Metni önerisinde ortaya çıkmıştır (Council of Europe, 2001). Türkiye’de çok dillilik, etkili dil öğretim yöntemlerine mümkün olabilir (Jean-Claude and Micheal, 2002) ve öğrencilerin motivasyonları eğitim bağlamında öğrenilecek dilin zorunlu veya seçilebilir olmasına göre etkilenmektedir (Humphreys ve Spratt, 2008).


Dil öğrenme stratejileriyle ilgili birçok çalışma bulunmaktadır, çünkü 1970’ten sonra eğitim alanındaki çalışmalar, öğretim yöntemlerinden, kişilerde stratejilerin de bulunduğu öğrenci özelliklerine ve biyresel farklılıklarla kapatma. Bu çalışmalar genel olarak, strateji kullanımının farklı dil öğrenme becerileriyle, kültürler arası farklarla, duygusal faktörlere, teknoloji ve öğrenci başarı ve ilgili ilgili olandardaki sonuçları, öğrenci başarı ve strateji kullanımı.
arasında pozitif bir ilişki olduğunu ve birden fazla yabancı dil bilenlerin tek dillerine göre verilen dil ödevlerine yönelik olarak daha uygun stratejiler seçtiğini göstermişlerdir.

Ücüncü bir dil öğrenilmesi süreci, öğrenciler daha fazla stratejiye sahip olduklarını için ikinci dili öğrenme süreci ve sonucundan etkilenmektedir. İngilizce tipolojik olarak germen dil ailesi içinde diller arasında pozitif bir ilişki olduğunu ve birden fazla yabancı dil bilenlerin tek dillerine göre verilen dil ödevlerine yönelik olarak daha uygun stratejiler seçtiğini göstermişlerdir. Almanca ve Fransızca öğrenenlerin ikinci dilleri öğrenirken bir fark olup olmadığını da incelenmiştir.

Bu çalışma, üçüncü dil olarak Almanca ya da Fransızca öğrenen öğrencilerin stratejilerinin ders saatlerini arttırma ve buna paralel olarak öğrencilerin dil öğrenme süreçlerinde ve akademik başarılarının de bir ilişki olup olmadığını incelemek için birinci dönem Almanca ve Fransızca notları değerlendirilmiştir. Bu çalışma, üçüncü bir dil öğrenilmesi süreci, öğrenciler daha fazla stratejiye sahip olduklarını için ikinci dili öğrenme süreci ve sonucundan etkilenmektedir. İngilizce tipolojik olarak germen dil ailesi içinde diller arasında pozitif bir ilişki olduğunu ve birden fazla yabancı dil bilenlerin tek dillerine göre verilen dil ödevlerine yönelik olarak daha uygun stratejiler seçtiğini göstermişlerdir. Almanca ve Fransızca öğrenenlerin ikinci dilleri öğrenirken bir fark olup olmadığını da incelenmiştir.

Çalışmaya 111 Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngiliz Dili Edebiyatı Öğrencileri katılmıştır. İkinci yabancı dil dersi seçilmiş olduğunda 65 kişi Almanca ve 36 kişi de Fransızca'yı üçüncü dil olarak öğrenmeyi seçmiştir.

Çalışmada strateji kullanımını ortaya çekmeyi için, geçerliliği ve güvenceliği kanıtlanmış ve birçok tez ve araştırmada kullanılmış olan Oxford'un (1990) İngilizce öğrenen ve diğer dillerde konuşanlar için geliştirildiği Dil Öğrenici için strateji Envanterini kullanmıştır. Bu çalışmada kullanılan strateji envanterinin içsel geçerliliği Cronbach alfa değeri, genel olarak 0,896; Almanca için 0,90 ve Fransızca için ise 0,87'dir. Hafıza, bilişsel, telafi, biliş ötesi, duyuusal ve sosyal stratejilerden oluşan bu envanter, katılımcıların İngilizcési ileri düzeyde olduğu için çevirmenden ve sadece İngilizce yerine Almanca ya da Fransızca yaparak uygulandığı. Katılımcıların strateji kullanımları ve akademik başarılar arasındaki ilişki olarak bilimsel bir analizde kullanılmaktır.

Veriler SPSS programı kullanılarak analiz edildi ve bağımsız gruplar t-testi ve ortalama değerleri göz önünde bulunduruldu. Çalışmada üçüncü dil olarak Almanca ve Fransızca öğrenen öğrencilerin strateji kullanımlarında fark olup olmadığını araştırılmıştır. Almanca ve Fransızca öğrenenlerin ikinci dilleri öğrenirken bir fark olup olmadığını da incelemek için birinci dönem Almanca ve Fransızca notları değerlendirilmiştir. En son olarak, resmi olan mülakat sonuçları nicel kısımdan çıkan sonuçları yorumlamak için kullanıldı.

Sonuçlar göz önünde alındığında, iki grup öğrencinin üçüncü dil öğrenme stratejileri arasında t-test sonuçuna göre anlamalı bir fark olduğu görüldü, fakat ortalama değerler arasında incelendiğinde strateji kullanımlarının dersler arasında fark olup olmadığını daha iyi anlamak için birinci dönem Almanca ve Fransızca notları değerlendirilmiştir. Almanca ve Fransızca öğrenenlerin ikinci dilleri öğrenirken bir fark olup olmadığını da incelemek için birinci dönem Almanca ve Fransızca notları değerlendirilmiştir. En son olarak, resmi olan mülakat sonuçları nicel kısımdan çıkan sonuçları yorumlamak için kullanıldı.

Sonuçlar göz önünde alındığında, iki grup öğrencinin üçüncü dil öğrenme stratejileri arasında t-test sonuçuna göre anlamalı bir fark olduğu görüldü, fakat ortalama değerler arasında incelendiğinde strateji kullanımlarının dersler arasında fark olup olmadığını daha iyi anlamak için birinci dönem Almanca ve Fransızca notları değerlendirilmiştir. Almanca ve Fransızca öğrenenlerin ikinci dilleri öğrenirken bir fark olup olmadığını da incelemek için birinci dönem Almanca ve Fransızca notları değerlendirilmiştir. En son olarak, resmi olan mülakat sonuçları nicel kısımdan çıkan sonuçları yorumlamak için kullanıldı.

Çalışmada strateji kullanımını ortaya çıkarmak için, geçerliliği ve güvenceliği kanıtlanmış ve birçok tez ve araştırmada kullanılmış olan Oxford’un (1990) İngilizce öğrenen ve diğer dillerde konuşanlar için geliştirildiği Dil Öğrenici için strateji Envanterini kullanmıştır. Bu çalışmada kullanılan strateji envanterinin içsel geçerliliği Cronbach alfa değeri, genel olarak 0,896; Almanca için 0,90 ve Fransızca için ise 0,87'dir. Hafıza, bilişsel, telafi, biliş ötesi, duyuusal ve sosyal stratejilerden oluşan bu envanter, katılımcıların İngilizcési ileri düzeyde olduğu için çevirmenden ve sadece İngilizce yerine Almanca ya da Fransızca yaparak uygulandığı. Katılımcıların strateji kullanımları ve akademik başarılar arasındaki ilişki olarak bilimsel bir analizde kullanılmaktır.

Veriler SPSS programı kullanılarak analiz edildi ve bağımsız gruplar t-testi ve ortalama değerleri göz önünde bulunduruldu. Çalışmada üçüncü dil olarak Almanca ve Fransızca öğrenen öğrencilerin strateji kullanımlarında fark olup olmadığını araştırılmıştır. Almanca ve Fransızca öğrenenlerin ikinci dilleri öğrenirken bir fark olup olmadığını da incelemek için birinci dönem Almanca ve Fransızca notları değerlendirilmiştir. En son olarak, resmi olan mülakat sonuçları nicel kısımdan çıkan sonuçları yorumlamak için kullanıldı.

Sonuçlar göz önüne alındığında, iki grup öğrencinin üçüncü dil öğrenme stratejileri arasında t-test sonuçuna göre anlamalı bir fark olduğu görüldü, fakat ortalama değerler arasında incelendiğinde strateji kullanımlarının dersler arasında fark olup olmadığını daha iyi anlamak için birinci dönem Almanca ve Fransızca notları değerlendirilmiştir. Almanca ve Fransızca öğrenenlerin ikinci dilleri öğrenirken bir fark olup olmadığını da incelemek için birinci dönem Almanca ve Fransızca notları değerlendirilmiştir. En son olarak, resmi olan mülakat sonuçları nicel kısımdan çıkan sonuçları yorumlamak için kullanıldı.
iki sonuç hariç bir ilişki olmadığını göstermektedir. Fransızca öğrenen öğrencilerin hafıza stratejileri kullanımı ve akademik başarıları arasında pozitif bir ilişki görüürken, Almanca öğrenen öğrencilerin duyuşal strateji kullanımlarıyla akademik başarılar arasında negatif bir ilişki görülmüştür. Fransızca ve İngilizce arasında birçok ortak kelime olduğunu göz önünde bulundurursak, hafıza stratejileri ve akademik başarı arasındaki pozitif ilişkiyi anlamak mümkündür, fakat duyuşsal stratejilerin Almanca öğrenirken başarıyı olumsuz etkilemesi yeni bir çalışma yapmayı gerektirmektedir.

Sonuç olarak, dil öğrenen öğrenciler ve onların üzerinde etkiye sahip olabilecek yabancı dil öğretmenler ve öğretecek olan öğretmen adayları bir ya da daha fazla dilin öğrenilmesinin önemini kavramalı ve bu dilleri öğrenme süreçinde etkili olabilecek stratejilerle ilgili farkındalıklarını artırmalıdır. Bunun için ikinci dil veya üçüncü dil öğretme yöntemleri öğrencilerin daha fazla stratejiyi kullanmalara yönelik olarak düzenlenmelidir.
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