



Available online at www.jlls.org

JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES

ISSN: 1305-578X

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 16(1), 316-332; 2020

Turkish as a foreign language learners' use of vocabulary learning strategies

Gökçen Göçen^a * 

^a *Fatih Sultan Mehmet Vakaf University, İstanbul, Turkey*

APA Citation:

Göçen, G. (2020). Turkish as a foreign language learners' use of vocabulary learning strategies. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(1), 316-332. Doi: 10.17263/jlls.712838

Submission Date: 19/01/2020

Acceptance Date: 17/03/2020

Abstract

Learning a foreign language includes learning vocabulary together with grammar rules and using language skills by means of them. Words are presented to learners through teachers and coursebooks in educational processes. Yet, it is not possible to teach all the words through lessons, so learners are expected to become independent vocabulary learners. Learners can achieve this when they know and use the vocabulary learning strategies. To be able to support them in becoming independent vocabulary learners, teachers need to determine their level of strategy use and which strategies they use and examine if these differ according to different variables. For this reason, this study aims to determine the level of Turkish as a foreign language (TFL) learners' use of vocabulary learning strategies. For this purpose, the data in this study designed by using survey model were collected from 169 students that learn TFL at A1, A2, B1, B2, and C1 levels. "Foreign Language Vocabulary Learning Strategies Scale" developed by Kocaman and Kızılkaya Cumaoğlu (2014) was used as data collection tool. Frequencies, arithmetic means, and standard deviations were calculated, and t-test, ANOVA, and LSD tests were used for data analysis. As a result, the vocabulary learning strategies were identified and the level of TFL learners' strategy use was determined. The data were tested to check if there were any statistically significant differences among variables: gender, language level, region, ancestry, and native language.

© 2020 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: teaching Turkish; teaching Turkish as a foreign language; vocabulary; teaching vocabulary; vocabulary learning strategies

1. Introduction

Words are the smallest units that bear a meaning, and they are indicators of emotions and thoughts to be expressed (Özbay & Melanlioğlu, 2008; Yıldız, Okur, Ari, & Yılmaz, 2008). These indicators have an essential function in understanding what is said and written, and conveying emotions and thoughts to others (Çetinkaya, 2005). Words contribute to accurate, effective, and smooth language use,

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +90-216-521-8100
E-mail address: gokcengocen@gmail.com

understanding what is read and listened precisely, and expressing emotions and thoughts aloud and clear (Güneş, 2013).

Richness in vocabulary influences learners in understanding their environment, establishing communication with the people around them, making sense of texts and what they read, improving their language and thinking skills, having competency in language use and achieving social and academic success.

A key element of comprehension and narrative skills is vocabulary in language education (Göçen & Okur, 2015), so it is important to learn vocabulary. Vocabulary knowledge is at the heart of language competency, and it forms the base for learners' speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills (Doğan, 2014; Richards & Renandya, 2002). The fact that learners acquire reading, writing, listening and speaking skills and use these skills actively is closely related to the words that they have learned (Karatay, 2007). This is because learners can use their language skills only through their vocabulary (Özbay, Büyükkiz, & Uyar, 2011). Vocabulary level of learners directly affects their comprehension and narrative skill (Dilidüzgün, 2014; Günay, 2007; Karatay, 2007; Kara & Ünal, 2019). In this context, it is a prerequisite for the learners to learn words and expand their vocabulary (Göçer, 2010). The ultimate aim of language teaching process—which is using language skills effectively—cannot be achieved without learning the language rules and vocabulary required at a certain age, and level and reaching a certain level of competence in these matters (Memiş, 2019).

The importance of vocabulary becomes more apparent when it comes to teaching a language as a foreign or second language. One of the essential elements of foreign language education and competence in a foreign language is the vocabulary (Çelikkaya, 2012; Tanyer & Öztürk, 2014). As Thornbury (2002) stated, words play an important role in language teaching for the reason that language is built upon words. According to Wilkins (1972), while little can be conveyed without grammar knowledge, nothing can be conveyed without words. Vocabulary—an important constituent of foreign language teaching—is regarded as the base for communicative competence and foreign language acquisition, and vocabulary deficiencies pose obstacles for language learning (Susanto, 2017). Since the lack of vocabulary knowledge would hinder effective communication, vocabulary knowledge is regarded as a key element for foreign language learners (Alqahtani, 2015). In this sense, foreign language learning can be considered as closely related to vocabulary (Nassaji, 2006). The facts that vocabulary directly contributes to a learner in different areas and, as stated by Özdemir (2017), vocabulary teaching is directly related to all language skills make vocabulary teaching important in foreign language teaching.

According to Böyükbaş (2013), teaching and enhancing word knowledge have multi-dimensions and require a long time since it is possible to merely conceptualize the words if seen for the first time and it is possible to forget the word(s) unless they are transferred to long-term memory. Learners learn words explicitly or incidentally inside or outside school in language teaching process. Besides, learners also learn words by using different strategies as independent learners.

Learners gain vocabulary knowledge with the help of teachers, graded readers and coursebooks. However, it is not possible to teach all target vocabulary items within the time given for the teaching practices (Sokmen, 1997). Therefore, learners are required to control their own vocabulary learning (Schmitt, 2000). According to Biçer and Polatcan (2015), vocabulary learning strategies help learners gain the expected level of vocabulary knowledge. Regardless of what a teacher does or what a coursebook reads, learners eventually learn by themselves. If learners are aware how they learn best, then they do learn more (Nation, 2000). "The use of vocabulary learning strategies is crucial for learners to help them take control of their own learning." (Kırmızı & Topcu, 2014, p. 218). In this sense, it is important and necessary for learners to be aware of vocabulary learning strategies. According to Tok and Yığın (2014), learners are required to become aware of vocabulary learning strategies and learn

words by choosing the most suitable vocabulary learning strategies. “The need to create an effective teaching which considers students’ vocabulary learning strategies preference is critical as well as to give more attention and emphasize on students’ vocabulary knowledge development.” (Noprianto & Purnawarman, 2019, p. 273).

There are various studies in the literature that are focused on determining vocabulary learning strategies of foreign language learners (Bekleyen, 2005; Çelik & Toptaş, 2010; Çelikkaya, 2012; Engin, Dikbayır, & Genç, 2017; Gömleksiz, 2013; Hismanoğlu & Turan, 2019; Kırmızı, 2014; Kırmızı & Topcu, 2014; Noprianto & Purnawarman, 2019; Tanyer & Ozturk, 2014). There are also studies that examine strategy use of TFL learners in terms of language learning strategies (Alyılmaz & Şengül, 2017; Akin & Çetin, 2016; Barut, 2015; Boylu, 2015; Bölükbaş, 2013; Şengül, 2012; Varışoğlu, 2017). In the meantime, it was also found that there are studies on determining vocabulary learning strategies that learners of Turkish as a foreign/second language use (Baskın, İşcan, Karagöz, & Birol, 2017; Biçer & Polatcan, 2015; Demirekin, 2017; Kocaman, Yıldız, & Kamaz, 2018; Memiş, 2018; Syed, 2014; Tok & Yığın, 2014).

The studies on determining vocabulary learning strategies that are used by TFL learners tend to focus on the following matters: Tok and Yığın (2014) examined the vocabulary learning strategies of 51 students that learn TFL at B2 level. This descriptive study relies on learners’ opinions as the data. Syed (2014) intended to determine the vocabulary learning strategies of 104 undergraduates learning TFL in India and found Memory Strategies as the most frequently used one. Biçer and Polatcan (2015) studied if the vocabulary learning strategies used by 50 learners that learn TFL at B1, B2, and C1 levels significantly differ according to language levels. This study concluded that Cognitive Strategies were the least frequently used ones. They also found out that learners at C1 had the lowest average strategy use. Baskın, İşcan, Karagöz and Birol’s (2017) study focusing on vocabulary learning strategies used by 22 students learning TFL at A1 level found that strategy use of males was higher. However, this study failed to find any statistical difference between female and male TFL learners’ strategy use. Demirekin (2017) intended to determine vocabulary and language learning strategies used by TFL learners at B1, B2, and C1 levels and whether these strategies significantly differ according to gender, age, institution, course level, country, language family of the native language, and other foreign languages spoken. This study concluded that learners used the strategies with medium frequency. While Affective, Memory, Social, Metacognitive, Cognitive and Compensation Strategies were found to be the most frequently used ones in the study, Cognitive Strategies were concluded as the least frequently used one. This study found that females’ use of Cognitive Strategies and Social Strategies were significantly higher than that of males. In addition, no significant difference was found among B1, B2, and C1 levels for the strategy use of TFL learners. This study is the only one that included learners’ home countries as a variable. Participants’ ($n = 505$) level of vocabulary learning strategy use was identified in accordance with their countries ($n = 82$). Since 89% of these countries had only less than 10 representatives, it is hard to generalize the findings of this study failed. Moreover, no statistical tests were run to check significant difference between level of strategy use and country. Kocaman, Yıldız and Kamaz (2018) intended to determine the vocabulary learning strategies that are used by 155 students that learn Turkish as a second language at A1, A2, and B2 levels and whether the vocabulary learning strategies of the students differ significantly according to gender and language level. This study found Memory Strategies as the most frequently used one. This study found that strategy use of males was higher, but this study failed to find any statistical difference between females and males TFL learners’ strategy use. Memiş (2018) carried out a study on the vocabulary learning strategies of 182 students that learn Turkish as a foreign and second language at A1, A2, B1, and B2 levels. The study aimed to determine and compare the vocabulary learning strategies of learners of Turkish in Turkey and abroad and analyze the effect of age, gender, language level, and other foreign languages on these strategies.

This study concluded that learners used the strategies with medium frequency. Memory Strategies were found to be the most frequently used one. Strategy use of females was reported as higher than that of males. However, this study failed to find any statistical difference between females and males TFL learners' strategy use. The study also concluded that learners use the strategies with high and medium frequency at A1 and A2, and B1 and B2 levels, respectively. A1 level learners' use of the strategies was the highest whereas that of B2 level was the lowest. Level of strategy use regularly decreased from A1 to B2 level. It was also found out that learners at A1 and A2 levels used Memory Strategies with high frequency while they used Compensation Strategies least frequently. Strategy use of TFL learners at the levels of A1, A2, B1, B2 were analyzed and significant differences between A1 and B1, B2 levels as well as between A2 and B2 levels were found.

In these studies, samples were frequently chosen from learners of Turkish at B1 and B2 levels in determination of the vocabulary learning strategies that are used by the learners of Turkish as a foreign/second language. In addition, studies often attempted to determine which vocabulary learning strategies are used by the learners and investigated if the vocabulary learning strategies differ according to language level. On the other hand, none of these studies examined a sample group covering all of the A1, A2, B1, B2, and C1 levels. However, it is important to determine the learners' level of learning strategy use and which strategies are used as well as examining the differences among language levels in order to help learners. In addition, although these studies examine if the vocabulary learning strategies used by learners of Turkish significantly differ according to language level, a few of the studies held "gender" as a variable. Only one study held country and language family as variables, but these variables were examined for the vocabulary learning strategies that are used by learners of Turkish at B1 and above within the study scope. Yet, the vocabulary learning strategies of the learners of Turkish at different language levels may differ according to many variables. For this reason, the effects of different variables on the vocabulary learning strategies that are used by the learners of Turkish at each language level need to be studied.

For this reason, this study formed a sample group by including students from all language levels (A1, A2, B1, B2, and C1) in determination of the vocabulary learning strategies used by TFL learners and examined if the vocabulary learning strategies significantly differ according to gender, language level, region, ancestry, and native language. Thus, the vocabulary learning strategies used by learners at all language levels can be determined and whether these strategies differ according to various variables can be examined.

1.1. Literature review

Vocabulary learning strategies can be defined as study habits of students in foreign language vocabulary based on the definition by Sanaoui (1995) (Öztürk, 2006). Learners try to learn new words by using a vocabulary learning strategy that suits them (Biçer & Polatcan, 2015). Strategies may help both in discovering the meaning of and conceptualizing a new word when learners encounter the word (DeCarrico, 2001). In other words, vocabulary learning strategy can be defined as applications of students in the process of learning a new word or conceptualizing the previously learned words (Tok & Yığın, 2014).

The strategies that learners use in vocabulary learning process are classified differently by various researchers. Williams (as cited in Nation, 2000) mentioned five strategies that can be employed to guess the meaning of new words from in a text. These are guessing from the context, detecting lexical similarities, detaching nominal compounds, looking for synonyms, and analysis of words.

Oxford (1990) divided language learning strategies that also include vocabulary learning strategies into two main categories as "Direct Strategies" and "Indirect Strategies". Direct Strategies include the

strategies in the following areas: Memory Strategies, Cognitive Strategies, and Compensation Strategies. Indirect Strategies, on the other hand, include the strategies in the following areas: Metacognitive Strategies, Affective Strategies, Social Strategies. Accordingly, “when sub-groups are analyzed, it is seen that all strategies, no matter whether they are direct or indirect, interact with each other.” (Bölükbaş, 2013, p. 57).

Hatch and Brown (1995) suggested a model to learn new words consisting of five steps: “Encountering new words”, “Getting the word form”, “Getting a clear image”, “Learning the meaning of the word”, and “Using the word”. These steps are renamed and grouped into 5R processes by Shen (2003): “Receiving, recognizing, retaining, retrieving, and recycling in four language skills.”. Gu and Johnson (1996, p. 654) listed “second language (L2) vocabulary learning strategies as metacognitive, cognitive, memory and activation strategies”. Alqahtani (as cited in Schmitt & McCarthy, 1997) proposed “strategies to learn vocabulary as follows: (1) inferring from context, (2) using word parts and mnemonic techniques to recall words, and (3) using word cards to recall foreign language-first language word pairs.”

Schmitt (2000, pp. 135-136) categorized the list of vocabulary learning strategies in two ways: The list initially is classified into two major groups: (1) strategies necessary to discover the meaning of a word at first sight, and (2) those useful for recalling the vocabulary item after it has been introduced. Second, the strategies are then divided into five parts. The first one is called Determination strategies (DET) that refer to the ones used by someone when they see a new word’s meaning without recourse to another person’s expertise. Social strategies (SOC) utilize interaction with others to enhance language learning. Memory strategies (MEM) are about making connections with the target words and those that have already been learnt. Cognitive strategies (COG) show the common function of “manipulation or transformation of the target language by the learner” (Oxford, 1990, p. 43). These strategies resemble the memory strategies but are not closely related to manipulative mental processing; they involve repetition and mechanical exercises to study new words. Finally, Metacognitive strategies (MET) require learners to be aware of their learning process and to make decisions about designing, observing, or evaluating the optimum ways of studying.

Nation (2000, p. 353) presented a table for general strategies in vocabulary learning and type of strategies as follows: 1. Planning: deciding on the things to be focused on and when to focus on them (selecting words, selecting the aspects of vocabulary knowledge, selecting strategies, planning repetition); 2. Sources: finding information about word (analysis of the word, using context, referring to a source in L1 or L2, using parallels in L1 and L2); 3. Processes: building knowledge (noticing, retrieving, producing).

Gu (2003) classified vocabulary learning strategies in a second language as follows: Cognitive, metacognitive, memory, activation strategies.

Karadağ (2013) classified the strategies that learners can use in vocabulary learning under 3 main groups and also divided these groups into subgroups as: 1. The strategies to be used to find out the meaning of an unknown word (a. referring to the context of the word, b. looking for the word in another statement, sentence and text, c. Making use of morphology awareness, d. Guessing, e. Using dictionary); 2. The strategies that can be used to make sure of the meaning of a word and to expand vocabulary (a. Producing context, b. Intertextual reading, c. Creating a vocabulary notebook/glossary, d. Drawing up a concept map); 3. The strategies to be used to learn a new word or a concept (a. Acquiring language awareness, b. Being open to communication, c. Forming listening and reading habits).

In general, although the aforementioned classifications vary a bit by the strategies they contain, all of them present a list of commonly useable vocabulary learning strategies. Teachers are not able to spend time on each word in the class. Therefore, students can handle these words by themselves if they are

equipped with a series of strategies specified in the taxonomies; they can consequently learn a lot of words in the target language (Ghazal, 2007).

Learners need guidance on better ways of learning words. Teaching students how to use vocabulary learning strategies also helps them develop their own learning style. According to Okur (2019), teachers' awareness of vocabulary learning strategies and learners' awareness of these strategies help teachers teach and learners learn words quickly and permanently. Graves (as cited in Sokmen, 1997) also noted that learners should be guided for developing personal vocabulary acquisition plans as most of the learning takes place outside classroom. Evaluating which strategies work for learners is a way of helping them on this matter. For instance, a questionnaire that is prepared for this purpose may comprise the following questions:

- Do I learn words more easily when I do speaking activities with my classmates?
- Do I have any problems in making sense of prefixes and suffixes of words? Do I like learning the roots of words?
- Is it more beneficial for me to prepare and collect vocabulary cards or building a vocabulary list?
- Do games contribute to my learning process?
- Do I remember words more easily when I illustrate them?

Besides, it is also important for learners to become aware of the strategies that are specific to the target language. For example, given teaching TFL, as Tok and Yığın (2014) stated, language-specific cases arise in vocabulary teaching or learning: In Turkish, it is possible to correlate a word to another based on their roots. This characteristic is quite useful and important for learners to understand and memorize new words easily when they encounter them while learning TFL. In addition, Turkish is an agglutinative language, so it is highly open to deriving new words and new uses. It is essential for learners to become aware of these characteristics.

Learners need to be aware of the vocabulary learning strategies and decide on the ones suitable for their needs so that they will become independent vocabulary learners. Teachers should be guiding learners in this process. Determining the vocabulary learning strategies of learners, encouraging and teaching them to use these strategies are influential in improving their success in language (Bıcıç & Polatcan, 2015). Studies reveal that there is a significant relation between learners' level of strategy use and their success in vocabulary (Bölükbaş, 2013). Besides, teachers also need to determine the vocabulary learning strategies that the learners use, and then improve their use in order to help them become independent vocabulary learners. "Studying vocabulary learning strategies is a study which focuses more on students themselves" (Hamzah, Kafipour, & Abdullah, 2009, p. 40).

1.2. Research questions

This study intends to determine TFL learners' level of vocabulary learning strategy use based on the research question "What is TFL learners' level of vocabulary learning strategy use?". To this end, the following questions are intended to be answered:

1. Which vocabulary learning strategies do TFL learners use?
2. Do the vocabulary learning strategies that TFL learners use significantly differ by *gender*?
3. Do the vocabulary learning strategies that TFL learners use significantly differ by *language level*?
4. Do the vocabulary learning strategies that TFL learners use significantly differ by *region*?

5. Do the vocabulary learning strategies that TFL learners use significantly differ by *ancestry*?
6. Do the vocabulary learning strategies that TFL learners use significantly differ by *native language*?

This study was carried out based on different variables and different sample groups within the scope of all language levels, and it will help educators guiding learners in using vocabulary learning strategies depending on the characteristics of the target group. In addition, the study data are also considered to be helpful for teachers of TFL to teach words effectively and permanently.

2. Method

This survey study aims to find out to what extent do the TFL learners use vocabulary learning strategies. Such studies intend to describe a situation from the past or present as it is (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2016; Karasar, 2012).

2.1. Participants

The sample includes TFL learners studying at Turkish Language Centres at public and organizational universities located in Istanbul and Sakarya provinces. The following table shows the details of the sample including their gender and language level:

Table 1. The distribution of the sample by language level and gender

Level	Female	Male	Total
A1	21	11	32
A2	22	18	40
B1	37	13	50
B2	17	14	31
C1	10	6	16
Total	107	62	169

As seen in Table 1, 107 of the sample are females, and 62 are males. The numbers of learners studying TFL at A1, A2, B1, B2 and C1 levels are 32, 40, 50, 31, and 16, respectively. The following table shows where the learners are from:

Table 2. Distribution of the sample by countries

Country	f
China	31
Syria	30
Palestine	18
Afghanistan	12
Kazakhstan	9
Iran	6
Yemen	6
Algeria	5

Country	<i>f</i>
Jordan	4
Iraq	3
Egypt	3
Uzbekistan	3
Somali	3
Turkmenistan	3
Azerbaijan	2
Indonesia	2
Morocco	2
Libya	2
Lebanon	2
Saudi Arabia	2
Tunisia	2
Australia	1
Bosnia Herzegovina	1
Burkina Faso	1
Eastern Turkestan	1
Ethiopia	1
Georgia	1
India	1
Japan	1
Kyrgyzstan	1
Kosovo	1
Macedonia	1
Moldova	1
Mauritius	1
Norway	1
Pakistan	1
Serbia	1
Sudan	1
Tatarstan	1
Thailand	1
Total	169

According to Table 2, majority of the learners in the sample has come from China, Syria, Palestine, Afghanistan and Kazakhstan. The distribution of the sample by the regions that their countries belong to is presented in the table below:

Table 3. The distribution of the sample by region

Region	<i>f</i>
Middle East	65
East Asia	32
Central Asia	29
Southern Asia	11
North Africa	11
Other	6
East Africa	6
West Asia	5
Balkans	4
Total	169

According to Table 3, most of the learners have come from countries located in Middle East, East Asia, and Central Asia. The distribution of the sample by ancestry is presented in the table below:

Table 4. Distribution of the sample by ancestry

Ancestry	<i>f</i>
Foreign	151
Turkic	18
Total	169

Table 4 reveals that a larger portion of the sample are of foreign ancestry. The distribution of the sample by native language is listed in the following table:

Table 5. The distribution of the sample by native language

Native Language	<i>f</i>
Arabic	83
Chinese	31
Other	31
Turkic	18
Persian	6
Total	169

As Table 5 reveals, most of the learners in the sample speak Arabic as their native languages.

2.2. Instrument

The scale produced by Kocaman and Kızılkaya Cumaoğlu (2014) and named “Foreign Language Vocabulary Learning Strategy Scale (FLVLSS)” was used for data collection. This scale was built upon the scale named “The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)” developed by Oxford (1990). The data collection tool —FLVLSS— consists of 3 items and the following 6 sub-scales: Memory Strategies, Cognitive Strategies, Compensatory Strategies, Metacognitive Strategies,

Affective Strategies, and Social Strategies. It is a 5-point Likert scale. Reliability of the scale was tested using Cronbach's alpha coefficient: 0.89. the minimum and maximum possible scores on the test are 32 and 160, respectively. "To assess the frequency of strategy use, the mean score of each subscale is computed by dividing the sum of each sub-scale by the number of items in the relevant sub-scale. This procedure gives three levels of frequency: The range of 1.0 to 2.4 indicates a *low*-frequency strategy use, 2.5 to 3.4 indicates a *medium* frequency, and 3.5 to 5.0 indicates a *high* frequency." (Kocaman & Kızılkaya Cumaoğlu, 2014).

2.3. Data collection procedures

The data were collected between October 2019 and November 2019. The scale selected as the data collection tool was distributed to the learners and the data collection process was finalized when all learners completed filling in the scale. While collecting data, relevant ethical rules have been followed. On the other hand, since the data for this study was collected in 2019, Ethics Committee approval was not sought.

2.4. Data analysis

The collected data were first converted into digital format. The data were analyzed using SPSS 21.0 software.

First, skewness and kurtosis measures were calculated to check the normal distribution of the data. Skewness and Kurtosis values are divided by their standard error values and the distribution regarded as normal if the results are between ± 1.96 (Can, 2017). The calculated measures indicated normal distribution. Then, in order to make sure the data were normally distributed, Shapiro-Wilk test of normality was used. This normality test is used when the sample size is less than 50 ($n < 50$). If the p value calculated by the test is smaller than .05, then it is accepted that the data is normally distributed (Büyüköztürk, 2007). Therefore, considering the factors of gender, language level, learners' region, ancestry and native languages, the data collected through FLVLSS were normally distributed.

Descriptive statistical results —frequency, mean and standard deviation— were used to determine the vocabulary learning strategies that TFL learners use in general and the strategies used based on gender, language level, learners' region, ancestry and native language. Independent samples t-test was used to find out whether TFL learners strategy use significantly differ based on gender and ancestry. In order to find out whether the same independent variable significantly differ based on language level, learners' region and native language, One-Way ANOVA was used. First, homogeneity of the variances was tested. Levene's Test results showed that the variances were equal for each variable, and therefore One-Way ANOVA test could be run. When statistically significant differences were found between groups, a Post Hoc test was run so as to reveal which two groups differed significantly. LSD test was preferred for this purpose and the groups that differed significantly were reported.

3. Results

Among the research questions of this study, the following one was the first: "Which vocabulary learning strategies do TFL learners use?". To this end, which vocabulary learning strategies that learners use and at which levels they use these strategies were investigated. The following table shows the strategies that TFL learners used:

Table 6. Descriptive statistics regarding the vocabulary learning strategies that learners use

Strategies	N	Mean	Sd
Memory strategies	169	3.55	.56465
Cognitive strategies	169	3.19	.71377
Compensation strategies	169	3.17	.82190
Metacognitive strategies	169	3.44	.74479
Affective strategies	169	3.69	.57487
Social strategies	169	3.46	.70124
Total	169	3.44	.44073

1.0-2.4 = Low-frequency strategy use 2.5-3.4 = Medium-frequency strategy use 3.5-5.0 = High-frequency strategy use

Table 6 indicates that level of vocabulary learning strategy use by TFL learners is with *medium* frequency (3.44). Learners use of Affective Strategies and Memory Strategies are with *high* frequency. The use of other strategies is *medium*. The list of strategies that TFL learners use by frequency is: *Affective, Memory, Social, Metacognitive, Cognitive and Compensation Strategies*.

TFL learners frequently selected the following items on FLVLSS:

Table 7. Descriptive statistics regarding the frequently selected items on FLVLSS

Strategies	Items	N	Mean	Sd
Memory strategies	In order not to forget the Turkish words I have recently learned. I always repeat them.*	169	3.75	1.0692
	I associate the Turkish words I have learned before with the new ones.*	169	3.66	1.0411
	In order to remember a Turkish word. I visualise its picture in my mind.**	169	3.40	1.2403
Cognitive strategies	I study the Turkish words I want to learn by writing them down.*	169	3.91	1.1383
	While learning Turkish words. I keep a vocabulary journal.*	169	3.76	1.2655
Compensation strategies	In order to remember Turkish words. I stick the words to the places where I can see them.**	169	2.40	1.2925
	I prefer to learn Turkish words required for my classes with the help of technological programs.*	169	3.54	1.1389
	I prefer to learn Turkish words required for my classes with the help of videos.*	169	3.16	1.3730
Metacognitive strategies	I prefer to learn the necessary Turkish words for my classes with the help of technological games.**	169	2.84	1.2833
	I try to find the most suitable method while learning Turkish words.*	169	3.91	.9906
	While learning Turkish words. I try to learn the pronunciation of the words along with the meanings.*	169	3.74	1.0650
Affective strategies	While learning English words. I do various Turkish vocabulary tests.**	169	3.03	1.2073
	I feel much more comfortable in class when I improve my Turkish vocabulary knowledge.*	169	4.28	.9398
	It attracts my attention when the words I know are used in a video or in a movie.*	169	4.14	.9468
Social strategies	When I learn Turkish words. I reward myself.**	169	2.78	1.2792
	I ask my friends to correct me when I mispronounce the Turkish words that I have recently learned.*	169	3.73	1.1777
	I ask my friends whether I correctly pronounce the Turkish words I have recently learned.*	169	3.65	1.1970
While trying to learn Turkish words. I prefer working in a group.**				

*Highest **Lowest

The most frequently selected item on the entire scale is “I feel much more comfortable in class when I improve my Turkish vocabulary knowledge.”. The least frequently selected item, on the other hand, is “In order to remember Turkish words, I stick the words to the places where I can see them.”.

One other research question of this study is: “Do the vocabulary learning strategies that TFL learners use significantly differ by gender?”. Descriptive statistics regarding learners’ strategy use and gender factor is presented in the table below:

Table 8. Descriptive statistics regarding strategy use and gender

Gender	Value	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social	All
	Mean	3.57	3.19	3.19	3.47	3.72	3.45	3.46
Female	N	107	107	107	107	107	107	107
	Sd	.53987	.72340	.82637	.76225	.59344	.72265	.44280
	Mean	3.53	3.20	3.13	3.39	3.64	3.47	3.41
Male	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62
	Sd	.60872	.70268	.81951	.71672	.54225	.66816	.43978
	Mean	3.55	3.19	3.17	3.44	3.69	3.46	3.44
Total	N	169	169	169	169	169	169	169
	Sd	.56465	.71377	.82190	.74479	.57487	.70124	.44073

1.0-2.4 = Low-frequency strategy use 2.5-3.4 = Medium-frequency strategy use
3.5-5.0 = High-frequency strategy use

According to Table 8, females use vocabulary learning strategies with *high* frequency while males do so with *medium* frequency. Both females and males prefer *Affective* and *Memory Strategies* more than others. Females’ and males’ third most preferred strategy are *Metacognitive Strategies* and *Social Strategies*, respectively.

Although the mean score of females’ strategy use is higher than that of males, it was necessary to test whether there was a statistically significant difference between females’ and males’ strategy uses. The independent samples t-test results are presented in the following table:

Table 9. T-Test results regarding vocabulary learning strategy use and gender

Language level	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	t	df	p*
All levels	Female	107	110.57	14.169	.510	167	.611
	Male	62	109.42	14.073			

* Significant at p<.05

Table 9 indicates that there was no statistically significant difference between females’ and males’ use of vocabulary learning strategies ($t_{(167)}=510$, $p=0.611$).

The third research question of the study is: “Do the vocabulary learning strategies that TFL learners use significantly differ by *language level*?”. The descriptive statistics regarding TFL learners’ strategy use and language level is as follows.

Table 10. Descriptive statistic on TFL learners' vocabulary learning strategy use and language level

Level	N	Value	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social	All
A1	32	Mean	3.69	3.49	3.25	3.53	3.78	3.64	3.59
		Sd	.44309	.56793	.78030	.70924	.50377	.70598	.38215
A2	40	Mean	3.61	3.34	3.27	3.60	3.74	3.54	3.54
		Sd	.50945	.70803	.84616	.70912	.58342	.63547	.47773
B1	50	Mean	3.58	3.07	2.92	3.46	3.70	3.42	3.40
		Sd	.56027	.65852	.84280	.70051	.57735	.73559	.41176
B2	31	Mean	3.29	3.09	3.40	3.20	3.62	3.25	3.32
		Sd	.60490	.79471	.78997	.79167	.63679	.73896	.45041
C1	16	Mean	3.52	2.83	3.06	3.23	3.52	3.41	3.30
		Sd	.73563	.76898	.71589	.86828	.57373	.62054	.43361
Total	169	Mean	3.55	3.19	3.17	3.44	3.69	3.46	3.44
		Sd	.56465	.71377	.82190	.74479	.57487	.70124	.44073

1.0-2.4 = Low-frequency strategy use 2.5-3.4 = Medium-frequency strategy use 3.5-

5.0 = High-frequency strategy use

Table 10 displays a *high* frequency of strategy use for TFL learners at A1 and A2 levels. Learners at B1, B2, and C1 levels use these strategies with *medium* frequency. Learners at A1 level have the highest frequency of strategy use. C1 learners, on the other hand, have the lowest frequency. It has been observed that frequency of strategy use decreases as the language level gets higher: A1 > A2 > B1 > B2 > C1.

A1 level TFL learners' use of vocabulary learning strategy listed by frequency of use is: *Affective, Memory, Social, Metacognitive, Cognitive, Compensation Strategies*. A2 level TFL learners' use of vocabulary learning strategy listed by frequency of use is: *Affective, Memory, Metacognitive, Social, Cognitive, Compensation Strategies*. B1 level TFL learners' use of vocabulary learning strategy listed by frequency of use is: *Affective, Memory, Metacognitive, Social, Cognitive, Compensation Strategies*. B2 level TFL learners' use of vocabulary learning strategy listed by frequency of use is: *Affective, Compensation, Memory, Social, Metacognitive, Cognitive Strategies*. C1 level TFL learners' use of vocabulary learning strategy listed by frequency of use is: *Affective, Memory, Social, Metacognitive, Cognitive, Compensation Strategies*.

Descriptive statistics revealed that strategy use of TFL learners at different levels is not the same. However, for further analysis, One-Way ANOVA test was run to compare the effect of language level on strategy use, and the results are as follows:

Table 11. One-Way ANOVA results on TFL learners strategy use and language level

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.*
Between groups	2037.638	4	509.410	2.663	.034
Within groups	31377.664	164	191.327		
Total	33415.302	168			

* Significant at p<.05

Table 11 reveals that the effect of language level on vocabulary learning strategy use was statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level. An LSD Post Hoc test was run to reveal which groups caused this significant difference. Below are the LSD test results:

Table 12. The LSD test results on the significance of difference among language levels

(I) Level	(J) Level	Mean difference (I-J)	Std. error	Sig.*
A1	A2	1.81250	3.28057	.581
	B1*	6.27750*	3.13138	.047
	B2*	8.77621*	3.48580	.013
	C1*	9.43750*	4.23520	.027
A2	A1	-1.81250	3.28057	.581
	B1	4.46500	2.93423	.130
	B2*	6.96371*	3.30984	.037
	C1	7.62500	4.09159	.064
B1	A1*	-6.27750*	3.13138	.047
	A2	-4.46500	2.93423	.130
	B2	2.49871	3.16202	.431
	C1	3.16000	3.97297	.428
B2	A1*	-8.77621*	3.48580	.013
	A2*	-6.96371*	3.30984	.037
	B1	-2.49871	3.16202	.431
	C1	.66129	4.25791	.877
C1	A1*	-9.43750*	4.23520	.027
	A2	-7.62500	4.09159	.064
	B1	-3.16000	3.97297	.428
	B2	-.66129	4.25791	.877

* Significant at $p < .05$

Post Hoc comparisons using LSD test indicated that the mean score for the A1 level was significantly different than B1, B2, and C1 levels. In addition to this, the mean score for the A2 level was significantly different than B2 level.

The next research question of the study is: “Do the vocabulary learning strategies that TFL learners use significantly differ by *region*?” To this end, the following table has been produced to display TFL learners’ strategy use and the regions they have come from:

Table 13. Descriptive statistics regarding TFL learners' vocabulary learning strategy use and regions

Regions	N	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social	All
Balkans	4	Mean	3.90	3.20	3.50	3.68	4.21	3.92
		Sd	.55174	.90921	1.33853	.94373	.55067	.96705
West Asia	5	Mean	3.14	3.04	3.05	3.45	4.00	2.97
		Sd	.75593	.85323	.48088	.59687	.33333	.90062
Other	6	Mean	3.31	3.53	3.04	3.33	4.06	3.56
		Sd	.69644	.32660	1.08877	.90370	.56437	1.26345
East Africa	6	Mean	3.90	3.54	3.71	3.21	3.61	3.69
		Sd	.58321	.58878	.43060	.73172	.52352	.47629
East Asia	32	Mean	3.61	3.30	3.04	3.48	3.63	3.39
		Sd	.39953	.62009	.71310	.74693	.53837	.54615
Southern Asia	11	Mean	3.80	3.41	3.55	3.75	3.92	3.76
		Sd	.60701	.74002	.87905	.71589	.64275	.64275
North Africa	11	Mean	3.58	2.98	3.16	3.05	3.81	3.64
		Sd	.62745	.68384	.88227	.60019	.41133	.82266
Central Asia	29	Mean	3.68	3.25	3.00	3.73	3.70	3.52
		Sd	.59195	.73108	.93541	.81265	.64761	.67897
Middle East	65	Mean	3.41	3.07	3.19	3.32	3.58	3.36
		Sd	.54288	.75934	.78316	.69528	.56681	.68204
Total	169	Mean	3.55	3.19	3.17	3.44	3.69	3.46
		Sd	.56465	.71377	.82190	.74479	.57487	.70124

1.0-2.4 = Low-frequency strategy use 2.5-3.4 = Medium-frequency strategy use
3.5-5.0 = High-frequency strategy use

According to Table 13, the group with the highest level of vocabulary learning strategy use is those from Balkans. Learners from Southern Asia and East Africa follow them. It is understood that learners from the Balkans, East Africa, Southern Asia, Central Asia, and Other regions use these strategies with *high* frequency. Learners from the rest of the regions use the strategies with *medium* frequency. One-Way ANOVA test was run to compare the effect of region on strategy use, and the results are as follows:

Table 14. One-Way ANOVA results on TFL learners strategy use and region

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.*
Between groups	2511.075	8	313.884	1.625	.121
Within groups	30904.226	160	193.151		
Total	33415.302	168			

* Significant at p<.05

As seen in Table 14, there was not a significant effect of region on learners' strategy use at the p < .05 level for the nine conditions, [p = .121].

Another research question of the present study is: “Do the vocabulary learning strategies that TFL learners use significantly differ by *ancestry*?” Below is the descriptive statistics regarding TFL learners’ strategy use and their ancestry:

Table 15. Descriptive statistics regarding TFL learners’ strategy use and ancestry

Ancestry	N	Value	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social	Mean
Turkic	18	Mean	3.59	3.11	2.86	3.49	3.75	3.43	3.41
		Sd	.65353	.71364	.90839	.73999	.71458	.75239	.44387
Foreign	151	Mean	3.55	3.20	3.20	3.43	3.69	3.46	3.45
		Sd	.55543	.71554	.80660	.74761	.55841	.69747	.44168
Total	169	Mean	3.55	3.19	3.17	3.44	3.69	3.46	3.44
		Sd	.56465	.71377	.82190	.74479	.57487	.70124	.44073

1.0-2.4 = Low-frequency strategy use 2.5-3.4 = Medium-frequency strategy use

3.5-5.0 = High-frequency strategy use

Table 15 reveals that TFL learners of both Turkic and foreign ancestry use vocabulary learning strategies with *medium* frequency. In order to reveal whether there was a statistically significant difference between the means of these two groups, an Independent Samples T-Test was run. The following table shows the results:

Table 16. Independent samples T-Test results on TFL learners’ strategy use and ancestry

Language Level	Ancestry	N	X	Sd	t	df	p*
All levels	Turkic	18	109.11	14.203	-.329	167	.742
	Foreign	151	110.27	14.133			

* Significant at p<.05

As presented in Table 16, there was no statistically significant difference between strategy use of learners with Turkic and foreign ancestry ($p = .742$).

The last research question is: “Do the vocabulary learning strategies that TFL learners use significantly differ by *native language*?” Descriptive statistics on TFL learners’ strategy use and their native languages are as follows:

Table 17. Descriptive statistics regarding TFL learners’ use of vocabulary learning strategy and native language

Native Language	N	Value	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social	All
Arabic	83	Mean	3.48	3.10	3.21	3.32	3.62	3.39	3.38
		Sd	.57761	.74203	.76920	.67522	.54852	.70882	.40809
Chinese	31	Mean	3.62	3.30	3.03	3.50	3.65	3.39	3.45
		Sd	.40161	.63007	.72383	.74722	.53464	.55369	.40625

Other	31	Mean	3.59	3.34	3.30	3.55	3.79	3.66	3.56
		Sd	.61139	.67997	.94300	.89074	.55938	.75760	.49790
Persian	6	Mean	3.90	3.43	3.41	4.13	4.22	3.75	3.83
		Sd	.53959	.87101	1.02062	.51841	.58373	.79408	.55648
Turkic	18	Mean	3.59	3.11	2.86	3.49	3.75	3.43	3.41
		Sd	.65353	.71364	.90839	.73999	.71458	.75239	.44387
Total	169	Mean	3.55	3.19	3.17	3.44	3.69	3.46	3.44
		Sd	.56465	.71377	.82190	.74479	.57487	.70124	.44073

1.0-2.4 = Low-frequency strategy use 2.5-3.4 = Medium-frequency strategy use
3.5-5.0 = High-frequency strategy use

According to Table 17, TFL learners speaking Persian and other languages as their native speakers use vocabulary learning strategies with *high* frequency. Those speaking a Turkic language or Arabic and Chinese use the same strategies with *medium* frequency. One-Way ANOVA test was run to compare the effect of native language on strategy use, and the following results were obtained:

Table 18. One-Way ANOVA results on TFL learners strategy use and native language

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	1730.797	4	432.699	2.240	.067
Within groups	31684.504	164	193.198		
Total	33415.302	168			

According to Table 18, there was not a significant effect of native language on learners' strategy use at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions, ($p = .067$).

4. Discussion

Teaching strategies instead of skills has become an emergent topic in language teaching. The aim here is to enable learners to make informed decisions and use strategies for study fields (Çetinkaya Edizer, Dilidüzungün, Ak Başoglu, Karagöz, & Yücelşen, 2018). Researchers also recommend learners' active participation in vocabulary learning practices by employing effective and efficient strategies (İlter, 2014).

Teaching practices at schools include vocabulary teaching. However, it is not possible for teachers to teach all vocabulary items of the target language. That is why learners should be able to learn vocabulary independently. In this process, learners need to know the ways in which they learn vocabulary better and develop their own vocabulary learning strategies. Therefore, it is necessary to make learners aware of these strategies while teaching a foreign language. It is also important to help learners decide on the best strategy.

The results show that TFL learners use vocabulary learning strategies mostly with *medium* frequency. Teachers need to help TFL learners with vocabulary learning and use activities promoting more strategies depending on the learners' individual characteristics so that learners may use such strategies with *high* frequency. An investigation of vocabulary learning strategy use considering the

gender factor revealed that females used the strategies with *high* frequency while males used them with *medium* frequency. Therefore, it can be recommended that teachers encourage especially male learners to use the strategies. The learners at A1 and A2 levels use the strategies with *high* frequency. Learners at B1, B2, and C1 levels use these strategies with *medium* frequency. It may be useful to support learners especially at B1, B2 and C1 levels in using the strategies with the help of teachers and course materials.

The learners the most frequently used strategies are *Affective Strategies* and *Memory Strategies* and the least frequently used strategies are *Compensation Strategies* and *Cognitive Strategies*. Learners should be informed of the strategies they used the least. Also, providing exercises for learners that will make them practice different vocabulary strategies may help them become familiar with them.

The frequently used strategies by learners also vary by their *language level, region, ancestry, and native language*. Therefore, these various vocabulary learning strategies that learners frequently should be taken into consideration while preparing teaching materials. These materials should enable learners to use the strategies they do not use often.

5. Conclusions

The fact that the sample of this study was formed by students from all language levels (A1, A2, B1, B2, and C1) and the fact that whether the vocabulary learning strategies significantly differ according to gender, language level, region, ancestry, and native language was examined are the features that makes the present study prominent.

The present study attempts to identify to what extent TFL learners use vocabulary learning strategies at the levels of A1, A2, B1, B2, and C1. The results show that TFL learners use these strategies mostly with *medium* frequency. None of the similar studies included participants from all language levels. However, such studies reached similar conclusions when they examined the level of vocabulary learning strategy use of learners at different language levels. (Demirekin, 2017; Memiş, 2018).

The learners use *Affective Strategies* and *Memory Strategies* with *high* frequency. They use the rest of the strategies with *medium* frequency. The strategies that TFL learners use are listed by level of frequency as follows: *Affective, Memory, Social, Metacognitive, Cognitive* and *Compensation Strategies*. So, the most frequently used strategies are *Affective Strategies* and *Memory Strategies*. The present study also concluded that *Compensation Strategies* and *Cognitive Strategies* were used with the least frequency. Several other studies also drew the similar conclusions (Biçer & Polatcan, 2015; Demirekin, 2017; Kocaman, Yıldız, & Kamaz, 2018; Memiş, 2018; Syed, 2014).

Learners frequently selected the items “In order not to forget the Turkish words I have recently learned, I always repeat them” and “I associate the Turkish words I have learned before with the new ones” under *Memory Strategies*. The very same results have also been found in other studies (Demirekin, 2017). Similarly, Böyükbaş (2013) concluded repetition and practicing as the most commonly used strategies for learning vocabulary.

Among *Cognitive Strategies*, learners frequently selected the following items “I study the Turkish words I want to learn by writing them down” and “While learning Turkish words, I keep a vocabulary journal”. Some other studies also concluded the same results (Baskin et al., 2017; Demirekin, 2017; Syed, 2014; Tok & Yiğın, 2014). Likewise, Böyükbaş (2013) stated that noting down the new words on a notebook also helps expand vocabulary. Therefore, learners will be able to revise the learnt items and reflect on their learning.

Learners frequently selected the following items under *Compensation Strategies*: “I prefer to learn Turkish words required for my classes with the help of technological programs” and “I prefer to learn Turkish words required for my classes with the help of videos”. Other studies also concluded that learners use these strategies frequently (Demirekin, 2017).

Among *Metacognitive Strategies*, learners frequently selected these items: ““I try to find the most suitable method while learning Turkish words” and “While learning Turkish words, I try to learn the pronunciation of the words along with the meanings”. This result has been found by some other studies, as well (Baskın et al., 2017; Demirekin, 2017).

The most frequently selected items under *Affective Strategies* are: “I feel much more comfortable in class when I improve my Turkish vocabulary knowledge” and “It attracts my attention when the words I know are used in a video or in a movie”. Demirekin’s (2017) study also arrived at the same conclusion.

TFL learners preferred the following items of *Social Strategies* frequently: “I ask my friends to correct me when I mispronounce the Turkish words that I have recently learned” and “I ask my friends whether I correctly pronounce the Turkish words I have recently learned”. Several studies confirmed our findings by drawing the same conclusion (Baskın et al., 2017; Demirekin, 2017).

An investigation of vocabulary learning strategy use considering the gender factor revealed that females used the strategies with *high* frequency while males used them with *medium* frequency. Both females and males preferred *Affective Strategies and Memory Strategies* as the most frequently used two strategies. The third one was *Metacognitive Strategies* for females and *Social Strategies* for males. Although learners’ strategy uses were different, no statistically significant difference was found based on the gender factor. Several studies also arrived at similar conclusion (Baskın et al., 2017; Kocaman et al., 2018; Memiş, 2018).

When the data were examined considering the language level, it was found that learners at A1 and A2 levels use the strategies with *high* frequency. Learners at B1, B2, and C1 levels use these strategies with *medium* frequency. Memiş’s (2018) study also arrived at the similar conclusion.

The results of the present study showed that A1 level learners had the highest level of strategy use while those at C1 had the lowest level. It was seen that the amount of strategy use decreases as the language level gets higher: A1 > A2 > B1 > B2 > C1. Building upon these findings, it can be concluded that as the language proficiency goes up, amount of strategy use goes down (Memiş, 2018). A similar result was found in the other studies (Biçer & Polatcan, 2015; Memiş, 2018). The reason for this negative relation might be because learners regard themselves as more competent at the target language (Biçer & Polatcan, 2015).

Strategy use of TFL learners at A1 and C1 levels can be listed by frequency as follows: *Affective, Memory, Social, Metacognitive, Cognitive, Compensation Strategies*. Strategy use of TFL learners at A2 and B1 levels can be listed by frequency as follows: *Affective, Memory, Metacognitive, Social, Cognitive, Compensation Strategies*. Strategy use of TFL learners at B2 level can be listed by frequency as follows: *Affective, Compensation, Memory, Social, Metacognitive, Cognitive Strategies*. Memiş’s (2018) study also arrived at a similar conclusion.

It was also found out that strategy use at A1 was significantly different than B1, B2, and C1 levels. In addition, strategy use at A2 was significantly different than B2. The results revealed that the significant differences were observed between A1-A2 (lower levels) and others. No significant difference was found among B1, B2, and C1 levels. Some other studies also drew similar conclusions (Demirekin, 2017; Memiş, 2018).

The strategy use of TFL learners can be listed by the region factor from highest to lowest as follows: Balkans, Southern Asia and East Africa. Learners from Balkans, East Africa, Southern Asia, Central Asia and the Other region use the vocabulary learning strategies with *high* frequency while those from the rest of the regions use them with *medium* frequency. While there were differences among strategy use of learners from different regions, no statistically significant difference was found. No studies examining the level of vocabulary learning strategy use of TFL learners according to their countries have been found. Although Demirekin's (2017) study included country as a variable, it is not possible to compare the results due to the high number of countries and low ratio of representativeness of participants.

The present study found that learners of both Turkic and foreign ancestry used vocabulary learning strategies with *medium* frequency. There was no statistically significant difference between the means of strategy use of learners with Turkic and foreign ancestry. No other studies evaluating learners' level of vocabulary learning strategy use by their ancestry.

As for learners' native language, it was found that learners speaking Persian and Other languages as their native languages use the strategies with *high* frequency. Learners speaking Arabic, Chinese and one of the Turkic languages use the strategies with *medium* frequency. All learners, except those speaking Arabic, use the strategies more frequently than those speaking Turkic languages. This might be because learners speaking Turkic languages learn new vocabulary items more easily due to the fact that the target language and their native languages are similar. There was no statistically significant difference among strategy use of learners having different native languages. There are not any studies that grouped the learners and evaluated their level of strategy use by their native language. It is only the study by Demirekin (2017) that grouped learners as speakers of Turkic languages and speakers of other languages. This study concluded that learners speaking other languages use these strategies more than those speaking Turkic languages (Demirekin, 2017).

As a result, it is seen that TFL learners use the vocabulary learning strategies with *medium* frequency, the strategy use differs among learners' gender, language level, country, ancestry and native language. These differences should be taken into consideration while teaching TFL. Learners need to be encouraged to learn and use different strategies.

Learners need to be informed about how to use these strategies and they should be encouraged to do so. It is also important to raise learners' awareness on strategy use (Baskın et al., 2017; Memiş, 2018). Therefore, teachers need to evaluate learners' beliefs on vocabulary learning strategies and then work on making learners aware of the value of other strategies (Ghazal, 2007).

To this end, language teaching programs and coursebooks used for foreign language teaching should be encouraging learners to use vocabulary learning strategies in all levels and should inform learners of strategy use (Çelik & Toptaş, 2010; Gömleksiz, 2013). According to Sokmen (1997), conducting various in-class vocabulary activities would give learners chances to find the potentially appropriate strategies for themselves. For this reason, it is necessary to prepare learning environments where games, songs, puzzles may be involved; to provide learners with opportunities for practice, visual support, analogies, and examples so comprehension and retention will be increased; to widen the scope of the materials used (Çelikkaya, 2012). Learners need to be motivated with various materials and activities so that they will become independent learners (Çelik & Toptaş, 2010; Hamzah, Kafipour, & Abdullah, 2009). In this way, as Sarıçoban and Kürüm (2015) stated, it will be possible to direct learners' attention on strategies that they can make use of, but not aware of.

Being informed of the vocabulary learning strategies will provide learners with the awareness of improving their vocabulary knowledge as well as making them independent and autonomous

vocabulary learners, and giving them ample chances to keep learning new words throughout their lives (Göçen, 2018; Göçen, 2019).

6. Ethics Committee Approval

The author confirms that this study does not need ethics committee approval. (Date of Confirmation: 26.03.2020)

References

- Akın, H., & Çetin, M. (2016). Cinsiyet faktörünün yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenim stratejilerine etkisi (Bosna Hersek örneği). *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(2), 1021-1032. DOI: 10.7884/teke.664
- Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, 3(3), 21-34. DOI: 10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002
- Alyılmaz, S., & Şengül, K. (2018). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde dil öğrenme stratejilerine dayalı etkinliklerin dilbilgisine yönelik başarıya ve kalıcılığa etkisi. *Ankara Üniversitesi TÖMER Dil Dergisi*, 169(1), 67-110. DOI: 10.1501/Dilder_0000000248
- Barut, A. (2015). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen üniversite öğrencilerinin kullandıkları dil öğrenme stratejileri üzerine bir değerlendirme*. (Master's thesis), İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Baskın, S., İşcan, A., Karagöz, B., & Birol, G. (2017). The use of vocabulary learning strategies in teaching Turkish as a second language. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(9), 126-134. Retrieved in December 8, 2019 from: <https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/36067>
- Bekleyen, N. (2005). Öğretmen adayları tarafından kullanılan dil öğrenme stratejileri. *Ç. Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14(2), 113-122. Retrieved in December 12, 2019 from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/cusosbil/issue/4372/59825>
- Biçer, N., & Polatcan, F. (2015). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde kelime öğrenme stratejilerinin değerlendirilmesi. *A. Ü. Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi (TAED)*, 54, 811-828. DOI: 10.14222/Turkiyat1436
- Boylu, E. (2015). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin dil öğrenme stratejilerini kullanma düzeyleri*. (Master's thesis), Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Bölükbaş, F. (2013). The effect of language learning strategies on learning vocabulary in teaching Turkish as a foreign language. *H. U. Journal of Education*, 28(3), 55-68. Retrieved in December 1, 2019 from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/hunefd/issue/7791/101906>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2007). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Can, A. (2017). *Spss ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Çelik, S., & Toptaş, V. (2010). Vocabulary learning strategy use of Turkish EFL learners. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 62-71. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.013

- Çelikkaya, Ş. (2012). Almanca öğretmeni adaylarının sözcük öğreniminde kullandıkları öğrenme stratejileri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 28, 71-76. Retrieved in November 3, 2019 from: <http://dergisosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/susbed/article/view/67/51>
- Çetinkaya Edizer, Z., Dilidüzgün, Ş., Ak Başoğul, D., Karagöz, M., & Yücelşen, N. (2018). Türkçe öğretiminde üstbilişsel okuma stratejileri ile okuma yöntem-tekniklerinin metin türüne göre değerlendirilmesi. *Adiyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 29, 479-511. DOI: 10.14520/adyusbd.420841
- Çetinkaya, Z. (2005). Basit tekrar ve alıştırmalar yoluyla sözcük öğretimi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil Dergisi*, 130, 68-85. Retrieved in November 12, 2019 from: <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=556571>
- DeCarrico, J. S. (2001). Vocabulary learning and teaching. In M. Celce-Mursia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 285-299). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Demirekin, M. (2017). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçenin anlamlandırılmasında kelime ve dil öğrenme stratejilerinin kullanımı*. (Doctoral dissertation), Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Dilidüzgün, Ş. (2014). Türkçe öğretiminde sözcük öğretme yöntemlerinin yeterliliği. *Adiyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 7(17), 233-258. DOI: 10.14520/adyusbd.771
- Doğan, Y. (2014). Yabancılara Türkçe kelime öğretiminde market broşürlerinden yararlanma. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), 89-98. Retrieved in December 12, 2019 from: <https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/184/164>
- Engin, G., Dikbayır, A., & Genç, S. Z. (2017). Effectiveness of learning strategies taught to teacher candidates. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 12(2), 62-80. Retrieved in December 2, 2019 from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1170191>
- Ghazal, L. (2007). Learning vocabulary in EFL context through vocabulary learning strategies. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 1(2), 84-91. Retrieved in November 29, 2019 from: <http://www.novitasroyal.org/archives/vol-1-issue-2>
- Göçen, G. (2016). *Yabancılar için hazırlanan Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki söz varlığı ile Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin yazılı anlatımlardaki söz varlığı*. (Doctoral dissertation), Sakarya University, Sakarya, Turkey.
- Göçen, G. (2019). Yabancı dil öğretiminde sözcük öğretimi yaklaşımları ve yöntemleri. In A. Okur, & G. Göçen (Ed.), *Türkçenin sözcük öğretimi* (pp. 249-272). Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Göçen, G., & Okur, A. (2015). Ortaokula yönelik söz varlığı araştırmalarının incelenmesi: Tezler. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 3(1), 64-79. DOI: 10.16916/aded.66746
- Göçer, A. (2010). Türkçe eğitiminde öğrencilerin söz varlığını geliştirme etkinlikleri ve sözlük kullanımı. *Turkish Studies International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 5(1), 1007-1036. DOI: 10.7827/TurkishStudies.1318
- Gömeksiz, M. N. (2013). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının İngilizce dil öğrenme stratejilerine ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi (Fırat Üniversitesi örneği). *Adiyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11, 573-601. DOI: 10.14520/adyusbd.464
- Graves, M. F. (1986). Vocabulary learning and instruction. *Review of Research in Education*, 13, 49-89. DOI: 10.2307/1167219

- Graves, M. F., & Preen, M. C. (1986). Costs and benefits of various methods of teaching vocabulary. *Journal of Reading*, 29(7), 596-602. Retrieved in December 3, 2019 from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40029685?seq=1>
- Gu, P. Y. (2003). Vocabulary learning in a second language: Person, task, context and strategies. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language TESL-EJ*, 7(2), 1-25. Retrieved in December 3, 2019 from: <https://www.tesl-ej.org/ej26/a4.html>
- Gu, Y., & Johnson, R. K. (1996). Vocabulary learning strategies and language learning outcomes. *Language Learning*, 46, 643-679. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01355.x
- Günay, V. D. (2007). *Sözcükbilime giriş*. İstanbul: Multilingual.
- Güneş, F. (2013). Kelimelerin gücü ve zihinsel sözlük. *Siirt Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1, 1-30. Retrieved in December 24, 2019 from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/susbid/issue/17335/181025>
- Hamzah, M., Kafipour, R., & Abdullah, S. F. (2009). Vocabulary learning strategies of Iranian undergraduate EFL students and its relation to their vocabulary size. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(1), 39-50. Retrieved in December 10, 2019 from: https://www.academia.edu/13315871/Vocabulary_learning_strategies_of_Iranian_undergraduate_EFL_students_and_its_relation_to_their_vocabulary_size
- Hirsch, E. D. (2003). Reading comprehension requires knowledge of words and the world. *American Educator*, 27(1), 10-13. Retrieved in November 11, 2019 from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ672462>
- Hişmanoğlu, M., & Turan, Y. Z. (2019). A study on vocabulary learning strategies of Turkish EFL students. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 7(4), 857-875. DOI: 10.16916/aded.575501
- İlter, İ. (2014). Kelime öğretiminde grafik düzenleyicileri (Frayer modeli örneği). *Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 9(3), 755-770. DOI: 10.7827/TurkishStudies.6551
- Kara, M., & Ünal, M. (2019). Üstün yetenekli öğrencilerin yazılı anlatımlarındaki söz varlığının derlem tabanlı incelenmesi. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 7(1), 252-261. DOI: 10.18298/ijlet.3270
- Karadağ, Ö. (2013). *Kelime öğretimi*. İstanbul: Kriter Publications.
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Karatay, H. (2007). Kelime öğretimi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 27(1), 141-153. Retrieved in November 2, 2019 from: <http://www.gefad.gazi.edu.tr/tr/issue/6751/90771>
- Kırmızı, Ö. (2014). Measuring vocabulary learning strategy use of Turkish EFL learners in relation to academic success and vocabulary size. *World Journal of Education*, 4(6), 16-25. DOI: 10.5430/wje.v4n6p16
- Kırmızı, Ö., & Topcu, N. (2014). Vocabulary learning strategies of Turkish EFL students at Karabük University. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 18(3), 217-232. Retrieved in November 11, 2019 from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ataunisosbil/issue/2837/38706>
- Kocaman, O., & Kızılıkaya Cumaoğlu, G. (2014). Yabancı dilde kelime öğrenme stratejileri ölçüğünün geliştirilmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 39(176), 293-303. DOI: 10.15390/EB.2014.3611

- Kocaman, O., Yıldız, M., & Kamaz, B. (2018). Use of vocabulary learning strategies in Turkish as a foreign language context. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 5(2), 54-63. DOI: 10.17220/ijpes.2018.02.007
- Memiş, M. R. (2018). The relationship between vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary of learners of Turkish as a foreign or second language. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 13(4), 164-185. DOI: 10.29329/epasr.2018.178.10
- Memiş, M. R. (2019). Kelime öğretim stratejileri ölçüği: Geliştirme, geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Turkish Studies*, 14(4), 2579-2593. DOI: 10.29228/TurkishStudies.29172
- Nassaji, H. (2006). The relationship between depth of vocabulary knowledge and L2 learners' lexical inferencing strategy use and success. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(3), 387-401. DOI: 10.1353/cml.2004.0006
- Nation, I. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Noprianto, E., & Purnawarman, P. (2019). EFL students' vocabulary learning strategies and their affixes knowledge. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(1), 262-275. DOI: 10.17263/jlls.547730
- Okur, A. (2013). Yaşam boyu okuma için okuma öğretimi. In A. Okur (Ed.), *Yaşam boyu okuma eğitimi* (pp. 1-45). Ankara: Pegem Publications.
- Okur, A. (2019). Yabancı dil öğretiminde sözcük öğretimi ilkeleri ve sözcük öğrenme-öğretim stratejileri. In A. Okur, & G. Göçen (Eds.), *Türkçenin sözcük öğretimi* (pp. 223-246). Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle And Heinle Publishers.
- Özbay, M., & Melanlıoğlu, D. (2008). Türkçe eğitiminde kelime hazinesinin önemi. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(1), 30-45. Retrieved in November 10, 2019 from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/yyuefd/issue/13713/166023>
- Özbay, M., Büyükkiz, K. K., & Uyar, Y. (2011). İlköğretim yedinci sınıf öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatımlarındaki kelime hzineleri üzerine bir inceleme. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8(15), 149-173. Retrieved in December 10, 2019 from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mkusbed/issue/19555/208666>
- Özdemir, B. (2017). Sözcük öğretimi ve kalıp sözlerin öğretimi. In H. Develi, C. Yıldız, M. Balç, İ. Gültekin, & D. Melanlıoğlu (Eds.), *Uygulamalı Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi el kitabı (2. Cilt)* (pp. 55-110). İstanbul: Kesit Publications.
- Öztürk, M. (2006). Vocabulary teaching. *Dil Dergisi*, 133, 20-28. DOI: 10.1501/Dilder_0000000060
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sarıçoban, A., & E. Y. Kürüm (2015). Türkçenin yabancı/ikinci dil olarak öğrenimi stratejileri. In A. Sarıçoban (Ed.), *Yabancı dil olarak türkçe öğretimi metodolojisi* (pp. 258-285). Ankara: Anı Publications.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seal, B. D. (1991). Vocabulary learning and teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 296-311). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

- Sedita, J. (2005). Effective vocabulary instruction. *Insights on Learning Disabilities*, 33(45), 33-45. Retrieved in December 10, 2019 from: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Effective-Vocabulary-Instruction-Sedita/24a6b44b730d9c47d65bc9acbfe908fd50f0bf7b>
- Shen, W. (2003). Current trends of vocabulary teaching and learning strategies for EFL settings. *Feng Chia Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7, 187-224. Retrieved in December 10, 2019 from: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Current-Trends-of-Vocabulary-Teaching-and-Learning-Shen/01c205b5bab59ceed36ae5d1888aa5000daae2f>
- Sokmen, A. (1997). Current trends in teaching second language vocabulary. In N. Schmitt, & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 237-257). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Susanto, A. (2017). The teaching of vocabulary: A perspective. *Jurnal KATA*, 1(2), 182-191. DOI: 10.22216/jk.v1i2.2136
- Syed, S. S. (2014). *Determination of vocabulary learning strategies of students of Turkish as a foreign language at Jamia Milia Islamia University*. (Master's thesis), Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey.
- Şengül, M. (2012). Yabancı uyruklu ve Türk soylu bireylerin Türkiye Türkçesini öğrenirken kullandıkları dil öğrenme stratejileri arasındaki farklılıklar. *VII. Uluslararası Türk Dili Kurultayı Bildirisi*, September 24-28, 2012, Ankara.
- Tanyer, S., & Ozturk, Y. (2014). Pre-service English teachers' vocabulary learning strategy use and vocabulary size: A cross-sectional evaluation. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(1), 37-45. DOI: 10.4304/jltr.5.1.37-45
- Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to teach vocabulary*. Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.
- Tok, M., & Yiğın, M. (2014). Türkçenin ikinci dil olarak öğretiminde öğrencilerin kullandıkları kelime öğrenme stratejileri. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 41, 265-276. Retrieved in December 10, 2019 from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/dpusbe/issue/4783/65969>
- Varışoğlu, M. C. (2017). Türkçe öğrenen Litvanyalı öğrencilerin kullandıkları dil öğrenme stratejileri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkçay Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi [TAED]*, 59, 533-546. DOI: 10.14222/Turkiyat3749
- Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*. London: Arnold.
- Yıldız, C., Okur, A., Arı, G., & Yılmaz, Y. (2008). *Kuramdan uygulamaya Türkçe öğretimi*. Ankara: Pegem Publications.

Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin sözcük öğrenme stratejilerini kullanımları

Öz

Bir yabancı dili öğrenmek dil kuralları ile sözcükleri öğrenmeyi ve bunlar aracılığıyla dil becerilerini kullanmayı kapsamaktadır. Kelimeler, eğitim-öğretim sürecinde, öğretmenler ve ders kitapları aracılığıyla öğrenenlere aktarılmaktadır. Ancak bu süreçte, bütün kelimelerin dersler aracılığıyla öğretilmesi mümkün olmadığından, öğrenenlerin kendilerinin de bağımsız birer sözcük öğrenen durumuna gelmesi beklenmektedir. Bu ise öğrenenlerin sözcük öğrenme stratejilerini bilmeleri ve kullanmaları yoluyla mümkün olabilmektedir. Bağımsız birer sözcük öğrenen olmaları konusunda öğrenenlere destek olmak için öncelikle onların strateji kullanım düzeylerini, hangi stratejileri kullandıklarını belirlemek ve bunların çeşitli değişkenlere göre farklılaşmış farklılaşmadığını incelemek gerekmektedir. Bu gerek ile çalışmada, Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin sözcük öğrenme stratejilerini kullanma düzeylerini belirlemek amaçlanmıştır. Bu amaçla, tarama modelinde tasarılanan bu araştırmada veriler, Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak A1, A2, B1, B2 ve C1 seviyesinde öğrenen 169 öğrenciden toplanmıştır. Verilerin toplamasında Kocaman ve Kızılkaya Cumaoğlu (2014) tarafından geliştirilen "Foreign Language Vocabulary Learning Strategies Scale" kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde frekans, aritmetik ortalama, standart sapma, T Testi, ANOVA ve LSD testlerinden yararlanılmıştır. Çalışma sonucunda, Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin kullandıkları sözcük öğrenme stratejileri ve strateji kullanım düzeyi belirlenmiş; kullanılan stratejilerde cinsiyet, dil düzeyi, öğrencilerin geldikleri bölge, öğrencilerin uyruğu ve ana dili gibi değişkenlere göre bir farklılık olup olmadığı incelenmiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Türkçe eğitimi, Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi; sözcük; sözcük öğretimi; sözcük öğrenme stratejileri

AUTHOR BIODATA

Having graduated from the department of Turkish Language and Literature at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University in 2008, Göçen completed her MA and Ph.D. studies in Turkish Language Teaching at Sakarya University in 2011 and 2016, respectively. She taught Turkish as a foreign language at İstanbul University before completing her Ph.D studies. In 2016, the researcher started working as an assistant professor in the department of Turkish Language Teaching at Fatih Sultan Mehmet Vakıf University, where she is currently working. Göçen focuses on teaching Turkish as a native language as well as Turkish as a foreign language.