AN ANALYSIS OF TURKISH AND RUSSIAN TEACHERS' OF ENGLISH APPROACHES TO EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to determine teachers' approaches to Marzano's effective instructional strategies (MEISs), as defined by Marzano, Pickering and Pollack (2001) in the secondary schools in Turkey and Russia and tell whether they differ or not. In this study survey research - one of the quantitative approaches – was carried out. The participants for the study were 54 teachers of English in Turkey and 40 teachers of English in Russia. "The Effective Instructional Strategies Questionnaire" and an open-ended questionnaire were used to gather data. Data was generated utilizing content analysis and non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test. The results related to the first and second research questions revealed that there were partial differences between Turkish and Russian teachers' approaches to Marzano's nine effective instructional strategies and to usage of these strategies. Turkish teachers place less importance than Russian teachers on such strategies as summarizing and note taking, homework and practice, generating and testing hypothesis. As to Russian teachers, they do not espouse strategies in the category of non-linguistic representations as much as Turkish teachers do. The results of the study showed that Turkish and Russian teachers' approaches and the usage of the strategies differ.

Keywords: English teaching, effective teaching, Marzano's effective instructional strategies, teachers in Turkey and Russia

Celik, Aleksandra M.Ed.
M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction
Institute of Educational Sciences
Gaziantep University,
Gaziantep, Turkey
E-mail: aleksandracelik@yandex.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-6610-1301

Bay, Erdal PhD
Professor
Institute of Educational Sciences
Gaziantep University,
Gaziantep, Turkey
E-mail: erdalbay@hotmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0003-3167-9987

DOI: 10.52963/PERR_Biruni_V10.N3.28

INTRODUCTION

In the era when technology and information develop so fast the importance of teaching foreign languages increases more and more. Y generation is people who have started using technology actively, but Z generation is people who grow up and develop themselves integrated with technology and the Internet. The Internet and technology provide access to the unlimited information. People in different countries continually generate information interactively and share this information online. Shared information is mostly in English, the language that is used as the international language and accepted globally as the common language between people all over the world.

On the other hand, the more information resources we have, the more difficult it is to choose the proper information we need from this information plethora, and it requires unique skills. The only way to get rid of information pollution is to learn English properly and use it correctly. Foreign language learning improves analytical thinking skills, not just exploring the world.

According to the researches, individuals who master more than one language are more likely than unilingual individuals to exhibit superior skills in controlling executive functions; focusing, planning, setting up a strategy, coding and processing of information, determining the next step in successive tasks (Bialystok, 2011). Starting foreign language instruction in elementary school also positively affects children's achievements in mathematics and reading in their mother tongue (Stewart, 2005). It is also essential to know English for the desired employment in the future.

In Turkey and Russia as in manycountries besides teaching of mother tongues the first and second foreign languages are taught at schools, English is taught as the first foreign language. The histories of the education systems in Turkey and Russia are similar in many aspects. The reforms of Mahmud II (1808-1839) have many common features with the reforms made in the period of Peter I (1682-1725) in Russia. In both countries, education systems experienced the process of gaining experience and getting closer to Europeans (İvanov, 2000). In the 20th century, when the republics were established, state leaders brought reforms in the fields of secondary and higher education to improve the country, economy and nations. In the 20th century in Turkey and Russia attention was given to teaching English. Looking at the foreign language education in the two countries, neither has reached a high level. Both countries at the European borders in Eurasia have tried to apply European experience but have not got closer to the European countries leading in English education (EPI, 2017). This situation can have different causes. The fact that European languages are closer to English in origin and structure affects the process. In recent years, several changes have been made in the education system and training programs in Turkey and Russia. However, the desired results have not been reached yet.

In Turkey, despite the importance given by the Ministry of Education to English education, the desired success has not been achieved. "... it is assessed that despite the resources and the effort that has been spent, the efficiency cannot be obtained at the desired level. Traditional language teaching habits that have been ongoing for a long time, deficiencies in planning foreign language education and the methods, activities, materials, and inadequacies or mistakes in measuring and evaluating them can be shown as the reasons" (Işık, 2008, s.15).

Turkey, according to the English Proficiency Index has a "very low" level in terms of gaining skills in English, while Russia has a "low" level (EPI, 2017). When the literature is searched, it is seen that various studies have been made on the troubles related to foreign language teaching (Acat& Demiral, 2002; Çelebi, 2006; Demirel, 1990; Haznedar, 2010; Işık, 2008; Karahan,

2007; Karal &Berigel, 2006; Özer & Korkmaz, 2016; Svalova, 2011). According to Demirpolat (2015), it is not possible to link the failure of foreign language teaching to a single cause, but many factors create this situation in connection with each other.

In summary, the reasons for the failure of foreign language teaching are as follows:

- Shortcomings in foreign language teacher training system,
- Inadequate in-service training,
- The teachers who do not know the culture of the language they teach,
- Lack of practice in measurement-evaluation,
- The inadequacy of hardware and training materials,
- Crowded classes,
- Inadequate methods,
- Not having a common philosophy about foreign language teaching,
- No supervision of foreign language teaching process,
- Low motivation and negative attitudes of students,
- Inaccuracies in the methods, techniques and strategies used by teachers,
- Teachers who do not give necessary importance to the development of their listening and speaking skills.

Choosing appropriate methods and techniques to ensure learning and achieve learning objectives is among the responsibilities of a teacher in the teaching process. During the course, the teacher can apply various methods. The effective teacher will be aware of which teaching strategies are more successful and productive. Within the school organisation, teachers have essential responsibilities as leaders of the classroom, to develop schooling and education, and to educate students in accordance with expectations (Can, 2004, p.111). As in other fields, the role of the teacher in foreign language teaching is critical, and the fact that the strategies used in the lessons are effective or not affects the whole education-training process, the motivation and attitudes of the students.

If a teacher is effective it affects the success of students directly (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Jordan, Mendro, &Weerasinghe, 1997; Sanders&Rivers, 1996), effective teachers use effective instructional strategies. Teachers make strategy choice according to their perceptions, content and pedagogical knowledge (Izrik, 2005 and Shulman, 1987, quoted in Diego, 2012, p.3); thus it is believed that teachers' approaches to effective teaching strategies directly affect the success of students. One of the essential factors in the teaching process are teachers and the methods and strategies used by the teachers.

Effective instructional strategies are methods used by a teacher, methods involved in the student learning process and conferring specific learning goals. There are different examples of effective teaching strategies given by different researchers, such as direct and indirect teaching, cooperative learning, self-directed learning, problem-solving, research-based teaching, role play, writing, effective thinking and asking questions (Moore, 2005; Killen, 2006; Burden ve Byrd, 2007; Borich, 2014). In 2001, Marzano, Pickering and Pollock examined the results of researches on effective teaching and, as the result of the meta-analysis, put together the results of the researches and arranged them according to the effect sizes. The categories of instructional strategies that affect students' achievements are listed in Table 1 according to the effect sizes.

Table 1. *Marzano's Effective Instructional Strategies (Marzano, 2008, p.11)*

Category	**Ave. Effect Size (ES)**	**Percentile Gain**	**No of ESs**	**Standard Deviation (SD)**
Similarities and Differences	1,61	45	31	0,31
Summarizing and Note Taking	1,00	34	179	0,50
Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition	0,80	29	21	0,35
Homework and Practice	0,77	28	134	0,36
Non-Linguistic Representations	0,75	27	246	0,40
Cooperative Learning	0,73	27	122	0,40
Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback	0,61	23	408	0,28
Generating and Testing Hypothesis	0,61	23	63	0,79
Questions, Cues, and Advance Organizers	0,59	22	1,251	0,26

The effect size expresses the increase and decrease in the success of the test group in terms of standard deviation units. The number of ESs refers to the number of examined studies. As the result of the meta-analysis conducted by Marzano and his team, nine very effective teaching strategy categories, as shown in Table 1, have emerged. These effective teaching strategies are called Marzano's effective instructional strategies. The work of Marzano and his colleagues combines the positive experiences of many researchers to reveal their most effective results.

While just one study has been conducted on Marzano's effective instructional strategies and teaching of English in Turkey (Altunöz, 2017), there are no studies at all in Russia (DSDL, 2017, RSL, 2017). When the current research literature is reviewed, it is seen that no studies regarding the approaches of English teachers' to Marzano's effective instructional strategies, especially the comparative analysis of the approaches of teachers in Turkey and Russia experiencing similar difficulties in foreign language teaching have been done yet. As the result of the review of the research literature on foreign language teaching this study was designed to determine whether English teachers working in Turkish and Russian schools use Marzano's Effective Instructional Strategies or not and the reasons for it. Problems in teaching foreign languages need to be examined regarding approaches to effective instructional strategies of teachers who are ones practising one-to-one as the most crucial part of teaching and learning process.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

One of the variables of assessment in foreign language teaching is effective teaching strategies that teachers use. As a result of the meta-analysis by Marzano, nine (9) effective teaching strategies were introduced that could make teaching effective. The purpose of this study is to compare the approaches of English teachers working in Turkish and Russian schools to Marzano's effective instructional strategies, which of them they use and why.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this study, the approaches of English teachers in secondary schools to effective instructional strategies were explored.

1. Do approaches to Marzano's effective instructional strategies differ among teachers of English working in Turkey and teachers of English working in Russia?
2. What are opinions on the usage of Marzano's effective instructional strategies (usage levels, usage reasons and methods of application) of teachers of English working in Turkey and teachers of English working in Russia?

RESEARCH DESIGN

In this study, a combination of qualitative and quantitative research was applied. We used both a survey and open-ended questions collecting data to understand contradictions between quantitative results and qualitative findings.

PARTICIPANTS

The participants for the study were teachers of English working at private and state secondary schools in Sahinbey and Sehitkamil areas in Gaziantep in Turkey and schools located in Moscow and St. Petersburg in Russia. The demographic information of the participants is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The demographic information of the participants

		Turkey		Russia	
		f	**%**	**f**	**%**
Number of the schools		21	%100	30	%100
Type of the school	State	18	%85,71	30	%100
	Private	3	%14,29	0	0
Gender	Female	40	%74,07	37	%92,5
	Male	14	%25,93	2	%5
	Not determined	0	0	1	%2,5
Graduated from	Department of education at a university	33	%61,11	5	%12,5
	Arts & Sciences	15	%27,78	25	%62,5
	Institute of Education	0	0	0	0
	Master	2	%3,7	0	0
	Other	3	%5,56	10	%25
	Not determined	1	%1,85	0	0
Experience	1-5 years	26	%48,15	2	%5
	5-10 years	11	%20,37	11	%27,5
	10-15 years	5	%9,26	6	%15
	15-20 years	9	%16,67	3	%7,5
	20 years and more	2	%3,7	17	%42,5
	Not determined	1	%1,85	1	%2,5
Age	20-30	26	%48,15	5	%12,5
	30-40	19	%35,19	14	%35
	40-50	8	%14,81	6	%15
	50 and more	0	0	15	%37,5
	Not determined	1	%1,85	0	0

Purposive sampling was used to reach the participants working at secondary schools in Russia. Purposeful sampling involves identifying and selecting individuals or groups of individuals that are especially knowledgeable about or experienced with a phenomenon of interest (Cresswell & Plano Clark, 2011). We relied on our own judgment when choosing members of population to participate in the study. We tried to reach English teachers who work in secondary schools finding them randomly at schools and on social media. All of the teachers who filled in and returned the questionnaire became a part of the study group of this study. As seen in Table 2, there is an average age difference between Turkish and Russian participants.

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTATION

Data collection was broken up into two phases: The Effective Instructional Strategies Questionnaire prepared by Diego (2012) and an open-ended questionnaire by Altunöz (2017) was used to collect data.

THE EFFECTİVE INSTRUCTİONAL STRATEGıES QUESTİONNAİRE

The Effective Instructional Strategies Questionnaire is a scale using a 4-point Likert scale-response alternatives scored from 1 to 4. The questionnaire consists of 6 questions about demographic and 40 questions on effective instructional strategies. The reliability coefficient was calculated as .85. In Diego (2012) the Cronbach alpha reliability ranged from α=.48 to α=.92 with a median alpha of α=.61. The sub-dimensions of the questionnaire and the number of items are shown in Table 3. This questionnaire was applied in English.

In this study the Cronbach alpha coefficients were calculated for the reliability analysis of the sub-dimensions of the questionnaire and ranged from α=.52 to α=.77: Identifying Similarities and Differences – α=.56, Summarizing and Note-taking – α=.53, Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition – α=.60, Homework and Practice – α=.51, Non-linguistic Representations – α=.76, Cooperative Learning – α=.68, Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback – α=.73, Generating and Testing Hypotheses – α=.77, Questions, Cues, and Advanced Organizers – α=.67.

Table3. The Effective Instructional Strategies Questionnaire Sub-dimensions and Distribution of the Items

Effective Instructional Strategy	**Number of items**
Summarizing and Note Taking	5
Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition	4
Questions, Cues, and Advanced Organizers	4
Similarities and Differences	4
Homework and Practice	4
Non-Linguistic Representations	4
Cooperative Learning	4
Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback	6
Generating and Testing Hypothesis	5
Total number of items	***40***

The questions in the Effective Instructional Strategies Questionnaire are as follows:

Questionnaire Sample (Diego, 2012)

Statements	**1 Strongly disagree**	**2 disagree**	**3 agree**	**4 Strongly agree**
1. Assigning in-class and homework tasks that involve comparison is an effective instructional strategy.				

THE OPEN-ENDED QUESTİONNAİRE

The open-ended interview form used by Altunoz consists of 30 questions and aims to determine whether teachers use Marzano's nine effective instructional strategies, the reasons and if they are trained about effective instructional strategies or not, and what is effective teaching according to them. In the questionnaire, they were asked whether they used effective instructional strategies or not, how they used them, and why they did or did not use them.

DATA COLLECTION

The Effective Instructional Strategies Questionnaire was implemented in the fall semester of the 2017-2018 academic year in the schools previously determined by the researcher in Şahinbey and Şehitkamil districts of Gaziantep.

The open-ended questionnaire was also implemented to the department leaders in the same schools. Schools were visited by the researcher several times, and the questionnaires were distributed individually to the teachers. The number of English teachers attained at their posts is 54. As the department leaders of the three schools did not agree to fill out the open-ended questionnaire, the researcher obtained 18 open-ended questionnaires filled by department leaders from 21 schools.

At the same time, teachers from Russia were reached on the Internet, the effective instructional strategies questionnaire and the open-ended questionnaire were applied. The open-ended questionnaire was applied to 6 teachers from Russia.

DATA ANALYSIS

In the analysis of the data, firstly information about the questionnaire data will be provided, and then the information about the open-ended questionnaire data will be presented.

SURVEY DATA

The total score calculation for the subscales of the scale was performed first. Then, a Shapiro-Wilk normality test was conducted to check the suitability of each sub-dimension for parametric tests. Since the significance level in all sub-dimensions is smaller than 0.05, it is decided that scale scores do not have a normal distribution and it is decided to use non-parametric tests. The Mann-Whitney U test was conducted because the variable of the country where teachers worked had two values. The average and interval calculation were made separately for each item and module according to the countries. Table 4 below is used for the mean range comparison.

Table 4. Intervals of Average Values and Comments

Average Lower Value	Average Upper Value	Comment
1,00	1,75	Strongly Disagree
1,76	2,50	Disagree
2,51	3,25	Agree
3,26	4,00	Strongly Agree

THE OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

Other data from the study were collected via a questionnaire consisting of open-ended questions and analysed using the content analysis technique. Content analysis is a specific and systematic interpretation that can be controlled by clearly defining boundaries and directions. The purpose of the content analysis is to reveal the common aspects of multiplexed textual content; from this point of view, content analysis is a generalising approach. The content analysis takes the right way from quantitative towards qualitative terms in the light of the fact that qualitative and quantitative stages of meanings or meaning structures complement each other (Gökçe, Türkdoğan, 2012, p. 317).

The open-ended questionnaire was applied to the department leaders of 24 schools (18 Turkish and 6 Russian), and the department leaders answered 27 questions. There is a total of 9 modules related to the views of department leaders on effective instructional strategies. The modules, the questions in the open-ended questionnaire are the same as Marzano's 9 effective instructional strategies: Similarities and Differences, Summarizing and Note Taking, Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition, Homework and Practice, Non-Linguistic Representations, Cooperative Learning, Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback, Generating and Testing Hypothesis, Questions, Cues, and Advance Organizers. The content analysis resulted in 3 themes: 'Usage level', 'Usage reason' and 'Application level'. There are ten categories for the theme.

In the free coding, 205 codes were produced first. Then the codes were re-grouped under the themes and categories. Theme and category and sample code definitions are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Theme, Category and Code Definitions Table

Theme	Category
Reason	**Learner** Contains examples on reasons offered by teachers where codes related with learners. *"Students learn well"* "Because it is an effective method for students"
	Learning Contains examples on reasons offered by teachers where codes related with learning process. *"Provides learning.."* *"Useful for estimation and case study"*
	Content Contains examples of reasons offered by teachers where codes related with lesson structure and content. *"writing'e faydalı olduğunu düşündüğüm için"* *"eski ve yeni kelimeleri bilgileri bir biri ile bağlantıları olsun diye"*
	Skill Contains examples of usage reason offered by teachers where codes related to gaining skills. *"support thinking"* *"It gains an independent effort"*
Application	**General Approach** Contains examples offered by teachers as general approach. *"When the subjects are too general I want them to make it together"* *"In the home environment they can finish activities that we can't complete at the lesson due to the time limitation"*
	Methods and Techniques Contains examples offered by teachers at the methods and techniques level. *"At the end of each unit, the students work by taking note of the words they have just learned in their own vocabulary"* *"Group play, competition"*
	Activity Contains examples offered by teachers at the activity level *"We talk about the difference between already and yet, or the similarities and differences of similar patterns in English and Russian."* *"go to the park. He goes to the park. First of all, I will guide students to explain the difference, then explain the details myself."*
Usage level	**Yes** Codes indicating that teachers use the strategies *"Yes, I use."*
	Partially Codes indicating that teachers use the strategies partially *"Sometimes"*
	No Codes indicating that teachers do not use *"I don't use."*

Two weeks later, the codes were looked over, and as a result, 190 codes remained. The code reliability was calculated as (190/205) = 93%.**,**

FINDINGS

The findings were organised and analysed within the context of two research questions. In the presentation of the findings, findings from the survey data were first presented, followed by findings from the open-ended questionnaire data. In the survey findings, headings were presented in the context of the research questions.

FINDINGS RELATED TO THE FIRST RESEARCH QUESTION

FINDINGS RELATED TO DİFFERENCES İN APPROACHES TO EFFECTİVE İNSTRUCTİONAL STRATEGİES OF TEACHERS İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Mann- Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether the country where teachers work (Turkey or Russia) affects their approaches to MEIS or not.

Table 6. Mann-Whitney U Test According to Teachers' Duty Countries

Lower dimension	Country	n	Rank Order	Total Ranking	U	z	p
Similarities and Differences	Russia	40	46,71	1868,50	1048,50	-0,244	0,808
	Turkey	54	48,08	2596,50			
Summarizing and Note Taking	Russia	40	50,76	2030,50	949,50	-1,009	0,313
	Turkey	54	45,08	2434,50			
Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition	Russia	40	47,40	1896,00	1076,00	-0,031	0,975
	Turkey	54	47,57	2569,00			
Homework and Practice	Russia	40	55,08	2203,00	777,00	-2,346	0,019*
	Turkey	54	41,89	2262,00			
Non-Linguistic Representations	Russia	40	39,61	1584,50	764,50	-2,438	0,015*
	Turkey	54	53,34	2880,50			
Cooperative Learning	Russia	40	47,90	1916,00	1064,00	-0,124	0,901
	Turkey	54	47,20	2549,00			
Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback	Russia	40	48,06	1922,50	1057,50	-0,173	0,863
	Turkey	54	47,08	2542,50			
Generating and Testing Hypothesis	Russia	40	52,99	2119,50	860,50	-1,692	0,091
	Turkey	54	43,44	2345,50			
Questions, Cues, and Advance Organizers	Russia	40	50,05	2002,00	978,00	-0,792	0,429
	Turkey	54	45,61	2463,00			

* p <0,05

According to the results of Mann-Whitney U test conducted to determine whether there is any difference in the approach scores to MEIS according to the teachers' having Turkish or Russian nationality status; there is a difference in "Homework and Practice" and "Non-Linguistic Representations" sub-dimensions. Russian teachers' approach scale scores are higher in "Homework and Practice" sub-dimension, whereas Turkish teachers' scale scores are higher in "Non-Linguistic Representations" sub-dimensions. In other words, the countries where the teachers' work have some influence on the teachers' approach to MEISs.

FINDINGS RELATED TO THE SECOND RESEARCH QUESTİON

The open-ended questionnaire was used in this research to determine teachers' of English usage levels of MEIS, usage reasons and views on how they applied these strategies. Content analysis was conducted to analyse the data obtained from this questionnaire.

Modules are used to present these findings. In each module, the data were presented according to the general themes and codes, and then the comparative data were presented according to the countries where the teachers worked and the status of having taken teaching methods training or not.

GENERAL FINDINGS RELATED TO THE USAGE OF SİMİLARİTİES AND DİFFERENCES STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 7. Theme, Category and Code Distributions

Theme	**Category**	**Codes**
Usage Level	Yes	Yes (24)
	Partially	0
	No	0
Reason	Learner(5)	Learner (5)
	Learning(20)	Learning (15) Facilitating learning (3) Reinforcing learning (2)
	Content(11)	Content (11)
	Skill(2)	Skill (2)
Application	General Approach (13)	General Approach (13)
	Methods/Techniques (2)	Methods and Techniques (2)
	Activity (10)	Activity (10)

All of the participants use the "Similarities and Differences" module. Most of the usage reasons were presented in the learning category. When the application theme was examined, it was seen that most of the examples were presented at the general approach level. Two of the teachers did not determine their status of extra training.

FINDINGS RELATED TO DİFFERENCES İN THE USAGE OF SİMİLARİTİES AND DİFFERENCES STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 8. Distribution of Codes by Country and Training Status

	Turkey	Russia	Got no extratraining	Got extra training
Number of persons	18	6	10	12
Usage Level Yes	18	6	10	12
Reason Skill	2	0	0	2
Content	9	2	7	4
Learner	3	2	2	3
Learning	12	3	4	9
Application Activity	8	2	3	6
General Approach	8	5	6	6
Methods-Techniques	2	0	0	1

Although all teachers stated that they used the module when they presented the reasons for use, some of the Turkish teachers declared that they preferred to use it because of skill development, but Russian teachers did not give any reasons for this. Teachers who did not receive any specific training offered more reasons at the content level, while trained teachers offered more reasons at the learning level. In other words, teachers who did not receive any training attached importance to the content and those who received training on the topic gave more importance to the learning process. While almost all of the Russian teachers stated the form of usage, they presented examples at the level of general approach, only half of the Turkish teachers presented any examples in this subject. Teachers who received training provided examples at the level of activity and general approach, whereas teachers who did not receive extra training mainly offered examples at the level of general approach.

GENERAL FINDINGS RELATED TO THE USAGE OF SUMMARİZİNG AND NOTE TAKİNG STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 9. Theme, Category and Code Distributions

Theme	**Category**	**Codes**
Usage Level	Yes	Yes (18)
	Partially	Partially (3)
	No	No (3)
Reason	Learner (14)	Learner(11)
	Learning (17)	Being useful (7) Permanence (3)
	Content (9)	Content (8) *Not important (1)*
	Skill (0)	
Application	General Approach (3)	General Approach (3)
	Methods/Techniques (3)	Methods Techniques (3)
	Activity (13)	Activity (13)

18 teachers stated that they used, three teachers partially used and three teachers did not use the "Summarizing and Note Taking" module. Most of the reasons were presented in the learning category. In the content category, an expression such as "It teaches to distinguish what is important and what is not important" was presented as a positive reason besides those who indicated that they did not use the category because it was insignificant. An equal number of codes were used at the method-technique and general approach levels, while mostly activity-level usage examples were provided for the application-based examples.

FINDINGS RELATED TO DİFFERENCES İN THE USAGE OF SUMMARİZİNG AND NOTE TAKİNG STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table10. Distribution of Codes by Country and Training Status

	Turkey	Russia	Got no extra training	Got extra training
Number of persons	**18**	**6**	**10**	**12**
Usage Level Yes	12	6	9	7
No	3	0	1	2
Partially	3	0	0	3
Reason Content	3	6	5	3
Learner	13	1	6	7
Learning	15	2	6	10
Application				
General Approach	2	1	1	2
Methods-Techniques	3	0	1	2
Activity	6	7	7	5

All of the teachers who said that they did not use this category or partially used were Turkish. Five Russian teachers from six gave six reasons in the content category, while only three of 18 Turkish teachers gave reasons for the content. The Turkish teachers offered more reasons for learner and learning categories. While the Russian teachers mostly kept the topic of learning in the foreground, the Turkish teachers kept the learner and learning phenomenon in the foreground. On the other side teachers who got some education on the topic offered more reasons for learning, while those who did not get any extra training focused on content and learners. No differentiation was observed in the code distributions at the application level.

GENERAL FINDINGS RELATED TO THE USAGE OF REİNFORCİNG EFFORT AND PROVİDİNG RECOGNİTİON STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 11. Theme, Category and Code Distributions

Theme	**Category**	**Codes**
Usage Level	Yes	Yes (22)
	Partially	Partially (1)
	No	
Reason	Learner (23)	Learner (10) Motivation (10)
	Learning (17)	Affective dimension (9) Increase success (7)
	Content (1)	Content (1)
Application	General Approach (10)	General Approach(10)
	Methods-Techniques (11)	Methods-Techniques (11)
	Activity (0)	

In the "Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition" module, 22 teachers stated that they used the strategy while one teacher declared using it partially and one teacher did not answer the question. In the reason theme, most of the codes were produced in the learner category. When this category was examined in detail, it was seen that ten codes were directly related to learners and ten to motivation of the learners. The teachers did not use expressions at the level of activity while using expressions in general approach and methods-techniques categories.

FINDINGS RELATED TO DİFFERENCES İN THE USAGE OF REİNFORCİNG EFFORT AND PROVİDİNG RECOGNİTİON STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 12. Distribution of Codes by Country and Training Status

	Turkey	Russia	Got no extra training	Got extra training
Number of Persons	18	6	10	12
Usage Level Yes	16	6	9	11
Partially	1	0	1	0
Reason				
Learner	21	2	8	15
Learning	11	6	8	5
Content	0	1	1	0
Application				
General Approach	7	3	7	3
Methods-techniques	8	3	3	8

When we examined the usage level of the "Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition " module regarding country and education level, we saw that one teacher who was Turkish and got no extra training used the strategypartially. In the usage reason theme the Russian teachers expressed two codes related to learners, the Turkish teachers 21 times used codes related to this category. When the learning category was examined, it was clear that the Turkish teachers used more expressions about success, whereas the Russian teachers used more codes on affective dimension and importance of the process.

GENERAL FINDINGS RELATED TO THE USAGE OF HOMEWORK AND PRACTİCE STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 13. Theme, Category and Code Distributions

Theme	**Category**	**Codes**
Usage Level	Yes	Yes (20)
	Partially	Partially (3)
	No	No (1)
Reason	Learning (24)	Repetition (8) Reinforcement (5) Useful (2)
	Learner(4)	Learner (2)
	Skill (3)	
	Content(2)	
Application	General Approach (12)	General Approach (1) Repetitive homework (9)
	Methods-Techniques	Methods techniques (9)
	Activity	Activity (7)

When the level of usage was examined in the "Homework and Practice" module it was seen, that 20 teachers stated that they used the strategy, while three teachers indicated that they used partially, and one teacher indicated not using it. At the usage reasons level, most of codes were generated in the learning category. Reasons for reinforcement and repetition were brought into the forefront by the teachers. In the application theme at all three levels, numbers of extracted codes were close to each other.

FINDINGS RELATED TO DİFFERENCES İN THE USAGE OF HOMEWORK AND PRACTİCE STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 14. Distribution of Codes by Country and Training Status

	Turkey	**Russia**	**Got no extra training**	**Got extra training**
Number of Persons	18	6	10	12
Usage Level Yes	14	6	8	10
No	1	0	1	0
Partially	3	0	1	2
Reason				
Learning	20	4	9	13
Total positive codes	***15***	***4***	***6***	***11***
Total negative codes	***5***	***0***	***2***	***3***
Reason				
Learner	2	2	2	2
Skill	2	1	2	1
Content	1	1	2	0
Application				
General Approach	4	6	5	5
Methods-techniques	5	4	4	4
Activity	6	1	3	4

In the "Homework and Practice" module all of the Russian teachers stated that they used the strategy while three of the Turkish teachers stated that they partially used it and one did not use

it. In the usage reasons, Turkish teachers used five negative expressions for the learning category, whereasthe Russian teachers did not use negative codes.

GENERAL FINDINGS RELATED TO THE USAGE OF NON-LİNGUİSTİC REPRESENTATİONS STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 15. Theme, Category and Code Distributions

Theme	**Category**	**Codes**
Usage Level	Yes	Yes (23)
	Partially	Partially (1)
	No	0
Reason	Learning (17)	Permanence (8) Easy recall (3) Facilitation (3)
	Learner(4)	Useful (1) Motivation (1)
	Content(3)	Content (2) Real life conditions(1)
	Skill (3)	Skill (2) Effective communication (1) Creativity (1)
Application	General Approach	General Approach (1)
	Methods/Techniques (17)	Imitation-acting out (8) Methods-techniques (4)
	Activity (10)	Activity (5) Physical movement (4)

When the level of usage of the "No-Linguistic Representations" module was examined it was seen, that 23 teachers stated that they used the strategy, one teacher indicated using it partially. In the reasons theme, most of the codes were determined in the learning category. In this category, permanence, easy recall and facilitation codes were expressed most of all. In the skill category, the teachers expressed that they used it because of an expectation of an increase in creativity and communication skills. When the application examples were examined, it was seen that most of the codes were produced at the methods-techniques level. In this category, most of the examples were presented on imitation-acting out.

FINDINGS RELATED TO DİFFERENCES İN THE USAGE OF NON-LİNGUİSTİC REPRESENTATİONS STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 16. Distribution of Codes by Country and Training Status

	Turkey	**Russia**	**Got no extra training**	**Got extra training**
Number of Persons	**18**	**6**	**10**	**12**
Usage Level Yes	17	6	10	11
Partially	1	0	0	1
Reason				
Learning	16	6	9	11
Skill	3	0	1	2
Learner	3	1	2	2
Content	2	1	2	1
Application				
General Approach	1	0	0	0
Methods-Techniques	14	3	6	11
Activity	3	7	6	4

When the reasons for the "Non-Linguistic Representations" module were examined, it was determined that most of the codes were used in the learning category. In the learning category, the permanence code was expressed most of all and mainly by the Turkish teachers. An equal number of codes was expressed in teacher training dimension. While the Russian teachers were on easy recall code, Turkish teachers focused on facilitation.

GENERAL FINDINGS RELATED TO THE USAGE OF COOPERATİVE LEARNING STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 17. Theme, Category and Code Distributions

Theme	**Category**	**Codes**
Usage Level	Yes	Yes (21)
	Partially	Partially (3)
	No	
Reason	Learner(12)	Cooperation (7)
	Learning (11)	Learning (3) Easy learning (3)
	Skill (11)	Gaining skills (6)
	Content(0)	
Application	General Approach	General Approach (2)
	Methods-Techniques (19)	group assignment (7) Methods Techniques (5) Out-of-class activities (4)
	Activity	Activity (5)

When the usage level of the "Cooperative Learning" module was examined, it was seen, that 21 teachers indicated that they used the strategy and three teachers said that they used it partially. When the categories for usage reason were examined, it was determined, that most of the codes were produced in the learner category. In this category, the code of cooperation was at the forefront. It was noteworthy that the teachers did not say a word to justify content in this module.

FINDINGS RELATED TO DİFFERENCES İN THE USAGE OF COOPERATİVE LEARNİNG STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 18. Distribution of Codes by Country and Training Status

	Turkey	**Russia**	**Got no extra training**	**Got extra training**
Number of Persons	**18**	**6**	**10**	**12**
Usage Level Yes	16	5	8	12
Partially	2	1	3	0
Reason Learner	10	2	5	6
Learning	9	2	4	6
Application General Approach	1	1	1	1
Methods-techniques	10	4	5	7
Activity	3	2	1	4

In the "Cooperative Learning" module two Turkish teachers and one Russian teacher indicated that they used the strategy partially. All of the teachers who indicated that they used the strategy partially were teachers who had not got any extra training on the topic. The Turkish teachers produced codes predominantly in the learner and learning categories; the Russian teachers expressed relatively more codes in the skill category.

GENERAL FINDINGS RELATED TO THE USAGE OF SETTİNG OBJECTİVES AND PROVİDİNG FEEDBACK STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 19. Theme, Category and Code Distributions

Theme	**Category**	**Codes**
Usage Level	Yes	Yes (23)
	Partially	Partially (1)
	No	
Reason	Content(14)	Measurement (7) Content (4) Linking to everyday life (3)
	Learner(12)	Learner (10)
	Learning (9)	Learning (8)
	Skill (1)	Skill (1)
Application	General Approach (7)	General Approach (4)
	Methods/Techniques (3)	Methods-Technique (2) Lesson preparation (1)
	Activity (9)	Activity (6)

Examining the levels of usage in the " Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback " module showed that 23 teachers used the strategy, while one teacher used it partially. Regarding usage reasons, most codes were produced in the content category. In this category, the measurement code was in the foreground.

FINDINGS RELATED TO DİFFERENCES İN THE USAGE OF SETTİNG OBJECTİVES AND PROVİDİNG FEEDBACK STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 20. Distribution of Codes by Country and Training Status

	Turkey	Russia	Got no extra training	Got extra training
Number of Persons	18	6	10	12
Usage Level Yes	18	5	9	12
Partially	0	1	1	0
Reason				
Content	10	4	6	7
Learner	12	2	6	8
Learning	7	3	8	2
Skill	1	0	0	1
Application				
General Approach	6	1	3	4
Methods-techniques	1	2	2	1
Activity	7	2	2	6

In the "Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback" module, one Russian teacher who had got no extra training declared that used the category partially. When the usage reasons were examined, it was seen that only the Turkish teachers mentioned codes of linking with everyday life in the content category. Other codes in the content category had relatively similar distributions. In the learning category, the Turkish teachers used relatively more expressions.

GENERAL FINDINGS RELATED TO THE USAGE OF GENERATİNG AND TESTİNG HYPOTHESİS STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 21. Theme, Category and Code Distributions

Theme	**Category**	**Codes**
Usage Level	Yes	Yes (18)
	Partially	Partially (2)
	No	No (2)
Reason	Skill (13)	Problem-solving skill(3) Skill (3) Analysing (2) Thinking skill (2)
	Content (9)	Content (3) *There is no area for an application (2)*
	Learning (6)	Learning (2)
	Learner (2)	Learner (1) Not to adjust memorizing (1)
Application	General Approach(1)	General Approach (1)
	Methods-Techniques (13)	Guess (8)
	Etkinlik (4)	In-class activity (2)

In the "Generating and Testing Hypothesis" module, 18 teachers stated that they used the strategy, two teachers said that they used partially and two teachers declared that the did not use it. When the usage reasons theme was analysed, it was indicated that most of the codes were produced in the skill category.

FINDINGS RELATED TO DİFFERENCES İN THE USAGE OF GENERATİNG AND TESTİNG HYPOTHESİS STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 22. Distribution of Codes by Country and Training Status

	Turkey	Russia	Got no extra training	Got extra training
Number of persons	**18**	**6**	**10**	**12**
Usage Level Yes	13	5	8	10
No	1	1	1	1
Partially	2	0	1	1
Reason				
Skill	7	6	7	6
Content	6	3	3	6
Learning	6	0	2	4
Learner	2	0	0	2
Application				
General Approach	1	0	1	0
Methods-Techniques	8	5	4	9
Activity	4	0	2	2

The teachers who stated that they did not use the "Generating and Testing Hypothesis " module were both Turkish and Russian and also those who had got some training on the topic and not. Teachers who indicated that they used partially were Turkish. In the usage reasons theme, the Russian teachers expressed proportionally much more codes in the skill category than the Turkish teachers did. The code for thinking skills was only mentioned by Russian teachers. The research homework was also given as an example only by the Russian teachers. Examples at activity level were mentioned by Turkish teachers.

GENERAL FINDINGS RELATED TO THE USAGE OF QUESTİONS, CUES, AND ADVANCE ORGANİZERS STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 23. Theme, Category and Code Distributions

Theme	Category	Codes
Usage Level	Yes	Evet (21)
	Partially	Partially(2)
	No	
Reason	Content(13)	Relating to previous information (10)
	Learner(9)	Learning preparation (2) Enjoyable (2)
	Learning (7)	Importance of control (2) Facilitating learning (2)
	Skill (7)	Supporting link building (2) Supporting thinking (2)
Application	General Approach (8)	Giving cues (5) Foreknowledge (2)
	Methods/Techniques(5)	Methods-techniques (5)
	Activity (1)	Activity (1)

In the " Questions, Cues, and Advance Organizers " module, 21 teachers said they used the strategy, and two teachers stated that they partially used it. In the reason theme, most of the codes were determined in the content category. The code of foreknowledge was expressed ten times. The teachers also mentioned repetition of content and spiral system. It is also the codes that are expressed by the teachers that the content is repeated and the spiral system. At the application level in the general approach category, most of the codes were about giving cues.

FINDINGS RELATED TO DİFFERENCES İN THE USAGE OF QUESTİONS, CUES, AND ADVANCE ORGANİZERS STRATEGY BY TEACHERS OF ENGLİSH WORKİNG İN TURKEY AND RUSSİA

Table 24. Distribution of Codes by Country and Training Status

	Turkey	Russia	Got no extra training	Got extra training
Number of Persons	18	6	10	12
Usage Level Yes	16	5	9	11
Partially	1	1	1	1
Reason				
Content	12	1	5	7
Learner	7	2	4	5
Learning	5	2	3	4
Skill	6	1	3	4
Application				
General Approach	6	2	2	6
Methods-Techniques	0	5	5	0
Activity	1	0	0	1

In the "Questions, Cues, and Advance Organizers " module the distribution of the teachers who partially used the category was equal according to the country where they lived and their education level. The code of relating to previous information was expressed nine times by Turkish teachers, but only once by Russian teachers in the content category at the reason level. The only example at the level of activity was voiced by the teacher who was Turkish and trained.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Both the Turkish and Russian teachers had similar levels of usage in the answers given to the questions on the "Similarities and Differences" strategy, and they were at the level of "I agree". Altunöz (2017) stated that the strategy observed in the lessons was quite extensively used. Diego's (2012) study found that teachers working in real and virtual learning teaching environments had similar positive views on the strategy of identifying similarities and differences. According to the findings obtained from the open-ended questionnaire both the Turkish and the Russian teachers stated that they used the strategies they presented most of all the example of providing learning as the reason. The examples of the content category that were given were about describing similarities and differences between different languages or between different linguistic structures on the same level.

According to the survey responses, the teachers in the two countries stated that they considered the "Summarizing and Note Taking" strategies to be effective. In the study of Altunöz (2017), it was seen that two of the teachers observed never applied this strategy. In Diego's (2012) study, it was seen that teachers working in the virtual environment rated the Summarizing and Note strategy lower than teachers working in traditional classrooms. According to the open-ended questionnaire, all the teachers who stated that they did not use or partially used Summarizing and Note Taking strategies were Turkish. Turkish teachers who had negative thoughts about this strategy presented such reasons as making students disinclined, students' inadequate levels. The similar reason for not using was also found in the research of Altunöz (2017). As a result of the research conducted with the students in Kara's (2016) study, it was concluded that “despite the fact that some students with low achievement levels were found to have some difficulties in some strategies” the usage of MEISs by a teacher made the course more comprehensible, the students increased their success and thinking levels, and the strategies had positive effect on the students motivation and attitudes. It can be considered that the fact that Russian teachers' pay more attention to the Summarizing and Note Taking strategy originates from the fact that the tradition of using this strategy actively in Russia has not changed over the last century (Krupskaya, 1960; Matusevich, 2012).

Compared to the Russian teachers, the Turkish teachers are more convinced that Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition through charts and rubrics and using particular symbols are more effective. On the contrary, we can see that the Russian teachers believe more than the Turkish teachers that Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition using real prizes and compliments is more effective. The reasons for these differences may be related to cultural differences. In the answers to the open-ended questionnaire, the Turkish teachers give examples of the usage reasons giving particular importance to a learner. At the same time, while the Turkish teachers have provided more reasons for success, the Russian teachers have expressed more reasons for emotional dimension and importance of the learning process. Altunöz (2017) observed in her study that the teachers did not hold this strategy in the foreground, whereas the students emphasised especially this strategy.

We can see that the Russian teachers are more convinced that applying skills, assigning homework for main in-class activities and explaining the purpose of homework is effective, whereas the Turkish teachers have shown more positive attitudes towards various forms of feedback on all assigned homework. This suggests that Russian teachers do not agree that providing feedback on homework is effective. In the study of Altunöz (2017), it was observed that the teachers often applied only the Practice part from this strategy category. When the answers of the department leaders were examined, it was seen that some of the Turkish teachers

did not use this strategy or used it partially. The teachers who had a negative approach towards this strategy category emphasised that these strategies could reduce students' love to school and that home environment is not proper for learning. It can be said that the Russian teachers think that Homework and Practice are an integral part of the learning process, whereas the Turkish teachers hesitate on this issue. In Russia assignment of homework with the purpose of practising and repetition, the knowledge and skills learnt at schools and students' independent work on their own have always been kept in the foreground by secondary and high school teachers (Mikelson, 1940; Sillaste and others, 2013; RFSES, 2014).

It is an effective strategy for the Turkish and Russian teachers to ask students to prepare graphical organisers representing content according to the answers to the questions about the "Non-Linguistic Representations" strategy. However, the Turkish teachers are more likely to believe that asking students to make physical models students, to draw pictures or pictographs or to act out content is an effective instructional strategy. A similar result was reached in the study of Altunöz (2017), the observed teachers preferred painting and kinesthetic activities in their lessons. The department leaders referring to the implementation section mentioned most of all imitation and acting out examples. Mostly the Turkish teachers have advocated permanence. While the Russian teachers stated that the strategy could make it easy to remember, the Turkish teachers emphasised that non-linguistic representations facilitate learning and gained skills as well. The findings of Diego's study (2012) also support the fact that most teachers espouse the Non-Linguistic Representations strategy.

The teachers in Turkey and Russia think that the "Collaborative Learning" strategy is effective. We can see that they strongly agree that organising students into formal and informal cooperative learning groups when appropriate are effective and agree that organising students in homogeneous or heterogeneous ability groups when appropriate are effective instructional strategies. The examples of application given by the Turkish and Russian teachers are close to each other. Competition management was only mentioned by the Turkish teachers. However, in the study of Altunöz (2017), it was observed that the teachers did not assign any tasks based on a collaborative process, but only individual tasks. In Diego's (2012) study, it was found that teachers working in virtual environments gave less importance to this strategy than teachers working in traditional classrooms. The findings of this study show that both Turkish and Russian teachers have declared that they use the Cooperative Learning strategy.

The Turkish and Russian teachers show a high level of belief in the effectiveness of using student-led feedback. While the Russian teachers are more convinced that criterion-referenced feedback is effective, the Turkish teachers are more convinced that providing specific feedback on student progress towards learning goals is effective. Altunöz (2017) observed that because of limited lesson time and the full classes there were some difficulties in using the strategy of providing individual feedback, but one of the two teachers who participated in the study informed the students about the goals. So as it is seen the teachers in Turkey are more likely to emphasise feedback towards learning goals, while teachers in Russia give more importance to criterion-referenced feedback. This situation may be caused by the fact that classes in Russia are in general not so crowded as they are in Turkey. In addition the fact that because of the high average age of most of the Russian teachers who make up the study group they were not considered to study setting learning goals as a teaching strategy during the period when they had their undergraduate education, but just in recent years, Russia has been targeting to set learning goals in the learning process can be another reason for the Russian teachers' attitude towards the Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback strategy. The example of linking to everyday life has only been expressed by Turkish teachers. The teachers in both countries

demonstrate positive attitudes to the Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback strategy, and that supports Marzano's (2008) idea, that this strategy can be effective in different educational environments and for different student profiles.

The Turkish and Russian teachers strongly agree that it is effective to engage students in projects that involve generating and testing hypotheses through problem-solving tasks and agree that engaging students in projects that involve generating and testing hypotheses through systems-analysis tasks are an effective instructional strategy. The Russian teachers strongly agree that engaging students in projects that involve generating and testing hypotheses through decision-making tasks and research are effective strategies, whereas the Turkish teachers agree with that. It seems that Turkish teachers are more convinced that engaging students in projects that involve generating and testing hypotheses through invention are not effective. The Russian teachers talked about guessing in their examples more than the Turkish teachers did. Research as homework was also given as an example only by the Russian teachers. It is seen that the teachers observed in Altunöz's (2017) research did not apply this strategy at all in their lessons. In the Diego (2012) study, it was found that different field teachers used this strategy differently: Mathematics and Science teachers compared to Social science and English teachers gave more importance to Generating and Testing Hypothesis strategy, the possible reason is specialities of the fields.

Both the Turkish and Russian teachers are firmly convinced that it is effective to use Questions, Cues, and Advance Organizers strategies to give students an opportunity to think on and organise the content. In the study of Altunöz (2017), it was also observed that the teachers used this strategy category actively. According to the findings of this research, it is understood that the teachers think that it is useful to give clear clues to students to make a direct connection between new information and what they have seen before. However, compared to the Turkish teachers, the Russian teachers are more likely to believe that it is effective to use questions to elicit inferences and to use analytic questions that analyse errors, construct support and analyse perspectives. The Turkish teachers presented more examples of the necessity of linking old and new knowledge than Russian teachers did. Entertainment was expressed as an example only by Turkish teachers and teachers who got no extra training.

In summary, it can be said that the Turkish teachers give less importance to the Summarizing and Note Taking, Homework, Generating and Testing Hypothesis strategies compared to the Russian teachers. The Russian teachers less emphasise Non-linguistic representations strategy than the Turkish teachers do. Besides, the examples and reasons presented for the Cooperative Learning, Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback, Questions, Cues, and Advance Organizers strategies have shown some difference:

- Compared to the Russian teachers, the Turkish teachers attach more importance to the fact that the content should be related to real life contexts. It can be said that it is vital for Turkish teachers to associate lessons with everyday life by adopting learning objectives and motivating them.
- The Turkish teachers give particular importance to learners while presenting reasons for using the strategies. Based on this data, it can be said that the Russian teachers embrace less the student-centred approach than the Turkish teachers do.
- As distinct from the Russian teachers when the Turkish teachers talked about language teaching, they did not give even an example of the culture of the target language. Learning a foreign language means acquiring a new foreign culture. Language is an

integral part of the culture. Language and culture exist together. To use a foreign language naturally, it is essential to know the culture as it is in the native language.

SUGGESTIONS

On the basis of the findings in the research our major suggestions are as follows:

- More efficient results can be obtained if English teachers in Turkey attach more importance to such strategies as homework, research tasks, summarizing and generating hypotheses.
- English teachers in Turkey should embrace the culture, literature and history that English is intertwined with as they are inseparable. It's important to organize foreign language lessons with activities based on the cultural content.
- Studies examining foreign language teachers' approaches to effective instructional strategies can be conducted with larger samples in different regions.
- As we see in the examples provided by the respondents the grammatical structure and features of the language are often seen as the ultimate goal in foreign language teaching that's why it is important to examine strategies and techniques that will enable students to use language as a tool naturally.

REFERENCES

Acat, M. Bahaddin& Demiral, Seyfettin. "Türkiye'de yabancı dil öğreniminde motivasyon kaynakları ve sorunları". *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 8 (3) (2002): 312-329.

Altunöz, Hatun Buğra. "*Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğretiminde etkili öğretim stratejilerinin analizi*" Yüksek lisan tezi. Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2017.

Bialystok, Ellen. "Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism". *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology/Revue canadienne de psychologie expérimentale*, 65 (4) (2011): 229-235.

Borich, Gary D. 2014. "Etkili Öğretim Yöntemleri Araştırma Temelli Uygulama". 8-th ed. M.B.Acat (trans.). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Burden, Paul R. & Byrd, Demetri. "Methods For Effective Teaching". 4th ed. New York: Pearson, 2007.

Can, Niyazi. "Öğretmenlerin Geliştirilmesi ve Etkili Öğretmen Davranışları". *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1 (16) (2004): 103-119.

Çelebi, Mustafa Durmuş. "Türkiye'de anadili eğitimi ve yabancı dil öğretimi". *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 21 (2006): 285-307.

Cresswell John W, Plano Clark Vicki L. "Designing and conducting mixed method research". 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2011.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Teacher quality and student achievement". *Education policy analysis archives* 8 (1) (2000).

Demirel, Özcan. "Yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin yeterlikleri". *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 5 (5) (1990): 133-163.

Demirpolat, Başak Coşkun. "Türkiye'nin Yabancı Dil Öğretimiyle İmtihanı". İstanbul: SETA, 2015.

Diego, Joslin. "*Teacher perceptions of Marzano's instructional strategies in traditional and virtual classrooms*" Doctoral Dissertation. University of Southern California, 2012.

EPI. "EF English Proficiency Index Report", 2017. Retrieved from https://www.ef.com/__/~/media/centralefcom/epi/downloads/full-reports/v7/ef-epi-2017-english.pdf.

RFSES. "Russian Federal State Educational Standards", 2014. Retrieved from http://uc.osu.ru/wp-content/uploads/.

Gökçe, Orhan, Türkdoğan, Orhan. "Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemi". 1.Baskı. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi Yayınları, 2012.

Haznedar, Belma. "Türkiye'de yabancı dil eğitimi: Reformlar, yönelimler ve öğretmenlerimiz". *In International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, Antalya, Turkey, 2010. Retrieved from http://www. iconte.org/FileUpload/ks59689/File/166. pdf.

Ivanov, Stanislav and Melnicheno, Boris N. "Rossiya i Vostok. Rossiya i Turtsiya (obshee i osobennoye v istoricheskom razvitii v epohu srednevekovya i novoye vremya) ". St. Petersburg: İzdatelstvo S.-Peterburgskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, 2000.

Işık, Ali. "Yabancı Dil Eğitimimizdeki Yanlışlar Nereden Kaynaklanıyor?". *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 4, (2) (2008): 15-26.

Jordan, Heather, Mendro, Robert, & Weerasinghe, Dash. "Teacher effects on longitudinal student achievement: A report on research in progress." Indianapolis: National Evaluation Institute, 1997.

Kara, Kevser. "*Fen bilimleri dersinde etkili öğretim stratejilerinin etkinliğinin değerlendirilmesi*" Doktora tezi. Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2016.

Karahan, Firdevs. "Language attitudes of Turkish students towards the English language and its use in Turkish context". *Journal of arts and sciences* 7 (1) (2007): 73-87.

Karal, Hasan. & Berigel, Muhammet. "Yabancı dil eğitim ortamlarının bilişim ve iletişim teknolojileri (BİT) kullanarak zenginleştirilmesi". Ankara: TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi, 2006. Retrieved from http://inet-tr.org.tr/inetconf11/kitap/karal_berigel_inet06.pdf

Killen, Roy. "Effective teaching strategies: Lessons from research and practice". 4th Edition. South Melbourne: Cengage Learning Australia, 2016.

Krupskaya, Nadejda. "Pedagogicheskiye sochineniya". 9 vols. Moscow: İzdatelstvo Akademii Pedagogicheskih Nauk, 1960.

Marzano, Robert J., Pickering, Debra J. ve Pollock, Jane E. "Classroom Instruction that Works". Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2001.

Marzano, Robert J., Pickering, Debra J. ve Pollock, Jane E. "Öğrenci Başarısını Artıran Öğretim Stratejileri". İstanbul: Sev Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık, 2008.

Matusevich, Olga A. "Strategiya aktivnogo obucheniya kak innovatsionnaya pedagogicheskaya tehnologiya". *Trudi BGTU: Uchebno-metodicheskaya rabota* 8 (155) (2012): 169-172.

Mikelson, Roman M. "O samostoyatelnoy rabote uchashihsya v processe obucheniya". Moskva: Uchpedgiz, 1940.

Moore, Kenneth D. "Effective Instructional Strategies". U.S.A: Sage Publications, 2005.

DSDL. The Digital Scientific Dissertations Library, 2017. Retrieved from http://www.dissercat.com/.

Özer, Bayram. ve Korkmaz, Celalettin. "Yabancı dil öğretiminde öğrenci başarısını etkileyen unsurlar". *Ekev Akademi Dergisi* 67 (20) (2016): 59-84.

RSl. The Russian State Library, Digital Library of Dissertations, 2017. Retrieved from http://diss.rsl.ru/.

Sanders, William L., & Rivers, June C. "Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement: Research Progress Report. " Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1996.

Sillaste, Galina, Pismennaya, Elena& Belgarokova, Natalya. *Samostoyatelnaya rabota studentov*, 2013. Retrieved from http://www. fa.ru/chair/socio/pps/Documents/metod_self_work.pdf.

Stewart, Janice Hostler. "Foreign language study in elementary schools: Benefits and implications for achievement in reading and math". *Early Childhood Education Journal* 33 (1) (2005): 11-16.

Svalova, Elena. "The problems of teaching English at the comprehensive school". *Aktualniye problemi germanistiki, romanistiki i rusistiki*, (2) (2011): 281-286.

Sillaste, Galina, Pismennaya, Elena & Belgarokova, Natalya. (2013). Samostoyatelnaya rabota studentov, from http://www. fa.ru/chair/socio/pps/Documents/metod_self_work.pdf.

Stewart, Janice Hostler. (2005). Foreign language study in elementary schools: Benefits and implications for achievement in reading and math. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 33 (1): 11-16.

Svalova, Elena. (2011). The problems of teaching English at the comprehensive school. *Aktualniye problemi germanistiki, romanistiki i rusistiki*, (2): 281-286.