NEVŞEHİR HACI BEKTAŞ VELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Ara, bul.

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi
Cilt: 14 Sayı: 2 Haziran 2024
E-ISSN: 2149-3871

SELF-REGULATED LEARNING STRATEGIES OF TERTIARY LEVEL EFL LEARNERS

İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN ÖZ-DÜZENLEMELİ ÖĞRENME BECERİLERİ

İlknur İSTİFÇİ
Anadolu Üniversitesi
Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu
Yabancı Diller Bölümü
iistifci@anadolu.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0002-3295-5747

Geliş Tarihi:
02.04.2024

Kabul Tarihi:
21.05.2024

Yayın Tarihi:
25.06.2024

Anahtar Kelimeler
Dil öğrenimi
Öz-düzenlemeli öğrenme
Öğrenci özerkliği
İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenmek

Keywords
Language learning
Self-regulated learning
Learner autonomy
EFL learning

ÖZ

Çalışma, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin öz-düzenlemeli öğrenme becerileri ile cinsiyet ve İngilizce yeterlilik düzeyi arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olup olmadığını ortaya çıkarmaya çalışmaktadır. Araştırmanın verileri yoğun bir hazırlık programında öğrenim gören 96 temel ve 88 üst-orta düzey öğrenciden toplanmıştır. Bu çalışmada S2R modelinin önerdiği Bilişsel, Duyuşsal, Sosyo-kültürel İnteraktif, Meta-Bilişsel, Meta-Duygusal, Meta-Sosyo-kültürel İnteraktif olmak üzere 6 alt başlık altında 35 maddeden oluşan Öz-Düzenlemeli Dil Öğrenme Stratejisi Kullanım Ölçeği ile veri toplanmıştır. Verilerin analizi SPSS 24 programı ve Bağımsız değişken t testi kullanılarak yapılmıştır. Araştırmanın sonuçları, iki öğrenci grubu arasında öz düzenlemeli öğrenme stratejilerinin kullanımı açısından bir fark olmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Elde edilen sonuçlara dayanarak öğrencilerin sınıf dışında öz-düzenlemeli öğrenme stratejilerini kullanarak daha özerk hale geldikleri yönünde bazı çıkarımlarda bulunulmuştur.

ABSTRACT

The study tries to find out if there is a significant relationship between self-regulated learning skills of EFL students in terms of gender and English proficiency level. The data of the research were collected from 96 elementary and 88 upper - intermediate level students studying in an intensive preparatory program. The instrument used in the study was The Self-Regulated Language Learning Strategy Usage Scale which consists of 35 items under 6 subheadings as Cognitive, Affective, Socio-cultural Interactive, Meta-Cognitive, Meta-Emotional, Meta-Socio-cultural Interactive, suggested by the S2R model. Data analysis was performed using SPSS 24 program and Independent variable t test. The results of the study revealed that there was no difference between the two student groups in terms of the use of self-regulated learning strategies. Based on the results obtained, some inferences were made about students becoming more autonomous by using self-regulated learning strategies outside the classroom.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.30783/nevsosbilen.1463866
Atıf/Cite as: İstifçi, I. (2024). Self-regulated learning strategies of tertiary level EFL learners. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi, 14*(2), 756-769.

Introduction

Learner autonomy is a widely investigated phenomenon, and it is explained as learners taking responsibility for their own learning. As Andrade & Bunker (2009) state, central to the idea of autonomy is freedom of choice – learners choose what, where, and how to learn and self-regulation offers learners the opportunity to become autonomous. Learning is no more confined to classrooms so the physical "brick and mortar" classroom is losing its domination as the place of learning (Nguyen, 2015:311). What is more, rapid developments in technology and the usefulness of online learning have made distance education easy (McBrien et al., 2009) and enhanced teachers' ideas on forming student-oriented and flexible learning environments (Bećirović et al., 2021; Kim, Hannafin, 2005). Contrary to face-to-face instruction, online education is learner-centered, and much autonomous effort is needed for favorable outcomes (Artino, 2010).

It is highly probable that the three factors of language proficiency, language learning skills, and an intrinsic value for learning the language could be the key to autonomous language learning: that being a situation where learners enjoy what they do, feel in control of their own learning, and take steps to manage or regulate the subjects they undertake to learn (Nakata, 2010). Hence, this study attempts to explore self-regulated language learning of two groups of university level EFL students who are getting distance language education at the time of the study.

Literature Review

Self-regulated learning

Self-regulation can be defined as the thoughts, feelings and actions that are planned and adapted in order to achieve the personal goals. Thus, self-regulated learning involves self-directed processes in which students monitor, control and evaluate their affects, cognition and behavior (Pintrich, 2005). Self-regulated learning has also been specifically defined as 'the ability of learners to control the factors or conditions affecting their learning' (Dembo, Junge, & Lynch, 2006, p. 188). The cognitive element of self-regulation refers to the use of learning strategies to understand and remember information; the metacognitive component is related to planning, setting goals, monitoring, and evaluating; motivation involves self-motivation, taking responsibility for one's successes and failures, and developing self-efficacy, which results in increased effort and persistence; behavior consists of seeking help and creating a positive learning environment for study (Dembo et al., 2006). The concept of self-regulated learning places less emphasis on choices and more on leading learners toward being effective without reliance on teacher structure. It focuses on how learners can take control of the learning process.

One popular cyclical model discusses three distinct phases: Forethought and planning, performance monitoring, and reflections on performance (Pintrich & Zusho, 2002; Zimmerman, 2000). During the forethought and planning phase, students analyze the learning task and set specific goals toward completing that task. Next, in the performance monitoring phase, students employ strategies to make progress on the learning task and monitor the effectiveness of those strategies as well as their motivation for continuing progress toward the goals of the task. In the final reflection on performance phase, students evaluate their performance on the learning task with respect to the effectiveness of the strategies that they chose. During this stage, students also must manage their emotions about the outcomes of the learning experience (Zumbrunn, 2011).

According to Zimmerman (1990), self-regulated learning is an endless cycle with a continuous feedback loop, because self-regulated students can 'select and use self- regulated learning strategies to achieve desired academic outcomes on the basis of feedback about learning effectiveness and skill' (p.6). On the basis of the learning cycle phases, Zimmerman (1998) compares the attributes of naive or novice learners and skillful self-regulated learners. Novice learners are trapped by the vicious circle characterized by unclear and distant goals, low self-efficacy beliefs, unfocused plans, self-evaluation avoidance, low ability attribution, and negative self-reactions. In contrast, skillful self-regulated learners are benefited by the virtuous circle (i.e. specific goals, high self-efficacy beliefs, self-monitoring, strategy attribution, and positive self- reactions) that helps them to control their own learning, select appropriate learning strategies, and motivate themselves without relying on teachers or other external agents of instruction. Therefore, it is the teachers' responsibility to help students understand and derive the benefits of the cyclical self-regulatory phases and to deter them from negative self-reactions that lower self-efficacy beliefs, as Zimmerman (2008) argues. There is a potential for self-regulated language learning research

to offer teachers practical solutions on goal attainment and learning methods for both successful and unsuccessful language learners in the EFL contexts (Nakata, 2011).

Self-regulated learning strategies

According to Oxford (2011) the Strategic Self-Regulation (S2R) Model is comprised of three major dimensions: cognitive, affective and sociocultural-Interactive (SI).

• Cognitive Strategies help the learner construct, transform, and apply L2 knowledge. The S2R Model includes six cognitive strategies as "Using the Senses to Understand and Remember, Activating Knowledge, Reasoning, Conceptualizing with Details, Conceptualizing Broadly, and Going beyond the Immediate Data." (Oxford, 2011, p. 46).

• Affective Strategies offer the learner some assistance with creating positive feelings and manner, and keep motivated. There are two affective strategies in the S 2R Model which are "Activating Supportive Emotions, Beliefs, and Attitudes, and Generating and Maintaining Motivation." (Oxford, 2011, p. 64)

• SI Strategies help the learner with communication, sociocultural contexts, identity, and power. They enable learners to interact and collaborate with others, ask for help, maintain social interaction when knowledge gaps occur as well. Three strategies included in the new model are "Interacting to Learn and Communicate, Overcoming Knowledge Gaps in Communicating, Dealing with Sociocultural Contexts and Identities" (Oxford, 2011, p. 88). Apart from these three major strategies, three types of meta-strategies are included in each dimension; metacognitive, meta-affective, and meta-SI strategies:

• Metacognitive Strategies provide the learner to control cognitive strategy use. These strategies are extremely employed by proficient L2 learners at the whole stages of proficiency. There are eight metacognitive strategies in the new model as "Paying Attention to Cognition, Planning for Cognition, Obtaining, and Using Resources for Cognition, Organizing for Cognition, Implementing Plans for Cognition, Orchestrating Cognitive Strategy Use, Monitoring Cognition, Evaluating Cognition" (Oxford, 2011, p.45).

• Meta-Affective Strategies facilitate learner control of affective strategy use. L2 learners are considered as both being cognitive information-processing mechanisms and having certain feelings, beliefs, attitudes, and motivations. The eight meta-affective strategies included in the model are "Paying Attention to Affect, Planning for affect, Obtaining and Using Resources for Affect, Organizing for Affect, Implementing Plans for Affect, Orchestrating Affective Strategy Use, Monitoring Affect, and Evaluating Affect" (Oxford, 2011, p. 63).

• Meta-SI Strategies enable the learner to control SI strategy use. There are eight meta-SI strategies as "Paying Attention to Contexts, Communication, and Culture, Planning for Contexts, Communication, and Culture, Obtaining and Using Resources for Contexts, Communication, and Culture, Organizing for Contexts, Communication, and Culture, Implementing Plans for Contexts, Communication, and Culture, Orchestrating Strategies for Contexts, Communication, and Culture, Monitoring for Contexts, Communication, and Culture, and Evaluating Contexts, Communication, and Culture" (Oxford, 2011, p. 87).

"A self-regulating learner is theorized to be highly active cognitively and metacognitively" (Winne, 2011, p. 19). Investigating the relationships between SRL and L2 proficiency, Fukuda (2018) states that there are six factors that are significantly different between the low- and high-proficiency groups: (1) self-efficacy, (2) intrinsic goal orientation, (3) task anxiety, (4) metacognitive strategies, (5) effort regulation, and (6) coping with problems. Self-efficacy and intrinsic goal orientation are considered the cores of the SRL (Pintrich, 2000) that provoke the cognitive strategies leading the process of SRL. On the contrary, test anxiety is known to have a negative influence on achievement (Zheng & Cheng, 2018); the less anxious learners feel, the better scores they might attain. As the results in Fukuda (2018) shows, less-proficient learners have significantly lower levels of self-efficacy, intrinsic goal orientation, metacognitive strategies, effort regulation, and coping skills, and a higher level of test anxiety.

In terms of the gender and SRL, Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1990) found differences across gender and giftedness. Females significantly had higher goal-setting and planning, and keeping records and monitoring as compared to males. Gifted students significantly had higher organization and planning, keeping records and monitoring, seeking teacher assistance, and reviewing notes.

When the studies in the literature are examined, it is seen that students with low language proficiency have deficiencies in language learning, have low self-efficacy and have problems in self-evaluation, students with high language proficiency have high self-efficacy, follow their learning and use various self-regulated learning strategies (Kitsantas & Zimmerman, 2002). Therefore, this study aimed at investigating self-regulated learning strategies of students with low language proficiency and high language proficiency to see if there is a difference in their use of self-regulated learning strategies. This study tried to fill the gap in the literature by comparing elementary and upper-intermediate EFL students studying in an intensive preparatory program at a state university.

In the light of the studies mentioned above, this study tried to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the mostly used self-regulated learning strategies by elementary and upper intermediate level EFL students in the prep class?
2. Is there a statistical difference in the use of self-regulated learning strategies in terms of gender?
3. Is there a statistical difference in the use of self-regulated learning strategies between elementary and upper-intermediate level of EFL learners?

Methodology

Research design

The present research was designed as a descriptive study with a quantitative approach. The data were collected from 96 elementary and 88 upper-intermediate level learners studying English in an intensive language learning program of a state university via Strategic Self-Regulation (S2R) Model by Oxford (2011) and adapted by Koksal and Dundar (2018).

Participants

The study was conducted in the 2019-2020 Spring Term at Anadolu University, School of Foreign Languages (AUSFL). The programme is delivered in four language levels ranging from Beginner to Intermediate. These levels are determined according to the Global Scale of English (GSE). The students are placed into these levels by means of standardized tests prepared by AUSFL. The participants of the study were 96 students studying English in elementary level (C) and 88 students in upper-intermediate level (A). The participants belonged to Anadolu University and Eskisehir Technical University at the time of the study. Because of Covid 19, all students were having distance education. The students were attending live lessons, watching videos related to course topics, and following the updates via a learning management system peculiar to the university. Their ages ranged from 18-21 (see Table 1).

Data Collection

The data were collected via a questionnaire that was adapted by Köksal and Dündar (2018). The questionnaire was sent to students in all elementary and upper-intermediate levels via Google forms. Although the questionnaire was sent to 310 students, only 184 of them answered the questions.

The Instrument

The Strategic Self-Regulation (S2R) Model developed by Oxford (2011) and adapted by Köksal and Dündar (2018) was used as an instrument of the study. In the light of strategies proposed by Oxford's (2011) Model, 53 items were generated by the researcher and administered to 305 L2 learners studying at the department of FLE. Subsequently, validity and reliability analyses of the scale were carried out on the collected data. Adapted Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale was composed of 35 items grouped into 6 factors as Cognitive Strategies, Affective Strategies, SI Strategies, Metacognitive Strategies, Meta-affective Strategies, Meta-SI Strategies, which are proposed by the S2R Model. The questionnaire also included a brief demographic information to find out students' department, age, gender and language level.

Validity and reliability

The Cronbach's Alfa coefficient was calculated to determine the reliability of the scale. The model is found to be at an acceptable level as the overall reliability of the measurement model is established by having a Cronbach's alpha statistic of .85. As a result of validity and reliability analyses of the scale, the final form of the instrument was composed of a total of 35 items and designed as a 4-point Likert-type scale having "never (1), sometimes (2), usually (3), and always (4)" options. There were no negative statements involved in the instrument. The Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale is a valid and reliable measuring instrument for finding out the self-regulated L2 learning strategy use of language learners based on their own responses. Items of the scale aims to determine the extent of strategy categories employed by L2 learners. As the total score that can be obtained from the scale is 140; participants getting scores higher than 70 is considered as high strategy users; whereas below 70 is regarded as low strategy users. Moreover, findings related to the reliability and validity results reveal that the scale has a satisfactory structure to find out L2 learners' preferences about strategies (Köksal & Dündar, 2018).

Table 1. Demographic Information

	Category	**N**	**%**
Age	18	18	9,8
	19	65	35,3
	20	68	37,0
	21 and above	33	17,9
Gender	Male	102	55,4
	Female	82	44,6
Level of Prep School	A	88	47,8
	C	96	52,2
Year at Prep School	1st year	162	88,0
	2nd year	22	12,0
University	Anadolu University	65	35,3
	Eskisehir Technical University	119	64,7
Faculty	Engineering Faculty	70	38,0
	Administration and Economy Faculty	31	16,8
	Science Faculty	24	13,0
	Communication Science Faculty	19	10,3
	Aviation Faculty	12	6,5
	Other	28	15,4
Department*	Administration	15	8,2
	Chemistry	15	8,2
	Economy	14	7,6
	Electrical Engineering	12	6,5
	Material Science Engineering	11	6,0
	Civil Engineering.	11	6,0
	Public Relations and Advertising	10	5,4
	Environmental Engineering	9	4,9
	Industrial Engineering	8	4,3
	Statistics	7	3,8

Note. The 10 departments with the most students enrolled

Data Analysis

In order to evaluate the self-regulated foreign language learning strategies of English preparatory class university students, the data collected through Google forms were entered into the IBM SPSS Statistics 24 program and made ready for data analysis. First, the students' self-regulated foreign language learning strategies use scale scores were analyzed on an item basis, and the mean and standard deviation values were calculated. Whether the scale scores showed a normal distribution or not was also determined. Z values were found by dividing the kurtosis-skewness values of the data by the standard error values. For the data to show normal distribution, Z values for $n<50$ were $-1.96<Z<1.96$; For $50<n<300$, it was expected to be $-3.29<Z<3.29$ (Kim, 2013). In addition, the data were analyzed by normality test. Since it was stated that the Shapiro-Wilk test could be used for $3<n<5000$ (Royston, 1995), the Shapiro-Wilk test results of the data were taken into account. In addition, scatter charts of the data were created. Whether the data showed a normal distribution or not was determined by looking at the kurtosis-skewness Z values, the results of the Shapiro-wilk test and the distribution graphs together. The kurtosis-skewness Z values of the data and the Shapiro-Wilk test results are given in the findings section. While students' self-regulated foreign language learning strategies usage scale scores, gender and preparatory class levels were analyzed with the T test, scale scores and ages were analyzed with the Kruskal-Wallis test.

Findings and Discussion

When the data collected within the scope of this quantitative research aiming to evaluate the self-regulated foreign language learning strategies of English preparatory class students were analyzed, findings were obtained about the self-regulated foreign language learning strategies used by the students and how the level of use of these strategies differed according to demographic variables.

The first research question aimed to find out the Self-regulated learning strategies of elementary and upper-intermediate level learners.

Table 2. Average Scores of Self-Regulated Language Learning Strategy Usage Scale

	Total Scores		**Item Scores**	
	$\bar{X}$	**Sd.**	$\bar{X}$	**Sd.**
Cognitive Strategies	7,94	1,91	2,65	0,64
Affective Strategies	8,88	1,69	2,96	0,56
Socio-Cultural Interactive Strategies	13,61	2,65	2,72	0,53
Meta Cognitive Strategies	27,82	4,58	3,09	0,51
Meta- Affective Strategies	27,86	5,79	2,79	0,58
Meta-Socio-cultural Interactive Strategies	14,90	3,08	2,98	0,62
Total	101,01	14,69	2,89	0,42

When Table 2 is examined, "metacognitive strategies" used by students have the highest average score (X=3.09; Sd.=0.51), while "cognitive strategies" have the lowest average score (X =2.65; Sd.= 0.64). In addition, it is seen that the total item average of the students' scores is 2.89 (X=2.89; Sd.=0.42). Accordingly, it can be said that the level of using self-regulated foreign language learning strategies of participating students is at a high level.

Before making the analyzes to reveal the relationships between the students' self-regulated foreign language learning strategies use scale scores and demographic variables, the kurtosis-skewness Z values of the data, the results of the Shapiro-wilk test, and the distribution charts were revealed. It was accepted that the total and subscale scores of the self-regulated foreign language learning strategies usage scale showed a normal distribution by evaluating the skewness Z, kurtosis Z, and Shapiro-wilk p values together according to the categories of the gender variable. Then, it was seen that the total and subscale scores of the self-regulated foreign language learning strategies usage scale show a normal distribution by evaluating together the skewness Z, kurtosis Z and Shapiro-wilk p values according to the preparatory class levels.

The findings obtained as a result of the analyzes made between the students' self-regulated foreign language learning strategies use scale scores and the variables of gender and preparatory class level are given in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3. T-Test Results Between Self-Regulated Foreign Language Learning Strategies Use Scale and Gender

	Gender	**N**	$\bar{X}$	**Sd.**	**t**	**df**	**P**
Cognitive Strategies	Male	102	7,86	1,87	-0,612	182	0,541
	Female	82	8,04	1,97			
Affective Strategies	Male	102	8,82	1,63	-0,508	182	0,612
	Female	82	8,95	1,78			
Socio-Cultural Interactive Strategies	Male	102	13,45	2,67	-0,932	182	0,352
	Female	82	13,82	2,62			
Meta Cognitive Strategies	Male	102	27,40	4,61	-1,370	182	0,172
	Female	82	28,33	4,51			
Meta- Affective Strategies	Male	102	27,94	5,66	-0,215	182	0,830
	Female	82	27,76	5,98			
Meta-Socio-cultural Interactive Strategies	Male	102	14,75	3,23	-0,722	182	0,471
	Female	82	15,09	2,89			
Self-Regulated Foreign Language Learning Strategies	Male	102	100,24	14,48	-0,798	182	0,426
	Female	82	101,98	14,97			

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference among the cognitive strategies subscale, affective strategies subscale, socio-cultural interactive strategies subscale, meta cognitive strategies subscale, meta-affective strategies subscale, meta-socio-cultural interactive strategies subscale and all scale scores ($p>0.05$). With this result, it can be said that the self-regulated foreign language learning strategies used by the students do not differ according to their gender.

Table 4. T-Test Results Between Self-Regulated Foreign Language Learning Strategies Use Scale and Prep Class Level

	Level	**N**	$\bar{X}$	**Sd.**	**t**	**df**	**p**
Cognitive Strategies	A Level	88	8,11	2,00	1,180	182	0,240
	C Level	96	7,78	1,82			
Affective Strategies	A Level	88	8,90	1,67	0,132	182	0,895
	C Level	96	8,86	1,72			
Socio-Cultural Interactive Strategies	A Level	88	13,36	2,58	-1,231	182	0,220
	C Level	96	13,84	2,70			
Meta Cognitive Strategies	A Level	88	28,11	4,83	0,847	182	0,398
	C Level	96	27,54	4,34			
Meta- Affective Strategies	A Level	88	27,91	6,31	0,113	182	0,910
	C Level	96	27,81	5,30			
Meta-Socio-cultural Interactive Strategies	A Level	88	15,07	3,21	0,699	182	0,485
	C Level	96	14,75	2,97			
Self-Regulated Foreign Language Learning Strategies	A Level	88	101,47	16,31	0,401	182	0,689
	C Level	96	100,59	13,10			

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference among students' English preparatory class levels and self-regulated foreign language learning strategies use, cognitive strategies subscale, affective strategies subscale, socio-cultural interactive strategies subscale, meta cognitive strategies subscale, meta-affective strategies subscale, meta-socio-cultural interactive strategies subscale and all scale scores ($p>0.05$). Accordingly, it can be said that the self-regulated foreign language learning strategies used by the students do not differ according to the preparatory class level.

The results of the study revealed that there was no difference between the two student groups in terms of the use of self-regulated learning strategies. The students in both levels used a variety of self-regulated learning strategies. The study's findings contrasted with previous studies that showed high-level language learners to be more proficient at self-regulated learning strategies. For example, Mezei (2008) claimed that higher level language learners are more aware of their learning processes, and they know how to regulate their learning behaviors. From this point of view, it can be said that today's students are more autonomous, they can manage their language learning outside the classroom, they are especially competent in the use of technology, and thus they can plan, follow and evaluate their language learning themselves.

The participants of the study were getting language education online using ICT tools. Thus, technology-enhanced learning environments provide opportunities for, and foster the development of, SRL abilities (Carneiro, Lefrere, & Steffens, 2007); and on the other hand, technology-enhanced learning environments are best used by learners with SRL abilities, and SRL enhances learning outcomes (Hannafin & Hannafin, 2010; Winters, Greene, & Costich, 2008). This study revealed that the language learners were using technology to engage in out-of-class activities to regulate different aspects of their language learning experience by watching movies, serials, listening to songs, reading books and magazines and playing games.

In terms of the use of strategies, metacognitive strategies were found to be higher than other strategy types since metacognitive strategies guide the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of cognitive (cognition-regulating) strategies. As Oxford (2011) states metacognitive strategies were viewed as guiding the use of all other strategies in the past. However, in a more articulated and more precise manner, meta-strategies (meta-cognitive, meta-affective, meta-motivational, meta-social strategies) guide the use of cognitive, affective, motivational, and social strategies, respectively. This finding is in line with Hamamcı (2012) who carried out a study with higher level language learners and stated that metacognitive strategies have the highest average followed by cognitive strategies. Cognitive strategies were found to be the least used strategy types since they involve strategies such as analyzing, comparing, synthesizing, and reasoning (e.g., figuring out a rule from multiple instances of a linguistic feature). Since the students were getting online language education, they might have had special training on using cognitive strategies.

Many studies (Barnard-Brak et al., 2010; Shea, Bidjerano, 2010) have shown that e-learning is highly learner-centered, where learners have to suppose more autonomy and responsibilities as well. Finding that learners like to interact is somehow expected as the nature of learning is social (Hamzić, Bećirović, 2021), and during the COVID-19, it is more likely that learners yearn for social relatedness owning to the physical lack of contact from classmates and teachers (Wong, 2020).

In terms of the relationship between SRL use and gender, this study revealed that there are no significant differences between the genders. This finding is in contrast with the study of Omur and Cubukcu (2017) who found that female students had higher self-regulated points than male students in terms of the relationship between self-regulation strategies and motivation levels. Altay & Saracaloglu (2017) also found that females use self-regulated learning strategies and they are more inclined to make a plan, set an objective, use relevant strategies, evaluate their work, and motivate themselves while learning. This contradictory finding may stem from Covid-19 since all education was carried online, students had to interact online, they might have learned how to regulate their own learning.

Conclusions, recommendations and limitations

The aim of the study was to reveal the self-regulated learning strategies of elementary and upper-intermediate level learners and to find if there was a significant difference in terms of the use of self-regulated learning strategies between the two groups of English learners. Moreover, this study also aimed at investigating if there

was a significant difference regarding the gender of the students. Results of the study indicated that there was not a significant difference between the two groups of learners in terms of using self-regulated learning strategies. Furthermore, there was not a significant difference between the two groups of learners regarding their gender.

Based on the results, some implications were mentioned in terms of training learners to be autonomous by applying self-regulated language learning strategies outside language classes. Firstly, giving explicit instruction on the use of self-regulated learning strategies may be beneficial for L2 learners especially on the use of ICT tools for self-regulated language learning under the umbrella of metacognitive strategies (Sahin-Kizil & Savran, 2016). There is also a need to conduct studies to determine what sort of training is needed and how it should be carried out (Celik, Arkin & Sabriler, 2012). Furthermore, applying online tasks and projects that enhance learner autonomy and encourage the use of strategies can be done. This study can also be enlarged through new research studies that analyze the relationships between self-efficacy, SRL and academic achievements. Moreover, new research studies can be designed by applying different types of data collection methods. In addition, longitudinal studies on how autonomous learning and self-regulation processes evolve and change in the course of language learning may shed new light on the dynamic nature of these constructs (Kormos and Csizer, 2014). As Mezei (2008) states, more classroom-based studies are needed to determine how students can start to become self-regulating and autonomous, and how far this capacity is teachable because, according to McKeachie (2000), "new self-regulatory skills are difficult to perfect. But with practice these skills can become habitual" (p.xxiii).

Teachers can also be of assistance to students in various ways: either with the help of motivational strategies (Dörnyei, 2001), scaffolding their learning by teaching learners what self-regulation is through collaborative project work (Randi & Corno, 2000), or providing students with an ample amount of practice and feedback (Winne, 2011). Furthermore, students need to be encouraged throughout the learning process so that they can become more self-regulated and autonomous – as Dörnyei (2005) points out, it is not automatic for learners to take ownership of their actions; they need to be supported. Teachers, undoubtedly, play a very important role in transforming students into highly self-regulated or autonomous learners (Tsuda & Nakata, 2013).

Last but not the least, understanding the strategy use of L2 learners can make language educators become aware of their learners' way of dealing with the target language, and language education programs can be designed according to learners' need on this issue.

The suggestions that can be drawn from the study are that language educators can directly teach and model the use of all types of self-regulated learning strategies in language teaching, train students on their own work and give them feedback, and enable students to use all types of self-regulated learning strategies, especially cognitive, affective and sociocultural-Interactive (SI) ones and independent work through reflective practices. Thus, L2 learners can gain awareness on the use of self-regulated learning strategies.

This study has several limitations. Firstly, the study was designed as a descriptive study with a quantitative approach. The data were collected from 96 elementary and 88 upper-intermediate level learners studying English in an intensive language learning program of a state university via Strategic Self-Regulation (S2R) Model by Oxford (2011) and adapted by Koksal and Dundar (2018). The data of the study might have been collected from students with different levels of language proficiency. Secondly, the data were collected via an online questionnaire. Interviews might have been carried out with students in terms of using self-regulated strategies. Lastly, the researcher did not apply a qualitative data collection process. More triangulated qualitative research connected to learning processes could play an increasingly significant role in investigating self-regulated language learning strategies. Eliminating these limitations can contribute to forthcoming research studies.

References

Altay, B., & Saracaloglu, A. S. (2017). Investigation on the Relationship among Language Learning Strategies, Critical Thinking and Self-Regulation Skills in Learning English. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *11*(1), 1-26.

Andrade, M. S., & Bunker, E. L. (2009). A model for self-regulated distance language learning. *Distance Education*, 30 (1), 47-61. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587910902845956

Artino, A. R. (2010). Online or face-to-face learning? Exploring the personal factors that predict students' choice of instructional format. *Internet and Higher Education*, 13(4), 272-276. doi: 0.1016/j.iheduc.2010.07.005

Barnard-Brak, L., Paton, V.O. & Lan, W.Y. (2010). Profiles in self-regulated learning in the online learning environment. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 11(1): 61-80. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v11i1.769

Becirovic, S., Ahmetovic, E. & Skopljak, A. (2022). An Examination of Students Online Learning Satisfaction, Interaction, Self-efficacy and Self-regulated Learning. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 11(1): 16-35 DOI: 10.13187/ejced.2022.1.16

Bećirović, S., Brdarević-Čeljo, A., Delić, H. (2021). The use of digital technology in foreign language learning. *SN Social Sciences*, 1(10): 1-21. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s43545-021-00254-y

Carneiro, R., Lefrere, P., & Steffens, K. (Eds.) (2007). *Self-regulated learning in technology enhanced learning environments: A European review*. UK: Kaleidoscope Network of Excellence. http://telearn.noe-kaleidoscope.org

Çelik, S., Arkın, E., & Sabriler, D. (2012). EFL learners' use of ICT for self-regulated learning. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *8*(2).

Dembo, M. H., Junge, L. G., & Lynch, R. (2006). Becoming a self-regulated learner: Implications for web-based education. *Web-based learning: Theory, research, and practice*, 185-202.

Dembo, M.H., & Eaton, M.J. (2000). Self-regulation of academic learning in middle-level schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 100(5), 473–490. https://doi.org/10.1086/499651

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fukuda, A. (2018). Examining the relationship between self-regulated learning and EFL learners' proficiency. *Intercultural Communication Review*, 16, 17-31.

Hamamcı, Z. (2012). Üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin dil öğrenme strateji tercihleri. ([University preparation class students' language learning strategies preferences]). *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*, 1, 314-323.

Hamzić, U. & Bećirović, S. (2021). Twice-Exceptional, Half-Noticed: The Recognition Issues of Gifted Students with Learning Disabilities. *MAP Social Sciences*, 1(1): 13-22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.53880/2744-2454.2021.1.1.13

Hannafin, M.J., & Hannafin, K.M. (2010). Cognition and student-centered, web-based learning: Issues and implications for research and theory. In J.M. Spector, D. Ifenthaler, P. Isaias, & K. Sampson (Eds.), *Learning and instruction in the digital age* (pp. 11–23). Springer Science & Business Media

Hirata, A. (2010). *An exploratory study of motivation and self-regulated learning in second language acquisition: Kanji learning as a task focused approach*. A thesis presented in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master in Second Language Teaching at Massey University, Manawatu, New Zealand (Doctoral dissertation, Massey University).

Kim, H. Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. *Restorative dentistry & endodontics*, 38(1), 52-54. doi: 10.5395/rde.2013.38.1.52

Kim, M. & Hannafin, M.G. (2005). Scaffolding problem solving in technology-enhanced learning environments (TELEs): Bridging research and theory with practice. *Computers & Education*. 56(2): 403-417. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.08.024

Kitsantas, A., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Comparing self-regulatory processes among novice, non-expert, and expert volleyball players: A microanalytic study. *Journal of applied sport psychology*, *14*(2), 91-105. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.4.660

Koksal, D. & Dundar, S. (2018). Developing a Scale for Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 33 (2): 337-352. 10.16986/huje.2017033805

Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2014). The interaction of motivation, self-regulatory strategies, and autonomous learning behavior in different learner groups. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 275-299. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.129

Lai, C., & Gu, M. (2011). Self-regulated out-of-class language learning with technology. *Computer assisted language learning*, *24*(4), 317-335. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.568417

McBrien, J. L., Cheng, R., & Jones, P. (2009). Virtual spaces: Employing a synchronous online classroom to facilitate student engagement in online learning. *International review of research in open and distributed learning*, *10*(3). https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v10i3.605

McKeachie, W. J. (2000). Foreword. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. xxi-xxiii). Elsevier Academic Press.

Mezei, G. (2008). *Motivation and self-regulated learning: A case study of a pre-intermediate and an upper-intermediate adult student. WoPaLP,* Vol. 2: 79-104.

Nakata, Y. (2011). Self-regulated learning and other learners' factors. In *Second language acquisition: From SLA theory to neuroscience.* ed. F. Sano, H. Oka, N. Yusa and A. Kaneko, 201-10. Taishukan.

Nguyen, T. (2015). The effectiveness of online learning: Beyond no significant difference and future horizons. *Journal of Online Learning & Teaching*, 11(2), 309–319.

Ömür, M., & Çubukçu, F. (2017). Investigating the relationship between foreign language learners' use of self-regulation strategies and their level of motivation. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies (IntJCES)*, 3(2), 18-33.

Oxford, R.L. (2011). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies.* Pearson Education.

Pintrich, P. R. (2005). The Role of Goal Orientation in Self-Regulated Learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, And M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation,* San Diego, Academic, 451-502.

Pintrich, P. R., & Zusho, A. (2002). Student motivation and self-regulated learning in the college classroom. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 55-128). Springer, Dordrecht.

Pintrich, P.R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P.R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 451–502). Academic Press.

Randi, J., & Corno, L. (2000). Teacher innovations in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 651- 685). Elsevier Academic Press.

Royston, P. (1995). A remark on algorithm AS 181: the W-test for normality. (Remark AS R94). *JR Stat Soc Ser C Appl Stat*, 44(4), 547-551. https://doi.org/10.2307/2986146

Sahin Kizil, A., & Savran, Z. (2016). Self-Regulated Learning in the Digital Age: An EFL Perspective. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *10*(2), 147-158.

Shea, P. & Bidjerano, T. (2010). Learning presence: Towards a theory of self-efficacy, self-regulation, and the development of a communities of inquiry in online and blended learning environments. *Computers & Education*, 55(4): 1721-1731. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.07.017

Tsuda, A., & Nakata, Y. (2013). Exploring self-regulation in language learning: A study of Japanese high school EFL students. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *7*(1), 72-88. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2012.686500

Winne, P. H. (2011). A cognitive and metacognitive analysis of self-regulated learning. *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance*, 15-32.

Winters, F.I., Greene, J.A., & Costich, C.M. (2008). Self-regulation of learning within computer-based learning environments: A critical analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 20, 429–444. DOI 10.1007/s10648-008-9080-9

Wong R. (2020). When no one can go to school: Does online learning meet students' basic learning needs? *Interactive Learning Environments*. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/10494820.2020.1789672

Zheng, Y., & Cheng, L. (2018). How does anxiety influence language performance? From the perspectives of foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety. *Language Testing in Asia*, 8(13), 1-19. (2018) 8:13 https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-018-0065-4

Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational psychologist*, 25(1), 3-17. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2501_2

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts., P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13-39). Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *25*(1), 82-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50031-7

Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1990). Student differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *82*(1), 51.

Zimmerman, B.J. (1998). Developing self-fulfilling cycles of academic regulation: An analysis of exemplary models. In D.H. Schunk, & B.J. Zimmerman (Ed.), *Self-regulated learning. From teaching to self- reflective practice* (pp.1–10). The Guilford Press.

Zimmerman, B.J. (2008). Goal setting: A key proactive source of academic self-regulation. In *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*, ed. D.H. Shunk and B.J. Zimmerman, 267-95. Erlbaum

Zumbrunn, S., Tadlock, J., & Roberts, E. D. (2011). Encourage self-regulated learning in the classroom. *Metrop. Educ. Res. Consort. MERC*. 1–28.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Öğrenen özerkliği geniş çapta araştırılan bir olgudur ve öğrenenlerin kendi öğrenmelerinin sorumluluğunu alması olarak açıklanmaktadır. Andrade ve Bunker'in (2009) özerklik fikrinin merkezinde seçim özgürlüğü olduğunu belirttiği gibi; öğrenciler neyi, nerede ve nasıl öğreneceklerini seçerler ve öz düzenleme öğrencilere özerk olma fırsatını sunar. Öz düzenleme, kişisel hedeflere ulaşmak için planlanan ve uyarlanan düşünce, duygu ve eylemler olarak tanımlanabilir. Dolayısıyla öz-düzenleyici öğrenme, öğrencilerin kendi duygulanımlarını, bilişlerini ve davranışlarını izledikleri, kontrol ettikleri ve değerlendirdikleri öz-yönetimli süreçleri içerir (Pintrich, 2005). Öz-düzenleyici öğrenme aynı zamanda özel olarak 'öğrencilerin öğrenmelerini etkileyen faktörleri veya koşulları kontrol etme yeteneği' olarak da tanımlanmaktadır (Dembo, Junge ve Lynch, 2006, s. 188).

Literatürdeki çalışmalar incelendiğinde dil yeterliliği düşük öğrencilerin dil öğrenmede eksiklikleri olduğu, öz yeterliklerinin düşük olduğu ve öz değerlendirmede sorunlar yaşadıkları, dil yeterliliği yüksek olan öğrencilerin öz yeterliklerinin yüksek olduğu, öğrenme ve çeşitli öz düzenlemeli öğrenme stratejilerini kullandıkları görülmüştür (Kitsantas ve Zimmerman, 2002). Dolayısıyla bu çalışmanın amacı bir devlet üniversitesinin yoğun hazırlık programında öğrenim gören temel ve orta-üst düzey öğrencilerinin öz-düzenlemeli öğrenme stratejileri kullanımlarını karşılaştırmaktır.

Bu araştırma nicel yaklaşıma sahip betimsel bir çalışma olarak tasarlanmıştır. Veriler, bir devlet üniversitesinin yoğun dil öğrenme programında İngilizce öğrenimi gören 85 temel ve 105 üst-orta seviyedeki öğrenciden Stratejik Öz Düzenleme (S2R) Modeli ile Oxford (2011) tarafından geliştirilen ve Köksal ve Dündar (2018) tarafından uyarlanan bir anket aracılığı ile toplanmıştır. Öz Düzenlemeli ikinci dil Öğrenme Stratejisi Kullanım Ölçeği, S2R Modeli tarafından önerilen Bilişsel Stratejiler, Duyuşsal Stratejiler, SE Stratejileri, Üstbilişsel Stratejiler, Üst Duyuşsal Stratejiler, Meta-SI Stratejileri olmak üzere 6 faktörde gruplandırılmış 35 maddeden oluşmuştur. Ankette ayrıca öğrencilerin bölüm, yaş, cinsiyet ve dil seviyelerini öğrenmeye yönelik kısa bir demografik bilgi de yer almıştır.

Araştırma 2019-2020 Bahar Döneminde Anadolu Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nda (AUSFL) Kovid 19 nedeniyle uzaktan eğitim gören öğrencilerle yapılmıştır. Uzaktan öğrenim süresince öğrenciler üniversiteye özel bir öğrenme yönetim sistemi üzerinden canlı derslere katılıp, ders konularıyla ilgili videolar izleyip güncellemeleri takip etmişlerdir.

Anket Google formları aracılığıyla tüm temel ve orta-üst seviyedeki öğrencilere gönderilmiştir. Anket 310 öğrenciye gönderilmiş olmasına rağmen bunlardan sadece 184'ü soruları yanıtlamıştır.

Araştırmanın sonuçları, iki öğrenci grubu arasında öz düzenlemeli öğrenme stratejilerinin kullanımı açısından bir fark olmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Her iki seviyedeki öğrenciler çeşitli öz-düzenlemeli öğrenme stratejileri kullanmışlardır. Araştırmanın bulguları, üst düzey dil öğrenenlerin öz-düzenlemeli öğrenme stratejilerinde daha yetkin olduklarını gösteren önceki çalışmalarla çelişmektedir. Günümüz öğrencilerinin daha özerk oldukları, dil öğrenimlerini sınıf dışında da yönetebildikleri, özellikle teknoloji kullanımında yetkin oldukları ve bu sayede dil öğrenimlerini kendilerinin planlayıp takip edebildiği ve değerlendirebildiği söylenebilir.

Araştırmanın katılımcıları dil eğitimini BİT araçlarını kullanarak çevrimiçi olarak almakta olduklarından teknolojiyle zenginleştirilmiş öğrenme ortamları öz düzenlemeli öğrenme yeteneklerinin geliştirilmesi için fırsatlar sağlar ve bu becerilerin gelişimini teşvik eder (Carneiro, Lefrere ve Steffens, 2007). Öte yandan, teknolojiyle zenginleştirilmiş öğrenme ortamları en iyi öz-düzenlemeli öğrenme yeteneklerine sahip öğrenciler tarafından kullanılır ve öz-düzenlemeli öğrenme, öğrenme sonuçlarını geliştirir (Hannafin ve Hannafin, 2010; Winters, Greene ve Costich, 2008). Bu çalışma, dil öğrenenlerin film, dizi izleyerek, şarkı dinleyerek, kitap ve dergi okuyarak ve oyun oynayarak dil öğrenme deneyimlerinin farklı yönlerini düzenlemek için sınıf dışı etkinliklere katılmak için teknolojiyi kullandıklarını ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Strateji kullanımı açısından üst-bilişsel stratejilerin diğer strateji türlerine göre daha yüksek olduğu görülmüştür; çünkü üst-bilişsel stratejiler bilişsel (bilişsel düzenleyici) stratejilerin planlanmasına, uygulanmasına, izlenmesine ve değerlendirilmesine rehberlik etmektedir. Oxford'un (2011) belirttiği gibi, üst-bilişsel stratejiler geçmişte diğer tüm stratejilerin kullanımına yol gösterici olarak görülmekteydi. Ancak daha açık ve net bir şekilde meta stratejiler (meta-bilişsel, meta-duygusal, metamotivasyonel, metasosyal stratejiler) sırasıyla bilişsel, duygusal, motivasyonel ve sosyal stratejilerin kullanımına rehberlik eder. Bu bulgu, Hamamcı'nın (2012) üst düzeyde dil öğrenenlerle

yaptığı araştırmada en yüksek ortalamanın üst-bilişsel stratejilerde olduğunu ve bunu bilişsel stratejilerin izlediğini belirttiği bulgusu ile örtüşmektedir. Bilişsel stratejilerin, analiz etme, karşılaştırma, sentezleme ve akıl yürütme (örneğin, dilsel bir özelliğin birden fazla örneğinden bir kural bulma) gibi stratejileri içermesi nedeniyle en az kullanılan durum stratejisi türleri olduğu bulunmuştur. Öğrenciler çevrimiçi dil eğitimi aldıkları için bilişsel stratejileri kullanma konusunda özel eğitim almış olabilirler.

Birçok çalışma (Barnard-Brak ve diğerleri, 2010; Shea ve Bidjerano, 2010), e-öğrenmenin oldukça öğrenci merkezli olduğunu ve öğrencilerin daha fazla özerklik ve sorumluluk üstlenmeleri gerektiğini göstermiştir. Öğrenmenin doğası sosyal olduğundan (Hamzić ve Bećirović, 2021) öğrencilerin etkileşimde bulunmaktan hoşlandıklarını bulmak bir şekilde beklenen bir durumdur ve COVID-19 sırasında öğrencilerin sınıf arkadaşları ve öğretmenlerle fiziksel temas eksikliğinden dolayı sosyal ilişkilere sahip olmayı özlemeleri daha olasıdır (Wong, 2020).

Öz düzenlemeli öğrenme kullanımı ile cinsiyet arasındaki ilişki açısından bu çalışma, cinsiyetler arasında anlamlı bir farklılık olmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Bu bulgu, Ömür ve Çubukçu'nun (2017) öz-düzenleme stratejileri ile motivasyon düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki açısından kız öğrencilerin öz-düzenleme puanlarının erkek öğrencilere göre daha yüksek olduğunu tespit eden çalışmasıyla çelişmektedir. Altay ve Saracaloğlu (2017) da kadınların öz-düzenlemeli öğrenme stratejilerini kullandıklarını ve öğrenirken plan yapma, hedef belirleme, ilgili stratejileri kullanma, işlerini değerlendirme ve kendilerini motive etme konusunda daha yatkın olduklarını bulmuşlardır. Bu çelişkili bulgu, Kovid-19'un ortaya çıkmasından sonra tüm eğitimin çevrimiçi olarak gerçekleştirilmesi, öğrencilerin çevrimiçi etkileşimde bulunmak zorunda kalması ve kendi öğrenmelerini nasıl düzenleyeceklerini öğrenmiş olmalarından kaynaklanıyor olabileceğini akla getirmektedir.