ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES,
JOURNALISM AND COMMUNICATION
DEPARTEMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
(GRADUATE PROGRAM)

GRAMMAR LEARNING STRATEGIES USE OF GRADE 11 STUDENTS AT MEDHANEALEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL: GENDER IN FOCUS

BY

YEMESERACH BAYOU

JUNE, 2015
ADDIS ABABA

GRAMMAR LEARNING STRATEGIES USE OF GRADE 11 STUDENTS AT MEDHANEALEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL: GENDER IN FOCUS

BY

YEMESERACH BAYOU

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Addis Ababa University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)

JUNE, 2015

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Studies

Grammar Learning Strategies Use of Grade 11 Students at Medhanealem Preparatory School: Gender in Focus

By

Yemeserach Bayou

Approved by Board of Examiners:

Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	**Signature**	**Date**
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	**Signature**	**Date**
_____	_____	_____

Acknowledgements

I express my sincere appreciation to Addis Ababa University for providing me this opportunity to undertake this study and for the financial support they made available to me.

Foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Fekadu Mulugeta for his continuous support, patience, motivation, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge that significantly contributed to the present shape of my thesis. His guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. I could not have imagined having a better advisor and mentor for my thesis.

I am also most grateful to the administrative bodies of Medehanealem Preparatory School for their permission to conduct this research in the school. Besides, I would like to thank the staff members of information desk, for their collaboration by providing the necessary information regarding the students. Moreover, my thanks go to the English department staff members and to the students who participated in the study.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my parents Bayou Kebede and Aregash Geleta, and my sister Eyerusalem Bayou for their moral support and encouragement with their best wishes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents **Page**

List of Tables

Tables **Page**

Abstract

This study explores grammar learning strategies used by grade 11 students of Medhanealem preparatory school focusing on the differences between the two genders. Survey research design was used in the study. The data for this research were gathered from 264 (117 Male and 147 Female) participants. The strategy use was assessed through a 35 items Grammar Learning Strategies Questionnaire (GLSQ), which was modified from Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). The internal reliability of the instrument was checked and revealed an acceptable reliability (.60). The data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version-20. The results show that Compensation Strategies were the first used strategy category by the learners, while Affective Strategies ranking last on students preference scale. The study also reveals that there were differences between male and female students in their preferences of strategy categories, in which males prefer Affective Strategies the least, while Metacognitive Strategies were the least favored strategy group by females, whereas Compensation Strategies were the most preferred strategy group by both male and female learners. In general, the result of the independent Samples t-test reveals that there were no significant relationship between gender and grammar learning strategies use. Finally, based on the findings of the study, it was suggested that teachers need to create opportunities for students to use indirect strategies. Additionally, it was recommended to incorporate learning strategies training into the curriculum.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

During the last few decades, EFL scholars and teachers have shifted their focus away from the teacher- centered perspective to learner-centered perspective. Now a days, learners take on more responsibility for their learning in order to meet their own individual needs. The learner-centered approach puts more responsibility on the students' shoulder to take full advantage of opportunities to learn by making use of language learning strategies (LLSs). That is, as language learning studies became more learner-centered, their intent was ultimately to introduce less successful learners to strategic ways to promote their personal success in language learning.

Learning strategies are "operations or steps used by a learner to facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval or use of information" (Rigney, 1978 cited in Aslan, 2009). O'Malley & Chamot (1990:1) characterized learning strategies as "the special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information." Additionally, according to Chamot (2004: 14) learning strategies are "the conscious thoughts and actions that learners take in order to achieve a learning goal."

Oxford (1990) proposed a comprehensive classification system of learning strategies using the two major groups: direct and indirect strategies. Each category was broken down in to subcategories reflecting the specific strategies that would fit under the labels. Direct strategies which are directly related to learning/ producing the target language are subdivided in to Memory strategies (retrieving and storing new information), Cognitive strategies (operating new input), and Compensation strategies (overcoming missing knowledge of a target language).

Indirect strategies are those that enable direct strategies to occur and/ or increase their successful application: Metacognitive strategies for managing the cognitive process, Affective strategies for controlling emotions in language learning, and Social strategies for interacting with others. In general these strategies help students (a) to become more autonomous, (b) to diagnose their own learning strengths and weaknesses, and (c) to self- direct their own learning process (Oxford,

1990). Learning strategies, therefore, help learners become efficient in learning and using a language.

It is impossible to deny that some learners perform better than others in language learning. This indicates that individual learner variables influence learning outcomes as the result of the learning strategies that the learners employ. A good language learner tries to find ways to use these strategies to succeed in language learning. These strategies usually make learning more successful if they make use of learning strategies while learning a foreign language. Otherwise, many learners fail to learn a foreign language as they are not self-directed learners or they are used to being spoon-fed learners.

Thus, investigating students' language learning strategies use is very important to make strategy training in accordance with the students' needs. Recently, there is a shift of research focus from general to skill learning strategies. Beside to this change, some studies have been conducted on vocabulary, reading, listening, and writing strategies employed by language learners with different socio- economic and cultural back ground though further research is still required by considering several variables.

However, a research in to the investigation of students' use of grammar learning strategies has been a less studied area since grammar plays an important role in almost every educational pursuit. Knowledge of grammar enables learners to understand how words can create intricate meanings and how subtle literary effects are created. Therefore, students are likely to be more analytical and receptive readers. Likewise, knowledge of grammar also allows for better speaking skills by eliminating misunderstanding. Those who speak well tend to sound more mature and professional. Moreover, learners can write with the correct grammar of the language if they are equipped with enough grammatical knowledge (Cornwall, 2010).

Nevertheless, as Brumfit & Johnson (1987: 117) agreed, "students especially in developing countries, who have received several years of formal English teaching, frequently remain deficient in the ability to actually use the language, and to understand its use, in normal communication, whether in the spoken or the written mode." And as most scholars (Anderson, 2005; Chamot, 2004; Ehrman, Leaver & Oxford, 2003; Oxford, 1990; 2003; Rubin, 1975)

indicate, one of the reasons for this problem is the students' limited use of grammar learning strategies for a long time without being effective.

On the other hand, there are variables which could influence the choice and use of language learning strategies. Many researchers have studied variables influencing learners' language-learning strategy use. They have investigated how the use of language- learning strategies are affected by learner specific variables, such as age, gender, language proficiency, motivation, anxiety, aptitude, and cultural background (e.g., Ahmadi & Mahmoodi, 2012; Aslan, 2009; Ghavamnia, Kassaian & Dabaghi, 2011; Gurata, 2008; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Li, 2005; Rahimi, Riazi & Safi ,2008; Salahshour et al., 2013). However, the variable that the current study intends to investigate is gender.

Gender which refers to the social categorization of male and female is considered as one of the factors which might affect learners' language learning strategy use. Many studies have investigated the correlation between LLSs and gender, and significant differences have been reported by most studies. Green & Oxford (1995) as cited in Radwan (2011) found that females use strategies more frequently than males. Contrary to this finding, in Radwan's (2011) study, males are reported to use social strategies frequently than females. On the other hand, Rahimi, Riazi & Safi (2008) did not report any differences in strategy use among Persian EFL learners as a result of gender difference. This indicates that the studies come up with mixed result rather than standing on one continuum.

In Ethiopia, it is believed that gender is the major factor which determines differences in all aspects including education. Since the gender gap between boys and girls students is wide, it has become a major concern to the education ministry to narrow this disparity. Currently, in Ethiopian schools female learners' enrollment is significantly increasing in all levels of academic setting. However, their number seems to be slightly declined in higher educational levels such as colleges and universities. Additionally, girls' participation is less in high school English lessons as compared with boys, because they are shy. As a result, female learners are said to be less effective in English learning and their expected overall achievement is also lower than male learners (Atkins, Hailom, & Nuru, 1995). Thus, this less achievement of female learners could be related with the learning strategies they use. Therefore, further studies are needed to look in to

the effects of gender on the learning strategies of the specific language skills (e.g. reading, writing, grammar, vocabulary).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

During the past 30 years or so we have seen grammar move from a central position in language teaching to positions of lesser importance, and back, although it has never again reached previous importance. Some scholars such as Hinkel & Fotos (2002) believe that teaching/learning of foreign language grammar has a paramount importance for good command of the foreign language where there is no natural way of acquiring the language though scholars like Krashen (1981, 1982) and Krashen & Terrell (1983) criticize the formal instruction of grammar.

Grammar has been described as interwoven with meaning, social function, and discourse (Celce-Murcia, 1988). Grammatical competence, along with sociolinguistic and strategic competences, is seen as crucial for mastering communicative competence. Muncie (2002: 183) also states that "grammar is just as important an instrument of communication, and a text cannot be written cohesively without attention being paid to how meaning is being expressed through grammar."In this view grammar, lexis, and phonology are resources for creating meaning in social communication. Briefly, knowing grammar is important since it is a means of achieving linguistic accuracy- the more accurately a message is conveyed, the lesser the opportunities for misunderstanding in communication. Whereas, if there is a lack of grammatical competence, communicators do not participate willingly and fully so that communication breaks down.

However, currently in Ethiopia a considerable number of students are attending higher institutions and colleges with a very weak knowledge of English grammar and little ability to use the language accurately (Haregewain, 2008). As a result, it is very difficult to uphold quality of education if the learners are deficient in grammar throughout their college stay. Although the main cause of learner difficulties in grammar learning can be attributed to different variables, quite recently, language scholars are drawing attention to 'learning strategies' that learners employ in grammar learning as one of the major factors for either success or failure in learning English grammar. The reason is that learners who use strategies more often, with more varieties, and more appropriately become successful while unsuccessful learners stick to only limited

strategies without recognizing that the strategies are helping them to accomplish their goal or not (Anderson, 2005; Chamot,2004; Oxford,1990; Rubin, 1975).

Moreover, among the many factors that are generally conceived to affect the use of language learning strategies, gender is the one which is said to have a 'profound effect on strategy choice' of learners (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989 cited in Zeynali, 2012). In the majority of studies, females are reported to use high number of strategies than their male counter parts. On the contrary, a study cited in Aslan (2009) as conducted by Tran (1988) in Vietnamese refugees discovered that male learners use strategies with greater frequency than female learners. The reason is that refugees are population typically characterized by survival learning where in men would be highly motivated to learn English for survival needs (e.g., supporting their family in the new society).

Generally, the discussion of the role of gender in language learning strategies has been in the agenda of many scholars for a long time; yet the results they reached are still far from being conclusive. The reason is that gender itself is not a stable factor; it depends on many variables such as biological factors, cultural and social elements. Along with this, more research on the effect of gender in strategy use requires to be done in various learning contexts.

In the second language literature, extensive researches have been conducted in order to determine general language learning strategies. In addition, several studies have investigated the learning strategies that learners employ in specific language skills. Regarding grammar most of the local and abroad researches more focused on the identification of teacher's pedagogical strategies than exploring learner's grammar learning strategies. Therefore, there is a great lack of studies that specifically target the identification of the learning strategies that learners use.

Thus, the researcher is inspired to conduct a study on Grammar learning strategies use of grade 11 students at Medhanealem preparatory school focusing on the effect of gender on the basis of various reasons. Firstly, most of the time teachers seem unaware of the effect of gender on the choice of grammar learning strategies. So, they fail to create conducive classroom environment for both genders.

Secondly, although much emphasis has been given for learner-center perspective in which learners are more responsible to control and make their learning quicker, to diagnose their own

learning strengths and weaknesses as well as to make their learning effective, students are not always aware of the power of consciously using learning strategies especially in learning grammar. So that learners use same strategies over and over again without recognizing whether the strategies are effective for them or not. In connection with this, teachers are not seen helping their students develop an awareness of learning strategies and enable them to use a wider range of appropriate strategies according to their gender differences.

Finally, as far as the researcher's knowledge goes, one research work by Gurata (2008) has been conducted abroad on grammar learning strategy employed by Turkish university students. This study investigates gender as a variable that affect the use of learning strategies and the data reveals a significant difference between males and females in terms of strategy use. However, there is a clear economical, political and sociocultural, and learning environment difference between the study which is conducted on Turkish University students and the present study in Medhanealem Preparatory School.

Additionally, one local study was conducted on grammar learning strategy use of Jimma university students by Temesgen Mereba (2013); yet this study did not mention the case of gender at all. And the study is confined to higher institution students learning in Jimma University. However, the present study focused on male and female learners learning in Preparatory school specifically in grade 11; in which a considerable attention is required in this level from different concerned bodies (e.g., school's administration, teachers, learners themselves, parents, etc.) to make competitive and effective learners who can meet the requirement of higher institution.

Therefore, no local research has been done so far on the area of gender differences in grammar learning strategies use though the impact of gender in education is enormous especially in Ethiopian context. Hence, the aim of this study is to fill the gap in this respect.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective

The main objective of the study is to explore grammar learning strategies use of grade 11 students focusing on gender differences in strategies use.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study are;

1. to asses learners overall grammar learning strategies use.
2. to find out males' and females' use of grammar learning strategies.
3. to identify the difference in grammar learning strategies use between male and female learners.

1.4 Research Questions

The present research has three research questions.

1. What grammar learning strategy categories do the participants use?
2. What grammar learning strategy groups do males and females prefer?
3. Is there a significant difference in grammar learning strategies use due to gender?

1.5 Significance of the Study

Assessing gender differences in EFL grammar learning strategies is mainly intended to generate theoretical and practical insights into EFL learning. Thus, the investigator hopes that conducting the study will have necessary contributions: for students, teachers, and curriculum designers.

Initially, the findings of this study can help teachers to get more insights in to how students learn grammar besides their gender differences, encourage their students to be conscious of several learning strategies, and create a more suitable learning environment appeal to the learning strategies of male and female learners. So that learners can improve and monitor their learning and become autonomous learners.

On the other hand, the study can provide deeper insight to curriculum developers to incorporate learning strategies training into the curriculum. Therefore, students will have enough access to strategy training. Finally, the results may call for more investigation to enrich the existing research findings in the area of learning strategies

1.6 Delimitation of the Study

The study was confined to one governmental school; Medhanealem preparatory school which is found around Gulele area. The subjects of the study were only grade 11 male and female students from both natural and social science sections. The study has involved 264 students out of 991 total student population. Moreover, this research mainly focused on identifying the learning strategies of grammar taking gender among the other variables which are believed to have relationships with learning strategies.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

This study is not perfect since it has some limitations. Firstly, the research site was limited to only one governmental preparatory school. So that comparisons was not made. The researcher, however, feels that it would have been much better if more governmental and private preparatory schools had been involved in the study. Secondly, the study did not investigate variables such as, achievement, anxiety, motivation and so on, which are believed to have relationships with learning strategies. Rather the study mainly concerned on investigating the effect of only one variable (gender) on learning strategies. Both these limitations were created due to time and financial constraints.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 The Role of Grammar in Language Learning

The role of grammar in the foreign language classroom has constituted an important and debated issue for a long time. In the history of language teaching, the role of grammar has been addressed by a number of linguistic theories and methodologies. The way grammar is or has been-considered has a direct and decisive influence on pedagogical grammars, learning processes and many other areas involved in foreign language teaching. (Rama & Agullo, 2012; Nassaji & Fotos, 2011; Pontarolo, 2013).

Grammar has given different positions in various methodologies and approaches to language teaching. These positions can be viewed in terms of three general instructional approaches, beginning with those that conceptualized teaching in terms of methods with an exclusive focus on grammar, continuing later as types of exposure to meaningful communication, and emerging more recently as a set of instructional options with a focus on both grammar and meaning. (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Previously grammar had a central position in language teaching since it was believed that knowing the structure of the language develop learners' intellectual ability and accurate production of the language in spontaneous language use. However, many researchers have questioned the above assumptions and the traditional methods based on the exclusive teaching of grammar criticized because of learners' inability to use the language communicatively though they knew grammar rules. So, new approaches that foster exposure to meaningful communication emerged. (Hinkel & Fotos, 2002; Nassaji & Fotos, 2011; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). These communicative approaches gave no formal grammar instruction assuming that the learners would acquire the forms and vocabulary naturally, during the process of comprehending and responding to the input. Therefore, grammar has a limited role. (Hinkel & Fotos, 2002).

The negation of the importance of grammar in language teaching was supported by Krashen (1981, 1982) and Krashen & Terrell (1983). Besides, his model of second language learning and the distinction he made between acquisition and learning provided ample theoretical support for

the principles of communicative language teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Krashen argues that learners should “acquire” language unconsciously and implicitly as a result of exposure to comprehensible input rather than “learn” it consciously through explicit teaching of grammatical rules (Krashen, 1981; 1982; Krashen & Terrell, 1983).

On the other hand, many researchers have tried to restore the role of grammar. Ellis (2006) for instance argues that instructed learning may require for attaining advanced level of grammatical competence and performance since grammatical competence is one component of communicative competence. He believes that the teaching of different grammatical structures in meaningful context influences proficiency in language learning. In addition, Hinkel & Fotos (2002) reported that instructed grammar learning can serve as communicative input, based on which learners can internalize grammar rules. This is seen as especially important for the EFL situation, in which communicative exposure to the target language is usually lacking.

Support is also given for the role of grammar in language learning by Lightbown & Spada (2006). They are confident that exposure to meaning in comprehensible input and mere reliance on communication do not lead to language acquisition automatically. In addition, Debata (2013) points out that grammar helps the students in the correction of mistakes and improvement of written work. He implies that a person cannot learn a foreign language accurately only through a process of unconscious assimilation. So, grammar is indispensible for learners. Likewise, Zhang (2009) asserts that grammar instruction can help learners acquire grammar they would not have learned on their own, otherwise learners reach a language plateau beyond which it is very difficult to progress or their linguistic competence fossilizes. Furthermore, a study which has been carried out to demonstrate the usefulness of formal instruction from teachers’ point of view indicates that all the participant teachers believe that grammar plays an important role in L2 learning. (Wong & Barrea-Marlys, 2012).

In general, research in second language acquisition has lead to a reconsideration of the importance of grammar. Many researchers now believe that grammar teaching should not be ignored in second language classrooms. Language teaching professionals have also become increasingly aware that grammar instruction plays an important role in language teaching and learning (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). There are a number of reasons for this re-evaluation of the role of grammar. First, the hypothesis that language can be learned without some degree of

consciousness has been found to be theoretically problematic (Schmidt, 1990). In addition, there is ample empirical evidence that teaching approaches that focus primarily on meaning with no focus on grammar are inadequate (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011).

2.2 Second Language Learning and Learning Strategies

The term second language learning refers to "the subconscious or conscious process by which a language other than the mother tongue is learnt in a natural or tutored setting" (Ellis, 1985:6). There has been much debate about exactly how language is learned, and many issues are still unresolved. There are many theories of second language acquisition/learning, but none are accepted as a complete explanation by all SLA researchers.

According to the behaviorists, speech is language because there are many languages without written forms. Because we learn to speak before we learn to read and write (Demirezen, 1988). So that language learning takes place through habit formation. That is, learners receive linguistic input from speakers in their environment by building up chains of stimulus-response links and when correct responses and imitations are coherently reinforced, then habit formation is established. In this behaviorist view of learning there was little attention for any active processing by the learner since the whole process of language learning is teacher centered rather than being a learner centered that encourage learners to take control of their language learning by employing different learning strategies (Brown, 2007; Demirezen, 1988; Ellis, 1985; Lightbown & Spada, 1993).

Later, this behaviorist theory for language learning was challenged by psychologists and language acquisition researchers and cognitive theory for language acquisition emerged. The most prominent characteristics of the cognitive theory could be described as the focus on the processes underlying complex learning. In this theory learners have to pay attention to any aspect of the language which they are trying to understand or produce. Gradually, through experience and practice, learners become able to use certain parts of their knowledge so quickly and automatically that they are not even aware that they are doing it (Lightbown & Spada, 1993).

Current cognitive theories to learning stress that learning is an active, constructive, cumulative, and self-directed process that is dependent on the mental activities of the learner rather than simply being an observable stimulus- response process (Brown, 2007). In the view of cognitive

theory, the notion of effective language learning requires the active involvement of the learner in the process. This explicitly acknowledges the use of various learning strategies since learning is goal-oriented, the learner must somehow organize his/her resources and activities in order to achieve the goal of learning. This theory is a relative new comer to SLA research, and has not yet been widely tested empirically. Because the theory itself cannot easily predict what kinds of structures will be automatized through practice (Horanicova, 2006).

Therefore, construction theory succeeds cognitive theory. A refreshing characteristic of constructivism is its integration of linguistic, psychological, and sociological paradigms, in contrast to the previous theories. Thus, in this theory learners are thought to construct mental pictures of the language being learned. These mental pictures are thought to develop in predictable stages. That is, certain structures are acquired in a predictable sequence. In other words, acquisition takes place internally as learners read and hear samples of the language that they understand. It means that the speech and writing which the learner eventually produces is seen as an outcome of the learning process rather than as the cause of learning or even as a necessary step in learning. Thus, learners' oral or written production is useful only when it allows the learner to participate in communicative situations. Likewise, this theory also emphasizes the importance of social interaction and cooperative learning in constructing both cognitive and emotional images of reality (Brown, 2007; Lightbown & Spada, 1993).

Moreover, constructivism advocates student-centered, discovery learning where students must individually discover and transform complex information if they are to make it their own or simply they use information they previously know to acquire more knowledge. Therefore, learners require playing a more active role in order to facilitate their learning using learning strategies (Brown, 2007).

On the other dimension, there is an interactionist theory. Like creative construction theory, this theory places a large emphasis up on the input that a learner receives. The main difference however, is that in interaction theory, the stress is placed almost entirely upon input. It means that this theory highlight the important role of the social environment and the important role social input has in structuring language learning.

Interactionists claim that a crucial element in the language learning process is the modified input that learners are exposed to and the way in which native speakers interact in conversation with learners (Ellis, 1985; Lightbown & Spada, 1993). In general, learning takes place as a result of a complex interaction between the linguistic environments and the learners' internal mechanisms (Ellis, 1997).

Furthermore, Ellis (1985) points out that mere exposure to the L2 is not enough. Learners appear to need L2 data that are especially suited to whatever stage of development they are at. Besides, learners require using learning strategies to processes the L2 input in order to develop linguistic knowledge or learners need to shift the input they received and relate it to their existing knowledge using learning strategies.

All in all, it is obvious that any given second language learner may differ from another second language learner because of the way in which learners use learning strategies to learn a L2 and the way they use their L2 knowledge. That is why Ellis (1985) stresses the importance of investigating learning strategies since it has a central place in Second Language Learning.

2.3 Language Learning Strategies

Learning strategies have been in the center of attention and they have gained great importance in the teaching-learning environment. A number of language theorists have defined language learning strategies in different ways. Rubin (1975: 43) who was one of the earliest researcher in this field, defines learning strategies as "the techniques or devise which a learner may use to acquire knowledge." O'Malley & Chamot (1990:1) characterized learning strategies as "the special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information." Thus learning strategies were seen as special ways of processing information that enhance comprehension, learning, or retention of the information. Brown (2007: 132) on the other hand views learning strategies relating with "input- to processing, storage, and retrieval, that is, to taking messages from others." Additionally, for Paterson & Rosbottom (1995:15) learning strategies are "the particular habits or patterns espoused when engaged in the learning process."

Whereas prior descriptions of learning strategies paid more attention to products of learning and behaviors reflecting unobservable cognitive processes, as well as limit learning strategies to

receptive skills, definitions eventually provided clearer understanding of what learners think and do during language learning. In this regard learning strategies have been explained by Cohen (1996: 2) as “the steps or actions selected by learners either to improve the learning of a second language, the use of it, or both.” Similarly, Chamot (2004: 14) also describes learning strategies as “the conscious thoughts and actions that learners take in order to achieve a learning goal.”

One of the most applicable definition which has been cited most frequently in the literature was provided by Oxford (1990: 8). She defines language learning strategies as “the specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self directed, more effective and more transferable to new situations.” It is indeed, a reflection of what the learner intends to do and specific actions he/she can take. The author also prominently includes how context plays a crucial role in the language learning process.

2.4 Main Features of Language Learning Strategies

Oxford (1990: 9) listed the main features of language learning strategies, in which Language learning strategies:

1. Contribute to the main goal of communicative competence. In order to develop communicative competence, it is important for learners to develop: knowledge of grammatical rules (grammatical competence), the ability to use the language as appropriate for the particular social context in which the communication takes place (sociolinguistics competence), the ability to interpret messages coherently with the entire text (discourse competence) and the ability to initiate, control, and redirect communication (strategic competence) Canale & Swain (1980).

2. Encourage learners for greater self-direction.

3. Expand the role of teachers. The roles of teachers include identifying students’ learning strategies, conducting training on learning strategies and helping learners become more independent.

4. Are problem oriented. They are tools used to solve a problem or to accomplish a task.

5. Are specific action taken by the learner to enhance their learning.

6. Involve many aspects of the learner, not just the cognitive; those dealing with mental processing and manipulation of the new language. Rather they include metacognitive functions like planning, evaluation and arriving one's own learning; emotional, social, and other functions as well.

7. Offer direct and indirect support of learning.

8. Are observable to some degree. They are not always readily observable. For instance, the act of making mental associations, which is memory strategy, cannot be observed. However, doing works in cooperation with others can be observed.

9. Have some levels of consciousness. They usually reflect conscious efforts by learners to take control of their learning.

10. Can be taught through strategy training.

11. Are flexible; that is, they are not always in the same sequences or certain patterns.

12. Influenced by a variety of factors to be chosen and used by the learner such as motivation, gender, nationality, age, learning style, etc.

2.5 The Purposes of Language Learning Strategies

Within communicative approaches to language teaching a key goal is for the learner to develop communicative competence in the target L2/FL, and language learning strategies can help students in doing so. As Oxford (1990; 2003) indicates, language learning strategies contribute a high importance for effective communicative competence. According to Canale & Swain (1980), there are four dimensions of communicative competence. These are grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. Therefore, language learning strategies can be used as a tool to facilitate these dimensions of communicative competence. More specifically, Cognitive strategies such as practicing, analyzing, and reasoning; Memory strategies or rehearsal, and Compensation strategies develop vocabulary and grammatical competence or accuracy (Oxford, 2003; Yalcin, 2005). Besides, Oxford (2003) notes although Memory strategies are often used for memorizing vocabulary and

structures in initial stages of language learning, but learners need such strategies much less when their knowledge of vocabulary and structures has become larger.

Additionally, Social strategies, such as frequent contact with native speakers and cooperation with other learners increase sociolinguistic competence. Several kinds of strategies, such as asking questions, rehearsing, and use of contextual clues, enhance discourse competence. Lastly, some strategies such as using synonyms or gestures and guessing the meaning of words form the basis of strategic competence.

Moreover, learning strategies can also enable students to become more independent, autonomous, lifelong learners and learners can be able to adopt and maintain certain attitudes to keep themselves involved in the language learning process (Oxford, 1990; 2003). As explained by Ehrman, Leaver &Oxford (2003) ,learning strategies are helpful if: (a) the strategy relates well to the L2 task at hand, (b) the strategy fits the particular student's learning style preferences to one degree or another, and (c) the student employs the strategy effectively and links it with other relevant strategies. Besides, they may assist learners in mastering the forms and functions required for reception or production in the second or foreign language and thus affect achievement (Rubin, 1975).

2.6 The Concept of Gender

The sex and gender distinction is not universal. In ordinary speech, sex and gender are often used interchangeably (Johnson & Repta 2012). However, some dictionaries and several academic disciplines give them different definitions. Sex is annotated as different from gender in the Oxford English Dictionary (2010), where it says sex "tends now to refer to biological differences" while gender is "a euphemism for the sex of a human being, often intended to emphasize the social and cultural, as opposed to the biological, distinctions between the sexes."

The World Health Organization (WHO) similarly states that "sex refers to the biological and physiological characteristics that define men and women and that 'male' and 'female' are sex categories." However, gender refers to "the socially constructed roles, behaviors, activities, and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for men and women and that 'masculine' and 'feminine' are gender categories."

The other scholar Jhonson & Repta (2012) defines these two terminologies similarly, but in a broad expression. So sex is defined as “a biological construct that encapsulates the anatomical, physiological, genetic, and hormonal variation that exists in species (p.19).” Whereas, gender is “a multidimensional construct that refers to the different roles, responsibilities, limitations, and experiences provided to individuals based on sex/gender (p.20).” According to the author’s view, gender builds on biological sex to give meaning to sex differences, categorizing individuals with labels such as woman and man. These categories are socially constructed.

Finally, according to Sunderland (2006: 29), gender is described as a “sort of social correlate of sex.” It means that biological males and biological females posses certain culturally imbued characteristics. In relation with this for the author “sex is a biological determination to be male and female.”

2.7 Gender and Language Learning Strategies

Gender has given little attention in research on the development of second and foreign language though it is assumed that it has a direct relationship with language (Bidlake, 2007; Oxford, 1992). The rare research on gender differences in second or foreign languages has concentrated on how people learn these languages, that is, on the choice of strategies they employ for language learning (Oxford, 1992).

Gender is considered as an important factor affecting the choice of language learning strategies in language learning and is said to have a profound effect on strategy choice (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989 cited in Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006). It has been found by many researchers that males and females employ different strategies in relation to their gender characteristics. However, studies which have examined the relationship between gender and strategy use have come to mixed conclusions.

The result of the majority of studies indicates higher use of strategies by females than males. Oxford & Nyikos (1989), for example, examined gender differences in strategy use of 1200 college foreign-language students in the US. The study found that females use learning strategies more frequently than males. The study revealed that females more frequently use general study strategies, formal- rule related practice strategies, and conversational input elicitation strategies

because of their desire for good grades and need for social approval (cited in Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006).

Similarly, Green & Oxford's (1995) study of English language use of university students in Puerto Rico also revealed a greater use of learning strategies by women than by men. Many frequently used strategies by female fell within the categories of memory, cognitive, affective, and social strategies. They concluded that differences in strategy use by gender can be explained within individual learning style, motivations, and attitudes (cited in Aslan, 2009). Likewise, Tam's (2013) study of language learning strategies of university students in Hong Kong also indicates female dominance over males in strategies use. The finding implies that male students are less willing to take a provocative role in communicating and seeking help from other English learners or speakers to improve their English skills. The findings of Gurata's (2008) study on study on grammar learning strategies employed by Turkish EFL students also support female dominance in strategies use. The major findings showed that females reported using more Metacognitive, Social and Affective strategies than the males.

However, while studies found that differences in strategy use may exist between males and females, other studies reported more strategies used by males. For instance, Radwan's (2011) study on the effects of L2 proficiency and gender on choice of language learning strategies by university students revealed that male students used more social strategies than female students which is totally contrary to the above studies. The author indicates that the culture of the society gives men more responsibility in the major political and social dimensions. So, they have to develop extremely good social skills to operate in this context. However, the conservative nature of culture, customs and habits prevents females to develop communicative abilities in the language with other people.

On the other hand, a study of Rahimi, Riazi & Saif (2008) on the investigation of the factors affecting the use of language learning strategies by Persian EFL learners reported that gender did not have a significant overall effect on the use of language learning strategies. In general, research findings have indicated that the differences in strategy use between females and males exist and the use of strategies between them differ somewhat. Researchers generally agree that gender difference in strategy use may result from various factors such as learning styles, language learning experiences, socialization, and/or life experience.

Moreover, one of the important issue which Oxford (1994) recommends is that teachers need to learn to identify and understand their students' individual differences, even they need become more aware that their teaching styles are appropriate to their learners strategies (cited in Fazeli, 2011) .

2.8 Grammar Learning Strategies

Oxford, Rang Lee & Park (2007) describe grammar learning strategies as "(…) actions and thoughts that learners consciously employ to make language learning and/ or language use easier, more effective, more efficient, and more enjoyable." (Cited in Pawlak, 2009). Similarly, to all other types of strategic behaviors, grammar learning strategies possess distinctive characteristics as summarized by Griffiths (2008) and cited in Pawlak (2009). These are: (1) they are actions to be taken by the learner; (2) Their application is at least partly conscious; (3) They are optional means learners choose; (4) Their use entails goal-oriented, purposeful activity, and (5) They are used to regulate, facilitate, and control the process of learning.

Regarding researches on the exploration of grammar learning strategies, Temesgen Mereba's (2013) study on the exploration of English grammar skills learning strategies by Jimma University Students shows that the students' perceived use of grammar learning strategies is different from their actual usage. The result of the questionnaire shows that respondents use all the six strategies. However, the result of the think aloud technique revealed that the students use only three (Cognitive, Compensation, and Memory strategies) of the six strategies. This study indicates that even though most of the learners had information about the use of learning strategies, some of them did not have any information about learning strategies use.

Additionally, the findings of Mystkowska-Wiertelak's (2008) investigation on the use of grammar learning strategies of Polish secondary school students indicates that the students use all the six strategies. In the study, many students are reported to use modern technology to establish and sustain contacts with the native speakers apart from using traditional teaching aids such as dictionaries and grammar books.

Another study that aimed to investigate the use of grammar learning strategies and student achievement of English preparatory classes in Turkish was conducted by Yalcin (2005). This study found no significant relationship between grammar leaning strategy use and achievement.

Likewise, the result of a study by Pawlak (2009) on the relationship between grammar learning strategies and language attainment of English department students also failed to find evidence for the existence of positive relationship between the use of grammar learning strategies and attainment.

Despite such undeniable accomplishments by some researchers, the investigation on grammar learning strategies is still in its infancy. Anderson (2005: 766) says that "what is greatly lacking in the research are studies that specifically target the identification of learning strategies that L2 learners use to learn grammar and to understand the elements of grammar." So that it is very unfortunate that the learner has been left out of the picture since, as is the case with any other skill, it is the learner that is responsible for deciding how to master the target language grammar. Therefore, the more it is known about what kind of grammar learning strategies used by learners accordingly with individual differences, the easier it will become to promote the most beneficial and effective ones and in so doing, foster autonomy in this area (Pawlak, 2008; 2009).

2.9 Classification of Grammar Learning Strategies

There are many language learning strategies which have been studied and classified in various ways by many researchers. Rubin (1981) distinguished between learner actions that directly contribute to learning such as clarification, monitoring, memorization, and practice as direct strategies, and processes that contribute indirectly to learning as indirect strategies such as creating opportunities for exposure to the target language or motivation to practice (cited in Lee, 2010).

In the other strategy classification by O'Malley & Chamot (1990), three main strategy categories are identified. These are Cognitive, Metacognitive, and Social/affective strategies. Cognitive strategies directly related to the performance of information processing (e.g., translation, note taking, repetition). Metacognitive strategies attempt to regulate language learning (e.g., planning, monitoring, self evaluation). Social/affective strategies are related to interactions with others in leaning (e.g., cooperation, asking for the clarification of questions).

Later Oxford (1990) proposed a comprehensive classification system of language learning strategies using the two major groups proposed by Rubin's (1981) model; direct and indirect strategies. The present study use Oxford's classification of language learning strategies because

the taxonomies are comprehensive, systematic, and detailed and they are applicable to most language skills in different leaning contexts.

2.9.1 Direct Strategies

According to Oxford (1990), direct strategies are directly related to learning/ producing the target language. They are subdivided in to three subcategories: Memory, Cognitive, and Compensation strategies.

1. **Memory Strategies**

These strategies help learners to relate new information to existing ones or relating one grammatical rule or word to another in order to create association in memory but do not necessarily involve deep understanding (Oxford, 1990; 2003). In this case the learners use various memory related strategies to be able to learn and retrieve grammatical rules.

According to Oxford (1990) memory strategies enable learners to create mental linkages of one grammatical rule with another by grouping, associating/elaborating, and by using the rules in a context. That is, learners learn grammar by classifying or reclassifying the grammar part into meaningful units, either mentally or in writing (e.g., ordering them together according to tense relationship, similarity or dissimilarity in form, meaning, etc). Therefore, learners can make grammar learning easier to remember by reducing the number of discrete elements. Similarly, learners can also relate new grammar structure to the rule already in memory. So that they create associations in memory as it is meaningful to them, either in a simple or complex manner. Besides, learners use the new structure in meaningful oral or written utterances (for instance, using in sentences, conversations, or stories) in order to remember it.

On the other hand, applying images and sounds using imagery, semantic mapping, and representing sounds in memory (for instance, remembering orally emphasized structures through loudness or repetition) help learners to remember grammatical rules. That is, learners relate new grammar structure to the structure they learnt previously by means of meaningful visual imagery, either in mind or in an actual drawing (e.g., pictures, objects, locations). Likewise, learners involve in arranging grammatical concepts into a picture on a paper by putting the key

grammatical concept at the center and link important concepts with the key concept via lines or arrows.

Moreover, making structured reviewing of different grammatical structures in carefully spaced intervals and physically act out a new expression or meaningfully relating a new expression to a physical feeling and using creative techniques (e.g., using highlight, underlying, circling) or location (e.g., on the page or blackboard) enable learners to memorize grammar structures effectively. Generally, Oxford (1990) claimed that learners can be effective using memory strategies if they simultaneously use metacognitive strategies, like paying attention, and affective strategies, like reducing anxiety through deep breathing. Although memory strategies are often used for memorizing vocabulary and structures in initial stages of language learning, learners need such strategies much less when their lexicon and structures have become larger (Oxford, 1990; 2003).

2. Cognitive Strategies

According to Oxford (1990), Cognitive strategies enable the learners to manipulate grammatical rules by practicing the grammar rule meaningfully like by recognizing and using a combination of rules in sentences repeatedly and apply the new pattern in a realistic setting such as, by participating in conversation, reading a book or article, listening to a lecture, or writing a letter in the new grammar structure. Learners also practice grammar structures by saying or writing them several times, listen to them again and again, rehearsing, and imitating a native speaker.

On the other hand, learners send messages by applying a combination of patterns as it can be comprehensible and understandable by the receiver and at the same time they exercise how to understand the main idea of the received message as much as quickly. In order to do so, they might use two techniques: skimming and scanning. Using skimming learners can determine the central idea the speaker wants to get across, whereas using scanning they can search for specific details of interest. Besides, print and non print resources can be used to understand incoming messages or produce out going messages. Printed resources such as, dictionaries, grammar books, encyclopedias, etc can provide important back ground information for learners to understand the message clearly. Non printed resources like TV, video cassettes, and radio are also important resources.

Additionally, learners can enhance their linguistic competence by determining the meaning of a new expression by breaking it down into parts; compare the patterns of L2 with the pattern of their native language; and apply the knowledge of words, or structures from their native language to L2. Likewise, creating structure for input and output by writing the main idea in a systematic way during the process of learning, and summarize longer units facilitate the process of language learning. In general, cognitive strategies are essential in learning grammar. These strategies are also typically found to be the most popular strategies with language learners (Oxford, 1990).

3. Compensation Strategies

Compensation occurs not only in understanding the new language but also in producing it. There for, compensation strategies help the learners to use the language for either comprehension or production though there are limitations in information. These strategies serve as auto fillers in learning a language where information gaps occur in understanding or applying grammar rules (Oxford, 1990; 2003). So, learners overcome their limitations by guessing intelligently using linguistic and non-linguistic clues to compensate the absence of complete grammatical knowledge. Learner's background knowledge of the target language, his/her own language or some other languages can provide linguistic clues to the meaning of what is heard. Learners can use clues like word order, word formation, and so on to their grammatical comprehension.

On the other hand, Learners prevail their limitation in speaking and writing with the appropriate grammatical rule by switching to the mother tongue for expression, asking someone for help for the missing expression by hesitating or explicitly asking the person, using gesture during speech, and altering the message by omitting some items of information.

2.9.2 Indirect Strategies

Indirect strategies are those that enable or support direct strategies to occur and/or increase their successful application (Oxford, 1990). Indirect strategies are divided in to three subgroups: metacognitive, affective, and social strategies.

1. Metacognitive Strategies

Metacognitive strategies allow learners to evaluate their own grammar learning pattern and coordinate the learning process (Oxford, 1990; 2003). Oxford believes that Metacognitive strategies are essential for successful language learning though learners rarely or unconsciously use these strategies. These strategies are used for centering learning by paying attention on certain grammar tasks, activities or materials such as, paying attention to the rules from reference books. Using such strategies, the learners overview a concept or principle and link it with already known material.

Additionally, learners can be effective when they can be able to arrange and plane their language learning by setting goals and objectives that they want to achieve, and create opportunities to practice grammar rules by communicating with others in natural situations (e.g., looking for people they can talk to in English). Similarly, learners also require doing self monitoring by identifying mistakes in learning grammar and evaluate one's own progress in learning grammar such as, identifying grammatical mistakes and looking the difference with the correct version. It means that if goals and objectives are set properly earlier, learners might have opportunities to self monitor their learning and self evaluate their progress in grammar learning. Therefore, setting a purpose help them be better prepared before the learning process. So that they will probably have mental plan to follow.

2. Affective Strategies

Affective strategies help learners gain control and regulate personal emotions, attitudes, and values; which are the necessary elements for successful language learning (Oxford, 1990; 2003). Knowing how to control one's emotions and attitudes may influence grammar learning process positively since it will make the learning more effective and enjoyable. It is also known that negative feelings hinder progress. Good language learners often know how to control their emotions and attitudes while learning grammar.

Therefore, lowering anxiety using progressive relaxation, deep breathing and meditation can enable learners to perform grammar activities and tasks effectively. Besides, listening to soothing music and using laughter (i.e., watching funny movie, listening to jocks and so on) is help learners relieve anxiety. Furthermore, encouraging oneself in learning grammar by making

positive statements can make one self to be more self confident, enable to take risk wisely, and rewarding oneself is also essential for achieving goals. Similarly, taking emotional temperature in the process of grammar learning by writing feelings in a checklist, diary or a piece of paper, and talking with another person (e.g., friends, or teachers) contributes for a healthy language learning process. Oxford (1990: 140) claims that "the effective side of the learner is probably one of the very biggest influences on language learning success or failure." So, learners need to give attention to their personal feelings.

3. Social Strategies

Social strategies are actions taken by learners so as to seek support or interact with other learners or more proficient speakers of the language (Oxford, 1990; 2003). Communication between and among people is required to learn language effectively since language is a form of social behavior. So that learners develop cooperation with others. As a result, they will have the chance to learn from their peers for instance if learners work different grammar activities in groups, there is a possibility that less successful learners use strategies used by successful learners.

Additionally, learners can be equipped with the correct grammatical form by asking questions and/or clarifications for the complex issues they confront with from more proficient friends, native speakers, or teachers. Moreover, social strategies enhance learners' ability to understand people's emotions and feelings and develop cultural understanding.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

3.1 Research Design

Survey study design was used in this research. The survey is the most widely used design in many fields. This research design involves the gathering of limited data from a relatively large number of cases at a particular time. Additionally, survey is frequently employed to indicate prevailing conditions or particular trends. It is not concerned with the characteristics of individuals as individuals, but it is concerned with providing information about population characteristics (Neuman, 2007; Verma & Mallick, 1999).

Moreover, the survey asks many people (called respondents) about their beliefs, opinions, characteristics, and past or present behavior. So that it is appropriate for research questions about self-reported beliefs or behaviors. Survey is strongest when the answers people (respondents) give to questions measure variables. That is, many questions can be asked at one time in survey to measure many variables (often with multiple indicators), and test several hypotheses in a single survey. Thus, survey is a broad study of a generalized statistical nature (Best & Kahn, 2006; Neuman, 2007; Rugg & Petre, 2007; Verma & Mallick, 1999). Therefore, this design is appropriate to address the "what" questions (what are the groups of strategies being preferred) and the inferential statistics.

After all, a quantitative research method was used in this study. This method is based on explaining phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analyzed using mathematically based methods (in particular statistics) such as frequencies, means, standard deviations, and ranges (Anderson, 1998; Best & Kahn, 2006). Besides, quantitative research method looks at relationships between variables, assumes sample is representative of the population, and the subjectivity of researcher in this method is recognized less.

Therefore, quantitative research method was appropriate to solve the research problems of the present study since the purpose of this research was to get an overall view of learners' grammar learning strategy preferences, and to assess the relationship between strategy use and gender. The

quantitative results (mean, standard deviation, and p-values) are reported in tables organized to give a suitable overall picture at a glance.

3.2 Sampling

3.2.1 Research Setting (the School and Grade)

Medhanealem preparatory school was selected purposively for this study because high number of students was learning in the school in 2014/15 academic year as compared to the other governmental schools found in Gullele Area. This helped the researcher to get a considerable number of samples for the study. Besides, this kind of research was not conducted in the school. The subjects of the study were grade 11 students. Because grade 12 students were busy in preparing themselves for national level examinations during the time of data collection and since they are likely to use exam-oriented strategies or limited techniques to achieve their immediate goal, their response to the self report cannot be valid.

3.2.2. The Participants

There were a total number of 1096 students distributed in 24 sections in the school. From these sections, 7 of them were social science while 17 were natural science. In a social science stream there were 302 students while 794 students were in Natural science stream.

In order to conduct this research, 2 sections each from natural science and social science stream were excluded because the 30 voluntary students participated in the pilot study were selected from these sections. As a result, 105 students from the two sections (i.e. 51 from natural science and 54 from social science) were not included in the actual study. Then the process of determining sample participants was made using a scientific sample size calculator with a 95% confidence level and 5 margin of error (Kotari, 2004). Thus, 277 sample participants were required from 991 total population. After all, a proportion of 2 sections from social science and 4 sections from natural science were selected as a sample from the total of 22 sections.

These sections (16, 22, 23, and 24 from Natural Science and section 01, and 05 from Social Science) were selected using simple random sampling technique. In these sections, there were 279 students. Then the questionnaire was distributed to the whole students in those sections.

However, 13 students were missed from the actual sample size (277) since they were absent from class room because of different reasons when the questionnaire was administered. Therefore, the questionnaire was distributed to 264 (117 Male and 147 Female) subjects. The participants' descriptions are summarized below in Table 1.

Table 1: Description of the Study Participants.

Gender	Field of Study				Age		Total	%
	N.S	%	S.S	%	Range	Average		
Male	90	52.3	27	29.3	16-20	17.3	117	40.8%
Female	82	47.7	65	70.7	16-20	17.3	147	59.2%
Total	172	100	92	100	16-20	17.3	264	100

As observed in the table, 40.8% of the participants were male learners, while 59.2% were female learners. The number of Female learners was higher than the male students in the study, because there were slightly more female students in the school. Their mean age was 17.3 ranging from 16 to 20 years. Since the questionnaire was completed in class with the presence of the researcher, the return rate was 100%.

3.3 Study Instrument

3.3.1 Self Report Questionnaire

"Questionnaires are among the most efficient and comprehensive ways to asses frequency of language learning strategy use" (Oxford, 1996: 28). In the most studies of language learning strategies, a self report questionnaire is chosen as a basic instrument, because respondents have enough time to read and give a well thought responses in written form without the intervention of the interviewer, it is suitable in the case of big enquires and it is also economical in terms of time and energy (Anderson, 1998; Kotari, 2004; Best & Khan, 2006; Rugg & Petre, 2007).

Thus, in order to gather valuable information from data sources, Oxford's (1990) version 7.0 ESL/EFL Strategy Inventory for Language Learners (SILL) was adapted. The SILL has been employed as a key instrument in numerous studies assessing the frequency of strategy use by students from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Besides, it has been used in various

studies to show how much strategy use correlate with various variables such as gender, proficiency level, task, culture, etc.

Therefore, the SILL was modified as it was convenient to explore the learners' grammar learning strategies. This modified Grammar Learning Strategies Questionnaires (GLSQ) consisted of two parts. The first part contained questions used to elicit information related with the learners' background such as age, gender, and field of study. The second part consisted of 35 statements grouped under the six categories as proposed by Oxford (1990). Part 1 included 7 statements related to Memory Strategies. Part 2 involved 8 statements about Cognitive Strategies. Part 3 consisted of 3 statements on Compensation Strategies. Part 4 contained 8 statements about Metacognitive Strategies. Part 5 consisted of 5 statements for Affective Strategies, and part 6 consisted of 4 statements on Social Strategies. The subjects were required to respond on a 5-point Likert Scale, ranging from 1 (Never or almost never true of me) to 5 (always or almost always true of me). The participants took about 20-25 minutes to finish.

3.3.1.1 Reliability of the Questionnaire

Before the questionnaire was administered in a large scale, it was piloted on a group of 30 voluntary grade 11 students at Medhanealem preparatory school. The questionnaire was administered by randomly selecting two sections each from social science and natural science. Then, the internal consistency of the questionnaire was checked using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS- Version 20) and the calculated Cronbach alpha revealed an acceptable reliability (.60) which fitted the purpose of the study.

3.3.1.2 Validity of the Questionnaire

In addition to testing the internal reliability of the questionnaire, the pilot study was used to verify whether the statements in the questionnaire were comprehended by the students. Feedback was sought from the students regarding the wording of the questionnaire. On the other hand, the researcher gave the questionnaire to 5 English language teachers to review the items of the questionnaire and assess whether the items were suitable for the purpose of the study. After all, the questionnaire was revised based on the comments and suggestions given by the students, and teachers regarding the use of some words and the structure of some statements. Thus, as the questionnaire was worded in very simple English, it was not required to translate in to Amharic.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

Prior to the data collection, the researcher went to the school with a permission letter from the department of foreign languages and literature and informed about the study to the administrative bodies of the school. Then, the data collection procedure for the actual study was started after two weeks of the pilot study. The data was collected by the researcher from the 6 randomly selected classes in 6 subsequent sessions. Before distributing the questionnaires to complete, the researcher explained the purpose of the study in each session.

In the explanation, the researcher emphasized that the study did not have anything to do with the assessment and evaluation of their current learning and the expected outcome of the study would be useful for future learners facing similar learning issues. Next, the researcher explained how to complete the questionnaires and the participants were told to forward questions that they are confused with. Finally, the researcher explicitly requested them to complete the questionnaires as truthfully as they could. Thus, it was hoped that the students would complete the questionnaires more sincerely.

3.5 Data Organization and Analysis

After the questionnaires were completed by the students, they were collected and checked for completeness. Then, the items were codified and were subjected to statistical procedures using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version-20. Descriptive statistics such as means and Standard deviations were computed to see the results of research question 1, which intended to investigate the learners grammar learning strategies, and an independent samples t- test was employed to see the means and Standard deviations in research question 2, which concerned on exploring male and female learners favorable type of grammar learning strategies, which were categorized in to six major groups; 1. Memory strategies; 2. Cognitive Strategies; 3. Compensation Strategies; 4. Metacognitive Strategies; 5. Affective Strategies; 6. Social Strategies. The levels of each strategy use were labeled based on Oxford's (1990) suggestion. Thus, the low use of strategy is determined between 1.00 and 2.49. The medium use of strategy is determined between 2.50 and 3.49, and the high use of strategy is determined as 3.50 and higher. Regarding research question 3, which focused on the analysis of significance difference on Grammar learning strategies between genders, an independent samples t- test was employed.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Overall Grammar Learning Strategy Use

Items 1- 35 were designed to investigate the overall grammar learning strategy use of the learners. The overall use of grammar learning strategies by the subjects has been shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Overall Grammar Learning Strategies Used by the Learners.

Strategies	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**Sub-scales**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
Memory	3.29	.547	Direct Strategies	3.37	.488
Cognitive	3.31	.509			
Compensation	3.51	.923			
Metacognitive	3.07	.649	Indirect Strategies	3.08	.522
Affective	3.04	.763			
Social	3.15	.830			
Total	-	-		3.23	.428

This table presents the mean and standard deviation of strategy use among all the subjects. The mean scores of the Likert-scaled strategy use items were interpreted based on Oxford's (1990) suggestion. So, 1.00-2.49 as low strategy use, 2.50-3.49 as medium strategy use, and 3.50-5.00 as high strategy use.

The average strategy use for overall strategy use ranged from a high 3.51 to a low of 3.04. Regarding strategy categories, the participants reported on using all the six categories of Grammar learning strategies. Similarly, they are reported as moderate strategy users except for Compensation Strategies, with mean value of 3.51, which was significantly higher than the means of all other strategy categories.

The mean for affective strategies (3.04) on the other hand, was significantly lower than all other strategy groups, except for the Metacognitive strategies whose mean score was 3.07.

Additionally, Table 2 above presents the mean value and standard deviation of two sub scales. As mentioned in chapter two, the first three of the six categories (Memory, Cognitive, Compensation) fall under a larger class- Direct Strategies, while the last three (Metacognitive, Affective, Social) are grouped under Indirect Strategies. Thus, descriptive statistics was employed in order to compute learners' responses.

As it is shown in the table, the students used both direct and indirect grammar learning strategies at a medium level that falls between 2.50- 3.49. The learners used direct strategies that are involved in conscious mental processes of grammar learning with mean value of 3.37, while indirect strategies that facilitate grammar learning without the direct involvement of grammar were used by the students with mean value of 3.08. These mean values indicate the learners employed direct strategies more than indirect strategies. Overall, the total mean value for the sample was 3.23, which shows the learners were moderate users of the overall strategies.

Generally, the participants of this study favored Compensation strategies as their best than the other strategy categories, followed by Cognitive strategies as the second preferred strategy group. Nevertheless, Affective strategies were the least to be employed by the students. All in all, the learners used more of direct strategies than indirect strategy categories.

4.2 Use of Grammar Learning Strategies by Gender

The second research question of the current study sought answer as to whether the type of grammar learning strategies used by males and females in GLSQ are similar, or there is a difference between them in the type of strategy use. Therefore, in order to find the results concerning gender difference in the preferences of grammar learning strategies, an independent samples t-test was employed.

The data were analyzed according to two main domains. That is, under "direct strategies" three strategy groups (Memory strategies, Cognitive strategies, Compensation strategies) were included and under "indirect strategies", categories of ", Metacognitive strategies, Affective strategies, and Social strategies" were analyzed in detail.

4.2.1 Gender and Direct Strategies

Items 1-18 were designed to assess male and female learners' use of direct grammar learning strategies. An independent samples t-test was computed to explore male and female learners' use of direct strategies. The result of male and female learners' use of direct strategies is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Male and Female Learners' Responses on Direct Strategies.

Gender		Mean	Std. Deviation
Direct	Male	3.36	.471
	Female	3.39	.504

As Table 3 above, indicates the mean value of males using direct strategies was 3.36, while the average of females using direct strategies was 3.39, which indicates both of them use direct strategies in moderate level.

4.2.1.1 Male and Female use of Memory Strategies

After analyzing the direct strategies as a whole, sub scales of this set were further analyzed. Thus, in order to examine males and females preferences of Memory strategy categories, an independent samples t-test was computed. Seven items (1-7) were included in Memory Strategies group, which refers to the strategies students use for storing and retrieving information in grammar learning. Table 4 bellow presented male and female learners use of memory strategies.

Table 4: Male and Female learners' Responses on Memory Strategies.

Gender		Mean	Std. Deviation
Memory Strategies	Male	3.22	.497
	Female	3.34	.580

As seen in Table 4, the average of male students' use of Memory strategies was 3.22, while the mean score of female learners using Memory strategies was 3.34, which shows that females use Memory strategies more than males.

4.2.1.2 Male and Female Use of Cognitive Strategies

In this category, items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 were planned to assess the participants' Cognitive strategies. These strategies are those which enable learners to understand and produce new grammar items to make sense of them. The results obtained from the analysis of the questionnaire regarding Cognitive strategies are presented below in Table 5.

Table 5: Male and Female Learners' Responses on Cognitive Strategies.

Gender		Mean	Std. Deviation
Cognitive Strategies	Male	3.35	.481
	Female	3.28	.529

As Table 5 above indicates males surpass females in the use of Cognitive strategies, in which the average of males using Cognitive strategies was 3.35, while the mean score of females using Cognitive strategies was 3.28.

4.2.1.3 Male and Female Use of Compensation Strategies

In Compensation strategies group, three items (16, 17, 18) were included. They are the strategies which learners assume they use for enabling themselves to use English grammar when they encounter problems related to the gaps they have in English grammar. Table 6 below shows male and female learners' responses to Compensation strategy category.

Table 6: Male and Female Learners' Responses on Compensation Strategies.

Gender		Mean	Std. Deviation
Compensation Strategies	Male	3.50	.901
	Female	3.53	.943

As indicated in Table 6 above, the average of males using Compensation strategies was 3.50, while the average of females using Compensation strategies was 3.53, which implies both males and females were almost equal.

4.2.2 Gender and Indirect Strategies

Items 19-35 were designed to investigate male and female learners' use of indirect strategies. Thus, in order to investigate male and female learners' responses to the indirect strategies, an independent samples t-test was computed. Table 7 below presented male and female learners' responses on indirect strategies.

Table 7: Male and Female Learners' Responses on Indirect Strategies.

Gender		Mean	Std. deviation
Indirect	Male	3.05	.471
	Female	3.11	.559

As illustrated in Table 7 above, males using indirect strategies were 3.05 in average score while females using indirect strategies were 3.11 in average, which indicated females' superiority in this domain.

4.2.2.1 Male and Female Use of Metacognitive Strategies

Items 19,20,21,22,23,24,25 and 26 were devoted to draw out information on a way that the learners use to control, regulate, or coordinate their own grammar learning process. The analysis of Metacognitive strategy category is illustrated in Table 8 below.

Table 8: Male and Female Learners' Responses on Metacognitive Strategies.

Gender		Mean	Std. deviation
Metacognitive Strategies	Male	3.15	.640
	Female	3.01	.652

as shown in Table 8 above, males surpass females in using Metacognitive strategies in which the average score of males was 3.15, whereas 3.01 was the mean score of females.

4.2.2.2 Male and Female Use of Affective Strategies

In items 27-31 of the questionnaire, an attempt was made to explore 5 types of Affective strategies that are necessary to grammar learning. These strategies help learners in regulating their emotions, and motivations so as to develop self confidence. The results obtained from the analysis of students responses concerning these strategies are presented in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Male and Female Learners' Responses on Affective Strategies.

Gender		Mean	Std. deviation
Affective Strategies	Male	2.96	.708
	Female	3.12	.800

As described in Table 9, females with the average score of 3.12 were superior to males with the mean score of 2.96 in their use of Affective strategies.

4.2.2.3 Male and Female Use of Social Strategies

Items 32-35 were all used to explore the various Social learning strategies, which require learners to interact with others in learning grammar. The results obtained from the analysis of the responses of the subjects regarding Social Strategies category are presented in Table 10 below.

Table 10: Male and Female Learners' Responses on Social Strategies.

Gender		Mean	Std. deviation
Social Strategies	Male	3.06	.795
	Female	3.23	.851

As shown in Table 10, the average of males using Social Strategies was 3.06, whereas the average of females using Social Strategies was 3.23, which implies females use more Social Strategies than males.

4.3 Males' and Females' Preferences of the Overall Grammar Learning Strategies

The data collected by means of questionnaire show that males and females use various grammar learning strategies spreading over six strategy groups. Table 11 below displays the results of descriptive statistics for each grammar learning strategy group. As regards what strategy group males and females favored the most and least, the mean scores gives this information.

Table 11: Male and Female learners' Preferences of the Six Categories of Grammar Learning Strategies in Rank Order.

Males				Females		
Strategy	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
Memory	3.22	.497	3	3.34	.580	2
Cognitive	3.35	.481	2	3.28	.529	3
Compensation	3.50	.901	1	3.53	.943	1
Metacognitive	3.15	.640	4	3.01	.652	6
Affective	2.96	.708	6	3.12	.800	5
Social	3.06	.795	5	3.23	.851	4

In the table, the Compensation Strategy group has the highest mean, 3.50 and 3.53 respectively for males and females. These mean scores indicate that males and females prefer to use Compensation Strategy more than the other strategy groups.

On the other hand, males prefer to use Cognitive Strategy in the second place with the medium mean value of 3.35, whereas this strategy group took the third place in the rank to be employed by females with the medium mean value of 3.28. However, while females favored Memory Strategy group at 3.34 medium mean score in the second place, males employ this strategy group in the third place with mean score of 3.22.

With regard to the Indirect Strategies, Metacognitive strategy group was the fourth preferred strategy group by males with the average value of 3.15, while females (M= 3.01) employed this strategy group the least. Otherwise, the Social strategy group at 3.23 employed by females in the fourth place though males (M=3.06) favored this group in the fifth place. The Affective strategy

group is the least preferred category with mean value of 2.96 among the six strategies in males' preferences of strategies, while females with the mean score of 3.12 employ affective strategy in the fifth place.

Moreover, regarding males and females preferences of the Direct and Indirect grammar learning strategies the descriptive statistics was presented in Table 12 below.

Table 12: Male and Female learners' Preferences of the Direct and Indirect Strategies in Rank Order.

Males				Females		
Strategy	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
Direct	3.36	.471	1	3.39	.504	1
Indirect	3.05	.471	2	3.11	.559	2
Overall	3.20	.390	-	3.25	.457	-

In the table, the direct strategies with mean values of 3.36 and 3.39 respectively for male and female students were preferred more than indirect strategies, which were employed by males with the mean score of 3.05 and females with the average value of 3.11. In other words, indirect strategies employed less by males and females. Generally, both males and females were medium users of the overall Grammar Learning Strategies with almost equal mean value of 3.25 and 3.20 respectively.

4.4 Analysis on Significance Difference of Grammar Learning Strategies by Male and Female learners

Beyond the description of what strategy and strategy group that male and female learners used and favored, regarding the third research question, an inferential statistics can show whether gender, significantly affected the use of grammar strategies. Thus, an independent samples t-test is the most appropriate statistical test to investigate the differences in strategy use between male and female learners and the statistical significance level was accepted to be $\alpha < .05$ for all the independent sample findings. Table 13 below, show the result of an independent samples t-test of the six strategy categories.

Table 13: Results of the Independent Samples t-test for the Male and Female Participants' Use of the Six Strategy Categories.

Strategy Categories	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Memory	.960	.328	-1.772	262	.078	-.11961
Cognitive	.728	.394	1.141	262	.255	.07195
Compensation	.116	.733	-.275	262	.784	-.03146
Metacognitive	.059	.808	1.712	262	.088	.13723
Affective	1.951	.164	-1.713	262	.088	-.16145
Social	1.006	.317	-1.665	262	.097	-.17063

The results of the t-test displayed in Table 13 show the results of Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, the t value, df, and the p value of each of the six strategy groups. As indicated in the table, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances of Memory strategies shows that, the sig. value was .32, which was greater than .05. Therefore, it can be assumed that the variances were equal. Additionally, the t-value was -1.77 (p= .07), which was greater than .05. Thus, it can be concluded that the difference in the use of Memory strategies of males and females was not significant.

In the case of Cognitive Strategies, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, the sig. value was .39, which was greater than .05. So that, it can be assumed that the variances were equal. Besides, the t value was 1.14 and the statistical significant value was (p=.25), which was greater than .05. This implies that there was no significant difference between males and females in the use of this strategy category.

Likewise, for Compensation Strategies, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, the sig. value was .73, which was greater than .05. As a result, the variances were assumed to be equal. And the t- value was -.27 (p= .78), which was higher than .05. As a result, the difference in the use of Compensation Strategies of males and females was not significant.

Similarly, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, the sig. value of Metacognitive strategy group was .80, the affective strategy group .16, and the social strategy group was .31. All these sig. values were greater than .05. Therefore, it can be assumed that the variances were equal. In addition, the t value for the Metacognitive strategy group was 1.71 (.08), the affective strategy group -1.71 (.08), and the social strategy group -1.66 (p= .09). Theses p values were greater than .05. Therefore, the difference in the use of Metacognitive, affective, and social strategies were not significant.

Moreover, Table 14 below shows the significance levels of direct and indirect grammar learning strategies. As can be seen in the table, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, the sig. value of direct strategies was .77 and the indirect strategies .10. These sig. values were greater than .05. Thus, the variances were assumed to be equal. And the t-value for the direct strategies was -.435 (p= .66) and the indirect strategies -1.00 (p= .31). These p values were greater than .05. As a result, it can be concluded that there was no significant difference between males and females in the use of both direct and indirect strategies.

Table 14: Results of the Independent Samples t-test for the Male and Female Participants' Use of Direct and Indirect strategies.

Sub- Scales	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Direct	.083	.773	-.435	262	.664	-.02637
Indirect	2.699	.102	-1.004	262	.316	-.06495
Overall	3.180	.076	-.859	262	.391	-.04566

Furthermore, the significance level of the total number of strategies employed by male and female learners was computed. As the results displayed in Table 14 above show that Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, the sig. value was .07, which was greater than .05. Therefore, it can be assumed that the variances were equal. And the t-value was -.859 (p=.39), which was greater than .05. Consequently, it can be concluded that the difference in overall grammar learning strategy use of males and females was not significant, which is there was no significant difference between males and females in the use of grammar learning strategies.

4.5 Discussion

The major focus of this study was to explore learners' use of grammar learning strategies and to detect the relationship between gender and grammar learning strategies use. Each strategy has its own objective on how to tackle the difficulty in learning grammar. The current study generated three significant findings. First, Compensation Strategies were the most preferred strategy category by the learners, while the least preferred was Affective Strategies. Second, male and female learners differ in their preferences of grammar learning strategies. Third, results of the independent samples t-test indicated that there was no significant difference between males and females in the use of the overall grammar learning strategies as well as in the six taxonomies of the grammar learning strategies.

4.5.1 Learners Overall Grammar Learning Strategies Use

The results of the present study indicate that the participants were reported to use direct strategies more than indirect strategies. According to Oxford (1990) direct strategies are more related with mental processing of the target language, while indirect strategies support and manage language learning without directly involving the target language. This implies that probably the participants of the present study did not realize the importance of indirect strategies that are related with their emotions, coordination of the learning process, and the creation of interaction with others to facilitate the successful learning of grammar.

Besides, the possible reason for this finding could be that, the nature of the classroom perhaps gives much emphasis for assignments, quizzes, and examinations. As a result, the learners might give less attention to the indirect strategies. After all, this result is not supported by the previous study findings, which reported that the participants were good at indirect strategies than direct strategies (e.g., Abdi & Daghir, 2010; Aslan, 2009). The possible reason for this contradiction could be the learning environment and, the cultural background of the learners.

Moreover, the participants of the study preferred Compensation strategies the most with the highest average value. This result is consistent with the previous studies (Li, 2005; Tam, 2013) that reported Compensation strategies as the most frequently used strategy category. Contrary to the finding of the present research, Abdi & Daghir's (2010) finding revealed Compensation Strategies as the least frequently used ones.

The fact that Compensation strategies are one of the important means of communication, learners prefer to use the strategies mostly in formal language learning settings to reduce communication breakdowns as a result of inadequate repertoire of grammar and vocabulary. However, the high use of Compensation strategies may reflect the very traditional and didactic nature of these classrooms and thus considered input-poor environments (Bedell & Oxford, 1996; Kourago, 1993 cited in Wahyuni, 2013). Besides, making informed guesses is strongly encouraged because of the exam-oriented nature of the learning environment. If students are not willing to take risks, or will respond only if they are certain their answer is correct, this would likely have a negative impact on their test performance because questions would be left unanswered.

The least favored strategies by the participants in this study were Affective Strategies. This finding is in line with some studies (Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Ozmen & Gulleroglu, 2013; Tam, 2013; Temesgen, 2013) that reported Affective Strategies as the least preferred category. Contrary to this result, in Ahmadi & Mahmoodi's (2012) study Affective Strategies were the most used category by the learners. This negative tendency in the use of Affective strategies is perhaps due to the learners' low intension to notice their personal emotions, attitudes, and motivations while studying or learning grammar.

Therefore, students would face a great disadvantage since Affective Strategies have lots of importance to the learners. Oxford (1990: 140) believes that "the affective side of the learner is probably one of the very biggest influences on language learning success or failure."

4.5.2 Choice of Grammar Learning Strategy Categories by Male and Female Learners

Male and female subjects differ in their choice of the six groups of grammar learning strategies. However, Compensation strategies were the top rated strategy category with a high mean value by males and females with no significant difference between them, though females were slightly higher in using the strategy. Similarly, in Green and Oxford's (1995) study, the Compensation strategy category did not show significant variation (cited in Li, 2005). Likewise, in Yalcin's (2006) study on language learning strategies based on gender indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between males and females in the use of Compensation strategies (cited in Aslan, 2009).

Furthermore, although Memory and Cognitive strategies were used in medium level by males and females without significant difference, Memory strategies were the second most preferred strategy category for females, while this category was the third strategy group for males. Whereas, Cognitive strategies were the second preferred strategies by males, while they were the third for females.

This finding seems contradict with what Oxford (1990: 40) has stated about the use of Memory strategies by language learners. She reported that regardless of the powerful contribution of Memory strategies to language learning, "some research shows that language learners rarely report using these strategies…especially beyond elementary levels of language learning." Since male and female participants of this study were moderate users of this strategy category.

Similarly, the result is inconsistent with some studies (Ahmadi & Mahmoodi, 2012; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Li, 2005; Rahimi, Riazi & Saif, 2008; Salahshour et al, 2013) that found least frequent use of Memory category by female learners. This inconsistency in the findings may be indicative of the context-specific nature of the strategies. However, as reported in Khamkhien (2010) research, Wen & Wang's (1996) study revealed females' superiority to their male counter parts in the use of Memory strategies was consistent with the finding of the present study. Likewise, the other correspondent research was Ozmen & Gulleroglu's (2013) study, which depicted females' use of Memory strategies more than males.

On the other hand, Oxford's (1990:43) report on Cognitive strategies agrees with the result of the present study. She points out that "Cognitive strategies are typically found to be the most popular strategies with language learners." since the participants of this study use this category in medium level. In congruent with the finding of this research, Rahimi, Riazi & Saif's (2008) study revealed males superiority to females in the use of Cognitive strategies. But inconsistent with the result of this study, (Ahmadi & Mahmoodi's, 2012) finding revealed that Cognitive strategies were the least applied strategy categories by males and females and in Salahshour et al (2013) study females were reported to use Cognitive strategies more than males.

All in all, a possible reason for the finding of the present study is probably the result of behavioral difference between males and females. That is, males are likely to be more interested in challenge. It means that according to Oxford (1990:43) Cognitive strategies are more of "practical for language learning." Thus, these strategies require learners to solve different problems. So that males prefer to get involved in problem solving, whereas for females the feeling of achievement is the most important aspect. As a result they tend to memorize what they have learnt.

Furthermore, the use of Affective Strategies of male subjects was much lower than that of female subjects. Even this strategy category was the least to be preferred by males. This finding parallels findings from studies by (Aslan, 2009; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Wahyuni, 2013; Zeynali, 2012) in which the findings revealed males use of Affective strategies the least among the other strategy categories and indicated females superiority in this group.

Hong-Nam & Leavell (2006) argue that women tend to build relationships and use social network with greater consistency than men. Consequently, the use of Affective strategies indicating the use of emotional support systems in the context of language learning is not unexpected. Likewise, Oxford (1993) cited in (Zeynali, 2012) believes, female learners tend to pay more attention to their feelings more than males. That is why males were less interested to use Affective strategies. This could be true for the context of this study too. Nevertheless, this finding is inconsistent with a study (Ahmadi & Mahmoodi, 2012) that found Affective strategies to be among the most used strategy categories.

Moreover, Social strategies were the second strategy category with the lowest mean value as preferred by males and the average score indicates females' superiority in this domain. This finding is compatible with (Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Tam, 2013; (Green and Oxford, 1995 as cited in Tam, 2013); Zeynali, 2012) in which female learners tend to use Social strategies more than male learners. However, the findings of the present study is incongruent with the result of Radwan's (2011) research, which reported males use of Social strategies more than females because of the cultural background of the students.

The reason which accounts for the reluctance of male subjects to make cooperation with others may be related to the gender-related behavior difference. Tannen (1990) (cited in Tam, 2013) indicates that males value status and independence more, whereas females value connection, cooperation, and intimacy more. Seeking help from others, which is a sign of showing a sense of inferiority, hampers male subjects' interest in cooperating with others in the learning process.

At last, Metacognitive strategies were the least to be selected by females. This results somewhat agrees with what Oxford (1990:137) states about Metacognitive strategies. She pointed out that "though Metacognitive strategies are extremely important, research shows that learners use these strategies sporadically and without much sense of their importance." In contrary to the finding of this research, some studies (Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Rahimi, Riazi & Saif, 2008; Salahshour et al., 2013) reported that females' use of Metacognitive strategies more than the other strategy categories. The reason for the result of the present research is perhaps due to female learners' unawareness of the power of Metacognitive strategies in the learning process of grammar.

4.5.3 Overall Strategy use in Relation to Gender

As is evident in Table 12 (see page 38), the mean scores of the overall strategy use were almost similar for male and female participants. Gender differences, therefore, turned out to have no significant effect (p= .39) on participants overall use of grammar learning strategies, though female participants were reported to have slight superiority to males in four strategy categories (Memory, Compensation, Affective, and Social).

The findings of the relationship between gender and the overall strategy use in the present study is consistent with former studies (Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Li, 2005; Nisbet, Tindall & Arroyo, 2005; Radwan, 2011; Rahimi, Riazi & Saif, 2008; Wahyuni, 2013), which have reported no significant difference between males and females in the use of overall learning strategies though there were significant differences in particular strategy categories and in the pattern of strategy category preferences between the two groups.

A possible explanation for this absence of gender effect in the present study might be the fact that the participants of this study were enrolled in a similar learning environment. Therefore, it is possible that the participants' awareness of grammar learning process minimized the gender effect in this study.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Summary

The purpose of this study was to gain a comprehensive understanding of the students' grammar learning strategy use focused on a broad idea of the relationship between the strategy use and gender. The study was conducted at the preparatory program, specifically Medhanealem Preparatory School. The participants were 264 grade 11 students from 6 sections. To achieve the above purposes, a quantitative method approach was adopted. Thus, in order to collect the quantitative data, the participants were given a 35- item questionnaire, and they were asked to respond to each item using 5 Likert- scales.

The study applied descriptive and inferential statistical analysis to make sense of the quantitative data. The descriptive statistics helped to investigate problems posed in the first research question, i.e. what grammar learning strategies students use. Inferential statistics were helpful in investigating research problems posed in the second research question, i.e. what strategy group male and female learners favored the most and least, and third research question, i.e. whether gender significantly affected strategy use.

As the findings of the study revealed the participants use five of the strategy categories (Memory, Cognitive, Metacognitive, Affective, and Social) in moderate level when learning and using grammar structures, whereas they use Compensation strategies category in the highest level. However, Affective strategy category was the one that found to be the least preferred group by the students. In addition, the results showed that the learners favored direct grammar learning strategies more than indirect grammar learning strategies.

On the other hand, males and females differed in the pattern of strategy group preferences though both of them favored Compensation strategies group more than the other strategy categories and direct strategies than indirect strategies. According to the results, male learners favored Affective strategies the least, while females preferred Metacognitve the least. All in all, significant differences were not found between males and females in the use of the six taxonomies of grammar learning strategies.

5.2 Conclusion

To conclude, the findings of this study provide a greater understanding of strategies use of the participants in general and males and females preferences of grammar learning strategies in particular. Generally speaking, the results of the study highlight that the strategies that are most used by the participants in this study were Compensation strategies. However, the least used strategy discovered was Affective strategies. Additionally, the learners are more of direct strategy users than indirect strategies. These results of the research show that the context of grammar learning such as the teaching approach adopted in the classroom and the grammar tasks to be completed seems played an important role in the learners' strategy preferences.

In terms of males and females preferences of strategies, both male and female learners favored Compensation strategies in the highest level. However, Affective strategies were the least preferred strategy group by males, while females favored Metacognitive strategies less than the other strategy groups. Consequently, it seems that awareness of strategy use and psychological traits might be the major factors for their strategy choices. The study also revealed that there was no significant difference between males and females using grammar learning strategies. In general, the learners perhaps enrolled in a traditional way of learning process than the communicative one that give much attention to facilitate practical grammar learning for real life situation.

5.3 Implications

Based on the findings of the present study the following implications are made:

1. It is very important for teachers to realize that not all strategies are suitable for all learners due to individual differences such as gender. Male and female learners may have different preferences for strategies use. Thus, if teachers have a better understanding of their students' preference of strategy choices, they may try to instruct them how to select a few strategies besides their own. Such awareness of teachers in respecting individual differences may lead them towards implementing a learner- centered class.

2. Teachers should raise learners' awareness of the functions and usefulness of learning strategies so that they become encouraged to select and use more appropriate strategies in their grammar learning.

3. There is a need to provide students with further opportunities to use indirect strategies specifically Affective, Metacognitive, and Social strategies. Thus, in order to lead learners to utilize those strategies, language teachers need to create a sufficiently input environment inside and outside the classroom. For example, they should involve their learners in a variety of communicative tasks. Thus, the role of a teacher should be modified as a facilitator, which motivates and encourages learners' active participation in the teaching and learning process.

4. Syllabus designers and material developers need to incorporate learning strategies training into the curriculum that provide opportunities to learners to use such strategies.

5. The current investigation measured learning strategy preferences using one self- report instrument (i.e. GLSQ) at a particular point in time. It is the recommendation of this researcher that future endeavors incorporate a variety of measures such as think- aloud protocols concurrent with a specific leaning task, observations, structured interviews, and other methods which might provide richer and more sample specific data and replicate the study in other settings to see the similarities and differences of the results between the studies.

6. The current research presents a wealth of information on the role of gender on grammar learning strategies use. However, it is no matter how carefully conducted, cannot be taken as conclusive. Thus, further research is needed to more fully explore this area and the nature of the relationship between grammar learning strategies and other variables such as achievement, motivation, anxiety of grammar learning, etc.

REFERENCES

Abdi, R., & Daghir, S. (2010). Investigating the Relationship between Learner's Gender, Proficiency and Language Learning Strategies: The Case of EFL Iraqi Learners. *Journal of the College of Arts, 53,* 32-56.

Ahmadi, A., & Mahmoodi, S. (2012). Language Learning Strategy Use and Instruction for the Iranian Junior High School EFL Learners. *RALS, 3* (2), 107-134.

Anderson, G. (1998). *Fundamentals of Educational Research (2nd Ed.).* London: the Falmer Press.

Anderson, N. (2005). L2 strategy research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *handbook of research in second language teaching and learning (pp.757-772).* Mahewah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Aslan, O. (2009). The Role of Gender and Language Learning Strategies in Learning English. Unpublished MA Thesis, Turkish: Middle East Technical University.

Atkins, J., Hailom, B., & Nuru, M. (1995). *Skills Development Methodology I.* Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Printing Press.

Best, W., & Khan, V. (2006). *Research in Education (10th Ed.).* New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Bidlake, E. (2007). *Language Learning as a Gendered Experience*. Retrieved from http://research.ncl.ac.uk/index-ARECLS/volume 4-documents BIDLAKE.

Brown, H. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (5th ed.).* New York: Pearson Education, inc.

Brumfit, C., & Johnson, K. (1987). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1-47.

Celce- Murcia, M. (1988).*Techniques and Resources in Teaching Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chamot, A. (2004). Issues in Language Learning Strategy Research and Teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 1*(1), 14-26.

Cohen, A. (1996). Second Language Learning and Use Strategies: Clarifying the Issues. *Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition,* 1-26.

Cornwall, T. (2010). *Benefits of Teaching Grammar: Teacher-2- teacher*. Retrieved from: http://www.speechwork.co.th,

Debata, P. (2013). *The Importance of Grammar in English Language Teaching- A Reassessment*. Available at: Language in India www.languageinindia.com 13(5), 482-486.

Demirezen, M. (1988). Behaviorist Theory and Language Learning. *Hacettepe University*, p. 135-140.

Ehrman, M. ,Leaver, B., & Oxford, R. (2003). A Brief Overview of Individual Differences in Second Language Learning. *System, 31*, 313-330.

Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Ellis, R. (2006). Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 83-107.

Fazeli, S. (2011). The Exploring Nature of Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) and their Relationship with Various Variables with Focus on Personality Traits in the Current Studies of Second/Foreign Language Learning. *Theory and practice in Language Studies, 1*(10), 1311-1320.

Ghavamnia, M., Kassaian, Z., & Dabaghi, A. (2011). The Relationship between Language Learning strategies, Language Learning Beliefs, Motivation, and Proficiency: A Study of EFL Learners in Iran. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(5), 1156-1161.

Gurata, A. (2008). The Grammar Learning Strategies Employed by Turkish University Preparatory School EFL Students. Unpublished MA Thesis, Turkish: Bilkent University.

Haregewain Abate. (2008). The Effect of Communicative Grammar on the Grammatical Accuracy of Students Academic Writing: An Integrated Approach to TEFL. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Hinkel, E., & Fotos, S. (2002). *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms.* Mahwah, N.J.L: Erlbaum Associates.

Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, A. (2006). Language Learning Strategy Use of ESL Students in an Intensive English Learning Context. *System, 34*, 399-415.

Horanicova, Z. (2006). The Influence of Cognitive Psychology in a Second Language Instruction. *Department of Foreign Languages, (pp. 153-156).* Safarik University: Slovakia.

Jhnson, J., & Repta, R. (2012). Sex and Gender: Beyond the Binaries. In J.L. Oliffe and L. Greaves (Eds.). *Designing and Conducting Gender, Sex and Health Research,* 17-37. Thousandoaks: Sage Publcations.

Khamkhien, A. (2010). Factors Affecting Language Learning Strategy Reported Usage by Thai and Vietnamese EFL Learners. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 7*(1), 66-85.

Kothari, R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques***.** New Delhi: New Age International Ltd.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition***.** Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in Classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Lee, K. (2010). An Overview of Language Learning Strategies. *ARECLES, 7, 172-152.*

Li, A. (2005). A Look at Chinese ESL Students Use of Learning Strategies in Relation to Their English Language Proficiency, Gender and Perceived Language Difficulties- A Quantitative Study. *Supporting Independent English Language Learning in the 21th Century: Proceedings of the Independent Learning Association Conference Inaugural*, p. 1-24.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1993). *How Languages are Learned***.** New York: Oxford University Press.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages are Learned (3rd ed.).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Muncie, J. (2002). Finding a Place for Grammar in EFL Composition Classes. *ELT Journal, 56*(2), 180-186. Oxford University Press.

Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A. (2008). The Use of Grammar Learning Strategies among Secondary School Students. *Faculty of Pedagogy and Fine Arts Press,* (pp.139-148). Adam Mickiewicz University

Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching Grammar in Second Language Classrooms: Integrating Form-Focused Instruction in Communicative Context*. New York: Routledge Press.

Neuman, W. (2007). *Basics of Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches (2nd ed.).* New York: Pearson Education, inc.

Nisbet, D., Tindall, E., & Arroyo, A. (2005). Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency of Chinese University Students. *Foreign Language Annals, 38*(1), 100-107.

O' Malley, J., & Chamot, U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition***.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2010). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know***.** New York. NY: Newbury House.

Oxford, R. (1992). Who are Our Students? A Synthesis of Foreign and Second Language Research on Individual Differences with Implications for Instructional Practice. *TESL Canada Journal, 9*(2), 30-49.

Oxford, R. (1996). Employing to Assess the Use of Language Learning Strategies. *Applied Language Learning, 7*(1), 25-45.

Oxford, R. (2003). Language Learning Styles and Strategies: An Overview. *GALA*, p. 1-25.

Ozmen, D., & Gulleroglu, H. (2013). Determining Language Learning Strategies Used by the Students at Faculty of Educational Sciences Based on Some Variables. *Education and Sciences, 38* (169), 30-40.

Paterson, P., & Rosbottom, J. (1995). Learning Style and Learning Strategies in a Multimedia Environment. *Association of Learning Technology Journal, 3* (1), 12-21.

Pawlak, M. (2008). Advanced Learners' Use of Strategies for Learning Grammar: A Diary Study. *Faculty of Pedagogy and Fine Arts Press*, (pp.109-125) Adam Mickiewicz University.

Pawlak, M. (2009). Grammar Learning Strategies and Language Attainment: Seeking a Relationship. *Research in Language, 7,* 43-60.

Pontarolo, L. (2013). The Role of Grammar in EFL Instruction: a Study on Secondary School Students and Teachers. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Italy: University of Padova.

Radwan, A. (2011). Effects of L2 Proficiency and Gender on Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students Majoring in English. *Asian EFL Journal*, p. 115-163.

Rahimi, M., Riazi, A., & Saif, S. (2008). An Investigation in to the Factors Affecting the Use of Language Learning Strategies by Persian EFL Learners. *CJAL, 11*(2), 31-60.

Rama, J., & Agullo, G. (2012). *The Role of Grammar Teaching: From Communicative Approaches to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*. (pp. 179-191) Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.4995/rlyla.2012.1134.

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (2nd ed.).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the Good Language Learners can Teach Us. *TESOL Quarterly*, *9* (1), 41-51.

Rugg, G., & Petre, M. (2007). *A Gentle Guide to Research Methods.* New York: Open University Press.

Salahshour, F. et al. (2013). The Relationship between Language Learning Strategy Use, Language Proficiency Level and Learners Gender. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*, p. 634-643. Iran: Azerbaijan University of Tarbiat Moallem, Tabriz.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 129-158.

Sunderland, J. (2006). *Language and Gender***.** New York: Routledge.

Tam, C. (2013). A Study on Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) of University Students in Hong Kong. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics, 11*(2), 1-42.

Temesgen Mereba. (2013). Exploring English Grammar Skills Learning Strategies used by University EFL Students: Jimma University in focus. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Verma, G., & Mallick, K. (1999). *Researching Education: Perspectives and Techniques.* London: UK Falmer Press

Wahyuni, S. (2013). L2 Speaking Strategies Employed by Indonesian EFL Tertiary Students across Proficiency and Gender. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Australia: University of Canberra.

Wong, C., & Barrea-Marlys, M. (2012). The Role of Grammar in Communicative Language Teaching: An Exploration of Second Language Teachers' Perceptions and Classroom Practices. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching: 9*(1), 61-75.

World Health Organization (WHO) (2015): *What Do We Mean by 'Sex' and 'Gender'?* (WHO> Programs and Projects > Gender, Women and Health.

Yalcin, F. (2005). An Analysis of the Relationship Between the Use of Grammar Learning Strategies and Student Achievement at English Preparatory Classes. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 1*(2), 155-169.

Zeynali, S. (2012). Exploring the Gender Effect on EFL Learners' Learning Strategies. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(8), 1614-1620.

Zhang, J. (2009). Necessity of Grammar Teaching. *International Education Studies, 2*(2), 184-187.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and Communication

Department of Foreign Language and Literature

(Graduate Program)

Students' Grammar Learning Strategies Questionnaire

Dear student,

I would like to thank you for your kind cooperation to fill this questionnaire.

This questionnaire is designed to gather information on grammar learning strategies use of grade 11 students at Medhanealem Preparatory school focusing on gender. It has no intention to evaluate you based on the responses you give to the statements. Each of your genuine responses has a high value for the success of the study. Thus, the researcher kindly requests you to give your frank and honest responses to the statements.

Thank you in advance!

Instruction 1: complete the following background information using **tick (√)** in the boxes provided.

Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐

Age: _____

Department: Social Science ☐ Natural Science ☐

Instruction 2: please read each statement carefully. Then, put **tick (√)** in the chart to indicate how often you use the grammar learning strategies described by the statement.

Part one : **Memory Strategies**		**Never true of me**	**Usually <u>not</u> true of me**	**Somewhat true of me**	**Usually true of me**	**Always true of me**
1	I think of the relationships between the grammar structures what I have already known and new structures I learn in English.					
2	I use new structures in a sentence to remember them well.					
3	I try to remember English grammar information by using their location on the page in the text book.					
4	I review grammar lessons regularly.					
5	I underline or circle structures to remember them.					
6	I try to remember a new structure that I learnt by making a mental picture of a situation in which the form might be used.					
7	I try to remember orally emphasized structures (through loudness or repetition).					
	Part two: Cognitive Strategies					
8	I write down structures, exceptions, and examples from several reference materials.					
9	I try to use grammar rules that I learnt to speak accurately and fluently as like as native speakers.					
10	I try to use the different grammar rules that I know in different ways, such as to write letters, messages, stories, etc.					
11	I watch TV shows and/or movies in English to develop my grammar knowledge.					
12	I read different texts written in English to learn how to use correct grammar (e.g. Magazines, Newspapers, fictions etc.)					
13	I try to find out the rules from sentences by breaking the sentences into parts.					

14	I try to apply the rules I learnt in a meaningful context as in participating in conversation.					
15	I make summaries of the rules that I learnt or read from different resources.					
	Part three: Compensation Strategies					
16	I try to discover the underlying grammar rules of different sentences based on all clues.					
17	If I am **not** sure of using one structure in my speech or writing, I try to use other structure to deliver my message clearly.					
18	I try to improve my grammatical mistake when someone gives me corrections.					
	Part four: Metacognitive Strategies					
19	I try to search for ways how to apply the rules that I know.					
20	I pay attention to the rules provided by the teacher or reference books.					
21	I try to notice my grammatical mistakes and try to look the difference with the correct version.					
22	I have clear goals to improve my English grammar.					
23	I try to find out ways how to become better learner of English grammar.					
24	I evaluate my progress in learning English grammar.					
25	I look for people that I can talk to in English in order to improve my grammatical proficiency.					
26	I plan my schedule for grammar revision.					
	Part five: Affective Strategies					
27	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using ungrammatical sentences.					
28	I encourage myself to use the rules I learnt in my speech even when I am afraid of making mistake.					
29	I give myself a reward when I do well in English grammar.					
30	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying grammar.					
31	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning grammar such as					

	teacher, friend, and relatives.					
	Part six: Social Strategies					
32	I practice grammar rules by working with other students.					
33	I ask others for help to check my sentences to see if I apply the rule correctly.					
34	I listen to any feedback that the teacher gives me about the structure I use.					
35	If I am not clear with my teacher's explanation of a new structure, I ask him/her for clarification.					

APPENDIX B

Descriptive Statistics of the Items

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM1	264	1.00	5.00	3.2538	1.17321
ITEM2	264	1.00	5.00	2.8258	1.11673
ITEM3	264	1.00	5.00	3.2159	1.37977
ITEM4	264	1.00	5.00	3.2765	1.27987
ITEM5	264	1.00	5.00	3.3182	1.38057
ITEM6	264	1.00	5.00	3.7652	1.31305
ITEM7	264	1.00	5.00	3.3750	1.40054
ITEM8	264	1.00	5.00	3.2348	1.26587
ITEM9	264	1.00	5.00	2.9015	1.27783
ITEM10	264	1.00	5.00	3.3598	1.29464
ITEM11	264	1.00	5.00	3.9545	1.33888
ITEM12	264	1.00	5.00	2.9583	1.23716
ITEM13	264	1.00	5.00	3.3447	1.34763
ITEM14	264	1.00	5.00	3.3712	1.25710
ITEM15	264	1.00	5.00	3.3750	1.32234
ITEM16	264	1.00	5.00	3.0682	1.39632
ITEM17	264	1.00	5.00	3.4129	1.30806
ITEM18	264	1.00	5.00	4.0758	1.27938
ITEM19	264	1.00	5.00	2.9470	1.30989
ITEM20	264	1.00	5.00	3.2689	1.46428
ITEM21	264	1.00	5.00	2.9773	1.38139
ITEM22	264	1.00	5.00	3.1364	1.38582
ITEM23	264	1.00	5.00	3.5189	1.37593
ITEM24	264	1.00	5.00	3.2121	1.32556
ITEM25	264	1.00	5.00	2.7992	1.37656
ITEM26	264	1.00	5.00	2.7083	1.30885
ITEM27	264	1.00	5.00	3.5682	1.49113
ITEM28	264	1.00	5.00	3.1098	1.48480
ITEM29	264	1.00	5.00	2.8788	1.53801
ITEM30	264	1.00	5.00	3.0985	1.64933
ITEM31	264	1.00	5.00	2.5720	1.42577
ITEM32	264	1.00	5.00	3.1364	1.37480
ITEM33	264	1.00	5.00	3.0227	1.38688
ITEM34	264	1.00	5.00	3.3902	1.44456

ITEM35	264	1.00	5.00	3.0530	1.41052
Memory	264	1.57	4.71	3.2900	.54713
Cognitive	264	1.88	4.50	3.3125	.50930
Compensation	264	1.00	5.00	3.5189	.92314
Metacognitive	264	1.25	4.75	3.0710	.64933
Affective	264	1.20	4.80	3.0455	.76346
Social	264	1.00	5.00	3.1506	.83005
Direct	264	1.90	4.39	3.3738	.48878
Indirect	264	1.38	4.29	3.0890	.52237
Overall	264	2.03	4.27	3.2314	.42864
Valid N (listwise)	264				

APPENDIX C

Statistics of an Independent Samples t-test for Gender and Grammar Learning Strategies

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ITEM1	male	117	2.9658	1.12136	.10367
	female	147	3.4830	1.16662	.09622
ITEM2	male	117	2.9231	1.00133	.09257
	female	147	2.7483	1.19842	.09884
ITEM3	male	117	3.1111	1.22318	.11308
	female	147	3.2993	1.49160	.12302
ITEM4	male	117	3.3077	1.28292	.11861
	female	147	3.2517	1.28129	.10568
ITEM5	male	117	3.1197	1.42128	.13140
	female	147	3.4762	1.33105	.10978
ITEM6	male	117	3.8205	1.27722	.11808
	female	147	3.7211	1.34359	.11082
ITEM7	male	117	3.3162	1.26389	.11685
	female	147	3.4218	1.50308	.12397
ITEM8	male	117	3.3675	1.16411	.10762
	female	147	3.1293	1.33587	.11018
ITEM9	male	117	2.7009	1.19817	.11077
	female	147	3.0612	1.32015	.10888
ITEM10	male	117	3.4274	1.16941	.10811
	female	147	3.3061	1.38787	.11447
ITEM11	male	117	3.8632	1.31245	.12134
	female	147	4.0272	1.35962	.11214
ITEM12	male	117	3.2564	1.19737	.11070
	female	147	2.7211	1.22072	.10068
ITEM13	male	117	3.4274	1.28865	.11914
	female	147	3.2789	1.39364	.11495
ITEM14	male	117	3.3162	1.14206	.10558
	female	147	3.4150	1.34390	.11084
ITEM15	male	117	3.4615	1.34253	.12412
	female	147	3.3061	1.30653	.10776
ITEM16	male	117	3.0855	1.38696	.12822
	female	147	3.0544	1.40830	.11615
ITEM17	male	117	3.4444	1.24875	.11545

	female	147	3.3878	1.35712	.11193
ITEM18	male	117	3.9744	1.38004	.12758
	female	147	4.1565	1.19187	.09830
ITEM19	male	117	3.0598	1.27503	.11788
	female	147	2.8571	1.33447	.11007
ITEM20	male	117	3.4530	1.29652	.11986
	female	147	3.1224	1.57418	.12984
ITEM21	male	117	3.1709	1.30840	.12096
	female	147	2.8231	1.42243	.11732
ITEM22	male	117	3.2222	1.36528	.12622
	female	147	3.0680	1.40283	.11570
ITEM23	male	117	3.5385	1.30343	.12050
	female	147	3.5034	1.43524	.11838
ITEM24	male	117	3.2393	1.30417	.12057
	female	147	3.1905	1.34640	.11105
ITEM25	male	117	2.6154	1.40716	.13009
	female	147	2.9456	1.33848	.11040
ITEM26	male	117	2.8803	1.28091	.11842
	female	147	2.5714	1.31899	.10879
ITEM27	male	117	3.5214	1.51770	.14031
	female	147	3.6054	1.47378	.12156
ITEM28	male	117	3.0427	1.47036	.13593
	female	147	3.1633	1.49904	.12364
ITEM29	male	117	2.7607	1.48933	.13769
	female	147	2.9728	1.57439	.12985
ITEM30	male	117	3.0085	1.61617	.14941
	female	147	3.1701	1.67730	.13834
ITEM31	male	117	2.4444	1.37367	.12700
	female	147	2.6735	1.46261	.12063
ITEM32	male	117	3.0513	1.37619	.12723
	female	147	3.2041	1.37462	.11338
ITEM33	male	117	2.8291	1.40988	.13034
	female	147	3.1769	1.35334	.11162
ITEM34	male	117	3.3077	1.50552	.13918
	female	147	3.4558	1.39584	.11513
ITEM35	male	117	3.0342	1.37045	.12670
	female	147	3.0680	1.44611	.11927

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
ITEM1	Equal variances assumed	2.437	.120	-3.640	262	.000	-.51718	.14208	-.79695	-.23741
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.656	252.855	.000	-.51718	.14144	-.79574	-.23863
ITEM2	Equal variances assumed	6.458	.012	1.265	262	.207	.17478	.13820	-.09734	.44690
	Equal variances not assumed			1.291	261.363	.198	.17478	.13542	-.09188	.44144
ITEM3	Equal variances assumed	12.853	.000	-1.101	262	.272	-.18821	.17088	-.52467	.14826
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.126	261.754	.261	-.18821	.16710	-.51724	.14083
ITEM4	Equal variances assumed	.009	.923	.353	262	.725	.05599	.15883	-.25676	.36874
	Equal variances not assumed			.352	248.737	.725	.05599	.15886	-.25688	.36887
ITEM5	Equal variances assumed	.758	.385	-2.098	262	.037	-.35653	.16995	-.69117	-.02189
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.082	241.123	.038	-.35653	.17122	-.69382	-.01925
ITEM6	Equal variances assumed	1.576	.210	.610	262	.542	.09942	.16287	-.22128	.42013
	Equal variances not assumed			.614	253.860	.540	.09942	.16194	-.21948	.41833
ITEM7	Equal variances assumed	13.837	.000	-.607	262	.544	-.10553	.17373	-.44761	.23655
	Equal variances not assumed			-.619	261.188	.536	-.10553	.17036	-.44098	.22992

ITEM8	Equal variances assumed	1.906	.169	1.523	262	.129	.23827	.15644	-.06977	.54631
	Equal variances not assumed			1.547	259.819	.123	.23827	.15402	-.06502	.54156
ITEM9	Equal variances assumed	.363	.547	-2.295	262	.023	-.36037	.15705	-.66960	-.05113
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.320	257.476	.021	-.36037	.15533	-.66624	-.05450
ITEM10	Equal variances assumed	10.324	.001	.755	262	.451	.12123	.16053	-.19486	.43732
	Equal variances not assumed			.770	261.128	.442	.12123	.15745	-.18881	.43127
ITEM11	Equal variances assumed	.136	.713	-.988	262	.324	-.16396	.16589	-.49060	.16268
	Equal variances not assumed			-.992	252.456	.322	-.16396	.16522	-.48935	.16142
ITEM12	Equal variances assumed	.532	.466	3.570	262	.000	.53532	.14997	.24003	.83061
	Equal variances not assumed			3.577	250.892	.000	.53532	.14964	.24062	.83002
ITEM13	Equal variances assumed	1.391	.239	.889	262	.375	.14844	.16703	-.18045	.47733
	Equal variances not assumed			.897	256.137	.371	.14844	.16555	-.17757	.47445
ITEM14	Equal variances assumed	6.765	.010	-.633	262	.527	-.09873	.15593	-.40575	.20830
	Equal variances not assumed			-.645	260.851	.520	-.09873	.15308	-.40016	.20271
ITEM15	Equal variances assumed	.176	.675	.948	262	.344	.15542	.16386	-.16724	.47807
	Equal variances not assumed			.946	245.818	.345	.15542	.16437	-.16834	.47917
ITEM16	Equal variances assumed	.131	.717	.179	262	.858	.03105	.17331	-.31022	.37232
	Equal variances not assumed			.179	250.480	.858	.03105	.17301	-.30970	.37179
ITEM17	Equal variances assumed	1.659	.199	.349	262	.727	.05669	.16233	-.26295	.37633
	Equal variances not assumed			.353	256.505	.725	.05669	.16080	-.25997	.37335

ITEM18	Equal variances assumed	2.928	.088	-1.150	262	.251	-.18210	.15841	-.49402	.12982
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.131	230.163	.259	-.18210	.16106	-.49945	.13524
ITEM19	Equal variances assumed	1.834	.177	1.250	262	.212	.20269	.16211	-.11653	.52190
	Equal variances not assumed			1.257	253.405	.210	.20269	.16127	-.11492	.52029
ITEM20	Equal variances assumed	13.313	.000	1.830	262	.068	.33054	.18061	-.02509	.68618
	Equal variances not assumed			1.871	261.680	.063	.33054	.17671	-.01740	.67849
ITEM21	Equal variances assumed	1.238	.267	2.045	262	.042	.34781	.17012	.01283	.68279
	Equal variances not assumed			2.064	256.530	.040	.34781	.16851	.01597	.67965
ITEM22	Equal variances assumed	.083	.773	.898	262	.370	.15420	.17176	-.18401	.49240
	Equal variances not assumed			.901	251.669	.369	.15420	.17123	-.18303	.49142
ITEM23	Equal variances assumed	2.576	.110	.205	262	.838	.03506	.17078	-.30122	.37134
	Equal variances not assumed			.208	257.434	.836	.03506	.16892	-.29758	.36770
ITEM24	Equal variances assumed	.151	.698	.297	262	.767	.04884	.16451	-.27510	.37278
	Equal variances not assumed			.298	252.127	.766	.04884	.16392	-.27398	.37166
ITEM25	Equal variances assumed	1.506	.221	-1.946	262	.053	-.33019	.16965	-.66424	.00386
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.935	243.073	.054	-.33019	.17062	-.66628	.00589
ITEM26	Equal variances assumed	1.041	v.308	1.915	262	.057	.30891	.16134	-.00878	.62661
	Equal variances not assumed			1.921	251.879	.056	.30891	.16080	-.00778	.62561
ITEM27	Equal variances assumed	.036	.849	-.454	262	.650	-.08407	.18502	-.44839	.28024
	Equal variances not assumed			-.453	245.562	.651	-.08407	.18564	-.44973	.28158

ITEM28	Equal variances assumed	.086	.770	-.654	262	.513	-.12053	.18416	-.48315	.24209
	Equal variances not assumed			-.656	250.892	.512	-.12053	.18375	-.48242	.24136
ITEM29	Equal variances assumed	.912	.340	-1.114	262	.266	-.21211	.19046	-.58714	.16293
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.121	254.286	.263	-.21211	.18926	-.58483	.16061
ITEM30	Equal variances assumed	1.543	.215	-.790	262	.430	-.16152	.20449	-.56417	.24113
	Equal variances not assumed			-.793	252.627	.428	-.16152	.20363	-.56254	.23950
ITEM31	Equal variances assumed	.575	.449	-1.298	262	.195	-.22902	.17641	-.57640	.11835
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.308	254.895	.192	-.22902	.17516	-.57397	.11592
ITEM32	Equal variances assumed	.083	.774	-.897	262	.371	-.15280	.17039	-.48831	.18271
	Equal variances not assumed			-.897	248.751	.371	-.15280	.17042	-.48844	.18284
ITEM33	Equal variances assumed	.004	.952	-2.036	262	.043	-.34781	.17081	-.68414	-.01148
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.027	244.184	.044	-.34781	.17161	-.68583	-.00979
ITEM34	Equal variances assumed	1.364	.244	-.827	262	.409	-.14809	.17908	-.50071	.20453
	Equal variances not assumed			-.820	239.832	.413	-.14809	.18063	-.50391	.20773
ITEM35	Equal variances assumed	2.005	.158	-.193	262	.847	-.03384	.17508	-.37857	.31090
	Equal variances not assumed			-.194	254.130	.846	-.03384	.17401	-.37652	.30884

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Memory	Male	117	3.2234	.49678	.04593
	Female	147	3.3431	.58033	.04786
Cognitive	Male	117	3.3526	.48150	.04452
	Female	147	3.2806	.52984	.04370
Compensation	Male	117	3.5014	.90192	.08338
	Female	147	3.5329	.94253	.07774
Metacognitive	male	117	3.1474	.64004	.05917
	female	147	3.0102	.65240	.05381
Affective	male	117	2.9556	.70765	.06542
	female	147	3.1170	.80029	.06601
Social	male	117	3.0556	.79540	.07353
	female	147	3.2262	.85174	.07025

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Memory	Equal variances assumed	.960	.328	-1.772	262	.078	-.11961	.06751	-.25254	.01333
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.803	260.585	.073	-.11961	.06634	-.25023	.01101
Cognitive	Equal variances assumed	.728	.394	1.141	262	.255	.07195	.06306	-.05222	.19613
	Equal variances not assumed			1.153	257.389	.250	.07195	.06238	-.05089	.19479

Compensation	Equal variances assumed	.116	.733	-.275	262	.784	-.03146	.11457	-.25706	.19415
	Equal variances not assumed			-.276	253.267	.783	-.03146	.11400	-.25596	.19305
Metacognitive	Equal variances assumed	.059	.808	1.712	262	.088	.13723	.08015	-.02060	.29506
	Equal variances not assumed			1.716	250.873	.087	.13723	.07998	-.02028	.29475
Affective	Equal variances assumed	1.951	.164	-1.713	262	.088	-.16145	.09424	-.34702	.02412
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.737	259.072	.084	-.16145	.09294	-.34446	.02155
Social	Equal variances assumed	1.006	.317	-1.665	262	.097	-.17063	.10249	-.37245	.03118
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.678	255.362	.095	-.17063	.10170	-.37091	.02964

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Direct	male	117	3.3591	.47104	.04355
	female	147	3.3855	.50375	.04155
Indirect	male	117	3.0528	.47122	.04356
	female	147	3.1178	.55968	.04616
Overall	male	117	3.2060	.39001	.03606
	female	147	3.2517	.45737	.03772

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Direct	Equal variances assumed	.083	.773	-.435	262	.664	-.02637	.06065	-.14580	.09305
	Equal variances not assumed			-.438	255.258	.662	-.02637	.06019	-.14490	.09216
Indirect	Equal variances assumed	2.699	.102	-1.004	262	.316	-.06495	.06472	-.19239	.06248
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.023	261.151	.307	-.06495	.06347	-.18993	.06003
Overall	Equal variances assumed	3.180	.076	-.859	262	.391	-.04566	.05313	-.15028	.05896
	Equal variances not assumed			-.875	260.729	.382	-.04566	.05218	-.14842	.05709

Declaration

I declare that the information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. Besides, I declare that this thesis is my original work and that all sources of material used for this thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name_____

Date_____

Signature_____