JTPSOL
Journal of Teaching Persian to Speakers of Other Languages
Vol. 10, No. 1 (Tome 21), Fall & Winter 2021
Print Issn:5394-2322
Electronic Issn:2676-3354

The Relationship between Language Learning Strategies and Metacognitive and Motivational Self-regulated Learning: The Case of Persian as a Second Language (PSL) Learners

Abbas Ali Zarei [1]

Corresponding Author, Associate Professor, Imam Khomeini International University, Qazvin, Iran

Mahboubeh Gilanian [2]

MA Graduate of TEFL, Freelance researcher, Iran.

Extended Abstract:

There is little doubt that learning a language is a challenging task. In the case of languages such as Persian, which do not enjoy the status of an international language and, consequently, the extensive investment of international agencies, the task of learning appears to be even thornier. To overcome this thorny task, language learners need to be quite motivated and self-regulated. The underlying assumption behind the present study was that some of the language learning strategies that language learners employ might be more strongly connected with their motivational and self-regulated learning. Therefore, the aim of the present study was to investigate language learning strategy use of Persian as Second Language (PSL) learners as predictors of their meta-cognitive and motivational self-regulated learning components.

To this end, a sample of 149 male and female B.A level non-Iranian learners of Persian at Imam Khomeini International University in Qazvin, Iran were selected through convenience sampling based on availability. The selected participants were then asked to fill in two questionnaires including the translated version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). The participants were required to answer the questionnaire by choosing the right alternative from among five choices on a Likert type scale. The collected data were summarized, processed and analyzed using four separate stepwise multiple regression analyses. To see how strong the relationship between the meta-cognitive self-regulated learning and each of the predictors is, the unstandardized as well as standardized coefficients of the three models, along with the observed t-values and significance levels were checked. The results showed that, from among the language learning strategies, cognitive, compensation, and meta-cognitive strategies could make significant contribution to

Received on: 26/05/2019 Accepted on: 11/11/2019
[1]. Email: a.zarei@hum.ikiu.ac.ir
[2]. Email: aazarei@yahoo.com
DOI: 10.30479/jtpsol.2021.10781.1440
pp.101-130

predicting meta-cognitive self-regulated learning. Moreover, meta-cognitive, memory, and affective strategies turned out to be significant predictors of task value. Meanwhile, meta-cognitive strategies and task value shared about 18%, and meta-cognitive and memory strategies together shared over 25% of variance with task value. Meta-cognitive, memory, and affective strategies collectively accounted for about 27% of the total variance with task value. The findings also showed significant relationships between meta-cognitive strategies and control of learning beliefs. In fact, meta-cognitive strategies entered into the regression equation as the single predictor of control of learning beliefs and meta-cognitive strategies and control of learning beliefs shared over 8% of variance. It also turned out that for every one standard deviation of change in meta-cognitive strategies score, there was .30 of a standard deviation change in the control of learning beliefs score. In addition, to examine the relationship between types of language learning strategies and test anxiety as a component of motivational self-regulated learning, another stepwise multiple regression procedure was used. Based on the results, the single negative predictor of test anxiety was compensation strategies. The result further indicated that for every one standard deviation change in one's compensation strategies, there will be .23 of a standard deviation negative change in one's test anxiety.

These findings may have theoretical and pedagogical implications for language learners, teachers, and syllabus designers. If teachers and materials developers are cognizant of the nature of the relationships between meta-cognitive and motivational self-regulated learning components and language learning strategy use, they will be better prepared to make more informed decisions about introducing and encouraging the use of certain types of strategies (and probably discouraging the use of certain other less productive or counterproductive strategies) in the classroom, or about using useful instructional books and materials to encourage students to use those language learning strategies which have predictive power on meta-cognitive and motivational self-regulated learning components (task value, control of learning beliefs, and test anxiety). By designing the right kind of materials and adopting the right kinds of teaching activities (which require the students' use of certain strategies), materials developers and teachers may be able to contribute to improving learners' motivation and self-regulation, and by so doing, help improve learners' achievements. The knowledge of how language learning strategies are related to metacognitive and motivational self-regulated learning can also help learners become more self-regulated and motivated. If they know that certain learning strategies are closely connected with being motivated and self-regulated, they will be more open and receptive to those strategies and will avoid resisting to use those strategies. Alternatively, they may come to the realization that some strategies are not very useful in this regard, and that they should not be overused.

Keywords: Language learning strategies, Metacognitive self-regulated learning, Motivational self-regulated learning, Persian as a second language

1. Introduction

There is little denial of the fact that teaching people to catch fish is a more effective help in the long run than simply giving them fish. That is why helping learners to become self-regulated has been a long-standing concern of many teaching practitioners. The trouble is such things are more easily said than done. What makes language learners more self-regulated is not clearly known. One possible way to make learners become more self-regulated is by encouraging them to use the right type of language learning strategies (LLS) (Zarei&Gilanian, 2014a). This, in turn, requires a clear understanding of how LLS are connected to self-regulated learning (SRL). The knowledge of how these two variables are connected can help teachers to make more informed decisions about which strategies to encourage their students to use. Therefore, the main problem this study is concerned with is to find out which of the already identified LLS are more strongly related to SRL.

Although several studies have already been carried out separately on both language learning strategies (Green & Oxford, 1995; Oxford, 1990) and self-regulated learning (Schraw, Crippen & Hartley, 2006; Zarei&Hatami, 2012), there appears to be a shortage of research on how LLS can predict learners' performance the components of SRL including test anxiety, task value, MSRL, and control of learning beliefs. This paucity of research is more specifically noticed in the case of learners of Persian as a Second Language (PSL). The main goal of this study was to address this gap. It addressed the following questions:

1. Are there any meaningful differences among LLSs as predictors of PSL learners' MSRL?
2. Are there any meaningful differences among LLSs as predictors of PSL learners' task value?
3. Are there any meaningful differences among LLSs as predictors of PSL learners' learning beliefs?
4. Are there any meaningful differences among LLSs as predictors of PSL learners' test anxiety?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Theoretical Background

Self-regulated learning (SRL) has been defined as the learners' ability to understand the surrounding environment during the learning process (Schraw, et al., 2006). According to Zimmerman (2000), motivation, meta-cognition, and cognition are among the three necessary self-regulation components. Pintrich, et al. (1993) point out that LRL includes learning strategies as well as motivational self-regulation. Motivational self-regulation (MSR) is divided into both extrinsic and intrinsic goal orientation, learning beliefs, task value, test anxiety, and learning self-efficacy. Learning strategies are also divided into

meta-cognitive and cognitive strategies, and resource management. Moreover, resource management is further divided into peer learning, environmental management, help seeking, and effort management. Finally, cognitive self-regulation is said to include organization, critical thinking, elaboration and rehearsal.

2.1.1 Metacognitive self-regulated learning (MSRL)

According to Babbs and Moe (1983), metacognitive strategies can be described as 'thinking about thinking'. They are strategies which show the way every person analyzes his/her personal habits of thinking. Schraw and Moshman (1995) opine that metacognition includes cognition regulation and knowledge of cognition. Diener and Dweck (1978), Nolen (1988), and Wenden (1987) consider monitoring, planning, revising, evaluating and regulating as the different components of MSRL. In their view,monitoring activities consist of those that are used to regulating one's own learning (Pintrich et al., 1991; Pressley &Ghatala, 1990). They also believe that planning consists of such activities as setting a goal, activating one's background knowledge, and analyzing the task (McKeachie et al., 1986). Evaluation and regulation strategies are used to regulate the learning process of a person and to help them adjust their mental activities in order to achieve the desired learning objectives (Pintrich, 1999)

2.1.2 Motivational self-regulation (MSR)

One of the components of SRL is motivation. It is actually how strongly students believe in their own ability to succeed in their academic career (Baumeister &Vohs, 2007; Nicholls, 1984). Motivation has two components including epistemological beliefs and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Epistemological beliefs are somehow the essence of one's knowledge (Schommer, 1994), and self-efficacy enables students to achieve challenging objectives (Pajares, 1996). According to Pintrich (1989), motivation can have three components consisting of value, expectancy, and affect. The component of value refers to the type of motivation that leads learners to engage themselves in learning activities. The expectancy component focuses enables students to accomplish a task by focusing on their beliefs (Duncan &McKeachie, 2005). The affect component has to do with how the learners respond to test anxiety. According to Pintrich, et al. (1993), the suncomponents of motivational scales include 'test anxiety', learning beliefs control', and 'task value'.

Test anxiety refers to a psychological state that a person experiences while taking a test (Zeidner, 1998). Acoording to the previous literature (Bandalos, et al., 2003; Everson et al., 1991; McKeachie et al., 2004; Pajares& Miller, 1994; VanZile-Tamsen& Livingston, 1999), students who experience

anxiety during tests may not be able to use their self-regulated strategies properly under pressure. As a consequence, their performance may be negatively affected. Several studies have investigated different aspects of test anxiety (Cassady & Johnson, 2002; Morris, et al., 1981; Sarason, 1984; Unruh & Lowe, 2010). Test anxiety has an emotional dimension; this has to do with the psychological reaction of learners to a test (Spielberger &Vagg, 1995). According to Deffenbacher (1980), there may also be a physical reaction which could appear in various ways including increased heartbeat, a feeling of panic, dizziness, etc. Another aspect of test anxiety is 'Worry', which associated with the cognitive aspect of anxiety (Hong, 1998; Lufi et al., 2004; Sharma & Sud, 1990). According to Hembree (1988), this means that students who are cognitively anxious have a ntural tendency to compare themselves with others. As a result, they are usually worried about failure and feel that they are not prepared for tests.

Learning beliefs control has to do with learners' personal beliefs in their own learning process. It is generally believed that an individual's control over their learning beliefs has the potential to play a big role in shaping the person's achievement (McKeachie et al., 1986).

Several reserachers including Eccles et al. (1984), Schunk (1991), Wigfield (1994), Wigfield and Eccles (2000), and Eccles and Wigfield (2002) have pointed out that task value is related to how significant and useful and cost-effective learners believe a task is. Moreover, it has been claimed that those learners who regrd a task as highly significant and useful normally use a wider range of strategies (both metacognitive and congnitive) than those who do not attach a great value to the task (McWhaw&Abrami, 2001; Pokay& Blumenfeld, 1990). The four constructs that are believed to underly task value include intrinsic, attainment, and utilility value, as well as the perceived cost (Battle &Wigfield, 2003). Intrinsic and attainment values have to do with the level of interest an individual has in doing an assigned task and the perceived importance of successfully accomplishing that task, respectively. Utility value is associated with how conducive a task is to fulfilling future objectives. And finally, perceived cost is defined as the learner's attempt (both affective and cognitive) to successfully perform a task.

2.1.3 Language Learning Strategies

Weinstein and Mayer (1986) define learning strategies (LS) as the learners' behaviour that help them to accomplish the learning task. Several studies (e.g, Bremner, 1999; Oxford, 1989) have already confirmed the effective role of LLS in successful language learning. It needs to be noted, of course that there are different types of strategies. Scholars like Rubin (1981) and Oxford (1990) divide LLS into two main types of indirect and direct strategies. Indirect strategies consist of three subclasses including social,

affective, and metacognitive strategies, whereas direct strategies consist of cognitive, compensation and memory strategies.

2.2. Empirical Background

The different components of SRL have been the subject of empirical studies. Neuville et al. (2007) studied how MSR components were linked with students' achievement. They used a self-report questionnaire to collect data. They reported that learners' motivation significantly influenced their SRLS, which in turn, influenced the learners' achievement performance. However, they observed that motivational factors were not differentially effective on the learners' performance. In another study, Zarei (2014) investigated the potential effect of motivation and reading anxiety on the reading strategies choice of EFL learners. He found that both variables significantly affected the learners' use of reading strategies. Meanwhile, Zarei and Gilanian (2014a) found that, of all the LLS, memory strategies had the strongest predictive power over rehearsal SRL, whereas elaboration SRL was best predicted through meta-cognitive, memory and affective strategies.

LLS have also attracted attention in the literature. In one study, the LLS use of EFL students was studied (Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006). The results suggested that higher proficiency level learners used LLS more frequently. Moreover, the findings showed that females used social and affective strategies more frequently than males.

Confirming the result of the above study, Yilmaz's (2010) study also showed that higher level learners made more frequent use affective strategies, which also made them less anxious. In addition, gender was highly influential on strategy use and females employed affective strategies more commonly than males. Zarei and Shahidi Pour (2013a) studied how LLS were related to idioms comprehension. The finding indicated that only affective and cognitive strategies could predict the learners' comprehension of idioms.

Finally, the study of the relationship between LLS and goal-orientation (Zarei&Gilanian, 2014b) showed that cognitive, metacognitive and compensation strategies were all positively related to goal orientation. In the meantime, affective strategies were also significantly and positively associated with extrinsic goal orientation.

3. Method

3.1. Participants

The initial participants of this study included a sample of 161 PSL learners at Imam Khomeini International University in Qazvin. After removing the participants who failed to cooperate fully and to fill all the questionnaires, 141 participants remained, who formed the main participants of the study. All

the participants were taking a course in PSL. Since all the participants had started learning Persian from the beginning at the Persian language center of the university and had undergone the same instructional programme (a six-month long intensive language programme), they were presumed to be at approximately the same language (Persian) proficiency level. They were at approximately intermediate proficiency level. Their age range was between 20 and 32. Their linguistic background varied, but they came mostly from countries like Iraq, Azerbaijan, China, South Korea, Japan, Syria, Lebanon, and central Asian countries.

3.2. Materials and Instruments

The instruments that were used to collect data in this study are described below.

3.2.1. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

To elicit information about the participants' LLS, the Persian translation of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning developed by Oxford (1990) was used. It had 50 items on a 5-point Likert type scale. The scale had six subscales from A to F. Part (subscale) A included 9 items that checked the use of memory strategies. Part B was on cognitive strategies and included 14 items. Part C had 6 items to measure compensation strategies. There were 9 items in Part D to measure learners' metacognitive strategy use. The final two parts (E and F) contained 6 items each and checked the use of affective and social strategies, respectively. Different reliability indices have been reported for the original questionnaire, indicating that the scale is a reliable instrument. Nevertheless, the reliability index of the translated questionnaire in its new context was estimated again using Cronbach's alpha. The outcome showed an index of .86.

3.2.2. Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)

The second instrument was the MSLQ of Pintrich, et al. (1993). The original questionnaire includes 81 items which gauge all the components of self-regulated learning. In this study, only the items that measured MSRL, and MSR (27 items) were used. Six items (items 3, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14) measured task value; four items (items 1, 5, 9, and 12) had to do with control of learning beliefs. Five items were used to measure the participants' test anxiety (items 2, 4, 7, 10, 15). These three parts constituted the subsections of motivational self-regulated learning. The remaining 12 items (items 16 to 27) measured the participants' metacognitive self-regulated learning. Pintrich et al (1993) have

reported internal consistency reliability indices of .90, .68, .80, and .79 for the above sections, respectively. To re-estimate the reliability of the translated version of the questionnaire in its new context, Cronbach's alpha was checked; it was .83.

3.3. Procedure

To address the research questions, the steps described below were taken.
First, the sample was selected based on availability. Next, the SILL was administered. The participants were asked to respond to the questionnaire items by expressing their degree of agreement with each statement on the Likert scale.

Then, the MSLQ was administered to see how the participants used MSRL and some components of MSR (including test anxiety, control of learning beliefs, and task value).
Having collected the data, the researchers summarized and processed the data and submitted the data to a series of multiple regression analyses.

3.4. Data Analysis

Discuss the computer programme(s) and statistical tests you used to analyse the data.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Results4.1. Research Question One

This question examined the relationship between LLS and MSRL. A stepwise multiple regression was used to address this question. The analysis showed that cognitive, meta-cognitive, and compensation strategies were the predictors of MSRL.

Table 1

Model Summary on MSRL

Model	R	Adjusted R Square	Change Statistics		
			R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.470	.216	.221	41.690	.000
2	.518	.258	.047	9.383	.003
3	.555	.294	.040	8.481	.004

Table 1 indicates that MSRL and cognitive strategies have more than 21% of their variance in common. The combination of compensation and cognitive strategies account for about 25% of the total variability in MSRL. The

mentioned strategies coupled with metacognitive strategies together explain around 29% of the variance with MSRL.

In Table 2, the F values and the significance levels indicate that all three models are statistically significant.

Table 2

Results of ANOVAon MSRL

Model		SS	MS	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1175.998	1175.99	41.690	.000
	Residual	4146.551	28.208		
2	Regression	1426.396	713.198	26.726	.000
	Residual	3896.154	26.686		
3	Regression	1641.686	547.229	21.557	.000
	Residual	3680.863	25.385		

Table 3 shows how strongly each of predictors is related to MSRL in each model. The coefficients along with the t-values as well as the error probability of each model are given in the table.

As Table 3 shows, in the initial model, every standard deviation (SD) of change in cognitive strategies goes with .47 SD change in MSRL. Model two indicates that for each SD of change cognitive and compensation strategies, we can expect .35 and .22 SD change in the positive direction in the score of MSRL, respectively. Model 3 also informs us that .25, .20, and .18 SD of change are expected in MSRL score per every unit of SD change in the cognitive, compensation and metacognitive strategies, respectively.

Table 3

Coefficients on MSRL

		Standardized Beta	Unstandardized		t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error		
1	Cognitive	.47	.47	.073	6.45	.000
	Cognitive	.35	.35	.081	4.40	.000
2						
	compensation	. 24	.22	.073	3.06	.003

	Cognitive	.25	.25	.086	2.97	.003
3	Compensation	.23	.20	.071	2.93	.004
	Meta-cognitive	.22	.18	.063	2.91	.004

4.2. Research Question Two

The purpose of this question was to check how LLS were related to the task value component of MSRL. To answer this question, another multiple regression analysis was used. The analysis suggested that affective, metacognitive and memory strategies had a significant relationship with task value and could predict it. Table 4 makes it clear that task value has around 18% of common variance with metacognitive strategies. In the second model, memory and metacognitive strategies collectively account for almost 25% of the variance that is observed in task value. In the third and final model, when memory strategies are added to the previous two types, the three types of strategies together have slightly less than 27% variance in common with task value.

Table 4

Task Value Model Summary

Model	R	Adjusted R Square	Change Statistics		
			R Square Change	F Change	Sig. of F Change
1	.437[a]	.185	.191	34.62	.000
2	.511[b]	.251	.070	13.88	.000 .035
3	.532[c]	.269	.021	4.52	

In Table 5, the F-values and the probability levels suggest in all the three models that the models have reached statistical significance.

Table 5
Task Value ANOVA Results

Model		SS	MS	F	Sig.
1	Regression	561.212	561.212	34.625	.000
	Residual	2382.627	16.208		
2	Regression	768.118	384.059	25.772	.000
	Residual	2175.721	14.902		
3	Regression	834.203	278.068	19.112	.000
	Residual	2109.635	14.549		

In Table 6, the coefficients and the level of significance are given for each model. As it can be seen in the table, for every SD change in metacognitive strategies, .43 of a SD change is expected in the dependent variable. In the second model, every SD change in memory and metacognitive strategies would go with around .28 and .32 of a SD change in task value, respectively. In the third model, with all the three strategy types taken together, for each SD unit change in one's affective, memory and metacognitive strategies score, one would expect to see .16, .25, and .27 of a SD unit change in the score of task value, respectively. In addition, the probability levels indicate the statistical significance of the all coefficients.

Table 6
Task Value Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	Meta-cognitive	.261	.044	.437	5.884	.000
2	Meta-cognitive	.195	.046	.326	4.235	.000
	Memory	.215	.058	.287	3.726	.000
3	Meta-cognitive	.164	.048	.274	3.418	.001
	Memory	.192	.058	.257	3.327	.001
	Affective	.101	.047	.165	2.131	.035

4.3. Research Question Three

The aim of this question was to find out which LLS types predict control of learning beliefs better. To do so, another multiple regression analysis was conducted, the summary of which suggested that the only significant predictor

was metacognitive strategies. According to Table 7, metacognitive strategies have more than 8% of common variance with the predicted variable.

Table 7

Learning Beliefs Model Summary

Model	R	Adjusted R Square	F	Sig
1	.272[a]	.081	13.23	.002

a. Predictor: metacognitive

The ANOVA result on the model suggests that the model has reached statistical significance.

Table 8

Results of ANOVA on Learning Beliefs

Model		SS	MS	F	Sig.
1	Regression	101.220	101.220	14.574	.000
	Residual	1020.968	6.945		

The coefficients were checked to see how strongly the predictor and predicted variables were related. The results are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9

Learning Beliefs Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	Meta-cognitive	.101	.027	.290	3.801	.001

The result of the model summary indicates that for one SD of change in the scores of the predictor variable, .29 of a SD change is expected in the predicted variable. Furthermore, this amount of relationship between the two variables is significant.

4.4. Research Question Four

This final question was intended to examine how types of LLS were related to test anxiety. Like the previous questions, a multiple regression analysis was made use of to address this question. It turned out that the only type of LLS that could predict test anxiety was compensation strategies. According to Table 10, the model summary is indicative of the fact that

compensation strategies have only more than 4% of variance in common with test anxiety.

Table 10

Model Summary on Test Anxiety

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Sig.
1	.232[a]	.054	.047	8.19	.006

The ANOVA results in Table 11 suggest that this regression model is also significant.

Table 11

Results of ANOVA on Test Anxiety

Model		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
1	Regression	101.079	1	101.079	8.210	.005
	Residual	1809.875	147	12.312		

As it can be seen in Table 12, compensation strategies and test anxiety are significantly but negatively related. This means that for every SD positive change in the former, .21 of a SD negative change is expected in the latter.

Table 12

Test Anxiety Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	compensation	-.19	.06	-.210	-2.67	.007

4.2. Discussion

There are areas of similarity as well as disparity between the results obtained in this study and those reported in other studies. One study the finding of which is partially in agreement with our study is that of Zarei and Shahidi Pour (2013a), who observed in their study that cognitive strategies are strongly connected with idioms learning. However, they also reported a negative relationship between the use of affective strategies and the comprehension of idioms. This part of their finding contradicts our finding. In this study, affective strategies were not meaningfully related even to test anxiety, which appears to be an affective trait.

Similar to the finding of our study, suggesting a positive relationship between cognitive strategies and MSRL as well as between the use of affective

strategies and performance on the task value component of MSRL, cognitive and affective strategies have been reported to be meaningfully associated with learners' idiom production (Zarei& Shahidi Pour, 2013b). This finding also seems to confirm the assertion that metacognitive strategies can actually assist language learners to analyze and improve their thinking process and engage themselves more meaningfully and deeply in the learning process (Pintrich& De Groot, 1990).

From another perspective, the findings of this study are compatible with that of Neuville, et al., (2007), who reported that self-regulated learning strategies use can be influenced by motivational attributes. In addition, similar to the results obtained here, they also discovered that task value was meaningfully connected to LLS. At the same time, their findings also deviate from our findings in the sense that in their study motivational variables, although related to LLS, were not meaningfully associated with the learners' achievement performance. Furthermore, the findings of this study also contradict those of Zarei (2014), who found no meaningful relationship between motivation and reading anxiety, on the one hand, and reading anxiety and reading strategies, on the other.

Additional support for the findings of this study comes from studies that have shown LLS to be meaningfully related to cognitive self-regulated learning (Zarei&Gilanian, 2014b). They also found that LLS were related to goal orientation, which is a component of MSR. Moreover, the present findings are in line with those of Pintrich (1989), who also reported a significant relationship between LLS and goal orientation.

Another finding of this study was that compensation strategies were negatively related to test anxiety, and task value was strongly associated with memory, metacognitive and affective strategies. In support of this finding, Yilmaz (2010) also reported a negative relationship between anxiety and affective strategies. Because compensation strategies are normally employed by learners to make up for the gap in their knowledge while communicating with others (Oxford &Crookall, 1989) it could be assumed that frequent use of such strategies might lead to a reduction in the learners' anxiety level, which would, in turn, improve their learning performance. Given this assumption, our finding corroborates that of Yilmaz (2010), who observed that the use of affective strategies was conducive to reducing learners' anxiety and improving their motivation and ability to manage their emotions.

Although a part of our findings was supported by other findings in the literature, they were, nevertheless, contradicted by some others. There are a number of potential factors that might be used to explain the discrepancies between the results of this and other studies in the field. To name only a few, one can mention learners' age, gender, home culture, proficiency level, field of

study, and the social context. For manageability reasons, these variables could not be studied here. However, studies such as Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006) and Yilmaz (2010), among many others, have already provided evidence that the mentioned variables are related to ones covered in this study. What this implies is that such controversial findings call for further research in the hope of resolving these issues and shedding more light on the darker corners of this field of research.

6. Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study contribute to a major theme, namely Turkman students' academic engagement is predicted positively and significantly by their Persian language teachers' nonverbal immediacy and credibility. To put it differently, Persian language teachers' nonverbal immediacy and credibility can remarkably enhance the academic engagement of their Turkman students.

These findings can be beneficial for Persian language teachers who teach Persian as the second language to speakers of other languages, notably Turkman students. If Persian language learners consider their teachers as credible, their motivation to engage with language learning activities improves. Hence, Persian language teachers are highly recommended to behave in a manner to be considered as a trustworthy and attentive instructor.

Additionally, in order to decrease the negative reactions of Turkman students against the use of teachers' corrective feedback, Persian language teachers are strongly advised to use some nonverbal actions such as smiling, moving around the classroom, and using gestures while communicating with their pupils. Employing these nonverbal actions, they can also enhance the psychological closeness between themselves and their students, which significantly lead to students' academic engagement. A higher degree of L2 learners' academic engagement can improve their ability to communicate in the target language, which is the main objective of second language learning (Amiryousefi & Mirkhani, 2019; Fallah, 2014; Khajavy et al., 2016). Additionally, the outputs of this research can be informative for Persian language teacher educators. They should put emphasis on the importance of teachers' interpersonal variables, notably nonverbal immediacy and credibility to help Persian language teachers increase the amount of their L2 learners' academic engagement.

Future studies on Persian language learners' academic engagement are expected to investigate the role of other interpersonal variables of Persian language teachers, including teacher stroke, teacher caring, and teacher resilience. Moreover, the present research can be replicated with speakers of other languages such as Baluchi, Turkish, Kurdish, and Kazakh to understand whether similar findings can be found. In addition, this research study was purely quantitative; hence, further studies are recommended to include some interviews to attain more comprehensive results.

References

Babbs, P. J., & Moe, A. J. (1983). Metacognition: A key for independent learning from text. The Reading Teacher, 36(4), 422-426.

Bandalos, D. L., Finney, S. J., &Geske, J. A. (2003). A model of statistics performance based on achievement goal theory. Journal of Educational Psychology, 95(3), 604-616.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191-215.

Battle, A., &Wigfield, A. (2003). College women's value orientations toward family, career, and graduate school. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62(1), 56-75.

Baumeister, R. F., &Vohs, K. D. (2007).Self-regulation, ego depletion, and motivation. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 1(1), 115-128.

Bremner, S. (1999). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: Investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. Canadian Modern Language Review, 55(4), 490-514.

Cassady, J. C., & Johnson, R. E. (2002).Cognitive test anxiety and academic performance.Contemporary Educational Psychology, 27(2), 270-295.

Deffenbacher, J. L. (1980). Worry and emotionality in test anxiety. In I. G. Sarason, (Ed.), Test anxiety: Theory, research, and applications (pp. 111–124). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Diener, C. I., & Dweck, C. S. (1978). An analysis of learned helplessness: Continuous changes in performance, strategy, and achievement cognitions following failure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36(5), 451–462.

Duncan, T. G., &Mesachie, W. J. (2005).The making of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire. Educational Psychologist, 40(2), 117-128.

Eccles, J. S., Adler, T., &Meece, J. L. (1984). Sex differences in achievement: A test of alternate theories. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46(1), 26-43.

Eccles, J. S., &Wigfield, A. (2002).Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. Annual Review of Psychology, 53, 109-132.

Everson, H. T., Millsap, R. E., & Rodriguez, C. M. (1991).Isolating gender differences in test anxiety: A confirmatory factor analysis of the Test Anxiety Inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51(1), 243-251.

Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. (1995).Acloser look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. TESOL Quarterly, 29 (2), 261-297.

Hembree, R. (1988). Correlates, causes, and treatment of test anxiety. Review of Educational Research, 58(1), 47–77.

Hong, E. (1998). Differential stability of individual differences in state and trait test anxiety. Learning and Individual Differences, 10(1), 51-69.

Hong-Nam, K., &Leavell, A. G. (2006).Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. Science Direct, 34, 399-415.

Lufi, D., Okasha, S., & Cohen, A. (2004). Test anxiety and its effect on the personality of students with learning disabilities. Learning Disability Quarterly, 27(3), 176-184.

McKeachie, W. J., Lin, Y., & Middleton, M. J. (2004). Two types of low test-anxious (low worry) students. Counseling & Clinical Psychology Journal, 1(3), 141-152.

McKeachie, W. J., Pintrich, P. R., Lin, Y., & Smith, D. A. F. (1986).Teaching and learning in the college classroom: A review of the research literature. Ann

Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

McWhaw, K., &Abrami, P.C. (2001). Student goal orientation and interest: Effects on students' use of self-regulated learning strategies. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26(3), 311-329.

Morris, L. W., Davis, M. A., & Hutchings, C. H. (1981). Cognitive and emotional components of anxiety: Literature review and a revised worry-emotionality scale. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73(4), 541–555.

Neuville, S., Frenay, M., & Bourgeois, E. (2007). Task value, self-efficacy and goal orientations: Impact on self-regulated learning, choice and performance among university students. PsychologicaBelgica, 47(1), 95-117.

Nicholls, J.G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. Psychological Review, 91(3), 328-346.

Nolen, S. (1988). Reasons for studying: Motivational orientations and study strategies. Cognition and Instruction, 5 (4) 269–287.

Oxford, R. L. (1989). Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implication for strategy training. System, 17(2), 235-247.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language learning strategies. What every teacher should know. New York: Newbury House.

Oxford, R. L., &Crookall, D. (1989). Research on language learning strategies: methods, findings, and instructional issues. Modern Language Journal, 73(4), 404-419.

Oxford, R. L., &Nyikos, M (1989).Variable affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. The Modern Language Journal, 73(3), 291-300.

Pajares, F. (1996).Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. Review of Educational Research, 66(4), 543–578.

Pajares, F., & Miller, M. (1994). The role of self-efficacy and self-concept beliefs in mathematical problem-solving: A path analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 86(2), 193-203.

Pintrich, P. R. (1989). The dynamic interplay of student motivation and cognition in the college classroom. In C. Ames, & M. L. Maehr (Eds.).Advances in Motivation and Achievement: Motivation-enhancing Environments (pp.117-160). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Pintrich, P. R. (1999). The role of motivation in promoting and sustaining self-regulated learning. International Journal of Educational Research, 31 (6), 459-470.

Pintrich, P. R. (2000a). Multiple goals, multiple pathways: The role of goal orientation in learning and achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 92(3), 544–555.

Pintrich, P. R. (2003). A motivational science perspective on the role of student motivation in learning and teaching contexts. Journal of Educational Psychology, 95(4), 667–686.

Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(1), 33-40.

Pintrich, P. R., McKeachie, W. J., & Lin, Y. G. (1987). Teaching a course in learning to learn. Teaching of Psychology, 14(2), 81–86.

Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A. F., Garcia, T., &Mckeachie, W. J. (1993). Reliability and predictive validity of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ). Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53(3), 801-813.

Pokay, P., & Blumenfeld, P. C. (1990).Predicting achievement early and late in the semester: The role of motivation and use of learning strategies. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(1), 41-50.

Pressley, M., &Ghatala, E. S. (1990). Self-regulated learning: Monitoring learning from text. Educational Psychologist, 25(1), 19–33.

Rubin, J. (1981). Study of cognitive processes in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, II (2), 117-131.

Sarason, I. G. (1984). Stress, anxiety, and cognitive interference: Reactions to Tests. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46(4), 929–938.

Schommer, M. (1994).Synthesizing epistemological belief research: Tentative understandings and provocative confusions. Educational Psychology Review, 6(4), 293–319.

Schraw, G., Crippen, K.J. & Hartley, K. (2006).Promoting self-regulation in science education: Metacognition as part of a broader perspective on learning. Research in Science Education, 36, 111-139.

Schraw, G., &Moshman, D. (1995).Meta-cognitive theories. Educational Psychology Review, 7(4), 351–371.

Schunk, D. H. (1991).Self-efficacy and academic motivation. Educational Psychologist, 26, 207-231.

Sharma, S., &Sud, A. (1990). Examination stress and test anxiety: A cross-cultural perspective. Psychology & Developing Societies, 2(2), 183-201.

Spielberger, C. D., &Vagg, P. R. (1995). Test anxiety: A transactional process model. In C. D. Spielberger & P. R. Vagg (Eds.), Test anxiety: Theory, assessment and treatment (pp. 3-14). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.

Unruh, S. M. & Lowe, P. A. (2010). The development and validation of a Spanish language version of the test anxiety inventory for children and adolescents. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 32(1), 164-183.

Van Zile-Tamsen, C., & Livingston, J. (1999).The differential impact of motivation on the self-regulated strategy use of high- and low-achieving college students. Journal of College Student Development, 40(1), 54-60.

Weinstein, C., & Mayer, R. E. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 315-327). New York: Macmillan.

Wenden, A. (1987). Metacognition: An Expanded view on the cognitive abilities of L2 learners. Language Learning, 37(4), 573-597.

Wigfield, A. (1994). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation: A developmental perspective. Educational Psychology Review, 6(1), 49-78.

Wigfield, A., &Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25, 68-81.

Yilmaz, 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(2), 682-687.

Zarei, A. A. (2014). The effect of reading anxiety and motivation on EFL learners' choice of reading strategies. Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 1(1), 12-28.

Zarei, A. A., &Azin, Z. (2013a). Multiple intelligences as predictors of resource management and motivational self-regulated learning. International Journal of Applied Linguistic studies (IJALS), 2(2), 48-54.

Zarei, A. A., &Azin, Z. (2013b). Multiple Intelligences as predictors of cognitive and metacognitive self-regulated learning. International Journal of Management and Humanity Sciences, 2(S), 844-853.

Zarei, A. A., &Gilanian, M. (2014a). On the relationship between cognitive self-regulated learning and language learning strategies. Journal of Social Issues & Humanities, 2(12), 200-209.

Zarei, A. A., &Gilanian, M. (2014b). Language learning strategies as predictors of goal orientation. International Journal of Applied Linguistic Studies (IJALS), 3(1), 8-19.

Zarei, A. A., &Hatami, G. (2012). On the relationship between self-regulated learning components and L2 vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2 (9), 1939-1944.

Zarei, A. A. & Shahidi Pour, V. (2013a). Language learning strategies as predictors of L2 idioms comprehension. International Journal of Language Learning and applied Linguistics Word (IJLALW), 4(2), 313-330.

Zarei, A. A. &ShahidiPour, V. (2013b).Language learning strategies as predictors of L2 idioms production. In S. O'Neill, & A. Maleki (Eds.), Advances in TESOL for 21st century practitioners, leaders, learners and strategies (pp. 145-156). Brisbane: Adam House Press.

Zeidner, M. (1998). Test anxiety: The state of the art. New York: Plenum Press.

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. 13-40). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Appendices

Appendix A: Strategies Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (The English Version)

Introduction: Please answer to the following questions according to your true cases from 1 (Never or almost never true of me) to 5 (always or almost always true of me).

(1. Never true of me 2. Rarely true of me 3. Sometimes true of me 4. Often true of me 5. Always true of me)

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
	Part A	1	2	3	4	5
1	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.					
2	I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.					
3	I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.					
4	I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.					
5	I use rhymes to remember new English words.					
6	I use flashcards to remember new English words.					
7	I physically act out new English words.					
8	I review English lessons often.					
9	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.					
	Part B					
10	I say or write new English words several times.					
11	I try to talk like native English speakers.					
12	I practice the sounds of English.					
13	I use the English words I know in different ways.					
14	I start conversations in English.					
15	I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.					

16	I read for pleasure in English.					
17	I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.					
18	I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.					
19	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.					
20	I try to find patterns in English.					
21	I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.					
22	I try not to translate word-for-word.					
23	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.					
	Part C					
24	To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.					
25	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.					
26	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.					
27	I read English without looking up every new word.					
28	I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.					
29	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.					
	Part D					
30	I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.					
31	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.					
32	I pay attention when someone is speaking English.					
33	I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.					
34	I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.					
35	I look for people I can talk to in English.					
36	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.					

37	I have clear goals for improving my English skills.					
38	I think about my progress in learning English.					
	Part E					
39	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.					
40	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.					
41	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.					
42	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.					
43	I write down my feelings in a language-learning diary.					
44	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.					
	Part F					
45	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.					
46	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.					
47	I practice English with other students.					
48	I ask for help from English speakers.					
49	I ask questions in English.					
50	I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.					

Appendix B: Strategies Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (The Persian Version)

پرسشنامه راهکارهای یادگیری زبان

دستورالعمل: لطفا به سوالات زیر باتوجه به مواردی که در مورد شما صدق می کند پاسخ دهید. موارد داده شده از گزینه ۱(هرگز یا تقریبا هرگز در مورد من درست نیست) تا گزینه ۵ (همیشه یا تقریبا همیشه در مورد من صادق است) می باشد.

(۱. هرگز در مورد من درست نیست. ۲. بندرت در مورد من صادق است. ۳. گاهی اوقات در مورد من درست است. ۴. اغلب در مورد من صدق می کند. ۵.همیشه در مورد من درست است.)

بخش ۱

۱. در مورد رابطه بین آنچه که از قبل می دانستم و موارد جدیدی که در زبان فارسی یاد می گیرم، فکر می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۲. با بکارگیری لغات جدید زبان فارسی در جمله می توانم آنها را به خاطر بسپارم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۳. برقرای رابطه بین صدای یک کلمه جدید فارسی با تصویر یا عکس آن به من کمک می کند تا آن کلمه را به خاطر بسپارم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۴. با ایجاد تصویر ذهنی در موقعیتی که کلمه ممکن است در آن استفاده شود، کلمه جدید زبان فارسی را به خاطر می سپارم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۵. از شعر برای به خاطر سپردن کلمات جدید فارسی استفاده می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۶. از فلش کارت برای به خاطر سپردن کلمات جدید فارسی استفاده می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۷. ادای کلمات جدید فارسی را عینا در می آورم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۸. اغلب دروس فارسی را مرور می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۹. کلمات و عبارات جدید فارسی را با به خاطر سپردن جای آنها در صفحه، روی تابلو، یا علائم خیابانی یاد می گیرم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

بخش ۲

۱۰. کلمات جدید فارسی را چندین بار می نویسم یا تکرار می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۱۱. سعی می کنم شبیه فارسی زبانها صحبت کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

اوقات

۱۲. صداهای فارسی را تمرین می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۱۳. کلمات فارسی را که یادگرفته ام، به شیوه های مختلف استفاده می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۱۴. مکالمات را به زبان فارسی شروع می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۱۵. برنامه های تلویزیونی که به زبان فارسی هستند را تماشا می کنم یا به به سینماهایی که فیلم فارسی پخش می کنند می روم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۱۶. از خواندن فارسی لذت می برم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۱۷. یاداشت، پیغام، نامه، یا گزارشها را به زبان فارسی می نویسم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۱۸. متن فارسی را ابتدا بطور سطحی می خوانم (کل متن را با سرعت می خوانم) سپس برمی گردم و با دقت می خوانم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۱۹. در زبان خود به جستجوی معادلهای مشابه برای کلمات جدید در زبان فارسی می پردازم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۲۰. سعی می کنم الگوهایی را در زبان فارسی پیدا کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۲۱. به معنی یک کلمه فارسی با تقیسم کردن آن به قسمتهایی که برایم قابل فهم است، پی می برم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۲۲. سعی می کنم لفظ به لفظ ترجمه نکنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۲۳. اطلاعاتی را که شنیده یا خوانده ام را به فارسی خلاصه می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

بخش ۳

۲۴. به منظور فهمیدن کلمات نا آشنا معنی آنها را حدس می زنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۲۵. زمانی که در خلال مکالمه نتوانم معادل فارسی کلمه ای را به یاد آورم، از ایما و اشاره استفاده می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۲۶. اگرمعادل فارسی درست کلمات را ندانم، کلمات جدیدی را می سازم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۲۷. بدون اینکه به جستجوی هر کلمه جدید در کتاب لغت بپردازم، فارسی می خوانم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۲۸. سعی می کنم آنچه را که دیگران به زبان فارسی خواهند گفت را حدس بزنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۲۹. اگر نتوانم یک کلمه فارسی را به یاد بیاورم، از کلمه یا عبارتی که همان معنی را داشته باشد استفاده می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

بخش ۴

۳۰. سعی می کنم تا آنجا که می توانم روش های زیادی را برای استفاده از زبان فارسی پیدا کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۳۱. متوجه اشتباهاتم در زبان فارسی هستم و بکاربردن این اطلاعات به من کمک می کند تا عملکرد بهتری داشته باشم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۳۲. وقتی دیگران فارسی صحبت می کنند، به آنها توجه می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۳۳. به دنبال راهی هستم که زبان آموز بهتری بشوم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهیاوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۳۴. از آنجا که برنامه زمانی برای خود طراحی می کنم، فرصت کافی برای مطالعه زبان فارسی خواهم داشت.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۳۵. به دنبال افرادی می گردم که بتوانم با آنها فارسی صحبت کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۳۶. به دنبال فرصت هایی هستم که تا آنجایی که امکان دارد، فارسی بخوانم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۳۷. اهداف آشکاری برای پیشرفت مهارتهای زبان فارسی خود دارم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۳۸. پیشرفت خود در یادگیری زبان فارسی را بررسی می کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

بخش ۵

۳۹. سعی می کنم که هر وقت در استفاده از زبان فارسی دچار ترس شدم، آرامش خود را حفظ کنم.

۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۴۰. سعی می کنم حتی وقتی که از اشتباه کردن هراس دارم، خود را به فارسی صحبت کردن ترغیب کنم.
۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۴۱. هر گاه عملکردم در فارسی خوب باشد به خود پاداش یا جایزه می دهم.
۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۴۲. متوجه مواقعی که در هنگام مطالعه یا استفاده زبان فارسی دچار استرس و هیجان می شوم، هستم.
۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۴۳. احساساتم را در خاطرات روزانه یادگیری زبان خود یادداشت می کنم.
۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۴۴. با دیگران در مورد اینکه به هنگام یادگیری زبان فارسی چه احساسی دارم، صحبت می کنم.
۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

بخش ۶

۴۵. اگر مطلبی را در زبان فارسی متوجه نشم از دیگران می خواهم تا آن را مجددا و به آرامی بگویند.
۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۴۶. از افراد فارسی زبان تقاضا می کنم تا به هنگام صحبت کردن اشتباهات من را تصحیح کنند.
۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۴۷. با سایر دانشجویان فارسی تمرین می کنم.
۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۴۸. از افراد فارسی زبان تقاضای کمک می کنم.
۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۴۹. به زبان فارسی سوالات خود را می پرسم.
۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

۵۰. سعی می کنم در مورد فرهنگ فارسی زبانان مطلع شوم.
۱. هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. همیشه

Appendix C: Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) (The English Version)

Instructions: Please answer to the following questions according to your true cases from 1 (Never or almost never true of me) to 5 (always or almost always true of me).

1. If I study in appropriate ways, then I will be able to learn the material in this course.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
2. When I take a test I think about how poorly I am doing compared with other students.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
3. I think I will be able to use what I learn in this course in other courses.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
4. When I take a test I think about items on other parts of the test I can't answer.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
5. It is my own fault if I don't learn the material in this course.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
6. It is important for me to learn the course material in this class.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
7. When I take tests, I think of the consequences of failing.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
8. I am very interested in the content area of this course.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
9. If I try hard enough, then I will understand the course material.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
10. I have an uneasy, upset feeling when I take an exam.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
11. I think the course material in this class is useful for me to learn.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
12. If I don't understand the course material, it is because I didn't try hard enough.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
13. I like the subject matter of this course.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
14. Understanding the subject matter of this course is very important to me.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
15. I feel my heart beating fast when I take an exam.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
16.During class time I often miss important points because I'm thinking of other things.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
17. When reading for this course, I make up questions to help focus my reading.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
18. When I become confused about something I'm reading for this class, I go back and try to figure it out.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
19. If course readings are difficult to understand, I change the way I read the material.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
20. Before I study new course material thoroughly, I often skim it to see how it is organized.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
21. I ask myself questions to make sure I understand the material I have been studying in this class.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
22. I try to change the way I study in order to fit the course requirements and the instructor's teaching style.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
23. I often find that I have been reading for this class but don't know what it was all about.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
24. I try to think through a topic and decide what I am supposed to learn from it rather than just reading it over when studying for this course.

1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
25. When studying for this course I try to determine which concepts I don't understand well.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
26. When I study for this class, I set goals for myself in order to direct my activities in each study period.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always
27. If I get confused taking notes in class, I make sure I sort it out afterwards.
1) almost never 2) seldom 3) sometimes 4) often 5) almost always

Appendix D: Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) (The Persian Version)

پرسشنامه راهبردهای انگیزشی و خود تنظیمی فراشناختی (MSLQ)

دستورالعمل: لطفا به سوالات زیر باتوجه به مواردی که در مورد شما صدق می کند پاسخ دهید. موارد داده شده از گزینه ۱(هرگز یا تقریبا هرگز در مورد من درست نیست) تا گزینه ۵ (همیشه یا تقریبا همیشه در مورد من صادق است) می باشد.

۱. اگر به روشهای مناسبی مطالعه کنم، می توانم مطالب این درس را یاد بگیرم.
۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۲. وقتی امتحان می دهم به این فکر می کنم که در مقایسه با سایر دانشجویان چه اندازه ضعیف تر عمل کرده ام.
۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۳. فکر می کنم آنچه را که در این درس یاد گرفتم می توانم در دروس دیگر استفاده کنم.
۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۴. وقتی امتحان می دهم به سوالات دیگری فکر می کنم که نتوانستم جواب دهم.
۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۵. اگر مطلبی را دراین درس یاد نگیرم، مقصر خود من هستم.
۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۶. برایم مهم است که مطالب درسی را در این کلاس یاد بگیرم.
۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۷. وقتی امتحان می دهم به این نتیجه که ممکن است در امتحان موفق نشوم، فکر می کنم.
۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۸. به حوزه محتوایی این درس بسیار علاقه مند هستم.
۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۹. اگر به اندازه کافی، سخت تلاش کنم، مطالب درسی را خواهم فهمید.
۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۱۰. وقتی امتحان دارم احساس ناراحتی و اضطراب می کنم.
۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۱۱. فکر می کنم مطالب درسی در این کلاس برای یادگیری من مفید هستند.
۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۱۲. اگر مطالب درسی را متوجه نشوم به این علت است که سخت تلاش نکرده ام.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۱۳. مطالب و موضوعات این درس را دوست دارم.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۱۴. فهمیدن موضوع و مطالب این درس برایم بسیار مهم است.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۱۵. وقتی امتحان دارم احساس می کنم ضربان قلبم تند می شود.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۱۶. در طی زمان کلاس اغلب نکات مهم را از دست می دهم زیرا به چیز های دیگری فکر می کنم.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۱۷. وقتی این درس را می خوانم، سوالاتی مطرح می کنم که به من کمک می کنند تا روی خواندنم تمرکز کنم.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۱۸. هر وقت در فهم چیزهایی که برای این کلاس می خوانم دچار اشتباه می شوم. به عقب برمی گردم و سعی می کنم که آنها را بفهمم.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۱۹. اگر فهمیدن آنچه که در این درس می خوانم، مشکل شود، روشم را در خواندن مطالب تغییر می دهم.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۲۰. قبل ا ز اینکه مطالب درسی را به طور کامل بخوانم، اغلب آن را به طور سطحی می خوانم تا بفهمم که به چه شکل سازماندهی شده است.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۲۱. از خود سوالاتی می پرسم تا مطمئن شوم مطالبی را که در کلاس مطالعه کرده ام، فهمیده ام.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۲۲. سعی می کنم روشی مطالعه خود را تغییر دهم تا مناسب نیازهای درسی و شیوه آموزشی مدرس گردد.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۲۳. اغلب متوجه این موضوع می شوم که آنچه را که برای این کلاس خوانده ام بطور کامل درک نکرده ام.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۲۴. سعی می کنم به جای اینکه فقط در طول مطالعه این درس سرفصل را بخوانم، به آن فکر کنم و در مورد اینکه قرار است چه چیزی را بیاموزم، تصمیم بگیرم.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۲۵. وقتی این درس را مطالعه می کنم، سعی می کنم تا مفاهیمی را که متوجه نمی شوم، مشخص کنم.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۲۶. زمانی که برای این کلاس مطالعه می کنم، اهدافی را برای خود تعیین می کنم تا بتوانم برفعالیت های خود در هر دوره مطالعاتی نظارت داشته باشم.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

۲۷. اگر برای یادداشت برداری در کلاس دچار اشتباه شوم، مطمئن هستم که بعدا می توانم آن را رفع کنم.

۱. تقریبا هرگز ۲. بندرت ۳. گاهی اوقات ۴. اغلب ۵. تقریبا همیشه

Acknowledgements

The present researchers would like to express their sincere gratitude to all the participants at Imam Khomeini International University who cooperated in the data gathering process. We would also like to thank the instructors of the classes for kindly agreeing to dedicate a part of their class time to this research.

پژوهش‌نامه‌ی آموزش زبان فارسی به غیر فارسی‌زبانان(علمی-پژوهشی)
سال دهم، شماره‌ی اول (پیاپی۲۱)، بهار و تابستان ۱۴۰۰
شاپا چاپی: ۵۳۹۴-۲۳۲۲
شاپا الکترونیکی: ۲۳۵۴-۲۶۷۶

رابطه بین راهبردهای زبان آموزی و یادگیری خود تنظیم انگیزشی و فراشناختی: ویژه زبان آموزان فارسی بعنوان زبان دوم(پژوهشی)

عباسعلی زارعی[۱]
نویسنده‌ی مسئول، دانشیار زبان انگلیسی، دانشگاه بین المللی امام خمینی (ره)
محبوبه گیلانیان[۲]
دانش آموخته‌ی کارشناسی ارشد زبان انگلیسی، پژوهشگر آزد

چکیده

این پژوهش با هدف بررسی رابطه بین راهبردهای زبان آموزی و یادگیری خودتنظیمی انگیزشی و فراشنختی زبان آموزان فارسی بعنوان زبان دوم انجام شد. به این منظور، تعداد ۱۴۹ فارسی آموز غیر ایرانی (دختر و پسر) در مقطع کارشناسی در دانشگاه بین المللی امام خمینی بر اساس قابلیت دسترسی انتخاب شدند. از این افراد خواسته شد به دو پرسشنامه راهبردهای زبان آموزی (SILL) و راهبردهای انگیزشی برای یادگیری (MSLQ) پاسخ دهند. داده های به دست آمده با بکار گیری فرایند رگراسیون چندگانه مرحله ای مورد پردازش قرار گرفت. نتایج نشان داد که از میان راهبرد های فراگیری زبان، راهبردهای شناختی، جبرانی و فراشناختی به گونه ای معنا دار در پیش بینی یادگیری خود تنظیمی فراشناختی نقش داشتند. همچنین مشخص شد راهبردهای فراشناختی، حافظه ای و عاطفی در پیش بینی ارزش عملکرد نقش معنا داری دارند. یافته ها همچنین حاکی از آن بود که بین راهبردهای فراشناختی و اعتقاد به کنترل یادگیری رابطه ای معنادار وجود دارد. علاوه بر این، مشخص شد که تنها عاملی که به گونه ای معنادار اضطراب در آزمون را پیش بینی می کند و با آن رابطه منفی دارد، راهبرد های جبرانی است. این یافته ها می تواند برای فراگیران، معلمان و تهیه کنندگان مطالب درسی کاربری داشته باشد.

کلیدواژه‌ها: راهبردهای زبان آموزی، یادگیری خودتنظیمی فراشناختی، یادگیری خودتنظیمی انگیزشی، فارسی بعنوان زبان دوم

تاریخ دریافت مقاله: ۱۳۹۸/۰۳/۰۵ تاریخ پذیرش نهایی مقاله: ۱۳۹۸/۰۸/۲۰
۱. رایانامه: a.zarei@hum.ikiu.ac.ir
۰۲ رایانامه: aazarei@yahoo.com
شناسه دیجیتال: 10.30479/jtpsol.2021.10781.1440
صص: ۱۳۰-۱۰۱