Factors affecting the use of self-regulated L2 learning strategies in Turkish FLE context[*]

Dinçay Köksal[a] ID, Sinem Dündar[b+] ID

[a]Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey
[b] Trakya University, Edirne, Turkey

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the overall self-regulated L2 learning strategy use of L2 learners depending upon the *S*trategic *S*elf-*R*egulation (S[2]R) Model proposed by Oxford (2011), and to examine the relationships between their reported self-regulated L2 strategy use and their personality traits, identity, beliefs about L2 learning, and proficiency. The mixed methods sequential explanatory design was used in this study. Data were gathered by means of quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments. Quantitative data collection instruments were administered to 205 participants attending the Department of FLE at Trakya University, Turkey. Data were analyzed using frequency distribution and stepwise multiple regression analysis. As for the qualitative phase of the study, semi-structured interviews conducted with more and less frequent strategy users, were analyzed by means of descriptive analysis. Findings demonstrated that self-regulated L2 learning strategy use is affected by L2 learners' personality traits, identity, beliefs about L2 learning, and proficiency. This study discusses sociological and psychological aspects of L2 learners apart from investigating their reported self-regulated L2 learning strategy use, and factors affecting their strategy choice. Hence, it is assumed that the study will assist foreign language educators to make better sense of what Turkish L2 learners bring to the foreign language education context.

Keywords: Foreign language education; language learning strategies; self-regulation; self-regulated L2 learning strategies; the *s*trategic *s*elf-*r*egulation (S[2]R) model

1. Introduction

Language learning strategies (LLS) have attracted the attention in the field of language learning since the 1970s as the term provides insight into the learning process by demonstrating how learners actively and constructively control their learning in order to become efficient learners (Cohen, 1998; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Rubin, 1975;). On the other hand, the notion of "self-regulation", which is one of the latest developments in L2 learning, has become a significant term

---

since it refers to learners who control their learning process, set goals for learning, and use effective strategies to enhance their learning. In this respect, it can be put forward that learners who use self-regulated L2 learning strategies actively take charge of and construct their learning process to become more efficient learners (Como, 2001; Weinstein, Husman & Dierking, 2000, Zimmermann, 2000). Consequently, the notion of "self-regulated language learning strategies", which suggests planned and goal-directed strategies employed by learners for taking control of their learning (based on Afflerbach, Pearson, & Paris, 2008; Oxford, 2011), has appeared in L2 learning process.

It is well-known that departments of FLE aim to offer prospective foreign language (FL) teachers education on how to teach the target language more effectively in their future professions. In this context, language educators have put emphasis on *teaching* dimension of FLs. As the main focus of FLE contexts is "how to become a good teacher", prospective L2 learners are provided with different activities for teaching language skills. On the other hand, it is significant to consider that prospective FL teachers are also the learners of the target language. The experiences they gain or the difficulties they face in language learning process may affect or construct their future teaching practices. However, studies about experiences and difficulties that prospective FL teachers have in language learning process have been neglected so far; hence, it becomes primarily important to seek out how prospective FL teachers as L2 learners manage to deal with the target language they are going to teach. In this sense, it is important to become aware of the self-regulated L2 learning strategies used by L2 learners to understand how strategy use lead to a successful L2 learning process and find out the factors that affect their strategy choice.

Literature suggests that there are various factors affecting learning process and learners' choice of LLS such as motivation, age, sex, nationality, investment, beliefs, aptitude and so on (Day, 2002; Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003; Gardner, 1995; Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; Ellis, 2008; Nyikos, 1990; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Peirce, 1995; Wenden, 1987; White, 2008). However, of those factors, studies investigating the frequency of self-regulated L2 learning strategy use together with reference to learners' personality traits, identity, beliefs about L2 learning and proficiency are somehow limited. These factors still need to be explored in the field of FLE, particularly in Turkish context to comprehend what lies behind learners' strategy choice.

1.1. Literature review

1.1.1. The Strategic Self-Regulation (S^2R) Model of Language Learning

Oxford (2011) expresses that self-regulated L2 learning strategies in the Strategic Self-Regulation (S2R) Model facilitate learners to control or manage their own learning to enable the learning process to become easier and more efficient. In the suggested model, by taking into account the definitions made by Afflerbach et al. (2008), self-regulated L2 learning strategies are regarded as "deliberate, goal-directed attempts to manage and control efforts to learn the L2" by adding that these strategies are "broad, teachable actions that learners choose from among alternatives and employ for L2 learning purposes (e.g. constructing, internalizing, storing, retrieving, and using information; completing short-term tasks; and /or developing L2 proficiency and self-efficacy in the long term)". (Oxford, 2011, p.12)

It is well-known that Oxford (1990) identified LLS into two main parts as direct strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation strategies) and indirect strategies (metacognitive, social, affective strategies). On the other hand, the current S2R Model is comprised of three major dimensions of L2 learning as cognitive, affective, and sociocultural-interactive (SI). Apart from these three major strategies, three types of metastrategies are included in each dimension as metacognitive, meta-affective, and meta-SI strategies. (Oxford, 2011)

The S2R Model is different from the mentioned taxonomies related to L2 learning strategies so far in that it includes metastrategies dimension and fills the gaps by adding meta-affective and meta-SI strategies. Apart from the inclusion of metastrategies, one of the most significant feature of the S2R Model is the addition of tactics to the model. Oxford (2011) discusses that self-regulated learning tactics are specific and goal oriented actions which can be regarded as the way or ways that the learner implements the strategy at a definite stage in a particular condition to fulfill the immediate needs.

1.1.2. Factors Affecting LLS Use

Numerous studies have been conducted up to now so as to reveal the relationship between the use of LLS and the factors that contribute the frequent use of L2 learning strategies (Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003; Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; Ellis, 2008; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; White, 2008). Of those factors, it has been sought out that learner's motivation, gender, proficiency level and learning style seem to have strong impact on the diverse types of strategy use of learners (Bialystok, 1981; Ehrman, 1990; Griffiths, 2003; Kaylani, 1999; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Peacock & Ho, 2003; Rahimi, Riazi & Saif, 2008; Yang, 2010; Yılmaz, 2010). Moreover, studies carried out by Oxford (1990) reveals that the frequency and types of learning strategy use by L2 learners can display difference regarding some factors such as consciousness level of learning strategies, phase of learning, task necessities, age, gender, cultural and mother language background, learning target, personality traits, and motivation (Salahshour, Sharifi & Salahshour, 2013).

Research has shown that there is a relationship between personality types and self-regulated learning strategies of language learners. For instance, Gyhasi, Yazdani & Farsani (2013) found that learners belonging to "conscientiousness" dimension as a personality trait were more likely to employ all strategies, specially managing time and study environment. Besides, extroverted students were found to employ peer learning and help-seeking strategies. In another study carried out by Babakhani (2014) revealed that except neuroticism, all four personality traits of Big Five Model- Openness to experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion-introversion, Agreeableness- are found to have a positive relation with self-regulated learning strategies. In Turkey, Asmalı (2014) demonstrated that participants mostly have Agreeableness personality trait followed by Extraversion, Intellect/Imagination, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism/Emotional Stability. Furthermore, there were significant relationships between cognitive strategies and extraversion; agreeableness and intellect; compensation strategies and agreeableness; affective strategies and agreeableness; social strategies and agreeableness.

The notion of identity is viewed as "a set of essential characteristics that are unique to humans, independent of language, and unchanging across contexts" (Hall, 2012, p. 30). Studies showed that learners from different nationalities, learning situations, different age groups, gender can have diverse ways of learning and strategy use (Griffiths, 2013; Nikoopour, Farsani & Neishabouri, 2011; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Politzer & McGroarty, 1985; Yılmaz, 2010). Griffiths (2003) found that SILL strategies are employed more frequently by European students than their counterparts from other nationalities. Nikoopour, Farsani & Neishabouri (2011) investigated the strategies employed by Iranian EFL learners. The findings of the study showed that Iranian EFL students employ metacognitive strategies more than other strategies. Concerning Turkish EFL context, Yeşilçınar (2014) showed that L2 learners used mostly metacognitive strategies; whereas cognitive strategies were the least preferred strategy type by L2 learners of the faculty of education in Turkey.

Another factor related to strategy use is learner beliefs. Learner beliefs are defined as "general assumptions that students hold about themselves as learners, about factors influencing language learning, and about the nature of language learning and teaching" (Victori & Lockhart, 1995, p. 224). They are regarded as one part of individual learner differences that are likely to have an effect on the

processes and outcomes of second/foreign language learning/acquisition (SLA) (Kalaja & Barcelos, 2003). In this respect, White (2008) suggests that good language learners are likely to have positive beliefs about themselves as language learners and about the language they are learning. In a study carried out by Chang & Shen (2005), it is found that learners' beliefs are strongly related to LLS. The results of their study revealed that the students mostly used metacognitive strategies, and compensation and affective strategies least. Also, they held strong motivational beliefs about English language learning. Similarly, in their study Abedini Rahimi & Zare-ee (2011) revealed that EFL learners holding more favorable and reasonable beliefs, generally; employ strategies more and also have higher level language proficiency. Furthermore, the results of Meshkat & Saeb's (2012) study demonstrated that there is a significant positive relationship between beliefs and strategy types. The strongest relationship was found between the students' metacognitive strategies and their motivation and expectations. Also, the students held strong motivational beliefs about English language learning.

One of the foremost reasons in an attempt to explore language strategy use was to reveal the relationship between strategies and proficiency (Takeuchi, Griffiths & Coyle, 2007). Literature suggests a vast array of studies that have explored the relationship between strategy use and proficiency and found a strong relationship between two variables (Bialystok, 1981; Griffiths, 2003; Peacock & Ho, 2003; Wharton, 2000). In a study conducted by Zhang (2015), it has been found that learning strategy use was significantly associated with and directly influenced students' English proficiency. Moreover, it affects their achievements in English learning not only in terms of frequency and types of strategies used but also about the manner of their strategy use. The findings also revealed that self-regulation might affect the success of language learning.

On the basis of Turkish context, Demirel (2012) investigated LLS used by university students and aimed to reveal whether their use of learning strategies create any difference regarding gender and academic achievement. According to the findings of the study, it was noticed that the university students have an average level of LLS, and they mostly use compensation, and they merely use memory strategies. Concerning the results in terms of proficiency, it was found that as the level of the use of language strategies increases, the achievements of the students increase as well. In another study, Yağlı (2014) examined the differences between students' the self-regulated learning and achievement. The research results of the study showed that there is a meaningful relation between the achievement and self-regulation skills of the students.

Having reviewed the existing literature, this study aims to examine self-regulated L2 learning strategies in the scope of Oxford's (2011) S2R Model and seek out to what extent factors such as personality traits, identity, beliefs about L2 learning, and proficiency influence the use self-regulated L2 learning strategies by L2 learners attending the department of FLE. In an attempt to contribute to the recent literature, the study is expected to be beneficial for researchers by revealing self-regulated L2 strategy use in Turkish FLE context and examining the relationships between learners' reported self-regulated language strategy use and the above mentioned factors. Moreover, the study is assumed to be enlightening in terms of revealing sociological and psychological aspects of L2 learners. Thus, the study is supposed to assist FL educators to make better sense of what Turkish L2 learners bring to the FLE context.

1.2. Research questions

In relation to this purpose, the following questions were explored in the current study;

- What are the main self-regulated L2 learning strategies used by L2 learners studying at the Department of FLE?

- What are the personality traits of L2 learners attending the Department of FLE?

- What beliefs do L2 learners hold about language learning?

- Is there any relationship between the use of self-regulated L2 learning strategies and personality traits?

- Is there any relationship between the use of self-regulated L2 learning strategies and learners' beliefs about L2 learning ?

- Is there any relationship between the use of self-regulated L2 learning strategies and identity?

- Is there any relationship between the use of self-regulated L2 learning strategies and L2 learners' proficiency?

2. Method

This study aims to gather both quantitative and qualitative data to reach a deeper understanding of self-regulated L2 learning strategy use and justify the results of statistical analyses through the data gathered qualitatively. For this purpose, explanatory sequential mixed methods design was used in the study.

2.1. Participants

The participants of the study were 205 L2 learners attending the Department of FLE, namely German Language Teaching (GLT) and English Language Teaching (ELT) Divisions at Trakya University, Turkey. The number of the participants is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of Participants According to Gender, Age, Division & Grade

	GENDER			AGE					DIVISION			GRADE				
	Female	Male	Total	17-19	20-23	24-27	27 & above	Total	GLT	ELT	Total	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	Fourth Year	Total
Frequency	156	49	205	18	141	37	9	205	87	118	205	32	59	58	56	205
Percent	76.1	23.9	100	8.8	68.8	18	4.4	100	42.4	57.6	100	15.6	28.8	28.3	27.3	100

It is evident that out of 205 learners, female learners (*n=156*) outnumber the males (*n=49*). Moreover, the age groups of the participants were not equally distributed. Thus, gender and age differences were not taken into consideration while determining the factors influencing strategy use in this study. On the other hand, grade and division of the participants were taken into account as it is noticeable that they are approximately distributed equally concerning the number.

For the qualitative phase of the study, 10 learners were interviewed. These learners were chosen with regard to results of the total scores they obtained from the Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale. Table 2 demonstrates the characteristics of these learners.

Table 2. Participants Chosen for Interviews

	Gender	Division	Grade	Self-regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Total Score
Student 1	Female	ELT	2	130
Student 2	Male	ELT	2	127
Student 3	Male	GLT	2	123
Student 4	Male	ELT	1	121
Student 5	Male	GLT	2	116
Student 6	Female	GLT	2	70
Student 7	Male	GLT	3	70
Student 8	Male	GLT	2	69
Student 9	Female	GLT	3	61
Student 10	Male	ELT	1	60

2.2. Instruments

In this study, a total of five data collection instruments were administered to the participants: the Self-regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale; Beliefs about L2 Learning Scale; Adjective Based Personality Test, Identity Knowledge questionnaire; and semi-structured interviews.

2.2.1. The Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale

The Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale was developed by the researchers to determine the level of L2 learners' preferences for self-regulated strategies within the scope of Oxford's (2011) S^2R Model of Language Learning. The scale development phase was carried out by the participation of 305 (232 female, 73 male) L2 learners studying at the department of FLE at Trakya University, Turkey.

Of factor analysis (FA) types, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) were performed to find out construct validity of the scale. Basing on the results of EFA, the scale is composed of 35 items embedded in 6 factors depending on Cognitive Strategies, Affective Strategies, SI Strategies, Metacognitive Strategies, Meta-affective Strategies, and Meta-SI Strategies dimensions. (the total variance explained is 41.625%, factor loadings of 35 items vary from .80 to .35.). The findings of CFA had acceptable fit in terms of the acceptance of the model ($\chi2/df=1298.61/545$). The corrected item total correlation values of items in the scale range from .44 to .76. The results of t-test of bottom 27% and top 27% groups were assessed in terms of total scores and reveal that the differences are significant ($p<.05$) for all items and factors. The overall reliability of the measurement model demonstrated that the model is at an acceptable level with a Cronbach's alpha statistic of .85. Ultimately, 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. Moreover, items of the scale were written in Turkish which is the native language of the learners so that it would be easier for learners studying in GLT to comprehend the statements. The total score of this scale is 140; 1 is considered as the lowest score, 70 as the medium score, and 140 as the highest one. In this sense, participants getting scores higher than 70 is regarded as high strategy users; whereas below 70 is considered as low strategy users.

2.2.2. Beliefs about L2 Learning Scale

Beliefs about L2 Learning Scale was the other instrument developed by the researchers as well to reveal L2 learners' beliefs about L2 learning as the name suggests. The items constructing the scale were generated basing on the literature review in terms of learning beliefs scales. (Bacon &

Finnemann, 1990; Cheng, 2001; Horwitz, 1987; Mori, 1999). The scale was designed according to the same procedure as the Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale. 305 (232 female, 73 male) L2 learners studying at the Department of FLE at Trakya University, Turkey took part in the scale development procedure.

The results of EFA demonstrated that the scale consists of 34 items and 3 factors grouped in Cognitive Beliefs, Affective Beliefs, and Behavioral Beliefs dimensions. The total variance explained is 27.135%, and factor loadings of 34 items range from .61 to .35. As a result of the CFA, it has been found out that $\chi 2/df$ ratio of the model is 1.80 ($\chi 2/df$=944.95/524) which indicates that the model is in perfect fit (Kline, 2005; Sümer, 2000). The corrected item total correlation values of items in the scale range from .29 to .67. The results of t-test of bottom 27% and top 27% groups, which are figured out in terms of total scores, indicate that the differences are significant ($p<.05$) in relation to the items and factors. The overall reliability of the measurement model is determined by having a Cronbach's alpha statistic of .76, which means that the model is at an acceptable level. Consequently, the scale included 34 items grouped into 3 factors as Cognitive Beliefs, Affective Beliefs, and Behavioral Beliefs. The instrument was designed on a 5 point Likert-type scale which consists of *"no idea (1), strongly disagree (2), disagree (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5)"* options. Items of the scale were prepared in Turkish which is the native language of the participants. No negative statements were included in the scale. The total score of this scale is 170 in which 1 is considered as the lowest score, 85 as the medium score, and 170 as the highest one.

2.2.3. Adjective Based Personality Test

In this study, ABPT was used in an attempt to figure out personality traits of L2 learners attending the Department of FLE at Trakya University. This scale was developed by Bacanlı, İlhan & Aslan (2007), and researchers were asked for permission to implement the scale. The scale was designed as a 7 point Likert-type including 40 items in the scale which are comprised of adjectives pairs. Participants were asked to choose the most appropriate adjective pairs with regard to their personality. The internal consistency coefficients of dimensions related to APBT range from .73 and .89. Moreover, findings regarding test-retest method revealed that Agreeableness sub-dimension has the highest reliability (r=.86, $p<.01$), whereas Openness to Experience sub-dimension has the lowest (r=.68, $p<.01$) relation. Consequently, the fact that internal consistency coefficients are above .70 is an indicator of the reliability of ABPT as shown in Table 3 (Bacanlı et al., 2009).

Table 3. Total Item Correlations, Internal Consistency Coefficients and Test-retest Correlation Coefficients

Dimensions	Item Number	Total Item Correlations (*n*=285)	α (*n*=285)	rtt (*n*=90)
Neuroticism-Emotional stability	9	.26-.55	.73	.85**
Extraversion	9	.44-.75	.89	.85**
Openness to experience	7	.33-.68	.80	.68**
Agreeableness	7	.45-.69	.87	.86**
Conscientiousness	8	.53-.79	.88	.71**
PS. **$p<.01$				

2.2.4. Identity Knowledge Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in the study was designed by the researchers with the help of an expert on statistics to figure out identity features of L2 learners. There are a total of 18 statements including 3

statements with open-ended items, and 15 statements with close-ended items in the questionnaire. The statements of the questionnaire were prepared in the native language of the participants -Turkish to avoid any possible misunderstandings related to the statements.

2.2.5. Semi-structured Interviews

Interview is another instrument performed in this study to gather qualitative data. It is assumed that conducting interview would be enlightening in terms of both supporting the quantitative data and having detailed information about more or less frequent use of self-regulated L2 learning strategies. The interview was conducted in the native language of the learners -Turkish so that participants did not feel any hesitation during the interview process while relating their responses. The interviews were carried out face-to- face, and the participants' responses were tape-recorded by the researcher.

In addition to quantitative and qualitative data of this study, participants' university GPA were taken for granted to determine their proficiency level.

2.3. Data collection procedures

The study started with the development procedure of two scales which were administered to 305 participants attending the Department of FLE at Trakya University. The implementation of the scales lasted for 30 minutes, and the researcher actively took part in the process in case of any clarification of the misunderstandings related to the scales, or items. Moreover, the questionnaire with regard to identity knowledge was piloted with 50 participants at the department. Following the pilot implementation and minor adjustments to the wording, four instruments constructing the quantitative phase of the study -that is, Self-regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale; Beliefs about L2 Learning Scale; ABPT, and the questionnaire for getting information about identity were administered to remaining 205 participants.

After gathering quantitative data, more and less frequent strategy users from the participants were determined so as to conduct interviews for the qualitative phase of the study. Therefore, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 participants- 5 of them who were determined as more frequent strategy users and 5 of them as less frequent strategy users. The interviews were carried out in the native language of the participants- Turkish. Each interview lasted approximately for 20-30 minutes. The interviews were recorded basing on the consent given by the participants. In this study, qualitative data are expected to shed light on the findings of quantitative data by providing profound information about self-regulated L2 learning strategy use.

2.4. Data Analysis

2.4.1. Quantitative Data Analysis

With regard to the first three research question of the study, frequency distribution was performed. The rest of four research questions of the study were analyzed by stepwise multiple regression analysis.

As the self-regulated L2 learning strategies scale was examined under six sub-dimensions, multiple regression analysis was carried out separately for the scores obtained from each sub-dimension. Of the predictor variables, it has been found that factor scores of Beliefs about L2 Learning and ABPT scales have an equal distance, and they are considered as continuous variables. On the other hand, all variables except "type of high school graduated" variable, which is related to identity scale, are obtained at hierarchical level. So, "type of high school graduated" variable is a discrete variable at nominal scale. "Type of high school graduated" variable is included in multiple regression analysis as "dummy variable", and examined in five categories as general high school, Anatolian high school, science high school, vocational-technical high school and other high school types. Additionally, other

high school category is coded as "0" and determined as dummy variable. Moreover, certain assumptions are required for multiple regression to acquire valid findings.

One of the assumptions of multiple regression analysis is that scores of outcome variables have normal distributions (Büyüköztürk, 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Results related to this assumption are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *Skewness and Kurtosis Values*

	N	Skewness	Kurtosis
Cognitive Strategies	198	.28	-.33
Affective Strategy	198	-.24	-.63
SI Strategies	198	.23	.01
Metacognitive Strategies	198	-.36	.35
Meta-affective Strategies	198	-.09	.08
Meta-SI Strategies	198	.25	-.43
Neuroticism	198	.33	-.31
Extraversion	198	-.23	-.48
Openness to experience	198	-.56	.03
Agreeableness	198	-.57	-.13
Conscientiousness	198	-.34	-.52
Cognitive Beliefs	198	-.21	-.01
Affective Beliefs	198	-.72	.67
Behavioral Beliefs	198	-.88	.82
GPA	198	-.65	-.22

Multiple regression analysis has two other requirements: **a.** outcome and predictor variables should have a linear relationship, **b.** predictor variables should not have a multi-collinearity problem. (Özdamar, 1999; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001) Figure 1 displays that there is a linear relationship between outcome variable and predictor variables.

Figure 1. Graphics related to linearity assumptions

Tolerance value, variance inflation factors (VIF), and condition index (CI) of the variables were examined to determine whether there is a multicollinearity problem between the predictor variables or not. Table 5 demonstrates the multicollinearity values of variables in each sub-dimension of the Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale.

Table 5. Multicollinearity Values of Variables in Each Sub-dimension of the Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale

	Tolerance	VIF	Condition Index (CIF)
(Constant)			1.000
Place of birth	.70	1.43	1.10
High school1	.16	6.35	1.16
High school2	.15	6.69	1.27
High school3	.42	2.40	1.33
High school4	.49	2.06	1.42
Department	.47	2.11	1.49
Spoken language	.75	1.33	1.54
Number of language	.62	1.61	1.55
Social activity	.86	1.16	1.66
Age	.69	1.44	1.66
Mother education	.68	1.46	1.70
Father education	.66	1.51	1.82
Number of sisters/brothers	.84	1.19	1.84
livinginbiggerdistrict/citybeforeuniversity	.75	1.33	1.93

Income	.75	1.34	2.08
Neuroticism	.81	1.23	2.17
Extraversion	.61	1.65	2.22
Openness to experience	.61	1.63	2.26
Agreeableness	.71	1.41	2.40
Conscientiousness	.73	1.37	2.46
Cognitive beliefs	.64	1.57	2.57
Affective beliefs	.47	2.15	2.90
Behavioral beliefs	.71	1.41	3.38
GPA	.67	1.50	6.44

Table 5 shows that all of the tolerance values are higher than .10. According to Field (2005) and Mertler & Vannatta (2005), tolerance values higher than .10 indicate that there is no multicollinearity problem among the variables. Finally, it is observed that CI has lower values. CI value lower than 10 means indicates that multicollinearity problem is at a low level. So, there is no multicollinearity between the predictor variables. The significance of the statistics gathered from the study is based upon minimum .05 level.

2.4.2. Qualitative Data Analysis

As for the qualitative phase of the study, semi-structured interviews were analysed using descriptive analysis. In this study, learners' views about self-regulated L2 learning strategy use were explained and interpreted by making associations with each other. Moreover, the names of the participants were kept confidential by using code names such as S1, S2, S3, etc.

3. Results

3.1. Results of the Quantitative Data

Table 6 demonstrates that Affective Strategies (34 %) are the most common strategy type used by the participants followed by Metacognitive Strategies (33%), Meta SI Strategies (27 %), and Meta-affective Strategies (20 %); while Cognitive strategies (15 %) ranked as the least used followed by SI Strategies (17%).

Table 6. Frequency Distribution of Self-regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use

Strategies	Never		Sometimes		Usually		Always		Total	
	Mean	**%**	**Mean**	**%**	**Mean**	**%**	**Mean**	**%**	**Mean**	**%**
Affective Strategies	8	4.04	43	21.72	79.67	40.24	67.33	34	198	100
Metacognitive Strategies	14.33	7.24	40.33	20.37	78.33	39.56	65	32.83	198	100
Meta SI Strategies	18.66	9.43	60.67	30.64	65.67	33.16	53	26.77	198	100
Meta-affective Strategies	9.33	4.71	63.67	32.16	84.67	42.76	40.33	20.37	198	100
SI Strategies	19.33	9.76	77.33	39.06	68.67	34.68	32.67	16.50	198	100
Cognitive Strategies	19.67	9.94	74.33	37.54	74.33	37.54	29.67	14.98	198	100

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of Participants' Personality Traits

	Personality Traits									
	Agreeableness		Openness to experience		Conscientiousness		Extraversion		Neuroticism-Emotional stability	
	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
1	7.89	3.98	3.25	1.64	4.14	2.09	5.22	2.64	37.57	18.98
2	7.22	3.65	6.38	3.22	7	3.54	9.44	4.77	46.57	23.52
3	10.56	5.33	8.62	4.36	12.29	6.20	16.44	8.30	28	14.14
4	21.11	10.66	2.62	12.94	28.86	14.57	34.44	17.40	28.43	14.36
5	21	10.61	31.50	15.91	35.86	18.11	37	18.69	25.57	12.92
6	60.89	30.75	53.38	26.96	58.28	29.44	49.56	25.02	18.72	9.45
7	69.33	35.02	69.25	34.97	51.57	26.05	45.90	23.18	13.14	6.63
Total	198	100	198	100	198	100	198	100	198	100

Participants of the research study have the personality of agreeableness (35.02 %) in general, followed by openness to experience (34.97 %). However, of the five dimensions, findings reveal that participants have lower levels of conscientiousness (26%), extraversion (23%) and neuroticism-emotional stability (7%) personality traits.

Table 8. Frequency Distribution of Learners' Beliefs about L2 Learning

	Beliefs about L2 learning					
	Behavioral Beliefs		Affective Beliefs		Cognitive Beliefs	
	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
No Idea	5.99	3.02	12.89	6.51	9.62	4.86
Strongly Disagree	2.08	1.05	14.05	7.10	14.69	7.42
Disagree	9.32	4.71	41.10	20.76	39.23	19.81
Agree	82.57	41.70	82.44	41.64	83.77	42.31
Strongly Agree	98.04	49.52	47.52	23.99	50.69	25.60
Total	198	100	198	100	198	100

It is obvious that most of the participants (91%) prefer to hold behavioral beliefs about L2 learning. Furthermore, more than half of them (68%) possess cognitive beliefs, and 66% of the participants state that they have affective beliefs about L2 learning.

3.2. Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis

In this study, all predictor variables are included in stepwise multiple regression analysis for seeking out the factors that influence whether there is a relationship between each sub-dimension of Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale and predictor variables. Findings of the analysis are presented respectively below.

Table 9. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis with regard to Cognitive Strategies Sub-dimension

	B	β	*t*	*p*	Partial r	Part r
(Constant)	7.747		67.757	.000		
Openness to Experience. X_1	.316	.186	2.697	.008	.190	.182
Lived in bigger places. X_2	.304	.179	2.635	.009	.186	.178
Behavioral. X_3	.289	.171	2.488	.014	.176	.168

R^2=.115 $F_{(3;194)}$=8.392 *p*=.000

Cognitive=7.747 + .316 (X_1) +.304 (X_2)+ .289 (X_3)

Results of multiple regression analysis indicate that there is a significant relationship between three variables and cognitive strategies sub-dimension of the Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale. Moreover, the analysis explains approximately 12% of the total variance together with these three variables considering cognitive strategies score (R^2=.115; *p*<.01). On the basis of standardized regression coefficients, the relative significance of three variables on outcome variable is ranked as openness to experience personality trait, living in a bigger place before university, and behavioral beliefs about L2 learning. Considering the partial and binary correlation coefficients, of three variables having a relationship with cognitive strategies, the variable that has the highest relationship is openness to experience personality trait (*r*=.190); whereas the variable that has the lowest relationship is behavioral beliefs about L2 learning (*r*=.176). On the basis of the correlation values between two variables regarding the other variables, *r*= .182 was found for openness to experience personality trait, and *r*=.168 for behavioral beliefs about L2 learning.

Consequently, participants who have openness to experience personality trait, lived in bigger places before attending university and hold cognitive beliefs about L2 learning have higher cognitive strategies sub-dimension scores than other participants.

Table 10. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis with regard to Affective Strategies Sub-dimension

	B	β	*t*	*p*	Partial r	Part r
(Constant)	9.121		77.346	.000		
behavioral. X_1	.484	.273	4.054	.000	.279	.271
department. X_2	.357	.202	2.992	.003	.210	.200

R^2=.130 $F_{(2;195)}$=14.552 *p*=.000

Affective=9.121+ .484 (X_1) +.357 (X_2)

There is a significant relationship among two variables and affective strategies sub-dimension of Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale. Furthermore, the analysis explains approximately 13 % of the total variance regarding these two variables and affective strategies sub-dimension (R^2=.130; *p*<.01). Standardized regression coefficients reveal that the relative significance of two variables on outcome variable is ranked as behavioral beliefs about L2 learning and ELT students. The partial and binary correlation coefficients of two variables with regard to affective strategies sub-dimension of the scale demonstrate that the variable having the highest relationship with affective strategies sub-dimension is behavioral beliefs about L2 learning (*r*= .279); whereas the variable that has the lowest relationship is GLT Division (*r*=.210). Considering the correlation values between two variables and the other variables, it was revealed as *r*= .271 for behavioral beliefs about L2 learning and *r*= .200 for GLT Division. In conclusion, participants who hold behavioral beliefs about L2 learning, and attend GLT division have higher affective strategies sub-dimension scores than other participants.

Table 11. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis with regard to SI Strategies Sub-dimension

	B	β	t	p	Partial r	Part r
(Constant)	11.960		70.770	.000		
cognitive. X_1	.674	.273	3.976	.000	.279	.271

R^2=.075 $F_{(1;196)}$=15.807 p=.000

Socio=11.960+ .674 (X_1)

Table 11 shows that there is a significant relationship between only one variable and SI Strategies sub-dimension scores of Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale. Additionally, the analysis explains approximately 8 % of the total variance regarding this variable and SI Strategies sub-dimension (R^2=.075; p<.01). Standardized regression coefficients display that the relative significance of this variable on outcome variable is ranked as cognitive beliefs about L2 learning. In terms of the partial and binary correlation coefficients with regard to SI Strategies sub-dimension of the scale, cognitive belief about L2 learning has the highest relationship with SI Strategies sub-dimension (r=.271). To conclude, participants who hold cognitive beliefs about L2 learning have higher SI Strategies scores than the other participants.

Table 12. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis with regard to Metacognitive Strategies Sub-dimension

	B	β	t	p	Partial r	Part r
(Constant)	27.753		111.020	.000		
conscientiousness. X_1	1.671	.404	6.532	.000	.425	.396
behavioral. X_2	1.036	.250	4.108	.000	.283	.249
GPA. X_3	.565	.137	2.205	.029	.156	.134

R^2=.288 $F_{(3;194)}$=26.148 p=.000

meta cognitive =27.753 + 1.671 (X_1) +1.036 (X_2)+ .565 (X_3)

Multiple regression analysis presents that there is a significant relationship among three variables and Metacognitive Strategies sub-dimension of the Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale. In addition, the analysis explains approximately 29 %   the total variance with regard to these three variables when metacognitive strategies score is considered. (R^2=.288; p<.01) Findings of standardized regression coefficients point out that the relative significance of three variables on outcome variable is ranked as conscientiousness personality trait, behavioral beliefs about L2 learning, and participants' GPA. On the other hand, results of the partial and binary correlation coefficients show that of the three variables that have a relationship with metacognitive strategies, the variable that has the highest relationship is conscientiousness personality trait (r= .425); whereas the variable that has the lowest relationship is participants' university GPA (r= .156). In terms of the correlation values between two variables and the other variables, the value r= .396 was found for conscientiousness personality trait, and r= .134 for participants' GPA.

As a conclusion, participants who have conscientiousness personality trait, hold behavioral beliefs about L2 learning and get higher GPA have more metacognitive strategies sub-dimension scores.

Table 13. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis with regard to Meta-affective Strategies Sub-dimension

	B	β	*t*	*p*	Partial r	Part r
(Constant)	27.217		87.591	.000		
extraversion. X_1	1.176	.237	3.647	.000	.254	.229
conscientiousness. X_2	1.227	.248	3.832	.000	.266	.241
behavioral. X_3	1.077	.218	3.423	.001	.239	.215
income. X_4	.647	.131	2.075	.039	.148	.130

$R^2 = .237$ $F_{(3;193)} = 26.148$ $p = .000$

meta affective $= 27.217 + 1.176 (X_1) + 1.227 (X_2) + 1.077 (X_3) + .647(X_4)$

Results of multiple regression analysis point out that there is a significant relationship between four variables and Meta-affective Strategies sub-dimension of the Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale. Furthermore, the analysis explains approximately 24 % the total variance with regard to these three variables considering metacognitive strategies score. ($R^2 = .237$; $p < .01$). Results of standardized regression coefficients reveal that the relative significance of four variables on outcome variable is ranked as extraversion personality trait, conscientiousness personality trait, behavioral beliefs about L2 learning, and income status of the participants' parents. According to results of the partial and binary correlation coefficients, of four variables having relationship with meta-affective strategies, the variable that has the highest relationship is extraversion personality trait ($r = .254$); whereas the variable that has the lowest relationship is income status of the participants' parents ($r = .148$). On the basis of the correlation values between two variables and other variables, $r = .229$ was found for extraversion personality trait, and $r = .130$ for income status of the participants' parents.

Eventually, it was found that participants who have extraversion and conscientiousness personality traits, hold behavioral beliefs about L2 learning, and have parents with higher income status have more meta-affective strategies scores than other participants.

Table 14. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis with regard to Meta SI Strategies Sub-dimension

	B	β	*t*	*p*	Partial r	Part r
(Constant)	14.207		80.049	.000		
behavioral. X_1	.756	.282	4.184	.000	.287	.278
openness to experience. X_2	.528	.197	2.922	.004	.205	.194

$R^2 = .138$ $F_{(2;195)} = 13.581$ $p = .000$

meta socio $= 14.207 + .756 (X_1) + .528 (X_2)$

Multiple regression analysis demonstrates that there is a significant relationship between two variables and Meta SI Strategies sub-dimension of the Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale. Besides, the analysis explains approximately 14 % of the total variance with regard to these three variables considering meta SI strategies score. ($R^2 = .138$; $p < .01$). In terms of standardized regression coefficients, the relative significance of these two variables on outcome variable is ranked as behavioral beliefs about L2 learning and openness to experience personality trait. Basing upon the partial and binary correlation coefficients, of two variables having a relationship with meta SI strategies, the variable that has the highest relationship is behavioral beliefs about L2 learning ($r = .287$); whereas the variable that has the lowest relationship is openness to experience personality trait ($r = .205$). In terms of the correlation values between two variables and other variables, $r = .278$ was found for beliefs about L2 learning and $r = .194$ for openness to experience personality trait.

Ultimately, it was found that participants who hold behavioral beliefs about L2 learning, and have openness to experience personality trait have higher meta SI strategies sub-dimension scores than other participants.

According to the results of t-test with regard to the significance of regression coefficients obtained from the results of regression analysis in terms of six sub-dimensions of the Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use Scale, all variables are found to be significant in accordance with .05 level. Furthermore, according to the results of variance analysis with regard to the significance of regression models constructed for each sub-dimension, models are found to be significant. ($F_{(3;194)}=8.392$; $F_{(2;195)}=14.552$; $F_{(1;196)}=15.807$; $F_{(3;194)}=26.148$; $F_{(3;193)}=26.148$; $F_{(2;195)}=13.581$; p<.01).

3.3. . Results of Qualitative Data

In this study, semi-structured interviews were analysed through descriptive analysis. Findings are presented through the responses of more frequent and less frequent strategy users. In the light of theoretical framework and research questions of the study, the participants' responses are grouped in 6 themes as difficulties during L2 learning process, how to overcome difficulties during L2 learning process, Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use, factors affecting Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use, the Advantages of Using Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategies, and being a Good Language Learner. Responses given by the more frequent and less frequent strategy users are grouped and distinguished according to the sub dimensions of the mentioned themes.

3.3.1. Findings in relation to Difficulties during L2 Learning Process

Table 15. Responses of More and Less Frequent Strategy Users on Difficulties during L2 Learning Process

Q1. What difficulties do you experience in L2 Learning?"		
Participant	**Sub Dimension**	**Response**
S2 More frequent strategy user	Problem with Vocabulary Knowledge	*"I think I have difficulty if I don't know the meaning of words in a conversation. If you don't understand the words or terms when someone explains or says something, I feel suspended..."*
S1 More frequent strategy user	Adapting Different Methods Applied by the Instructors	*"Some of my instructors have different points of views about teaching methods; some of them apply their views; whereas the others just have a perspective, but insist on implementing traditional teaching methods. For this reason, I feel confused in determining whose perspective is the right one, and which methodology I should use..."*
S6 Less frequent strategy user	Problem due to Insufficient Vocabulary Knowledge	*"I learn German as a foreign language, some words are very long. My instructors are sometimes speaking very fast, or their accents may be different. I also have difficulty in comprehending some reflective verbs or pair verbs. It is also difficult for me to understand collocations..."*

In the light of the statements of participants, it is apparent that their common problem regarding difficulties encountered during the L2 learning process is their insufficient vocabulary knowledge. Moreover, participants using more frequent strategies expressed that they have difficulty in adapting themselves to diverse methods applied by their instructors during the courses.

3.3.2. Findings in relation to Overcoming Difficulties during L2 Learning Process

Table 16. Responses of More and Less Frequent Strategy Users on Overcoming Difficulties in L2 Learning Process

Q2. "How do you deal with your problems in L2 learning process?"		
Participant	**Sub Dimension**	**Response**
S2 More frequent strategy user	Studying Individually	*"When I have difficulty in L2 learning process, I study harder individually to overcome my problems..."*
S5 More frequent strategy user	Studying Systematic	*"I plan and think about the ways of making the learning process easier. So, I try to develop strategies in terms of learning. I make plans in my learning process...."*
S4 More frequent strategy user	Using New Knowledge in Real Life	*"I try to use new things I learn in my real life. I can only visualize my knowledge in that way. This makes my process easier..."*
S3 More frequent strategy user	Getting Support from Instructors and/or Friends	*"To overcome this problem, I get in contact with my instructors or my friends; so I comprehend better by getting help from them."*
S9 Less frequent strategy user	Memorizing	*"I go home and revise the new words, I memorize, and rewrite them..."*
S7 Less frequent strategy user	Revising	*"I usually revise the terms I don't understand..."*
S8 Less frequent strategy user	Summarizing	*"... I should summarize after I listen to explanations of my instructors, and I should regularly study."*

The statements of both more and less frequent strategy users indicate that strategy learners using more frequent strategies solve their problems in terms of L2 learning process by studying individually, studying systematic, using the new knowledge in real life, and getting support from instructors or friends. On the other hand, learners using less frequent strategies overcome their problems through memorizing, revising, and summarizing.

3.3.3. Findings in relation to Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use

Table 17. Responses of More and Less Frequent Strategy Users on Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategies

Q3. "Do you think that you use self-regulated L2 learning strategies?"		
Participant	**Sub Dimension**	**Response**
S1 More frequent strategy user	Affective Strategies Metacognitive Strategies Cognitive Strategies	*"I use strategies for my studies. While I am learning a new subject, I also try to check the previous ones. I particularly pay attention to what my instructors explain during lectures. I underline the important parts, even highlight them to attract my attention. I sometimes listen to relaxing music. So, I use metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, affective strategies..."*
S2 More frequent strategy user	Meta-affective Strategies Meta SI Strategies	*"Especially, I use meta-affective strategies and metacognitive strategies, I try to listen carefully during lectures..."*

S4 More frequent strategy user	SI Strategies Meta SI Strategies	*"I think I mostly use SI strategies and meta SI strategies. Because I learn better when I interact with other people."*
S6 Less frequent strategy user	Cognitive Strategies Affective Strategies Metacognitive Strategies	*"I rewrite the new words for learning better, so I use cognitive strategies. I usually listen to music while studying, I mean I employ affective strategies. I start to study for subjects that attract my attention. For this reason, I use metacognitive strategies."*
S10 Less frequent strategy user	SI Strategies Meta SI Strategies	*"I learn a foreign language a lot from computer games, I look for the meanings of unknown words that I come across in the computer games... I practice with foreign people when I play computer games; this also makes me learn better."*

The overall statements of the participants indicate that they usually employ self-regulated L2 learning strategies during their L2 learning process. Moreover, it is evident that both more frequent and less frequent strategy users use nearly all six dimensions of self-regulated strategies proposed by S^2R Model.

3.3.4. Findings in relation to Factors Affecting Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use

Table 18. Responses of More and Less Frequent Strategy Users on Factors Affecting Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategy Use

Q4. "What are the factors that influence you to use self-regulated L2 learning strategies?"		
Participant	**Sub Dimension**	**Response**
S2 More frequent strategy user	Personality	*"I think my personality is a factor that influences my strategy choice. For example, I am an organized person...I even think that my horoscope has an effect on strategy use. I am Virgo, an organized horoscope. So, I study in an organized and systematic way, and this affects my choice of strategies."*
S3 More frequent strategy user	Experience about Strategies	*"I determine which strategies I should use according to my experiences. When I notice that they are useful in my learning process, I continue using them."*
S9 Less frequent strategy user	Need for Actualising Knowledge	*"I need to actualise what I learn at courses. So, using strategies makes me learn better and enables my knowledge to become permanent..."*
S10 Less frequent strategy user	Need for Visualising Knowledge	*"I do not memorize words in a foreign language at once as the language is different. For this reason, I need to visualize what I learn, I need to revise..."*

Regarding the views of more and less frequent strategy users, it can be inferred that according to more frequent users, personality and experience are considered as important factors in strategy use; whereas less frequent users state that they perform strategies as they need to actualise and visualise their knowledge to improve their language learning.

3.3.5. Findings in relation to the Advantages of Using Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategies

Table 19. Responses of More and Less Frequent Strategy Users on the Advantages of Using Self-Regulated L2 Learning Strategies

Q5. "Do you think that it is useful to use self-regulated L2 learning strategies in L2 learning ?"		
Participant	**Sub Dimension**	**Response**
S5 More frequent strategy user	It makes learning more enjoyable	*"...When the students choose the right strategy for themselves, learning process becomes more fruitful."*
S1 More frequent strategy user	It improves language learning	*"In my opinion, using strategies is advantageous. Because I take different courses from different instructors, and they all have different teaching methods. So, I learn different things from them, and I synthesize the things I learn. For this reason, I need to use strategies to improve language learning and comprehend better."*
S4 More frequent strategy user	It increases motivation	*"I definitely think that using strategies is useful. Because I feel motivated..."*
S6 Less frequent strategy user	I learn better by using strategies	*"I think using strategies has advantages. For example, when I rewrite new words or listen to music while studying, I remember the words as I can visualize them in my mind, or when I hear the same music, I remember what I was studying. So, I learn better in that way."*
S7 Less frequent strategy user	It improves fluency	*"I think using strategies is beneficial. I have two friends; they learnt a foreign language better in this way. Especially, they learnt to speak fluently..."*
S9 Less frequent strategy user	It makes learning efficient	*"I think using strategies makes learning process efficient. I can say this thanks to the outcomes of implementing strategies..."*

The examination of more frequent strategy users' views shows that they find it advantageous to use strategies as strategies make learning more enjoyable, help to improve learning, and increase motivation. On the other hand, less frequent strategy users think that using strategies is advantageous as well, since employing strategies enables them to learn better, improves fluency, and makes learning efficient.

3.3.6. Findings in relation to the Views of Participants as a Good Learner

Table 20. Responses of More and Less Frequent Strategy Users as a Good Learner

Q6. "Would you consider yourself as a good language learner? Why / Why not?"		
Participant	**Sub Dimension**	**Response**
S1 More frequent strategy user	I struggle to be a good learner	*"My goal is to be a good language teacher, so I should know the target language well. For this reason, I struggle to be a good learner..."*
S3 More frequent strategy user	I am good at comprehending L2	*"I think I am a better learner than my friends, because I express myself well in foreign language... I do not have any difficulty when I go abroad; I can understand everything...."*
S5 More frequent strategy user	I learn through communication	*"I do not think I study hard, but I think I am a good learner, because I learn through communication, interacting with other people, not through reading, or studying harder..."*
S7 Less frequent strategy user	I do not study hard	*"I can't say that I am a good language learner, because I think I do not study hard..."*
S8 Less frequent strategy user	I do not attend some of the lectures	*"I think I am not a good language learner, because I do not attend some of the lectures at the university; therefore I cannot concentrate on my studies..."*
S10 Less frequent strategy user	I do not pay enough attention to my studies	*"I think I am not; because I think I do not give the necessary attention to my studies or courses..."*

It is clear from the statements of the participants that more frequent strategy users state that they consider themselves as good learners, whereas less frequent self-regulated L2 learning strategies users assert that they do not regard themselves as good learners.

4. Discussion & Conclusion

The primary purpose of the study was to explore the overall frequency of self-regulated L2 learning strategy use of L2 learners studying at the Department of FLE in Turkey depending upon Oxford's (2011) S^2R Model. Another aim of the study was to investigate the relationships between their reported self-regulated L2 learning strategy use and their personality traits, identity, beliefs about L2 learning and proficiency.

According to the findings of the study, it was found that six dimensions proposed in the S^2R Model were used by L2 learners to some extent. Findings showed that these learners mostly employed Affective strategies followed by Metacognitive strategies. Moreover, it was found that learners displayed a low use of Meta SI and Meta-affective strategies. On the other hand, Cognitive strategies were found to be the least employed strategy followed by SI strategies. In this context, findings of this study are consistent with other studies which revealed that Metacognitive Strategies are preferred by L2 learners in different contexts. (Bremner, 1999; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Nikoopour et al., 2011; Shmais, 2003; Yeşilçınar, 2014). However, it is surprising that the results are inconsistent with Yılmaz's (2010) study which put forward that affective strategies were ranked as the lowest preferable strategy type in a Turkish university context, and with certain studies which proposed cognitive strategies as more favorite type among other strategy types (Alhaisoni, 2012; Oxford, 1990; Touba, 1992; Vandergifts, 1997). Griffiths (2013) highlights that it is necessary to deal with strategy effectiveness in relation to target, situation, learner characteristics, and co-ordination with other strategies. Additionally, Wharton (2000) argued that the types of strategies performed depend upon learner types and setting that learning takes place. It is possible that strategy choice shows difference from context to context; a useful strategy may not be regarded as efficient for other users even in the same context. Hence, it becomes crucial to investigate and reveal the factors behind the strategy choice of learners.

In this study, personality traits of L2 learners were examined with regard to the five domains constructing the Big Five Model, namely Neuroticism-Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Conscientiousness. The frequency distribution of the statistical analysis of personality traits displayed that most of the L2 learners have Agreeableness and Openness to Experience personality traits followed by Conscientiousness and Extraversion. Furthermore, Neuroticism-Emotional stability was figured out as the least reported personality trait. Participants of this study mostly preferred to use affective strategies and metacognitive strategies, which was the result of their personalities. It was observed that they did not report themselves pertaining to Neuroticism- Emotional stability dimension which was the indicator of having anxiety about L2 learning. Having good-natured and likable personality in terms of Agreeableness dimension along with being flexible, creative, untraditional, and moved by art within the scope of Openness to Experience dimension signify that learners tend to use more affective and metacognitive strategies.

Another finding with regard to the beliefs about L2 learning showed that L2 learners in this study held strong beliefs about Behavioral beliefs about L2 learning, followed by Cognitive and Affective beliefs. The results of the interview sessions also supported these findings as the participants pointed out that learning became permanent and efficient when they had an opportunity to use language. The

reason of this arises out of learners' having very few opportunities in Turkey to practice the target language as L2 learning in Turkish context is still a problematic issue. This problem is also illustrated in several studies that were carried out in Turkey (Akalın & Zengin, 2007; Büyükyavuz & İnal, 2008; Gökdemir, 2010; Öz, Demirezen & Pourfeiz, 2015).

Concerning the relationship between self-regulated L2 learning strategy use and the mentioned factors, it was figured out that self-regulated L2 learning strategy use of L2 learners are affected by certain factors such as personality, identity, beliefs about L2 learning, and proficiency of the learners to some extent. Findings demonstrated that L2 learners reporting themselves within the openness to experience dimension employed Cognitive and Meta SI strategies more than their counterparts. Moreover, L2 learners reporting themselves within Conscientiousness personality trait used Metacognitive and Meta-affective strategies more; whereas extraverted L2 learners were found to employ Meta-affective strategies more than other L2 learners. It is acceptable for L2 learners, who described themselves as having openness to experience personality trait, to prefer activities which facilitate L2 knowledge on one hand, and provide contexts that require being in contact with people on the other hand. The interviews also demonstrated that learners who were social and outgoing preferred using cognitive strategies and meta SI strategies. Although the number of studies which found relationship between openness to experience and language learning strategy use is somehow limited, there are many studies in diverse disciplines which revealed a positive relationship between openness to experience and learning outcomes (Ackerman & Heggestad, 1997; Blickle, 1996; Farsides & Woodfield, 2003; Noftle & Robins , 2007; Öz, H., 2014). It is reasonable for L2 learners having conscientiousness personality trait to use activities that require organization and management of their emotions. The semi-structured interviews supported these findings as learners, who described themselves as organized, planned, and preferred studying systematic, believed that their personalities had an influence on the strategy choice. The results of this finding are in accordance with certain studies from different cultures which figured out that openness to experience dimension has a positively significant relationship with metacognitive strategies (Ayhan & Türkyılmaz, 2015; Kang, 2012). Moreover, the findings of the study are consistent with Kang's study (2012) which showed that openness to experience and conscientiousness dimensions were the most significant predictors of using LLS. Extraversion as a personality dimension is also another predictor of the study as findings of the study revealed that extraverted L2 learners used more meta-affective strategies. It is acceptable that extraverted learners in this study tended to take control of their motivation and senses by using meta-affective strategies as they were assumed to express and manage their feelings while carrying out language learning activities. This finding is in parallel with certain studies in which extraversion is found to be in relationship with strategy use (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; Reiss, 1983; Wakamoto, 2000).

On the basis of the relationship between L2 learners self-regulated strategy use and their beliefs about L2 learning, it was found that learners holding behavioral beliefs about L2 learning were figured out to employ Cognitive, Affective, Metacognitive, Meta-Affective and Meta SI strategies more except for SI strategies. On the other hand, L2 learners holding Cognitive beliefs about L2 learning were determined to employ SI strategies more than other learners. It is inferred that L2 learners who believed that using rather than just knowing and having a perspective on the target language were more inclined to prefer using strategies in their studies. This results from L2 learners' need to employ strategies in order to use the target language; thus, putting their experiences about L2 into practice triggers learners' strategy use. On the other hand, the reason for SI strategy use by L2 learners who held cognitive beliefs, assumptions, ideas, and knowledge about L2 may be due to the fact that these learners gained knowledge about the target language through interactions with people or social activities related to L2. In this sense, they believed that SI strategies enhance L2 knowledge more. This study is in accordance with several studies which support that there is a relationship between

language learning beliefs and LLS use (Abedini Rahimi & Zare-ee, 2011; Chang & Shen, 2005; Horwitz, 1987; Meshkat & Saeb, 2012; Yang, 1999). As Griffiths (2013) points out, learners implement their beliefs to the requirements of their situation and thereby employ effective strategies accordingly. Therefore, it is crucial to know what beliefs L2 learners hold about language in order to facilitate an efficient language learning process.

Concerning the influence of identity on self-regulated L2 learning strategy use, findings showed that learners, who have lived in bigger districts or cities before attending university, performed cognitive strategies more than other learners coming from villages or towns. The reason of this is that learners are in interaction with more educated people in larger places which enables them to broaden their horizons. As Berger (1978, p.212) highlights that 'larger cities usually have more highly educated, professional people, and are able to carry out many of the central place functions', it is possible for L2 learners coming from bigger places to use cognitive strategies which is related to getting knowledge and information about language system. Hence, learners coming from bigger places are exposed to more opportunities with regard to language knowledge; thus, they are more equipped with language learning related issues compared to their counterparts coming from smaller places. Another finding regarding identity displayed that learners coming from families with higher incomes used more meta-affective strategies. This arises out of the fact that these learners do not have financial difficulty as they are supported by their families; hence they do not have much anxiety about their living. The findings of certain studies on financial stress demonstrated that financial stressors are related to increased anxiety, depression, and low academic performance. (Andrews & Wilding, 2004; Joo, Durband & Grable, 2008). For that reason, it is likely for learners who are financially supported by their parents to feel more relaxed and motivated towards their studies. On the basis of the relationship between identity and self-regulated L2 learning strategy use, the findings also revealed that L2 learners attending GLT Division used affective strategies more than ELT learners. Depending on the interviews, GLT learners stated that although German and English languages belong to the same language family, they think that German has a more complex structure; thus they find it hard to deal with German language. For this reason, they preferred employing affective strategies which helped to increase motivation and lower their anxiety towards language learning. Despite the fact that there are many studies concerning identity and language learning (Anwaruddin, 2012; Khatib & Ghamari, 2011; Kim, 2003), research related to the relationship between identity and language strategy use is very limited in the literature. In this sense, the findings of this study will provide insight into the reasons of L2 learners' strategy choice.

As for the relationship between self-regulated L2 learning strategy use and their proficiency, it was figured that L2 learners having higher university GPA used metacognitive strategies more than other strategy types. It is acceptable for successful learners to use more metacognitive strategies in their studies. This was supported by the interview results of the study as more frequent strategy users declared that they were able to regulate their language learning process through planning, monitoring, and evaluating their L2 tasks as required by metacognitive knowledge. This finding is in accordance with several studies which point out that metacognitive strategies are regarded as one of the important strategy types, and there is a relationship between metacognitive strategy use and learners' proficiency (Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 1999; Chamot & Küpper; 1989, O'Malley et al., 1985,1985a; Vandergrift, 1996, 1997).

Depending on the results of the research study, findings demonstrated that employing self-regulated L2 learning strategies enables L2 learners to take control of their language process and fosters their language studies in an FLE context. In this sense, learners can be encouraged to use more strategy types. Moreover, learners can be fostered to employ strategies that are found to be used less frequently, namely Cognitive, Meta SI and Meta-affective strategies in this study. Furthermore, it is

advisable to attach importance to factors affecting the self-regulated strategy choice since research on strategy use demonstrates that L2 learners' strategy choice are constructed by their personality, identity, beliefs about L2 learning, and proficiency. Thus, it will be beneficial to take into account the sociological and psychological background of L2 learners with respect to having an insight into how they deal with the target language. Furthermore, having a profound information about learners will be enlightening in terms of determining learners' needs in FLE context.

References

Abedini, A., Rahimi, A., & Zare-ee, A. (2011). Relationship between Iranian EFL learners' beliefs about language learning, their language learning strategy use and their language proficiency. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 28,* 1029-1033.

Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. & Paris, S. (2008). Clarifying the differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher,* 61 (5), 364-373.

Ackerman, P. L. & Heggestad, E. D. (1997). Intelligence, personality, and interests: Evidence for overlapping traits. *Psychological Bulletin,* 121, 219–245.

Akalın, S. & Zengin, B. (2007). Türkiye'de halkın yabancı dil ile ilgili algıları. (The Attitude of People towards Foreign Language in Turkey). *Journal of Language and Linguistics Studies*, 3(1), 181-200.

Alhaisoni, E. (2012). Language Learning Strategy Use of Saudi EFL Students in an Intensive English Learning Context. *Asian Social Science,* Vol 8, No: 13.

Andrews, B. & Wilding, J. M. (2004). The relation of depression and anxiety to life-stress and achievement in students. *British Journal of Psychology,* 95, 509-521.

Anwaruddin, S. M. (2012). Learner Identity in Second Language Education. *3L: Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies.* Vol. 18 Issue 2, p13.

Asmalı, M. (2014). The Relationship Between the Big Five Personality Traits and Language Learning Strategies. *Balıkesir University The Journal of Social Sciences Institute,* 12/2014; 17(32):1-18.

Ayhan, Ü. & Türkyılmaz, U. (2015). The Use of Meta-Cognitive Strategies and Personality Traits among Bosnian University Students. *Mevlana International Journal of Education (MIJE)* Vol. 5(2), pp. 40-60, 31 August, 2015.

Babakhani, N. (2014). The relationship between the big-five model of personality, self-regulated learning strategies and academic performance of Islamic Azad University students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 116 (2014) 3542 – 3547.

Bacanlı, H., İlhan, T. & Aslan, S. (2009). Beş Faktör Kuramına Dayalı Bir Kişilik Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi: Sıfatlara Dayalı Kişilik Testi (SDKT). *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, Bahar 2009, 7(2), 261-279.

Bacon, S. M., & Finnemann, M.D. (1990). A study of attitudes, motives and strategies of university foreign language students and their disposition to authentic oral and written input. *Modern Language Journal,* 74(4), 459–473.

Berger, A. S. (1978). *The City: urban communities and their problems.* Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers. Dubuque, Iowa.

Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. *Modern Language Journal,* 65, 24-35.

Blickle, G. (1996) Personality traits, learning stratigies, and performance. *European Journal of Personality.* Volume 10, Issue 5, pages 337–352, December 1996.

Bransford, J., Brown, A. L. & Cocking, R. R. (1999). How People Learn: brain, mind, experience, and school. In J. D., Bransford A. L., Brown & Cocking R. R. (Eds.), *Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning.* Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. National Research Council.

Bremner, S. (1999). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: Investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. *The Canadian Modern Language Review,* Vol. 55, pp. 490-514.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2006). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı.* Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Büyükyavuz, O. & İnal, S (2008). A descriptive study on Turkish teachers of English regarding their professional needs, efforts for development and available resources. *The Asian EFL Journal,* 10: 215-234.

Chamot, A. U. & Küpper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals,* 22, 13-24.

Chang, C. & Shen, M. (2005). The effects of beliefs about language learning and learning strategy use of junior high school EFL learners in remote districts. *Research in Higher Education Journal, 8*(1), 1-8.

Cheng, Y-S. (2001). Learners' Beliefs and Second Language Anxiety Studies in English. *Literature and Linguistics.* 27.2 (June 2001): 75-90.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language.* London: Longman.

Como, L. (2001). Volitional aspects of self-regulated learning. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (pp.191-225). Hillsdale, NJ.: Erlbaum.

Day, E. (2002). *Identity and the Young English Language Learner.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Demirel, M. (2012). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Kullandıkları Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi.* 43: 141-153.

Dörnyei Z. & P. Skehan, (2003). Individual differences in second language learning. In Doughty and M. Long (eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Ehrman, M. (1990). The role of personality type in adult learning: an ongoing investigation. In T. Parry & C. Stansfield (Eds.): *Language Aptitude Reconsidered.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern Language Journal,* 74, 311-326.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition.* Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farsides, T. & Woodfield, R. (2003). Individual differences and undergraduate academic success: The roles of personality, intelligence, and application. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 34, 1225–1243.

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS.* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Gardner, H. (1995). Reflections on multiple intelligences. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 77, 200- 208.

Gökdemir, C. V. (2010). Üniversitelerimizde verilen yabancı dil öğretimindeki başarı durumumuz. (The state of success in Foreign Language Education at our universities). *Erzurum Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 6 (2), 251-264.

Griffiths, C. (2003). *Language learning strategy use and proficiency: The relationship between patterns of reported language learning strategy (LLS) use by speakers of other languages (SOL) and proficiency with implications for the teaching/learning situation.* Published PhD Thesis, University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Griffiths, C. (2013). *The strategy factor in successful language learning.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gyhasi, M., Yazdani, M. & Farsani, M. A. (2013). The Relationship between Personality Types and Self-Regulated Learning Strategies of Language Learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature,* Vol. 2 No. 4; July 2013

Hall, J. K. (2012). *Language and Identity.* Teaching and Researching Language and Culture. NY: Routledge.

Horwitz, E. K. (1987). Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A., Wenden & J., Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. (p.119-129).

Joo, S., Durband, D. B. & Grable, J. (2008). The academic impact of financial stress on college students. *Journal of College Student Retention,* 10(3), 287-305.

Kalaja, P. & Barcelos, F. M. A. (2003). Rationale for "Beliefs about SLA: New research Approaches. In P., Kalaja & F. M. A., Barcelos (Eds). *Beliefs about SLA: New Research Approaches.* NY: Springer Science.

Kang, S. (2012). *Individual Differences in Language Acquisition: Personality Traits and Language Learning Strategies of Korean University Students Studying English as a Foreign Language.* Unpublished PhD Thesis. Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana. May 2012.

Kaylani, C. (1996). The influence of gender and motivation on EFL learning strategy use in Jordan. In R., Oxford (Ed). *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-Cultural Perspectives.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Khatib, M. & Ghamari, M. R. (2011). Mutual Relations of Identity and Foreign Language Learning: An Overview of Linguistic and Sociolinguistic Approaches to Identity. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies,* Vol. 1, No. 12, pp. 1701-1708

Kim, L. S. (2003). Exploring the Relationship between Language, Culture and Identity. GEMA *Online Journal of Language Studies.* Vol.3(2)2003. [Available online at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228538484_Exploring_the_relationship_between_language_culture_and_identity], Retrieved on December, 2, 2015.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling: A Researcher's Guide.* London: Sage.

Magogwe, J. M. & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *System,* 35, 338-352.

Mertler, C. A. & Vannatta, R. A. (2005). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Pyrczak.

Meshkat, M. & Saeb, F. (2012). The Relationship between High School Students' Beliefs about Language Learning and Their Use of Language Learning Strategies. *Issues in Language Teaching (ILT),* Vol. 1, No. 2, 273-296.

Mori, Y. (1999). Epistemological beliefs and language learning beliefs: What do language learners believe about their learning? *Language Learning,* 49(3), 377–415.

Nikoopour, J., Farsani, M. A. & Neishabouri, J. K. (2011). Language Learning Strategy   Preferences of Iranian EFL Students. *International Conference on Social Science and Humanity IPEDR,* Vol.5, IACSIT Press, Singapore

Noftle, E. & Robins R. (2007). Personality predictors of academic outcomes: Big Five correlates of GPA and SAT scores. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 93, 116–130.

Nyikos, M. (1990). Sex-related differences in adult language learning: Socialization and memory factors. *The Modern Language Journal 3*, 273-287.

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

O'Malley, J. M. , Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G, Russo, R. P. & L. Kupper. (1985). Learning Strategy Applications with Students of English as a Second Language. *TESOL Quarterly* 19, 557-584.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L., & Russo, R. (1985a).

  Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. Language Learning, 35(1), 21-46.

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

Oxford, R. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Oxford, R. & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal,* 73:291-300.

Öz, H. (2014). Big Five personality traits and willingness to communicate among foreign language learners in Turkey. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal,* 42, 1473 1482. http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.9.1473.

Öz, H., Demirezen, M., & Pourfeiz, J. (2015). Willingness to communicate of EFL learners in Turkish context. Learning and Individual Differences, 37, 269-275. [Available online at https://doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2014.12.009], Retrieved on December, 2, 2015.

Özdamar, K. (1999). *Paket programlar ile istatistiksel veri analizi.* Eskişehir: Kaan Kitabevi.

Peacock, M. & Ho, B. (2003). Student language learning strategies across eight disciplines. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* Vol.13, No:2, pp. 179-199.

Peirce, B.N. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29(1),* 9-31.

Politzer, R. L. & McGroarty, M. (1985). An Exploratory Study of Learning Behaviors and their Relationship to Gains in Linguistic and Communicative Competence. *TESOL Quarterly* 19: 103-124.

Rahimi, M., Riazi, A. & Saif, S. (2008). An investigation into the factors affecting the use of language learning strategies by Persian EFL learners. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 01/2008; 11(2).

Reiss, M. A. (1983) Helping the unsuccessful language learner. *Can. Modern Language Rev.* 39(2), 257-266.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9 (1), 41-51.

Salahshour F., Sharifi M. & Salahshour N. (2013). The Relationship between Language   Learning Strategy Use, Language Proficiency Level and Learner Gender. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences.* Volume 70, 25 January 2013, Pages 634–643.

Shmais, W. A. (2003). Language learning strategy use in Palestine. *TESL-EJ,* 7(2), 20-33.

Sümer, N. (2000). Yapısal Eşitlik Modelleri. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları.,* 3 (6), 49-74.

Stern, H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Takeuchi, O., Griffiths, C. & Coyle, D. (2007). Applying strategies to context: The role of individual, situational, and group differences. In A. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds*.).   Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice* (pp. 69–92) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Touba, N. (1992). Language learning strategies of Egyptian student teachers of English.   *Paper presented at the Twelfth National Symposium on English Teaching in Egypt,* Cairo, Egypt.

Vandergrift, L. (1996). Listening strategies of core French high school students. *The Canadian Modern Language Review,* 52 (2), 200-223.

Vandergrift, L. (1997). The Comprehension Strategies of Second Language (French) Listeners: A Descriptive Study. *Foreign Language Annals,* 30: 387–409.

Victori, M. & Lockhart. W. (1995). Enhancing metacognition in self-directed language learning. *System,* 23(2), 223-234.

Wakamoto, N. (2000). Language learning strategy and personality variables: Focusing on extroversion and introversion. *International Review of Applied Linguistics.* 38/1:71-81.

Weinstein, C. E., Husman, J. & Dierking, D. R. (2000). Self-regulation interventions with a focus on learning strategies. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self Regulation* (pp. 727-747). San Diego: Academic Press.

Wenden, A. L. (1987). Conceptual background and utility. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning,* 3-13. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language Learning Strategy Use of Bilingual Foreign Language Learners in Singapore. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language   Studies.* Volume 50, Issue 2, pages 203–243, June 2000.

White, C. (2008). Beliefs and good language learners. In Griffiths, C. (Ed.) , *Lessons from good language learners.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 121-130.

Yağlı, Ü. (2014). The Self-Regulatory Strategies and Motivation Used in Learning English and its Relation to Achievement. *Karaelmas Journal of Educational Sciences* 2 (2014) 108-116.

Yang, M. (2010). *Language learning strategies of English as foreign language university students in Korea.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Yang, N. D. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System, 27*(4), 515-535.

Yeşilçınar, S. (2014). Identifying Learner Strategies of University Students in an EFL Context. *Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi,* Volume: 2, N: 2, December: 2014

Yılmaz, C. (2010). The relationship between language learning strategies, gender, proficiency and self-efficacy beliefs: a study of ELT learners in Turkey. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2 (2010), 682-687.

Zhang, J. (2015). The Relationships among Learning Styles, Learning Strategy Use, and English Proficiency of Chinese EFL University Students: A Mixed Methods Study. Unpublished PhD Thesis, New Zealand, University of Otago.

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. 451-502). San Diego, C.A: Academic Press.

Türkiye'de yabancı dil eğitimi bağlamında öz-düzenlemeli yabancı dil öğrenme stratejileri kullanımını etkileyen faktörler

Öz

Bu araştırmanın amacı, yabancı dil öğrencilerinin kullandığı öz-düzenlemeli yabancı dil öğrenme stratejilerini, Oxford (2011) tarafından geliştirilen Stratejik Öz-Düzenleme Modeli'ne dayanarak araştırmak ve kullanılan stratejiler ile öğrencilerin kişilik özellikleri, kimlik bilgileri, yabancı dil öğrenme inançları ve başarıları arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Bu amaca ulaşmak için, çalışmada sıralı açıklayıcı karma yöntem deseni kullanılmış ve araştırma verileri nicel ve nitel veri toplama araçlarıyla elde edilmiştir. Nicel veri toplama araçları Trakya Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümünde öğrenim gören 205 katılımcıya uygulanmıştır. Nicel veriler frekans dağılımı ve aşamalı çoklu regresyon analiz yoluyla çözümlenmiştir. Araştırmanın nitel bölümü için, daha çok ve daha az strateji kullandığı belirlenen 10 öğrenciye yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşmeler uygulanmış ve nitel veriler betimsel analiz yoluyla çözümlenmiştir.

Araştırmanın sonucu, öz-düzenlemeli yabancı dil öğrenme stratejileri kullanımında kişilik özellikleri, kimlik, yabancı dil öğrenme inançları ve başarı faktörlerinin etkisi olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu çalışma, yabancı dil öğrencileri tarafından kullanılan öz-düzenlemeli yabancı dil öğrenme stratejilerini ve strateji tercihlerini etkileyen faktörleri araştırmanın yanı sıra, öğrencilerin sosyolojik ve psikolojik yönlerini de tartışmaktadır. Bu nedenle, çalışmanın yabancı dil eğitimcilerine, Türkiye'deki öğrencilerin yabancı dil eğitim bağlamındaki durumunu anlama konusunda yardımcı olacağı düşünülmektedir.

AUTHOR BIODATA

Prof. Dr. Dinçay Köksal graduated from ELT Department of Faculty of Education at Ondokuz Mayıs University in Samsun in 1984 and worked as teacher in secondary schools for 3 years. Then he started his M.A in Gazi University in 1987 and completed it in 1990. He finished his doctoral study in the same university in 1994. He also worked as lecturer in ELT department of Gazi faculty of Education for seven years and gave Advanced Translation courses in the Turkish Military Academy. He worked as an instructor and assistant professor in Abant İzzet Baysal University for eighteen months. In December 1995 he started to work in Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. Since then, he has been teaching such courses as 'Translation', 'Testing and Evaluation in English Language Education', 'Teaching English/Foreign Language to Young Learners' in B.A and M.A programmes 'Philosophy of Educational Research' in PhD programme. He founded Foreign Language Education Research and Practice Center in that university in 1996. He organised many international conferences – International ELT Research Conferences. He also founded Educational Research Association in Turkey in 2008. He coordinated one EU lingua project locally as a partner called 'European Awareness and Intercomprehension'. He is now a local coordinator of another project called 'Redinter'. He has many articles published in journals and papers presented at international conferences and congresses. He is the author of a book on teaching translation, and co-author of a book on Intercultural Communication and the editor of two books.

Dr. Sinem Dündar is a research assistant at Trakya University, ELT Department of Faculty of Education. She held B.A. degree in Faculty of Letters, Department of English Linguistics from Hacettepe University in 2005 and worked as a teacher of English Language at a private high school for three years in Edirne. In 2008, she started to work at Trakya University and completed her MA studies on critical discourse analysis and second language education at the same university in 2010. She received her PhD degree from Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, ELT Department in 2016. Her research interests include discourse, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching methodology.