

Saudi Female EFL Learners' Use of Self-Regulation and Language-Learning Strategies: A Comparative Study

Amira Almutairi

English Language Institute,
King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
aalmutairi0934@stu.kau.edu.sa
 <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5862-7386>

Mona Sabir

Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics, Associate Professor
English Language Institute,
King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
msabir@kau.edu.sa
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1995-3699>

Received: 26/12/2024; Revised: 06/04/2025; Accepted: 10/04/2024

الملخص

الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو مقارنة استخدام استراتيجيات تعلم اللغة (LLS) و استراتيجيات التعلم المنظم ذاتيًا (SRL) من قبل متعلمات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية (EFL) السعوديات من مستويات تعليمية ومستويات إتقان لغة إنجليزية مختلفة. لقد قامت اغلب الدراسات بفحص استخدام استراتيجيات تعلم اللغة (LLS) واستراتيجيات التعلم المنظم ذاتيًا (SRL) بناءً على مستويات إتقان اللغة. في هذه الدراسة نبحث في كيفية استخدام متعلمات اللغة الانجليزية كلغة أجنبية السعوديات من مستويات تعليمية ومستويات إتقان اللغة مختلفة لهذه الاستراتيجيات. لبلوغ هذه الغاية، تم توزيع اختبار أكسفورد السريع لتحديد المستوى و استبيانين للتأكد من مدى استخدام استراتيجيات تعلم اللغة (LLS) واستراتيجيات التعلم المنظم ذاتيًا (SRL) على مئة و ثمانية عشر متعلمة سعودية للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية لديهن مستويات إتقان مختلفة و هي: A1 و A2 و B1 و B2 عبر مستويات تعليمية مختلفة: المتوسطة والثانوية وبرنامج السنة التحضيرية بالكلية. وقد كشفت النتائج عن عدم وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في استخدام استراتيجيات تعلم اللغة (LLS) بين متعلمات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية السعوديات عبر مستويات التعليم وإتقان اللغة المختلفة. وعلى الرغم من عدم وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في استخدام استراتيجيات التعلم المنظم ذاتيًا (SRL) عبر المستويات التعليمية، فقد وجد فرق كبير بين المتعلمين في المستوى B2 وأولئك في المستويين A2 و B1، حيث أظهر المتعلمون في المستوى B2 بأقل استخدام لاستراتيجيات التعلم المنظم ذاتيًا. ووفقًا لنتائج هذه الدراسة، فإن متعلمات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية السعوديات يستخدمن استراتيجيات تعلم اللغة (LLS) بشكل متشابه، وإلى حد ما، يستخدمن استراتيجيات التعلم المنظم ذاتيًا (SRL) بشكل متشابه عبر مختلف المستويات التعليمية وإتقان اللغة. ومن الممكن أن توفر هذه النتائج للمدرسين والأكاديميين رؤية قيمة حول استخدام SRL و LLS من قبل متعلمات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في المملكة العربية السعودية.

Saudi Female EFL Learners' Use of Self-Regulation and Language-Learning Strategies: A Comparative Study

Amira Almutairi

English Language Institute,
King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
aalmutairi0934@stu.kau.edu.sa
 <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5862-7386>

Mona Sabir

Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics, Associate Professor
English Language Institute,
King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
msabir@kau.edu.sa
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1995-3699>

Received: 26/12/2024; Revised: 06/04/2025; Accepted: 10/04/2024

Abstract

The aim of this study is to compare the implementations of language-learning strategies (LLS) and self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies by female Saudi learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) with different educational and proficiency levels. Most studies have examined the use of LLS or SRL strategies based on proficiency levels. In this study, we investigate how Saudi female EFL learners with varying language proficiency and educational levels employ these strategies. To accomplish this aim, Oxford Quick Placement Test and two questionnaires investigating the implementation of SRL and LLS strategies were administered to (118) female Saudi EFL learners who have various proficiency levels; that is, levels A1, A2, B1, and B2 across different educational levels: intermediate, secondary, and preparatory-year college program. The findings revealed no significant differences in the implementation of LLS among female Saudi EFL learners across educational and proficiency levels. Although there were no significant differences in SRL usage across educational levels, a significant difference was found between learners at the B2 level and those at the A2 and B1 levels, as learners at the B2 level reported the lowest use of SRL. According to the results of this study, Saudi EFL learners employ similar LLS strategies and, to some extent, similar SRL strategies across various educational and proficiency levels. These findings can provide instructors, and academics with valuable insights into the implementation of SRL and LLS by female EFL learners in Saudi Arabia.

Keywords *language-learning strategies; language proficiency; Saudi EFL learners; self-regulated learning*

Introduction

Self-regulated learning (SRL) and language-learning strategies (LLS) are two approaches that help learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) to achieve higher proficiency levels. SRL refers to an individual's ability to monitor, control, and manage their thoughts, emotions, and behaviors to achieve specific goals (Zimmerman, 2000). It is expected to empower learners to become lifelong learners and supports independent learning. LLS, on the other hand, refers to mental processes and practices that are intended to improve learners' language proficiency; more specifically, LLS is expected to enhance proficiency and performances in languages over time (Oxford, 2017). It implies that the learner's mind determines and controls the tools, techniques, or methods that are appropriate for the current purpose of the language-learning process, ultimately leading to improved language outcomes.

A recent model developed by Oxford (2017), entitled the Strategic Self-Regulation (S²R) model, integrates SRL and LLS. In this model, both SRL and LLS involve the application of strategies that assist learners to achieve better outcomes in the target language. While SRL mainly focuses on setting goals and controlling and monitoring one's learning process, LLS refers to the specific techniques and approaches that learners use to acquire, store, and retrieve information.

The S²R model, which integrates LLS and SRL, highlights the importance of learners' active participation in the language-learning process. To foster greater involvement, The Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia adopt teaching approaches that encourage active learner participation, such as the communicative approach. A clear example of this shift can be seen in the assigned English textbooks, which aim to promote the communicative approach and to encourage Saudi EFL learners to become active participants in their learning processes (Alqahtani, 2018). According to this approach, Saudi EFL learners are expected to play a crucial role in the learning process rather than simply being recipients of teacher-designed curricula. A student-centered approach requires Saudi EFL learners to be active participants and to take control of their learning. It predicts that learners who take control of their learning processes will achieve higher levels of language proficiency compared to their peers. In other words, learners with higher proficiency levels are expected to use learning strategies more often than those with lower proficiency levels (Fukuda, 2017; Machimana & Genis, 2022). Additionally, Alzahrani (2024) concluded that when learners' native language and second language do not belong to the same family—as is the case for Saudi EFL learners—they are privileged to use more learning strategies to enhance the acquisition of their second language.

Alahmari (2021) stated that self-regulatory research is a relatively understudied area and that there is a lack of research examining the relationship between SRL and linguistic competence. The majority of studies in this field in Saudi Arabia have focused on comparing the differences between using LLS or SRL strategies among different proficiency levels but within the same educational level. Therefore, the aim of the current study is to extend the existing research by comparing the use of LLS and SRL strategies across different educational and proficiency levels by investigating how female Saudi EFL learners with different educational levels (intermediate, secondary, and preparatory college year) and proficiency levels (A1, A2, B1, and B2) implement these strategies. To collect the data for this study, an Oxford placement test and two questionnaires that examine the use of LLS and SRL strategies were used. The results of this study may provide a more thorough understanding of Saudi EFL learners' varied use of LLS and SRL strategies and their correlation with proficiency and educational levels.

This study is guided by two main research questions (RQs):

RQ1. To what extent do female Saudi EFL learners with different levels of education and language proficiency differ in their use of LLS strategies?

RQ2. To what extent do female Saudi EFL learners with different levels of education and language proficiency differ in their use of SRL strategies?

Background to the Study

Self-Regulation

Zimmerman et al. (2017) described SRL as a process that is directed and controlled by learners, stating that SRL is “the process whereby students activate and sustain behaviors, cognitions, and affects that are systematically oriented toward the attainment of their goals” (p. 313). It emphasizes the existence of a goal, in pursuit of which learners control and regulate their behaviors, cognitions, and emotions. This definition aligns with Oxford’s (2017) S²R model, which is applied in this study. The S²R model refers to SRL as the process in which learners select specific strategies based on their learning goals and then monitor, evaluate, and reflect on their choices to ensure goal attainment.

Zimmerman’s (2002) cyclical model is one of the most widely cited SRL models in the literature and is consistent with the S²R model. Based on the cyclical model, SRL strategies are divided into three phases, namely forethought, performance, and self-reflection, according to the sequence in which learners apply them when studying or completing a task. These phases have also been labeled ‘before task,’ ‘during task,’ and ‘after task’ by researchers such as Dent and Koenka (2015) and Erdogan (2016), and researchers such as Xiao and Yang (2019) and Hung (2022) have continued to use this model in recent SRL research. The cyclical model is applied in the present study by utilizing the SRL questionnaire that was developed and validated by Erdogan and Senemoglu (2016). See Table 1 (See Appendix A) for a description of the SRL strategies as defined by Zimmerman (2008).

Language Learning Strategies (LLS)

Oxford (2017) defines LLS as:

Complex, dynamic thoughts and actions, selected and used by learners with some degree of consciousness in specific contexts in order to regulate multiple aspects of themselves (such as cognitive, emotional, and social) for the purpose of (a) accomplishing language tasks; (b) improving language performance or use; and/or (c) enhancing long-term proficiency. Strategies are mentally guided but may also have physical and therefore observable manifestations. Learners often use strategies flexibly and creatively; combine them in various ways, such as strategy clusters or strategy chains; and orchestrate them to meet learning needs. Strategies are teachable. Learners in their contexts decide which strategies to use. Appropriateness of strategies depends on multiple personal and contextual factors (p. 48).

This definition covers the major themes in LLS concepts, including diverse strategies, learners’ intentions, creativity, and consciousness. It is the most relevant for the purposes of the present study because it correlates the use of strategies with language proficiency and is an important part of Oxford’s (2017) S²R model that links SRL to LLS.

With regard to LLS classification, Oxford's (1990) taxonomy is one of the most frequently cited strategy classifications in the literature. According to Oxford's taxonomy, LLS can be classified according to the two main domains of direct and indirect strategies, and is applied in this study by using the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire that she developed see Table 2 (See Appendix A).

S²R Model

The integration of SRL and LLS in this study is based on Oxford's (2017) pioneering S²R model; this framework emphasizes the role of learners as active decision makers in the language-learning process, and suggests that language learners can become more successful by using a variety of learning strategies to manage and direct their learning.

The S²R model highlights the importance of SRL in the language-learning process. SRL involves the ability to apply, control, and regulate various strategies to achieve a specific goal, such as language proficiency in the present context. Learners rely on SRL to set goals for their learning processes or tasks, choose the strategies that are best suited to attain these goals, and then regulate their behavioral, emotional, or motivational strategies. In her S²R model, Oxford (2017) referred to Zimmerman's (2002) three-stage model, which includes the forethought phase, the performance phase, and the self-reflection phase.

According to the S²R model, learners are expected to take control of their learning processes, to set clear goals, to identify areas of weakness, and to use different strategies to overcome them. By doing so, learners can develop and improve their language skills, thus leading to increased proficiency.

Methodology

Participants

For this comparative study, 118 female participants with different language proficiency levels and three different educational levels were recruited. Twenty-eight participants were at the intermediate level, 41 were at the secondary level, and 49 were attending a preparatory year college program. The (118) participants are divided into four groups based on their proficiency levels (A1, A2, B1, and B2); 24 participants have A1, 42 have A2, 23 have B1, and 29 have B2 levels. Table 3 shows the classification of the participants according to their educational and proficiency levels. Due to time constraints, a nonprobability sampling method was used to recruit female participants from one public university and one private school in Jeddah. The participants were recruited by using a convenience sampling method, and the data are collected during the middle of the 2023-2024 academic year. Since this study focuses on female Saudi EFL learners, future research will take gender into account.

Table 3*Participants' Demographics*

Demographic		N	%
Educational level	Preparatory college year	49	23.7%
	Secondary	41	34.7%
	Intermediate	28	41.5%
Proficiency level	A1	24	20.3%
	A2	42	35.5%
	B1	23	19.4%
	B2	29	24.5%
Total		118	100%

Instruments and Procedure

A quantitative research design is used in this study. In order to gather data efficiently and quickly, self-reported data were collected. However, self-reported data have some limitations to consider. For instance, they can be influenced by the subjective judgments of individuals. Furthermore, the phrasing and formulation of the questions can affect the validity and reliability of the data collected through self-report measures. Thus, reliability and validity tests, as well as a pilot study, were conducted to minimize this potential negative effect. The three instruments used in this study were a standardized Oxford Quick Placement Test and two self-report questionnaires (See Appendix B); all the instruments were distributed to the participants in a paper-and-pencil format. The placement test consisted of 40 multiple-choice questions that focused on vocabulary, reading, and grammar.

The test results included four proficiency levels (A1, A2, B1, and B2), and the test was followed by two questionnaires regarding the use of LLS and SRL strategies. Both questionnaires were translated into Arabic, which was the participants' mother tongue language. A Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always) was used to respond to the items. Due to the number of items in both questionnaires, the items in each questionnaire were reduced by deleting similar or repeated concepts, as keeping the questionnaire as brief as possible could help to motivate the participants and encourage them to cooperate. The first questionnaire investigated the use of LLS strategies via the SILL, which was adapted from Oxford (1990). It is usually considered one of the most frequently cited tools in the field.

The questionnaire initially contained 50 items, but was reduced to 29 items by deleting similar items and testing their validity using the Pearson correlation. The items covered two main constructs, which were direct (cognitive, memory, and compensation; 18 items) and indirect (metacognitive, affective, and social; 11 items) learning strategies. The second questionnaire investigated the participants' use of SRL strategies using the Scale on Self-Regulation in Learning (SSRL), which was developed and validated by Erdogan and Senemoglu (2016). It originally included 67 items but was reduced to 23 items after similar items were

deleted and the Pearson correlation was used to evaluate the validity of the items. Furthermore, all the items were statistically significant, thus confirming the validity and correlation in both questionnaires. Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the internal consistency and reliability of the two questionnaires. The alpha value was greater than 0.8, which indicates that both questionnaires had good internal consistency.

Each instrument (the placement test, the LLS questionnaire, and the SRL questionnaire) used in this study had a cover sheet (in Arabic) on which the participants were asked to confirm that they were participating voluntarily before beginning to complete the instrument. The participants had the option to remain anonymous or to state their names. The administration departments of the public university and the private school provided authorization to conduct the study before the participants were recruited.

After translating the questionnaires into Arabic, a pilot study was conducted with (13) participants to ensure that the items in both questionnaires were clear and easy to answer. The instruments were then printed and compiled into a paper format; the participants began with the placement test, followed by the LLS questionnaire, and then the SRL questionnaire. The completion of the instruments was estimated to take approximately 30–40 minutes per participant. The researcher gave the participants the option of receiving their placement test results by providing their phone numbers, which could further motivate them to participate in the study.

Ethical approval was obtained from the preparatory year college program to conduct the study before the participants were recruited. Three classes in the Academic English track were informed of the research aim and invited to participate voluntarily. Fifty-three participants returned their papers; however, four participants' responses were eliminated because they were incomplete. With regard to the participants from the intermediate and secondary private school, the owner of the school was contacted and graciously consented to distribute the questionnaires. The teachers from the private school volunteered to distribute and collect the papers.

Review of the Related Literature

Due to the limited research conducted in the Saudi context, the literature review includes studies from various contexts on how EFL learners use LLS and SRL strategies in relation to language proficiency and educational levels. The existing literature reports various and sometimes contradictory results with regard to the relationship between LLS and learners' proficiency levels. While Almoslamani (2022), Yaghi (2021), and Alrashidi (2022) found a significant and positive relationship between LLS and learners' proficiency levels, Ranjan et al. (2021) and Alhaysony (2017) concluded that no significant relationship existed. In terms of Saudi EFL learners' use of LLS and the impact on their academic performance, after surveying (365) Saudi university students, Almoslamani (2022) found that learning strategies and students' achievements are positively correlated.

Similarly, the questionnaire responses of (256) Saudi EFL learners in Alrashidi's (2022) study revealed a positive correlation between their proficiency levels and LLS. Conversely, in Alhaysony's (2017) study, a total of 134 Saudi university students completed a questionnaire about LLS; no significant differences were found in the Saudi EFL learners' use of LLS in relation to the duration of studying English. The evidence reviewed in this paper suggests that conflicting findings still exist regarding the relationship between LLS and language proficiency.

Many researchers have discussed the relationship between SRL and academic achievement/language proficiency, and have attempted to determine whether SRL has a positive or negative correlation with language proficiency. Most of the studies in the field have revealed a positive correlation between SRL and language proficiency; for example, Abbasian and Hartoonian (2014), Amini et al. (2020), and Wang et al. (2023) used SRL questionnaires and identified a statistically significant relationship among students' use of SRL strategies, their language proficiency levels, and their academic achievements. The researchers indicate that learners of foreign languages can achieve better learning outcomes when applying SRL, including improved language proficiency, while Adıgüzel and Orhan (2017) found a small but significant correlation between students' SRL and their academic achievements.

However, researchers such as Hung (2022) have concluded that there is a negative correlation between SRL and learners' academic achievement. Despite some disagreements, most of the research in the field has shown that SRL assists foreign-language learners to improve their language proficiency. These findings indicate a difference in learners' uses of SRL strategies depending on their proficiency levels.

Research Hypotheses

The majority of the studies in the existing literature have concluded that learners with different educational and proficiency levels use LLS and SRL strategies differently. Thus, the hypotheses that were tested in this study are as follows:

- H1. There are differences in the overall LLS scores according to educational and language proficiency levels among female Saudi EFL learners.
- H2. There are differences in the overall SRL scores according to educational and language proficiency levels among female Saudi EFL learners.

Results

In the data analysis, the differences in the overall LLS and SRL scores according to the educational and language proficiency levels of the female Saudi EFL learners were investigated using a two-way ANOVA, as there were two categorical variables (educational level and proficiency level) and a continuous variable (LLS and SRL); the ANOVA assumptions were met.

Results for the First RQ

- RQ1. To what extent do female Saudi EFL learners with different levels of education and language proficiency differ in their use of LLS strategies?

Descriptive Statistics

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of LLS Scores According to Educational Level

LLS score		
<u>Education Level</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Preparatory	3.3617	.5045
Secondary	3.4668	.50161
Intermediate	3.4261	.73084

In Table 4, it can be seen that, on average, the highest LLS score of 3.46 ($SD = .50$) was observed when the educational level was the secondary level, and the lowest LLS score of 3.36 ($SD = .50$) was observed when the educational level was the preparatory level.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of LLS Scores According to Proficiency Level

LLS score		
<u>Proficiency Level</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
A1	3.3664	.57994
A2	3.3087	.60889
B1	3.6147	.43377
B2	3.4447	.54797

Table 5 above illustrates that, on average, the highest LLS score of 3.61 ($SD = .43$) was observed when the proficiency level was the B1 level, and the lowest LLS score of 3.30 ($SD = .60$) was observed when the proficiency level was the A2 level.

Hypotheses Testing

As the LLS scores for educational levels and proficiency levels followed normality assumptions, a two-way ANOVA was used to determine the mean difference.

Table 6

Two-way ANOVA Test for LLS Scores According to Educational and Proficiency Levels

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
LLS Score					
<u>Source</u>	<u>Type III Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
Corrected Model	2442.303 ^a	11	222.028	.822	.618
Intercept	814600.186	1	814600.186	3015.069	<.001
Education Level	38.238	2	19.119	.071	.932
Proficiency Level	1175.545	3	391.848	1.450	.232
Error	28638.688	106	270.176		
Total	1187401.000	118			
Corrected Total	31080.992	117			

a. R Squared = .079 (Adjusted R Squared = -.017)

The above two-way ANOVA output showed that the p -value for the educational level was 0.932, which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, at the 5% level of significance, there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis regarding the educational level. It can also be seen that the p -value for the proficiency level was 0.232, which is also greater than 0.05. Therefore, at the 5% level of significance, there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis regarding the proficiency level. Overall, there were no differences in the LLS scores according to the educational and language proficiency levels among female Saudi EFL learners.

Results for RQ2

RQ2. To what extent do female Saudi EFL learners with different levels of education and language proficiency differ in their use of SRL strategies?

Descriptive Statistics

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for SRL Scores According to Educational Level

<u>Education Level</u>	<u>SRL Score</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Preparatory	3.5200	.62724
Secondary	3.4443	.52746
Intermediate	3.3261	.80244

As Table 7 shows, on average, the highest SRL score of 3.52 ($SD = .62$) was observed when the educational level was the preparatory level, and the lowest SRL score of 3.32 ($SD = .80$) was observed when the educational level was the intermediate level.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics of SRL Scores According to the Proficiency Level

<u>Proficiency Level</u>	<u>SRL Score</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
A1	3.4891	.73375
A2	3.5269	.53666
B1	3.5955	.60251
B2	3.1814	.68213

Table 8 shows that, on average, the highest SRL score of 3.59 ($SD = .60$) was observed when the proficiency level was the B1 level, and the lowest SRL score of 3.18 ($SD = .68$) was observed when the proficiency level was the B2 level.

Hypotheses Testing

As the SRL scores for education levels and proficiency levels followed normality assumptions, a two-way ANOVA can be used to check the mean difference.

Table 9*Two-way ANOVA Test for SRL Scores According to Educational and Proficiency Levels*

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
<u>SRL Score</u>						
<u>Source</u>	<u>Type III Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>Partial Eta Squared</u>
Corrected Model	3998.923 ^a	11	363.538	1.798	.063	.157
Intercept	497640.959	1	497640.959	2461.535	<.001	.959
Education Level	98.019	2	49.010	.242	.785	.005
Proficiency Level	2609.874	3	869.958	4.303	.007	.109
Error	21429.696	106	202.167			
Total	767407.000	118				
Corrected Total	25428.619	117				

a. R Squared = .157 (Adjusted R Squared = .070)

The above two-way ANOVA output shows that the p -value for the educational level was 0.785, which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, at the 5% level of significance, there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis for educational level. Thus, it can be concluded that there are no significant differences in the SRL scores for the different educational levels. It can also be seen that the p -value for the proficiency level was 0.007, which is less than 0.05. Therefore, at the 5% level of significance, there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis regarding the proficiency level, and it can be concluded that there was at least one significant difference in the SRL scores for the different proficiency levels. The effect size was measured using partial eta-squared (η^2), with values of 0.01 considered small, 0.06 medium, and 0.14 large (Richardson, 2011), in light of the significant difference in proficiency level. The effect size for proficiency level was 0.10, which is regarded as medium.

Pairwise comparisons for different proficiency levels were then performed to identify pairs that had significant differences in terms of SRL scores.

Table 10*Pairwise Comparisons of SRL Scores According to Proficiency Level*

Pairwise Comparisons				
<u>(I)Proficiency Level</u>	<u>(J) Proficiency Level</u>	<u>SRL Score</u>		
		<u>Mean Difference (I-J)</u>	<u>Std. Error</u>	<u>Sig.^b</u>
A1	A2	-4.885	4.253	1.000
	B1	-6.626	4.621	.927
	B2	8.163	4.787	.546
A2	A1	4.885	4.253	1.000
	B1	-1.741	4.028	1.000
	B2	13.048*	4.217	.015
B1	A1	6.626	4.621	.927
	A2	1.741	4.028	1.000
	B2	14.789*	4.588	.010
B2	A1	-8.163	4.787	.546
	A2	-13.048*	4.217	.015
	B1	-14.789*	4.588	.010

Note: Based on estimated marginal means

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

b. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

It is apparent from Table 10 that the p -values for each pair of proficiency levels were identified. Of these pairs, the significantly different pairs were B2-A2 and B2-B1 because the p -values for these pairs were less than 0.05. Therefore, at the 5% level of significance, it can be concluded that the SRL scores were significantly different between the proficiency levels of B2-A2 and B2-B1. Overall, the hypothesis regarding SRL can be partially accepted.

Discussion

In this section, the results in the previous section are discussed, explained, and compared to those of previous studies in the field based on the two RQs.

The Differences in the Use of LLS

With regard to RQ1, there were no significant differences in the overall LLS scores according to educational and language proficiency levels among the Saudi female EFL learners in this study. Based on this finding, it appeared that participants' use of LLS was relatively consistent across various educational and proficiency levels, which implied that Saudi female EFL learners with higher educational and proficiency levels employed strategies that were

comparable to the strategies that others with lower educational and proficiency levels used. The result in this study indicated that there was no relationship between the use of LLS strategies and learners' educational and proficiency levels. This result is in line with that of Alhaysony (2017), who concluded that there were no significant differences in the use of LLS in terms of the duration of studying English, despite the fact that students who studied English for a longer period reported using LLS more frequently.

However, this finding is partially similar to that of Alrashidi (2022), who concluded that there were no significant differences in the use of LLS according to the year of study, although Alrashidi did state that LLS was correlated positively with proficiency levels; the positive correlation with proficiency levels suggested that students employed these strategies more frequently as their proficiency levels increased. In contrast to the findings of this study, Erdogan (2018) found a statistically significant difference regarding first-, second-, third-, and fourth-year university EFL students' use of LLS, which indicated that students' use of LLS varied as their level of education increased. Moreover, Eken and Gundogdu (2021) concluded that there was a significant difference in the use of LLS according to different proficiency levels.

A possible explanation for the results of the present study is that many Saudi EFL teachers do not follow the suggested teaching methods in textbooks that aim to encourage learners to be active participants in the learning process. The lack of application of these methods may be due to limited access to resources, insufficient training and confidence, time constraints, and overcrowded classrooms (Alqahtani, 2018). If the suggested teaching methods are not applied, Saudi female EFL learners with different educational and proficiency levels may be exposed to traditional instructional methods, which could encourage them to adopt similar learning strategies. According to the S²R model, learners must be decision makers and have control over their learning in order to choose and apply the techniques that are most effective for them. Therefore, the results of the present study draw attention to the importance of enabling Saudi female EFL learners to become better active learners and decision makers.

With regard to the highest and lowest use of LLS according to the different educational and proficiency levels, the highest LLS score was observed at the secondary level and the lowest at the preparatory level. The results in this study suggest that students in their preparatory college year are the least likely to incorporate LLS into their learning process. In terms of proficiency, the highest LLS score was observed at the B1 level and the lowest at the A2 level. This result could be explained by the fact that most of the secondary-year participants in this study had B1 and B2 levels, while most of the preparatory college year participants had A1 and A2 levels. In summary, the current findings suggest that the application of LLS in this study is more closely associated with the proficiency level than it is with the educational level.

The Differences in the Use of SRL Strategies

With regard to RQ2, no significant differences were found in the SRL scores for the different educational levels, which implies that the educational level does not have a significant impact on SRL. The highest SRL score in this study was observed for the preparatory level and the lowest for the intermediate level, which suggests that, the higher the educational level, the more the learners applied SRL. This finding indicates that Saudi female EFL learners recognize the importance of SRL and apply it more frequently as they progress in their education. Even though Erdogan's (2018) study is from a different context, its results are similar to those of the present study, revealing an increase in students' SRL levels from their first to fourth year of

study. According to this finding, students at higher educational levels are required to be more independent and self-reflective, thus necessitating a greater use of SRL.

There was at least one significant difference in the SRL scores for the different proficiency levels, as the SRL scores were significantly different between the proficiency levels B2-A2 and B2-B1. According to the results, the B2-level proficiency group demonstrated the least use of SRL compared to the other proficiency level groups. This finding contradicts those of Erdogan (2018) and Saito (2020), who concluded that learners with higher proficiency levels used SRL more often compared to those with lower proficiency levels. Erdogan (2018) stated that high achievers outperformed low achievers in terms of SRL, while Saito (2020) concluded that the frequent use of SRL was correlated with higher levels of proficiency. This contradiction suggests that the relationship between SRL and proficiency levels is more complex than was initially thought.

With regard to the highest and lowest use of SRL based on proficiency levels, the highest SRL score was observed for the B1 and A2 levels, and the lowest for the B2 level. This finding indicates that Saudi female EFL learners at the B1 and A2 levels were more interested in managing their learning processes. Since Saudi female EFL learners at the B1 and A2 levels are still developing their language skills, they may be more motivated to manage their learning process by using strategies such as organization and self-evaluation. The low usage of SRL strategies by Saudi female EFL learners at the B2 level may be caused by the fact that learners at this level encounter more challenging language skills, which may cause them to focus on mastering these skills rather than on utilizing a variety of strategies. Moreover, learners at the B2 level may encounter greater difficulty in setting specific, manageable goals that motivate them to use a variety of strategies to achieve them, in contrast to learners at lower levels, whose objectives may be simpler and clearer. In addition, once Saudi female EFL learners reach the B2 level, they may refine their strategies to focus on those that are most effective. The findings of this study do not support the notion that proficiency levels are positively correlated with the use of SRL strategies. Furthermore, it is not always the case that the utilization of SRL strategies increases as proficiency levels improve.

Limitations of the Study and Future Research

As with any research, the present study has certain limitations that do not undermine the validity of the results. The following issues are considered to be limitations, but can also suggest potential areas for future research. First, this study focused entirely on female participants, as they were more easily accessible to the researcher. Therefore, a study comparing the implementation of SRL and LLS strategies across genders, based on educational and proficiency levels, is highly recommended.

Second, the results of this study were based on two self-reported questionnaires. Future studies can implement qualitative methodologies, such as observation and focus groups. Another potential limitation is that the scope of this study may have been overly broad, as it covered both SRL and LLS in relation to different educational and proficiency levels. Future research should focus on a single domain, such as SRL or LLS, to facilitate a more in-depth analysis and more specific conclusions.

Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

This study was conducted to compare the implementation of LLS and SRL strategies among female Saudi EFL learners with varying educational and proficiency levels. The results of this study indicated that there were generally no significant differences in the participants'

LLS scores; thus, the use of similar LLS by Saudi female EFL learners across various educational and proficiency levels suggests that there is no relationship between the use of LLS and learners' educational and proficiency levels. Furthermore, the frequent use of LLS was not necessarily correlated with high levels of proficiency or education. The second major finding was that no significant differences were found in the participants' SRL scores in relation to the educational level. However, one significant difference was found in relation to the proficiency level, as B2-level participants reported the lowest use of SRL strategies. This finding suggests that the implementation of SRL strategies does not necessarily increase as proficiency levels increase. Overall, the findings suggest that Saudi female EFL learners with various educational and proficiency levels use similar LLS and SRL strategies.

The major finding of this study is that there has not been significant progress in Saudi female EFL learners' applications of LLS and SRL strategies across various educational and proficiency levels. The data highlight the importance of allowing Saudi female EFL learners to play a more active role in and to take control of their learning processes in order to choose and apply strategies that are suitable for their educational and proficiency levels. Based on the S²R model, learners must be active and in control of their learning in order to select and apply the strategies that best suit their current learning needs.

These findings are relevant to practitioners in the field of teaching English in Saudi Arabia. Saudi EFL teachers should recognize the importance of implementing teaching methodologies that encourage learners to be more active in the learning process, ultimately enabling them to take control of their learning. Oxford (2017) indicated that strategies can be taught to learners, while Su et al. (2023) concluded that targeted SRL strategies could be learned through training sessions that included feedback and practical guidance to improve specific skills, and Griffiths (2014) stated that learners could acquire LLS either explicitly or implicitly by increasing their awareness and allowing them to practice these strategies. Oxford (2017) suggested that educators should recognize their students' existing level of strategy use to provide engaging activities that incorporate necessary strategies or assign students with higher strategy usage to support those with lower usage. Therefore, Saudi female EFL learners should be provided with practical training sessions under their teachers' guidance and should be given feedback about how to implement LLS and SRL strategies effectively.

Bio

Amira Almutairi is a dedicated Master's student in TESOL at the English Language Institute of King Abdulaziz University in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. She has a particular interest in learning strategies and language proficiency. She aspires to be a teacher who empowers students to take greater control of their learning and achieve higher academic success.

Dr. Mona Sabir is an Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics at the ELI who has been teaching language and linguistic courses at KAU since 2007. She has an MA degree in linguistics (KAU, 2008) and a PhD degree in Applied Linguistics (Leeds, UK, 2015). Her areas of interest include Applied Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition. In particular, she is interested in how language theory can inform the language classroom.

References

- Abbasian, G.-R., & Hartoonian, A. (2014). Using self-regulated learning strategies in enhancing language proficiency with a focus on reading comprehension. *English Language Teaching*, 7(6). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n6p160>
- Adıgüzel, A., & Orhan, A. (2017). The relation between English learning students' levels of self-regulation and metacognitive skills and their English academic achievements. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(9), 115–125. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1138845>
- Alahmari, M. (2021). Self-regulation and linguistic competence in language learning: A Socio-Cultural Theoretic perspective. *Journal of Research in Language & Translation*, 1(1), 17-33.
- Alhaysony, M. (2017). Language learning strategies use by Saudi EFL students: The effect of duration of English language study and gender. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(1), 18. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0701.03>
- Almoslamani, Y. (2022). The impact of learning strategies on the academic achievement of university students in Saudi Arabia. *Learning & Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*, 18(1), 4–18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lthe-08-2020-0025>
- Alqahtani, S. M. A. (2018). Teaching English in Saudi Arabia. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 120–137). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315688466-6>
- Alrashidi, O. (2022). Assessing language learning strategies employed by university English major students in Saudi Arabia. *Cogent Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2022.2074935>
- Alzahrani, I. (2024). Identifying grammar learning strategies used by EFL learners to develop explicit and implicit knowledge of grammar. *Journal of Research in Language & Translation*, 4(2), 60–83.
- Amini, D., Anhari, M. H., & Ghasemzadeh, A. (2020). Modeling the relationship between metacognitive strategy awareness, self-regulation and reading proficiency of Iranian EFL learners. *Cogent Education*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2020.1787018>
- Dent, A. L., & Koenka, A. C. (2015). The relation between self-regulated learning and academic achievement across childhood and adolescence: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(3), 425–474. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9320-8>
- Eken, M., & Gundogdu, K. (2021). Language learning strategies and self-regulation skills of university preparatory school and private language course students. *International Journal of Current Approaches in Language Education and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 83–114. <https://doi.org/10.35452/caless.2021.5>
- Erdogan, T. (2018). The investigation of self-regulation and language learning strategies. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(7), 1477–1485. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.060708>
- Erdogan, T., & Senemoglu, N. (2016). Development and validation of a scale on self-regulation in learning (SSRL). *SpringerPlus*, 5(1686), 1-13.

- Fukuda, A. (2017). The Japanese EFL learners' self-regulated language learning and proficiency. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 65–87. <https://doi.org/10.25256/paal.22.1.4>
- Griffiths, C. (2014). Language learning strategy instruction. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 36–49.
- Hung, D. M. (2022). EFL students' self-regulated learning strategies during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Arab World English Journal*, 2, 22–34. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/covid2.2>
- Machimana, P., & Genis, G. (2022). Language learning strategies of high and low performing second language learners: A sociocultural perspective. *I-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, 12(1), 56–69.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context* (2nd edn.). Routledge.
- Ranjan, R., Philominraj, A., & Saavedra, R. A. (2021). On the relationship between language learning strategies and language proficiency in Indian universities. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(3), 73–94. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.1435a>
- Richardson, J. T. E. (2011). Eta squared and partial eta squared as measures of effect size in educational research. *Educational Research Review*, 6(2), 135–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2010.12.001>
- Saito, A. (2020). Strategy use, self-efficacy beliefs, and self-regulatedness in adult foreign language learning. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 152–167. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v3n2.282>
- Su, L., Noordin, N., & Jeyaraj, J. J. (2023). Effectiveness of self-regulated learning intervention on foreign language learning at tertiary level: A systematic review. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(5), 403–411. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n5p403>
- Wang, J., Xue, H., & Wu, X. (2023). Mental health and academic achievement among Chinese adolescents during COVID-19 pandemic: The mediating role of self-regulation learning. *Social Psychology of Education*, 26(4), 1001–1015. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-023-09772-4>
- Xiao, Y., & Yang, M. (2019). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: How formative assessment supports students' self-regulation in English language learning. *System*, 81, 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.01.004>
- Yaghi, E. T. (2021). The impact of metacognitive online reading strategies on online reading disposition of Saudi EFL learners. *Arab World English Journal*, 1, 364–380. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/covid.27>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts., P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.) *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 13–39). Academic Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2

- Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Investigating self-regulation and motivation: Historical background, methodological developments, and future prospects. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1), 166–183. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207312909>
- Zimmerman, B. J., Schunk, D. H., & Dibenedetto, M. K. (2017). The role of self-efficacy and related beliefs in self-regulation of learning and performance. In A. J. Elliot, C. S. Dweck, & D. S Yeager, *Handbook of Competence and Motivation* (2nd ed., pp. 313-333). The Guilford Press.

Appendix A

Table 1

SRL Strategy Classification as Described by Zimmerman (2008, p. 178)

Main classification	Strategies	Definition
Before task (Forethought phase)	Goal setting and planning	The process of identifying learning goals, including subgoals, scheduling, and performing the related tasks.
	Environmental structuring	Selecting or setting up the environment in order to facilitate learning.
During task (Performance phase)	Organizing and transforming	Learners rearrange the course materials to enhance their learning.
	Seeking social assistance	Asking for assistance from adults, teachers, or peers.
	Seeking information	Students use nonsocial sources to obtain additional information.
	Keeping records and self-monitoring	Student-led attempts to document incidents or outcomes.
	Rehearsing and memorizing	Student-led practices to help them to memorize the content.
After task (Self-reflection phase)	Self-evaluation	Students' assessments of the quality or improvements in their work.
	Self-consequence	Students determine rewards or punishments for their achievements or failures.

Table 2*Oxford's Taxonomy (1990, pp. 16–17)*

Main categories	Meaning	Subcategories	Meaning	Examples
Direct Strategies	Related directly to how the target language is used and mentally processed.	Cognitive strategies	Assisting learners to interact cognitively and directly with the target language material.	Reasoning, note taking, summarizing, synthesizing, and organizing information.
		Memory strategies	Facilitating the connection among items or concepts without gaining a deep understanding of them.	Acronyms, rhyming, mental pictures, and body movements.
		Compensation strategies	Assisting in compensating for knowledge gaps.	Synonyms, gestures, or guessing based on the context.
Indirect Strategies	Mainly used to indirectly support and manage the learning process.	Metacognitive strategies	Responsibility for controlling the learning process.	Identifying learning needs, planning, organizing materials, arranging study times and places, monitoring and evaluating task performance.
		Affective strategies	Assessing the learner's mood and their level of anxiety.	Discussing feelings, praising oneself for accomplishments.
		Social strategies	Seeking social assistance	Asking for clarification or seeking assistance.

Appendix B

Data Collection Instruments

1. The Proficiency Test:

اختبار سريع لتحديد المستوى باللغة الإنجليزية

عزيزتي الطالبة/

هذا الاختبار هو جزء من رسالة ماجستير بعنوان استخدام متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في السعودية لاستراتيجيات التنظيم الذاتي وتعلم اللغة: دراسة مقارنة

أرجو مشاركتك في اكمال هذا الاختبار السريع

ملاحظة:

جميع الإجابات ستعامل بسرية ولن يطلع عليها سوى الباحثة

أوافق على المشاركة تطوعيا في هذا الاختبار:

☐ لا☐ نعم

الاسم (اختياري)

.....

ارغب بالحصول على درجة الاختبار

☐ لا☐ نعم

في حال الرغبة بالحصول على الدرجة الرجاء اضافة رقم الجوال:

.....

شاكراً ومقدرة لوقتكم ومجهودكم

Questions 1 – 5

- Where can you see these notices?
- For questions **1** to **5**, mark **one** letter **A**, **B** or **C** on your Answer Sheet.

1 You can look, but don't touch the pictures.

- A** in an office
- B** in a cinema
- C** in a museum

2 Please give the right money to the driver.

- A** in a bank
- B** on a bus
- C** in a cinema

3

NO
PARKING
PLEASE

- A** in a street
- B** on a book
- C** on a table

4 CROSS BRIDGE FOR TRAINS TO
EDINBURGH

- A** in a bank
- B** in a garage
- C** in a station

5

**KEEP IN A
COLD PLACE**

- A** on clothes
- B** on furniture
- C** on food

Questions 6 – 10

- In this section you must choose the word which best fits each space in the text below.
- For questions **6** to **10**, mark **one** letter **A**, **B** or **C** on your Answer Sheet.

THE STARS

There are millions of stars in the sky. If you look **(6)**..... the sky on a clear night, it is possible to see about 3000 stars. They look small, but they are really **(7)**.....big hot balls of burning gas. Some of them are huge, but others are much smaller, like our planet Earth. The biggest stars are very bright, but they only live for a short time. Every day new stars **(8)**..... born and old stars die. All the stars are very far away. The light from the nearest star takes more **(9)** four years to reach Earth. Hundreds of years ago, people **(10)**..... stars, like the North star, to know which direction to travel in. Today you can still see that star.

6 **A** at

B up

C on

7 **A** very

B too

C much

8 **A** is

B be

C are

9 **A** that

B of

C than

10 **A** use

B used

C using

Questions 11 – 20

- In this section you must choose the word which best fits each space in the texts.
- For questions **11** to **20**, mark **one** letter **A**, **B**, **C** or **D** on your Answer Sheet.

Good smiles ahead for young teeth

Older Britons are the worst in Europe when it comes to keeping their teeth. But British youngsters

(11) more to smile about because (12) teeth are among the best. Almost 80% of Britons over 65 have lost all or some (13) their teeth according to a World Health Organisation survey. Eating too (14) sugar is part of the problem. Among (15), 12-year olds have on average only three missing, decayed or filled teeth.

- | | | | | |
|----|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|
| 11 | A getting | B got | C have | D having |
| 12 | A their | B his | C them | D theirs |
| 13 | A from | B of | C among | D between |
| 14 | A much | B lot | C many | D deal |
| 15 | A person | B people | C children | D family |

Christopher Columbus and the New World

On August 3, 1492, Christopher Columbus set sail from Spain to find a new route to India, China and Japan. At this time most people thought you would fall off the edge of the world if you sailed too far. Yet sailors such as Columbus had seen how a ship appeared to get lower and lower on the horizon as it sailed away. For Columbus this (16) that the world was round. He (17)to his men about the distance travelled each day. He did not want them to think that he did not (18) exactly where they were going. (19), on October 12, 1492, Columbus and his men landed on a small island he named San Salvador. Columbus believed he was in Asia, (20) he was actually in the Caribbean.

- | | | | | |
|----|--------|------------|-----------|----------|
| 16 | A made | B pointed | C was | D proved |
| 17 | A lied | B told | C cheated | D asked |
| 18 | A find | B know | C think | D expect |
| 19 | A Next | B Secondly | C Finally | D Once |
| 20 | A as | B but | C because | D if |

Questions 21 – 40

- In this section you must choose the word or phrase which best completes each sentence.
- For questions **21** to **40**, mark **one** letter **A**, **B**, **C** or **D** on your Answer Sheet.

21 The children won't go to sleepwe leave a light on outside their bedroom.

- A** except **B** otherwise **C** unless **D** but

22 I'll give you my spare keys in case you home before me.

- A** would get **B** got **C** will get **D** get

23 My holiday in Paris gave me a great to improve my French accent.

- A** occasion **B** chance **C** hope **D** possibility

24 The singer ended the concert her most popular song.

- A** by **B** with **C** in **D** as

25 Because it had not rained for several months, there was a of water.

- A** shortage **B** drop **C** scarce **D** waste

26 I've always you as my best friend.

- A** regarded **B** thought **C** meant **D** supposed

27 She came to live here a month ago.

- A** quite **B** beyond **C** already **D** almost

28 Don't make such a! The dentist is only going to look at your teeth.

- A** fuss **B** trouble **C** worry **D** reaction

29 He spent a long time looking for a tie which with his new shirt.

- A** fixed **B** made **C** went **D** wore

30 Fortunately,.....from a bump on the head, she suffered no serious injuries
from her
fall.

- A** other **B** except **C** besides **D** apart

31 She had changed so much that.....anyone recognised her.

- A** almost **B** hardly **C** not **D** nearly

32teaching English, she also writes children's books.

- A** Apart **B** As well as **C** In addition **D** Moreover

33 It was clear that the young couple were of taking charge of the restaurant.

- A** responsible **B** reliable **C** capable **D** able

34 The book of ten chapters, each one covering a different topic.

- A** comprises **B** includes **C** consists **D**
contains

35 Mary was disappointed with her new shirt as the colour..... very quickly.

- A** bleached **B** died **C** vanished **D** faded

36 National leaders from all over the world are expected to attend themeeting.

- A** peak **B** summit **C** top **D** apex

37 Jane remained calm when she won the lottery and.....about her business as
if
nothing had happened.

- A** came **B** brought **C** went **D** moved

38 I suggest we outside the stadium tomorrow at 8.30.

- A** meeting **B** meet **C** met **D** will meet

39 My remarks wereas a joke, but she was offended by them.

A pretended **B** thought **C** meant **D**
supposed

40 You ought to take up swimming for the.....of your health.

A concern **B** relief **C** sake **D** cause

2. the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)Scale:

استبيان استراتيجيات تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية

عزيزتي الطالبة/

هذا الاستبيان هو جزء من رسالة ماجستير بعنوان استخدام متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في السعودية لاستراتيجيات التنظيم الذاتي وتعلم اللغة: دراسة مقارنة

أرجو مشاركتك في اكمال هذا الاستبيان.

ملاحظة:

جميع الإجابات ستعامل بسرية ولن يطلع عليها سوى الباحثة لذلك أرجو المصادقية التامة في الإجابة

أوافق على المشاركة تطوعيا في هذا الاستبيان:

☐

لا

☐

نعم

الاسم (اختياري)

.....

شاكرا ومقدرة لوقتك ومجهودك

اقرني العبارات التالية واختاري الإجابة المناسبة التي تصف مدى مصداقية العبارة بالنسبة لك حاليا.

1- أفكر في العلاقات بين ما أعرفه بالفعل والأشياء الجديدة التي أتعلّمها باللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

2- أستخدم الكلمات الإنجليزية الجديدة في جملة حتى أستطيع تذكرها.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

3- أتذكر كلمة إنجليزية جديدة من خلال تخيلي لموقف يمكن أن أستخدم فيه الكلمة.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

4- أستخدم البطاقات التعليمية لتذكر الكلمات الإنجليزية الجديدة.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

5- أنا أمثل بحركات اليد والجسد الكلمات الإنجليزية الجديدة.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

6- أراجع دروس اللغة الإنجليزية كثيرًا.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

7- أقول أو أكتب الكلمات الإنجليزية الجديدة عدة مرات.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

8- أحاول أن أتحدث مثل المتحدثين الأصليين للغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

9- أستخدم الكلمات الإنجليزية التي أعرفها بطرق مختلفة.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

10- أحاول أن أبدأ محادثات باللغة الإنجليزية في مواقف مختلفة.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

11- أشاهد البرامج التلفزيونية باللغة الإنجليزية أو أذهب إلى الأفلام الناطقة باللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

12- أقرأ لأجل المتعة باللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

13- أكتب ملاحظات أو رسائل أو خطابات أو تقارير باللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

14- أقوم أولاً بقراءة مقطع باللغة الإنجليزية بسرعة ثم أعود وأقرأه بعناية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

15- أبحث عن كلمات في لغتي العربية تشابه الكلمات الجديدة في اللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

16- أحاول أن أجد أنماطًا متشابهة لكلمات اللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

17- أقوم بإعداد ملخصات للمعلومات التي أسمعها أو أقرأها باللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

18- عندما لا أستطيع التفكير في كلمة ما أثناء محادثة باللغة الإنجليزية، أستخدم حركات اليد والجسد.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

19- ألاحظ أخطائي في اللغة الإنجليزية وأستخدم هذه المعرفة لمساعدتي في تحسين أدائي.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

20- أحاول أن أعرف كيف أصبح متعلما أفضل للغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

21- أرتب جدولتي بحيث يكون لدي الوقت الكافي لدراسة اللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

22- لدي أهداف واضحة لتحسين مهاراتي في اللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

23- أفكر في مدى تقدمي في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

24- أحاول الاسترخاء كلما شعرت بالخوف من استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

25- أشجع نفسي على التحدث باللغة الإنجليزية حتى عندما أخشى ارتكاب الأخطاء.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

26- أمنح نفسي مكافأة عندما أتقن شيء في اللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

27- أكتب مشاعري في مذكرة (دفتر يوميات) خاصة بتعلم اللغة.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

28- أتحدث مع شخص آخر حول ما أشعر به عندما أتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

29- إذا لم أفهم شيئا ما باللغة الإنجليزية، أطلب من الشخص الآخر أن يبطئ أو يقوله مرة أخرى.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

3. The Scale on Self-Regulation in Learning (SSRL):

استبيان التنظيم الذاتي

عزيزتي الطالبة/

هذا الاستبيان هو جزء من رسالة ماجستير بعنوان استخدام متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في السعودية لاستراتيجيات التنظيم الذاتي وتعلم اللغة: دراسة مقارنة

أرجو مشاركتك في اكمال هذا الاستبيان

ملاحظة:

جميع الإجابات ستعامل بسرية ولن يطلع عليها سوى الباحثة لذلك أرجو المصادقية التامة بالإجابة.

أوافق على المشاركة تطوعيا في هذا الاستبيان:

☐ لا☐

نعم

الاسم (اختياري)

.....

شاكراً ومقدرة لوقتكم ومجهودكم

اقرني العبارات التالية واختاري الإجابة المناسبة التي تصف مدى مصداقية العبارة بالنسبة لك حاليا.

- قبل البدء بالواجب:

1- أتأكد من وجود جميع الكتب والمذكرات والمراجع في متناول يدي قبل أن أبدأ المذاكرة.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

2- أتحدث مع معلمتي عن الدورات التي يجب أن أحصل عليها والتي قد تكون مفيدة لي على المدى البعيد.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

3- عادةً ما أذاكر في مكان يساعدني على التركيز

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

4- أضع قائمة للمهام الدراسية التي أحتاج إلى القيام بها أسبوعياً في دفتر ملاحظاتي.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

5- أقوم بتنظيم العروض التقديمية والواجبات التي أحتاج إلى تحضيرها والمواد التي سأقرأها والوقت الذي سأخصصه لها مع مراعاة الجدول الزمني للدرس.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

6- قبل أن أبدأ بحل واجب، أخصص بعض الوقت للتوقف ووضع خطة.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

7- أخطط عادةً في بداية الفصل الدراسي لكل واجب واختبار ومتى يجب أن أفعل ذلك

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

- خلال القيام بالواجب:

8- أقوم بوضع خط تحت الكلمات الرئيسية في النص أو أضع علامة عليها بلون مختلف لمساعدتي في تعلم المواضيع

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

9- عندما يكون هناك موضوع لا أفهمه في الدرس، أطلب المساعدة من معلمتي وزميلاتي

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

10- أحدد النقاط الرئيسية في الموضوع وأقوم بالربط بين النقاط الرئيسية والنقاط الفرعية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

11- أقوم بالتلخيص، وتدوين الملاحظات، ورسم الأشكال والجداول (أستخدم واحدة أو أكثر من هذه) لمساعدتي في فهم المواضيع المهمة

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

12- أبحث عن طرق وموارد سواء كتب أو على الانترنت لإكمال الواجبات بأسهل طريقة ممكنة

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

13- أثناء قراءة كتاب أو مراجعة ملاحظاتي، أتوقف أحيانا وأسأل نفسي: "هل أفهم ما يقال هنا؟"

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

14- للحصول على مزيد من المعلومات التفصيلية، آخذ كتبًا من المكتبة وأقرأها بعمق.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

15- أغلق النص بعد الانتهاء من قراءته وأكرر المعلومات المهمة في ذهني

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

16- أبحث في الإنترنت للحصول على واجب مشابه للواجب المطلوب مني.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

17- أنا أسأل نفسي: "هل أستخدم استراتيجيات الدراسة المناسبة؟"

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

18- أحدد وقت لأذاكر مع الطالبات في الفصل كمجموعة دراسية.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

- بعد القيام بالواجب:

19- عندما أقوم بحل أسئلة واجباتي المنزلية، أتأكد من إجاباتي للتأكد من صحتها.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

20- أعد نفسي بمكافأة عندما أحصل على درجات جيدة في الاختبارات أو الواجبات

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

21- أتأكد مما إذا كان الواجب الذي قمت بحله يتوافق مع المعايير التي طلبتها المعلمة.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

22- بعد أن أنتهي من حل واجباتي، أقرأها مرة أخرى وأجري تصحيحات عليها

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------

23- أقارن واجباتي بالواجبات المماثلة.

أبدا	نادرا	أحيانا	غالبا	دائما
------	-------	--------	-------	-------