Self-regulated Learning Strategies, Achievement Goals and Listening Achievement of Iranian EFL Learners

Alieh Nasrollahi-Mouziraji, Ph.D. Candidate, Faculty of English Language and Literature, Department of English, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
nasrollahi.alieh@yahoo.com
Parviz Birjandi (Corresponding author), Professor, Faculty of English Language and Literature, Department of English, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
parvizbirjandi2002@gmail.com

Abstract
Developing self-regulated learners has been the life-long ambition of different stakeholders in education. This study was set out to find the relationships between self-regulated strategies as defined by time and resource management, cognitive and metacognitive strategies, achievement goals classified as mastery, performance-approach and performance-avoidance, and the listening achievement of EFL learners. Two hundred and fifty five Iranian high-intermediate EFL learners attending Iran Language Institute of Mazandaran were randomly selected. Correlational analysis of the data demonstrated that self-regulated strategies were significantly correlated with mastery goal orientation and listening achievement of the learners. Performance-approach goal orientation was neither correlated with these strategies nor with mastery goal orientation. It only showed a significant negative correlation with performance-avoidance goal orientation. The findings are in congruence with the assumptions made in social cognitive theory of learning, expectancy-value theory and the model of self-regulated learning developed by Pintrich and De Groot (1990).

Keywords: listening achievement, mastery goals, performance-approach goals, performance-avoidance goals, self-regulated learning strategies

Introduction

Learning a foreign language is a great undertaking for the students and diverse factors might contribute to the success of the learners. Extensive research has been carried out to find out the causes behind the difficulties faced by such students and to provide an efficient way to help these struggling students in their quest for mastering English. One of the areas of research that has gained special attention in recent years has been self-regulated learning (SRL). Many researchers (Ames, 1992; Boekaerts, 1999; Zimmerman, 2001) have referred to the students' self-regulatory capacity as an important predictor of their academic achievement.

Self-regulated learning refers to the active participation of individuals in the learning process. It has been identified to conjoin three major constructs: metacognition, cognition, and resource management (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990). A self-regulated individual makes use of different metacognitive strategies for planning and monitoring, cognitive strategies used to learn, remember, and understand the material and time and effort management. From a social cognitive learning theory perspective, self-regulation is defined as the degree to which students are "metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally active participants in their own learning process" (Zimmerman, 1989, p.1). Self-regulation is developed as a result of the interrelationships among these major constructs: motivation, cognition, and environment.

Although there are a tremendous number of definitions for self-regulated learning, most of them include references to different strategies used by self-regulated learners which are so

important especially for classroom practice. The classification followed in this study is that of Pintrich (1999) who classifies self-regulated learning strategies into three categories as meta-cognitive learning strategies, cognitive learning strategies, and resource management strategies.

An extended body of research indicates the consistent relationship of SRL to numerous motivational beliefs (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2008; Zimmerman, 2011). Accordingly, in order to find better ways to improve students' cognitive engagement and their academic performance in classes, it is important to identify personal characteristics which are linked to self-regulated learning and delve into the individual differences in student motivation which might eventually influence their self-regulated learning.

While surveying the state of research in self-regulated learning as a motivationally driven process, the gap was felt in our understanding of how motivation relates to self-regulation and EFL achievement, in general, and EFL listening skill, in particular. Listening comprehension is the least explicit and the most difficult language skill to tackle with. Despite a multitude of research in areas such as reading, mathematics and sports, surprisingly, there has been little research conducted to evaluate the cognitive, behavioral, and motivational learning strategies of EFL students in listening. The need to cover such a gap is in concert with recent trends in applied linguistics which consider listening as an active process "in which individuals focus on selected aspects of aural input, construct meaning from passages, and relate what they hear to existing knowledge" (O'Malley, Chamot, & Kupper, 1989, p. 418). In order to help language learners to listen more competently and to maximize the efficiency of listening instruction in both EFL and ESL settings, recent studies have focused on the ways skillful listeners process oral input and spoken message. Highly proficient English learners believe that listening strategies are essential in their listening comprehension. The findings show that both cognitive and affective factors influence the way listeners manage their listening task and overcome its difficulty.

Review of Literature

Self-regulation and Listening Achievement

Among the very limited studies conducteded relating the listeners' use of different learning strategies, different motivational beliefs and listening performance, Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, and Tafaghodtari (2006) came up with the conclusion that listening tasks which help students deal with the process of listening, by involving them in the different stages of prediction, monitoring, evaluation and problem-solving, can assist listeners to develop the meta-cognitive and strategic knowledge essential for developing a self-regulated listener. Mareschal (2007) investigated the interrelationships between language learners' meta-cognitive awareness, self-regulatory abilities, listening comprehension strategy use, and the overall success in listening comprehension. The results indicated strong interrelationships between these factors. That is to say when listeners have self-regulatory abilities and metacognitive awareness about listening, they use listening comprehension strategies successfully and that result in their overall success in listening comprehension.

Fatemi, Alishahi, Noori Khorasani, and Seifi (2014) investigated the relationship between EFL learners' listening comprehension and their self-regulation. The results of Pearson correlation coefficient indicated a statistically significant relationship between the two variables.

In an attempt to explore the relationship between metacognitive strategy use, motivation and listening performance, Baleghizadeh and Rahimi (2011) also conducted a study on 82 EFL learners in Iran. The results of their study revealed that the correlations between meta-cognitive strategy use and listening performance was statistically significant.

Latifi, Tavakoli, and Dabaghi (2014) examined the influence of a self-regulatory approach on the enhancement of listening comprehension ability. The results demonstrated that both high and low skilled participants improved significantly. Besides, the researcher found that low skilled experimental group performed better.

In an attempt to examine the effect of meta-cognitive instruction on the listening performance, and meta-cognitive awareness of EFL learners, Bozorgian (2012) conducted a study on a group of high-intermediate learners in Iran. The participants went through a ten-week intervention program in meta-cognition, which focused on planning, monitoring, and evaluation. The results showed that metacognitive instruction helped high-intermediate learners develop their listening performance, but there was no immediate enhancement in their meta-cognitive awareness in listening as a result of meta-cognitive instruction.

Except few studies mentioned above, studies on the relationship between self-regulatory ability and listening comprehension are few and far between; hence, there is a need for more comprehensive pieces of research in different contexts.

Self-regulation and achievement goals

Goal orientation, the term mostly used to refer to achievement goals, has recently attracted the attention of motivation theorists. Early studies took a dichotomous perspective (Dweck & Elliot, 1983; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Nicholls, 1984, Ames 1992) with different labels used to refer to these distinctions. Matery and performance are the terms mostly found in referring to these classifications in self-regulation literature. Later, further details were added by dividing each classification into approach and avoidance dimensions. This study was reolved around a trichotomous framework, namely, mastery, performance-approach and performance-avoidance proposed by Elliot (1999).

An extensive body of literature suggests that mastery goal orientation has a direct and positive relationship with the use of self-regulation strategies. Mirhassani, Akbari, and Dehghan (2007) examined the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' goal-orientation and self-regulated learning and their language proficiency. They found that there was a significant relationship between goal-oriented learning and language proficiency. Besides, significant relationship between self-regulated learning and language proficiency was proved.

In another study, Kitsantas, Steen, and Huio (2009) set out to explore the role of self-regulated learning strategies and goal orientation in predicting academic achievement. The finding shed light on the fact that self-regulated strategies and goal orientation could predict students' achievement significantly.

Al khatib (2010) also based on the results of his study suggested that intrinsic goal orientation, meta-cognitive, self-efficacy, test anxiety, and self-regulated learning positively predict learners' performance while task value, control beliefs, and extrinsic goal orientation could not significantly predict learners' performance.

Shabani and Mohammadian (2014) investigated the direction of the relationship between goal orientation, meta-cognitive awareness, and critical thinking in order to discover the effects of these three constructs on students' self-regulation. The finding of their study illustrated that even though all four constructs were highly correlated, only two variables, namely goal orientation and meta-cognitive awareness can predict subsequent self-regulation.

The kind of goal which has been reported to have the most significant contribution to achievement-related behavior is mastery or intrinsic goal orientation. Pintrich and DeGroot (1990) found that the learners who select mastery goal orientations show higher levels of cognitive and metacognitive strategies than those who focus on proving their abilities to others or

avoiding the perception of incompetence. Middleton and Midgley (1997) examined the relationship between 703 sixth-graders' self-efficacy, self-regulation, academic goals, and academic achievement in mathematics. They found that mastery goal orientation positively predicted academic self-efficacy and reports of the use of self-regulated learning strategies.

Surprisingly, performance-approach goals did not significantly predict self-efficacy or self-regulated learning. Rezaei, Keivanpanah, and Najibi (2015) investigated the relationship between English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' motivational beliefs and their use of learning strategies. They found that less proficient learners experienced higher level of anxiety and were more extrinsically oriented compared to more proficient learners. They also discovered that self-efficacy, control of learning beliefs, intrinsic goal orientation and task value could account for 70% of variations in self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies. Similarly, Bell and Kozlowski (2002) found that learning goal orientation was significantly related to meta-cognitive activity.

Many studies indicated that performance goals had a negative impact on motivation and language learning. Students with performance goal orientations were found to use surface learning strategies, displayed a preference for less challenging tasks and were more likely to give up in face of difficult tasks (Ames, 1992), or less readily to use motivational regulatory strategies (Wolters, 1999). However, performance goals were found to be related positively to motivation, effective strategy use, positive affect and performance in many other studies (e.g., Elliot, 1999). Some research found no correlation between these variables (e.g., Button, Mathieu, & Zajac, 1996).

More recent studies pointed out that the different goal orientations do not necessarily need to be treated as opposites but can be seen as complementary. For example, Meece and Holt (1993) found that students could be high in mastery motivation and also high in performance orientation, while others could be low in both dimensions. To indicate how multiple goals interact and jointly influence student learning and achievement, Roebken (2007) studied achievement goals of 2309 college students. He found that students pursuing both mastery and performance goals are more satisfied with their academic experience, show a higher degree of academic engagement, and achieve better grades than students who pursue a mastery orientation alone or a performance-avoidance/performance orientation. In essence, it can be concluded from these studies that the kinds of goals students adopt serve to provide the framework for the challenging motivation and efficiency-related behaviors of students that teachers work with on a daily basis.

This study was set out as a result of the gap felt in research concerned with EFL listening achievement and its relation to self-regulatory strategy use and achievement goals to find the answer to the following research questions:

Q1. Is there any significant relationship between self-regulation and listening achievement of intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

Q2. Is there any significant relationship between achievement goals and self-regulation of intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

a. Is there any significant relationship between mastery goals and self-regulation of intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

b. Is there any significant relationship between performance-approach goals and self-regulation of intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

c. Is there any significant relationship between performance-avoidance goals and self-regulation of intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

Q3. Is there any significant relationship between different kinds of goal orientations of intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

a. Is there any significant relationship between mastery and performance-approach goal orientations of intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

b. Is there any significant relationship between mastery anf performance-avoidance goal orientations of intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

c. Is there any significant relationship between performance approach and performance-avoidance goal orientations of intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

Methodology

Participants

Participants of this study were selected through convenient sampling from among high intermediate EFL learners studying in Iran's Language Institute. The final sampel included 251 high intermediate language learners attending different branches of ILI in Mazandaran, Iran. The sample was heterogeneous regarding factors like age and gender. The males represented 52% (n= 12) of the participants which was slightly higher than the number of female students (n=, 48%). The age of the students ranged from 14 to 36 years old with an average of 18.48.The students reported an average of 6 years of formal English experience.

Instruments

In addition to demographic information related to gender, age, language learning experience, and field of study, the participants completed several scales. The following instruments were used for the data collection in the present study: a listening comprehension test, an achievement goal orientation questionnaire, and a self-regulation questionnaire consisting of the following subscales: metacognitive, cognitive, and time and resource management strategies.

Cambridge ESOL's First Certificate in English (FCE)

The listening section of Cambridge ESOL's First Certificate in English (FCE) was used as the test of listening comprehension. This section contains 40 multiple-choice or sentence completion tasks related to extracts from monologues or exchanges between interacting speakers. It is estimated to take 45 minutes.

Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)

Motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ: Pintrich & De Groot, 1990) consists of 81 self-report items which is designed to assess students' motivational beliefs and their learning strategy use. The students' use of different self-regulatory strategies was measured by the following subscales of MSLQ:

Metacognitive self-regulation:

This subscale contains a total of 12 items measuring students' control over their cognition. Sample items include "When studying for this course, I try to determine which concepts I don't understand well" and "I ask myself questions to make sure I understand the material I have been studying in this class."

Cognitive Learning Strategies:

Students' use of different learning strategies was measured by the cognitive strategies subscale of MSLQ. This subscale contains 19 items measuring four types of strategies for processing information: rehearsal, elaboration, organization, and critical thinking.

Resource Management Strategies:

Time and study environment and effort regulation and help seeking subscales of MSLQ were used to operationalize resource management. The effort regulation is measured through four items and eight items are used to measure time and study environment management.

Achievement Goal Orientation

Patterns of Adaptive Learning Scales (PALS: Midgley et al., 2000) was used to measure participants' mastery goal orientations. With a trichotomous perspective towards goal orientation, PALS comprised14 items, five items for mastery (α = .85) and performance-approach (α = .89) goal orientations and four items (α = .74) measure performance-avoidance goals orientation. The items on mastery goal orientation were made more domain-specific by rephrasing items to apply to specific goals in EFL courses.

Procedures

The data for this study was collected during the winter term of 2016 from high intermediate learners attending different branches of Iran language Institutes (ILI) of Mazandaran, a province in the northern part of Iran. The study was designed as a single institution study to eliminate the potential confounding factors of a multiple institutional study. Students were ensured about the anonymity and confidentiality of their answers and the removal of their identities prior to data analysis by assigning a code number. They were also informed about the purpose of the study and also the fact that participation was voluntary. The participants filled out a consent form and a general background information form. For the sake of clarity, all the instruments were translated into Persian. The data was collected in two successive sessions by the teacher or the researcher. In the first session, the listening test was administered. The questionnaires were distributed among the participants on the same session to be filled at home. They were requested to return the questionnaire the following session. Out of 332 questionnaires only 289 questionnaires were returned and 251 questionnaires were finally selected for further consideration.

Results

Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics for the variables of the study.

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics of the Variables of the Study*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Listening	**251**	**11**	**28**	**20.26**	**3.558**
Self-Regulation	**251**	**106**	**278**	**206.64**	**32.752**
Task Value	**251**	**17**	**42**	**34.50**	**5.558**
Mastery	**251**	**10**	**25**	**21.90**	**3.052**
Approach	**251**	**5**	**25**	**15.83**	**5.793**
Avoidance	**251**	**4**	**20**	**14.52**	**3.903**
Valid N (listwise)	**251**				

The reliability of the scales used in the study is demonstrated in Table 2. The reliability of the listening comprehension test is represented in Table 3. As indicated the reliability index for the listening comprehension test was found to be .72.

Table 2. *Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Statistics*

	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Self-Regulation	.916	44
Goal Orientation	.866	14
Mastery Approach	.824	5
Performance Approach	.917	5
Performance Avoidance	.812	4

Table 3. *KR-21 Reliability Index of Listening Comprehension Test*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Listening	250	20.26	3.572	12.757
KR-21	.72			

In search of significant relationships among variables of interest, a Pearson Product Moment correlation was run using SPSS 21 software. Table 4 indicates the correlational patterns between the variables of the study. As to the relationship between self-regulatory strategies and listening achievemnet (research question 1), results indicated a siginificant correlation between listening achievement and time and resource management, cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies (r= .446, r= .345, r= .477 respectively). The second research questin investigated the relationship between different goal orientations and self-regulatory strategies. Correlational analysis demonstrated that mastery goal orientation had a significant relationship with self-regulatory strategies (time and resource management: r=.347, n=251 p< .05; metacognitive strategies: r=.289, n=251 p< .05; and cognitive strategies: r=.399, n=251 p< .05). Performance approach did not show any significant relationship with any of the strategies (time and resource management: r=.180, n=251 p< .05; metacognitive strategies: r=.139, n=251 p< .05; and cognitive strategies: r=.192, n=251 p< .05). Significant but negative correlation was observed between performance-avoidance goal orientation and self-regulatory startegies (time and resource management: r= -.292, n=251 p< .05; metacognitive strategies: r= -.226, n=251 p< .05; and cognitive strategies: r= -.312, n=251 p< .05). As to the relationahip among different goals (research question 3), performance-approach goal orientation was only significantly and negatively correlated with the performance-avoidance goal orientation (r= -.555), having insignificant relationship with mastery goal (r=.117, n=251 p< .05). The performance-avoidance goal factor correlated negatively with the other two kinds of goals, mastery and performance-approach(r= -.253, r= -.555 respectively).

Table 4. *Correlation Between Components of Self-efficacy, Goal Orientation and Listening Achievement (N=251)*

	Mastery	Approach	Avoidance	Listening	Time-resource	Meta-cognitive	Cognitive
Mastery	1.000						
Approach	.117	1.000					
Avoidance	-.253	-.555	1.000				
Listening	.205	.160	-.263	1.000			
Time-resource	.374	.180	-.292	.446	1.000		
Meta-	.289	.139	-.226	.345	.450	1.000	

cognitive							
Cognitive	.399	.192	-.312	.477	.622	.480	1.000

**.correlation is significant as .05 level (2-Tailed)

Discussion

As indicated above, listening achievement had a significant relationship with all the three kinds of the self-regulatory strategies. Cognitive strategies were found to have the strongest relationship with listening achievement, followed by time and resource management and metacognitive strategies. The results of the current study provided support for the social cognitive theory of academic self-regulation indicating that students purposefully regulate and control their cognition in order to enhance academic performance (Pintrich, 2000a, 2004; Zimmerman,1990, 2000). Higher achievement in EFL listening was inspected in language learners who were more mastery-oriented and who tended to use a variety of self- regulatory strategies to sustain or increase effort or persistence and to enhance cognitive engagement.

The effect of self-regulation on academic achievement has been well documented in studies which identified self-regulation as the best predictor of academic achievement (Dupeyrat & Mariné, 2001). Students, who possess a larger repertoire of strategies to help them in approaching the task and overcoming challenges and difficulties, feel more confident and are not much disturbed by distracting and stressful factors and as a result perform better in completing different tasks. This pattern of relations between motivational factors, cognitive variables and performance is absolutely consistent with the model of self-regulated learning developed by Pintrich and his colleagues (Pintrich, 1989; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990; Pintrich & Garcia, 1991; Pintrich & Schrauben, 1992). They argue that learning strategies have a direct effect on student achievement, while motivational variables support the use of these strategies but do not influence student performance directly.

The finding that mastery goals are significantly related to different components of self-regulation is consistent with the findings of previous studies. These findings are similar to the findings in studies conducted by Wolters, Yu and Pintrich (1996), Elliot, McGrigor, and Gabel (1999), Ames & Archer (1988), Middleton & Migley (1997), and Schunk (1996). A positive relationship between mastery goals and metacognition has been established in previous research (Ames, 1992; Dweck & Legett, 1988). It has been suggested that, students with mastery goals are more likely to be metacognitively aware, and thereby, learn better than students adopting performance goals. Performance goals alone cannot contribute so much to academic success. As a result, adoption of mastery goals must be encouraged among the students. Findings corroborates that of Pintrich and DeGroot (1990) who found that learners with mastery goal orientations exhibit higher levels of cognitive and metacognitive strategies than those who focus on proving their abilities to others or avoiding the perception of incompetence. In addition, mastery oriented students were reported to invest considerable efforts in tasks and use learning strategies that promote comprehension of course material. Most important, mastery oriented students self-evaluate and persist in the face of failure (Elliot, 1999). Pintrich (1999, p. 467) states that ‘‘If students set as their goal self-improvement and learning, then they will be much more likely to continue to engage in various cognitive and metacognitive activities in order to improve their learning and comprehension’’.

As expected, performance-avoidance goals were negatively correlated with the other kinds of goals and all the self-regulated strategies of the study. This is an indication that these goals are mostly associated with maladaptive behaviors. Out of their fear of being labeled as incompetent,

performance-avoidant oriented students try to escape the situation which may lead to their failure. These goals mostly have debilitating effect on the performance of the students since they are mostly accompanied with withdrawal of effort and denial of help-seeking opportunities (Liem, Lau, & Nie, 2008).

Contrary to the researchers' expectations, based on earlier studies (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Elliot & Murayama, 2008; Harackiewicz et al., 2008; Hulleman et al.,2008), performance-approach goal orientation did not show any significant contribution to any of the other parameters. Studies on performance-approach goals arrived at mixed results. Some studies have associated these goals with adaptive behavior while others associated it with maladaptive behavior such as more anxiety, avoiding help-seeking, and disruptive classroom behavior (Butler, 1992; Harackiewicz et al., 1998; Smiley & Dweck, 1994; Urdan, 1997; Wolters, Yu, & Pintrich, 1996). Some studies could not detect any association at all. Al-Harthy et al. (2010), for instance, did not find a significant correlation between performance-approach goal and self-regulated learning of the participants.

Divergent findings regarding performance approach goals attracted the attention of scholars towards the suitability of self-report measures of achievement goals. Issues have been raised concerning the use of self-report measures in taking a snapshot of students' goal orientation. Urdan (2001), for instance, reported that comparing performance to others was seldom mentioned by students who were provided with the opportunity to describe their goals using their own words. Wigfield & Camria (2010) refer to the possibility of violation of reality in self-report measures by their capacity for displaying social desirability. To form favorable judgments of themselves, some students might tend to hide their real intentions of superiority over others and this may lead to method bias (Jan & Hall, 2005).

Another issue concerning the performance goals is mismatch between a specific adopted goal by the students and their relative criteria for eventual judgment of success. Students, for instance, may set the goal of outperforming others and demonstrating competence but use personal improvement as a measure toward the goal. A logical conclusion is that performance goals are a less frequent adopted goal by students. Further research is needed to examine the relational patterns of performance goals with different classroom practices, such as assessment practices, teaching methods, amount of interaction, and cultural and social contexts.

Furthermore, Pintrich et al. (2003) pointed to the possibility of a mismatch between goals adopted and criteria used for judging success and goal attainment. Different goals might be set by every learner, like understanding the material or developing competence, but goal attainment might be judged based on the criteria of personal improvement or a comparison with others. This could explain more the contradictory results regarding goal orientation research.

The other justification can be made based on the context of this study. This study was conducted among EFL learners attending private English institutes of Iran. Despite undergoing many years of formal and compulsory English learning at public schools, many students and parents are not satisfied with the results of their mastery over English. Therefore, they attend extra classes at different institutes to overcome their deficiency. So what gains importance in such classes is not their normative performance but mastery over the material and language. As a result it can be concluded that these students are mainly mastery- oriented.

Results also indicate a significant negative relationship between performance-avoidance goal orientation and performance approach goals and a moderate negative correlation with mastery goals. Performance approach goal orientation did not show a significant correlation with mastery goal orientation. Traditionally achievement goals theories based on the dichotomy of mastery-performance viewed these two goals as opposites. Few studies concerned with the

interdependence of these goals have found a negative correlation between the two goals (Nichols, Cobb, Wood, Yackel, & Patashnick, 1990; Rhodewalt, 1994). But Pintrich (2000a) reported that different results have been accrued in correlational studies from negative and even positive correlation to non-correlation. Pintrich (2000b) maintained that these differences in the results can be attributed to methodological issues such as the use of different instruments, research designs, and age of participants. He further contended that the relations between mastery and performance goals must be clarified both theoretically and empirically.

Conclusion

This study was an attempt to find the contribution of different self-regulatory strategies to listening achievement of EFL learners. The relationships between different goals and these strategies have also been detected. In essence, the findings of this study identified significant relatonships between differnet goal orientations, namely mastery goals, performance-avoidance goals, and different self-regulatory startegies and listening achievement of Iranian EFL learners and highlighted the importance of a consideration of motivational beliefs and a strategic approach towards learning in lesson planning and material development by EFL teachers, administrators and educators.

Consistent with past research, this study found that mastery goal orientation was significantly related to self-regulated learning and contributed to higher achievement in listening comprehension. The consistency of such results suggests that mastery goals are strong predictors of self-regulated learning and listening achievement. Students who believed in their capability in learning were more likely than others to self-regulate themselves and outperform others in listening comprehension. The same analyses revealed that the use of self-regulatory strategies was strongly related to listening performance of the learners. Students who reported greater use of self-regulatory strategies achieved better in their listening comprehension test.

The findings are consistent with the model of self-regulated learning developed by Pintrich and his colleagues (Pintrich, 1989; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990; Pintrich & Schrauben, 1992). The significance of self-regulation in academic learning and in developing long-life learners depicts the necessity of enhancing such skills as a major function of education (Zimmermann, 2002). This implies that learners must be taught and provided with opportunities to practice self-regulation in educational settings. Practically, teachers can introduce these strategies through direct explanation of different strategies, followed by a modeling of the strategies by the teacher and final practice of the strategies by the students through a variety of learning tasks.

Findings regarding achievement goals highlighted the significance of mastery goals. If education wishes to improve desired outcome, they should help them link their concerns and expectations with concrete strategies to take action. They should also provide future goals which increase their opportunities for self-evaluation and self-decisions. If students are given the opportunity to set a goal or are given a goal by teachers, they are more likely to perceive an initial sense of self-efficacy for achieving it and feel more committed to attempt it and engage in activities which are believed to lead to goal attainment.

Implications

Given the widely accepted influence of self-regulatory strategies on academic performance, the results of the study emphasize the necessity of the emphasis on the use of such strategies in the class by teachers. Previous studies (Orhan, 2007, Tseng, Dornyei, & Schmitt, 2006) have pointed to the teachability of self-regulatory skill. This implies that learners must be taught and provided with opportunities to practice self-regulation in educational settings. Teachers should

teach self-regulation strategies along with content so that students understand how to apply the strategies.

Theory and research show that self-regulation can be developed through exposure to models who explain and demonstrate strategies. Practically, teachers can introduce these strategies through direct explanation of different strategies, followed by a modeling of the strategies by the teacher and final practice of the strategies by the students through a variety of learning tasks. Paris and Winogard (2011) believe that teaching the students to take a new perspective towards failure as a constructive process, in which the reasons behind failure and not the failure itself gain importance, can lead to a revision of earlier approaches and plans in learning. Changing the evaluation and monitoring techniques in favor of more learner dominated practices such as self-assessment would also be beneficial. Schunk and Zimmerman (2007) believe that environments need also to be accommodated to differences in students' self-regulation skills. They recommend teachers to form students into small groups and tailor self-regulation instruction according to each group's needs. Most teachers understand how to differentiate instruction depending on students' learning capabilities, and they also need to practice differentiation with respect to students' self-regulation capabilities.

References

Al Khatib, S. A. (2010), Meta-cognitive self-regulated learning and motivational beliefs as predictors of college students' performance. *International Journal for Research in Education (IJRE), 27*, 57-72.

Al-Harthy, I., & Was, C.A., & Isaacson, R. M. (2010). Goals, efficacy and meta-cognitive self-regulation: A path analysis. *International Journal of Education, 2*(1), 1-20.

Ames, C. & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom. Students' learning strategies and motivation process. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 260-267.

Ames, C. (1992). Classroom: Goals, structure and motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 261 -271.

Baleghizadeh, S., & Rahimi, A. (2011). The relationship among listening performance, metacognitive strategy use and motivation from a self-determination theory perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1*, 61-67.

Bell, B.S., & Kozlowski, W.J. (2002). Goal orientation and ability: Interactive effects on self-efficacy, performance and knowledge. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 497-505.

Boekaerts, M. (1999). Self-regulated learning: Where we are today. *International Journal of Educational Research, 31*(6), 445-557. doi:10.1016/S0883-0355(99)00014-2

Bozorgian, H. (2012). Metacognitive instruction does improve listening comprehension. *International Journal of Listening, 28*(3), 149-161.

Butler, R. (1992). What young people want to know when: Effects of mastery and ability goals on interest in different kinds of social comparisons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 934 – 943.

Button, S., Mathieu, J., & Zajac, D. (1996). Goal orientation in organizational research: A conceptual and empirical foundation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 67*, 26–48.

Dupeyrat, C., & Mariné, C. (2001). Implicit theories of intelligence, achievement goals and learning strategy use. *Psychologische Beitrage, 43*, 34-52.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*, 256-273.

Elliot, A. J. & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2 × 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 80, 501–519.

Elliot, A. J., & Murayama, K. (2008). On the measurement of achievement goals: Critique, illustration, and application. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*, 613-628.

Elliot, A. J., (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation goals. *Educational Psychologist, 34*(3), 169-189.

Elliot, A.J., McGregor, H.A., & Gable, S. (1999). Achievement goals, study strategies and exam performance: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*, 549-563

Fatemi, M.A., Alishahi, M., Noori Khorasani, M., Seifi, M.(2014).The relationship between EFL learners' self-regulation and their listening comprehension. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 5*(4), 2203-4714

Ford, J. K., Smith, E. M., Weissbein, D.A., Gully, S. M., & Salas, E. (1998). Relationships of goal orientation, metacognitive activity, and practice strategies with learning outcomes and transfer. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 218-233.

Harackiewicz, J., Barron, K., & Elliot, A. (1998). Rethinking achievement goals: When are they adaptive for college students and why. *Educational Psychologist, 33*, 1 – 21.

Harackiewicz, J. M., Durik, A. M., Barron, K. E., Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., & Tauer, J. M. (2008). The role of achievement goals in the development of interest: Reciprocal relations between achievement goals, interest and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*, 105-122.

Hulleman, C. S., Durik, A. M., Schweigert, S. A., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2008). Task values,achievement goals, and interest: An integrative analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*, 398–416.

Jan, J., & Hall, R. (2005). The effects of social desirability bias on applied measures of goal orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*, 1891-1902.

Kitsantas, A., Steen, S., & Huie, F. (2009). The role of self-regulated strategies and goal orientation in predicting achievement of elementary school children. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 2*(1), 65-81.

Latifi, M., Tavakoli, M., & Dabaghi,A. (2014). The effects of a self-regulatory approach on the listening comprehension achievement of EFL learners. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 3*(3), 67-78.

Liem, A., Lau, S., & Nie, Y. (2008). The role of self-efficacy, task value, and achievement goals in predicting learning strategies, task disengagement, peer relationship, and achievement outcome. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 33*, pp.486-512.

Mareschal, C. (2007). *Student perceptions of a self-regulatory approach to second language listening comprehension development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Ottawa, Ontario.

Meece, J. H., & Holt, K. (1993). A pattern analysis of students' achievement goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(4), 582-590.

Middleton, M., & Midgley, C. (1997). Avoiding the demonstration of lack of ability: An underexplored aspect of goal theory. *Journal of educational psychology, 89*, 710-718.

Midgley, C., Maehr, M., Hruda, L., Anderman, E., Anerman, L., Freeman, K., … Urdan, T. (2000). *Manual for the patterns of adaptive learning scales.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.

Mirhassani, A., Akbari, R., & Dehghan, M. (2007). The relationship between Iranian EFL learners' goal- oriented and self-regulated learning and their language proficiency. *TELL Journal, 1*(2), 117-132.

Nicholls, J. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective

experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological Review, 91*, 328-346.

O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., & Kupper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 10*, 418-437.

Pintrich, P.R. (1989). The dynamic interplay of student motivation and cognition in the college classroom. In C. Ames & M. Maehr (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement motivation enhancing environments* (Vol.6, 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), 459-70.

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

Pintrich, P. R. (2000b). An achievement goal theory perspective on issues in motivation terminology, theory, and research. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*, 92–104.

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

Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review, 16*(4), 385-407. doi:10.1007/s10648-004-0006-x

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

Pintrich, P. R., & Schrauben, B. (1992). Students' motivational beliefs and their cognitive engagement in the classroom. In D. H. Schunk & J. L. Meece (Eds.), *Students' perceptions in the classroom: Causes and consequences* (pp. 149-183). Hillsdales, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A., Garcia, T., & Mckeachie, W. J. (1991). *A manual for the use of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ).* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Rezaei, A.R., Keivanpanah, S., & Najibi, S. (2015). EFL learners' motivational beliefs and their use of learning strategies. *Applied Research on English Language, 4*(1), 1-17.

Rhodewalt, F. (1994). Conceptions of ability, achievement goals, and individual differences in self-handicapping behavior: On the application of implicit theories. *Journal of Personality, 62*, 67–85.

Roebken**,** H**. (**2007**).** The influence of goal orientation on student satisfaction, academic engagement and achievement. *Journal of Research in Educational psychology, 5*(3), 679-704.

Schunk, D. H. (1996). Goal and self-evaluative influences during children's cognitive strategy learning. *American Educational Research Journal, 33*, 359-382

Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (Eds.). (2008). Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Smiley, P., & Dweck, C. (1994). Individual differences in achievement goals among young children. *Child Development, 65*, 1723 – 1743.

Urdan, T. (1997). Achievement goal theory: Past studies, future directions. In M. Maehr & P. Pintrich (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition* (pp. 350 – 378). New York: Guilford Press.

Urdan, T. (2001). Contextual influences on motivation and performance: An examination of achievement goal structures. In F. Salili, C. Chiu, & Y. Hong (Eds.), *Student motivation: The culture and context of learning* (pp. 171–201). New York: Kluwer/Plenum.

Vandergrift, L., Goh, C., Mareschal, C., & Tafaghodtari, M. (2006). The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire: Development and validation. *Language Learning, 56*, 431-

462.

Wigfield, A., & Cambria**,** J**. (**2010**).** Students' achievement values, goal orientations, and interest: Definitions, development, and relations to achievement outcomes. Developmental Review**,** 30**(**1**),** 1**–**35**.** doi:10.1016/j.dr.2009.12.001

Wolters, C. A. (1999). The Relation between high school students' motivational regulation and their use of learning strategies, effort, and classroom performance. *Learning and Individual Differences, 3*(3), 281-299.

Wolters, C. A., Yu, S. L., & Pintrich, P. R. (1996). The relation between goals orientation and students' motivational beliefs and self-regulated learning. *Learning and Individual Differences, 8*, 211-238.

Zimmerman, B.J. (1989). A social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*, 329-339.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational Psychologist, 25*, 3-17.

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

Zimmerman, B. J. (2001). Theories of self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview and analysis. In B. J.Zimmerman, & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: theoretical perspectives* (2nd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2011). Motivational sources and outcomes of self-regulated learning and performance. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 49-64). New York: Routledge.