The Relationship between the Type of Oral Communication Strategies and Self-regulated Learning among EFL Learners

Mahboobeh Saeedi

MA.Graduate,Department of English, Quchan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Quchan, Iran

naeemehkharaghani@gmail.com

Naeemeh Kharaghani (Corresponding author)

Assistant professor ,Department of English, Quchan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Quchan, Iran

naeemehkharaghani@gmail.com

Abstract

Oral communication strategies include listening and speaking strategies and self-regulated strategies include memory strategy, goal-setting, self-evaluation, seeking assistance, environmental structuring, learning responsibility, and planning and organizing. The present study using a mixed-method design, mainly aims to specifying the best predictor of oral communication strategies in SRL components, and exploring EFL students' perspectives of the role of oral communication strategy use in self-regulated learning. In so doing, a sample of 136 university students majoring in TEFL participated in this study from several universities in Khorasan Razavi Province. To measure oral communication strategies and self-regulated strategies, the relevant questionnaires were utilized by the researcher. The results of Pearson Correlation Coefficient showed that there was a large, positive correlation between self-regulated learning and oral communication strategies. Moreover, the results of Multiple Regression confirmed that the best predictor of oral communication strategies in SRL components was memory strategy. Then, the results of semi-structured interviews with the students regarding the role of oral communication strategies and self-regulated strategies revealed common themes including: challenging, interesting, new, useful, practical, effective, supportive and facilitative. At the end, the study offers some practical implications for EFL teachers and learners.

Keywords: Classroom Anxiety, Communication Anxiety, Speaking Self-efficacy, EFL Setting

1. Introduction

Oral communication skills mainly include the listening and speaking skills in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Listening is a complex active process of interpretation where listeners match what they hear with what they already know (Rost, 2002). Buck (2001) emphasizes that listening comprehension is multi-dimensional in nature with a number of different information

sources informing the comprehension process in no fixed order. Oral communication skills also include speaking skills. Lado (1961) posits, "the ability to speak a foreign language is without doubt the most prized language skill" (p. 239). Speaking is perceived as the basis of communication and literacy (Richards & Renandya, 2002), and speaking is considered as the most important language skills (Ur, 1999).

Actually, to be successful in oral communication in a L2 language, one needs to know the strategies that promote learning development. In this respect, an important factor in learning a new language is the students' ability to regulate their learning. According to Zimmerman (2001), self-regulated learning (SRL) refers to the active role individuals play in acquiring and constructing knowledge, and is considered a key for conditioning students to be life-long learners. It is evident that communication strategies and SRL have been found to be important variables in predicting students' academic achievement (Pintrich, 2004). Previous literature has acknowledged the role of cognitive variables such as learning strategies and regulation of learning that encompasses the regulation of motivation and self-regulatory motivational strategies (Ushioda, 2008). Oral communication strategies include listening and speaking strategies (Nakatani, 2006).

Indeed, by employing self-regulation strategies students can themselves work on the oral communication skills and manage their own learning. Indeed, Tutyandari (2005) states that strategy use would seem to be the ideal activity in which students could use their English classes and it aims at improving a conversational situation in which students might find themselves and give them an opportunity to practice and develop their oral communication skills. According to Green and Oxford (2008), explicit instruction on strategies is more efficient that simply asking the learners to apply, and combine whatever they know. The investigation of the oral communication strategies that arise while learning to interact in the target language will hopefully broaden the insight into the issue of strategy teaching in English courses and will help learners in making the classroom environment less stressful and more inspiring.

Having explored the previous works on oral communication strategies, the researcher found that there is a lack of research on the association between oral communication strategies and SRL for EFL learners so that she believes that there is a gap of research in this regard in the Iranian context. Indeed, listening and speaking skills are always hard for the learners because at high school they have to mainly focus on reading and writing skills. Moreover, it is evident that SRL has been found to be important variables in predicting students' academic achievement (Ushioda, 2008). While some educational researchers have reported the relationship of each of the SRL and learning motivation with students' academic achievement in developed countries (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Teng & Zhang, 2018), so far no study has been found to work on the linkage between SRL and listening and speaking strategies in the context of Iran. The present study is an attempt to fill the gap of research in this regard.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Oral Communication Strategies

Celce-Murcia and McIntosh (1991) mentioned that speaking in a second or foreign language has regularly seen as the most requesting of the four abilities. Listening and reading are known as receptive skills while speaking and writing are known as productive skills (Richards & Renandya, 2002). Despite its importance, L2 learners mostly consider listening as the most challenging language skill to learn (Hasan, 2000). As Vandergrift (2006) points out, one of the reasons might be that learners are not taught how to learn listening effectively. However, listening has changed its role from a passive activity which deserved less class time to an active process through which language acquisition takes place (Vandergrift, 2003).

Özcan and Yaman (2014), in a study, aimed to identify the oral communication strategies used by the students learning English as a foreign language in Turkey, using a reliable and valid measurement tool. In a study by Ferris and Tagg (1996), speaking is named oral generation and is one of the abilities learners are to learn in their language improvement. The capacity to converse is exceedingly esteemed by learners, however trainers frequently discover it an expertise that is difficult to promote. Amirian, Mallahi and Zaghi (2015) investigated the relationship between Iranian EFL students' self-regulation capacity for vocabulary learning and their vocabulary size. For this purpose, the researchers made use of two main instruments: the self-regulation capacity in vocabulary learning scale developed by Tsang et al. (2006) consisting of five subscales of commitment, metacognitive, emotion, satiation and environment control, and a bilingual vocabulary size test developed and validated by Karami (2012). Richards and Schmidt (2010) mentioned that during the listening comprehension tasks, teachers take specific notes on questions, main points and responses and provide appropriate hints for students whenever necessary. As Kolen and Brennan (2004) found, the strategy is simple but effective, and it can be used to assess children's understanding of a story once a teacher has adequately modeled it for them.

2.2 Self-regulated Learning in SLA

Research on SR dates back to late 1950s, during which a number of studies have been carried out on the self-regulated learning (Miller, Galanter, & Pribram, 1960; Powers, Clark, & McFarland, 1960). As the significant factors of learning, the self-regulation of cognition and behavior influences their academic success including the extent to which school students become self-regulators of their own learning (Beishuizen & Steffens, 2011). The skills necessary for self-regulation in academic settings such as schools have been investigated under the rubric of SRL (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2008). Meltzer (2007) concluded that by effective self-regulated learners actively set goals, decide on appropriate strategies, plan their time, organize and prioritize materials and information, shift approaches flexibly, monitor their learning by seeking feedback on their performance and make appropriate adjustments for future learning activities.

Zimmerman and Martines-Pons (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1990) used self-regulated learning interview schedule to identify the relationship between students SR strategies and their

understanding of verbal and mathematical self-efficacy. Although SRL as a theoretical framework has been explored from a variety of perspectives (e.g., Zimmerman, 2001), models of SRL development are typically grounded in a social cognitive perspective (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2005) in which intellectual development and social functioning are closely related and cannot be separated from the contexts in which they occur (Bandura, 1977). These models suggest that self-regulatory abilities develop gradually over the course of childhood and into adolescence (Bakracevic Vukman, & Licardo, 2010) with self-regulatory competence initially developing from social sources and subsequently shifting to self-sources in a manner that is reminiscent of a traditional apprenticeship (Beishuizen & Steffens, 2011). More recently, Erdogan (2018) sought to examine the relationship between students' self-regulations and their language learning strategies. The participants of the study included 860 university students in Turkey. The Scale on Self-Regulation in Learning (SSRL) and Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) were used to collect data. The results revealed that there was a medium positive correlation between the student self-regulation and their language learning strategies based on achievement and grade level.

2.3 Theoretical Framework of the Study

The present study followed the guidelines suggested by Clennel (1995) whose opinions diverge on what constitutes a communication strategy, and researchers in this field have used several competing taxonomies for communication strategies. In particular, two different types of definitions have evolved. Focusing on the interaction between interlocutors and negotiation of meaning has come to be recognized as the *interactional view* (Williams, Inscoe, & Tasker, 1997). Focusing on the range of problem-solving activities open to individuals has come to be regarded as the *psycholinguistic view* (e.g., Kitajima, 1997). This difference might be rooted in the methodologies of research.

Moreover, the self-regulated learners embark on planning, self-inspection, self-controlling and self-evaluation and thus create conducive learning environments at different stages of their learning (Zimmerman, 2001). Moreover, to enhance comprehension and memory when carrying out academic tasks, self-regulated learners engage in different cognitive strategies, for example, repetition, rehearsal, elaboration and organization. Having effectively employed these strategies, the learner is able to experience a sense of self- worth and independence in doing school work (Tavakolinzadeh & Ebrahimi-Qavam, 2011) which leads to increased success in academic achievement.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The sample consisted of 136 university students majoring in TEFL from Islamic Azad University of Quchan, Islamic Azad University of Torbat-e Heidarieh, and Tabaran University of Mashhad. Students participating in this study had already passed their English four-credit courses of English Structure, and English Conversation. The students were both male and female and they were junior and senior students. Nevertheless, at the first stage, the homogeneity of the participants was

specified based on their scores on the Nelson Proficiency Test. Indeed, in order to make the sampling fairly homogenous in terms of their level of proficiency, the researcher just included those students whose scores on Nelson Proficiency Test used in this study fell one standard deviation below or above the mean and ignores the rest. Therefore, out of 136 students, 112 students were remained to participate in the study. Moreover, six students were participated in the qualitative phase of the study based on data saturation method. The researchers tried to make use of more samples since in correlational studies the number of the participants should be large enough in order to generalize the findings (Dörnyei, 2007).

3.2 Instrumentation

The first instrument used for homogeneity purposes was the 50-item Nelson English Language Proficiency Test. This multiple-choice test includes cloze passages, vocabulary, structure, and pronunciation. The English language proficiency test used in the present study will be adopted from Fowler and Coe (1978). The reliability coefficient of this proficiency test is acceptable because the estimate measured by Cronbach Alpha in the Iranian context was 0.82 (Hashemian, Roohani & Fadaei, 2012). The scoring of the test is calculated out of 50, one score for each question. The second instrument used by the researcher was the questionnaire of listening strategies as well as speaking strategies developed by Nakatani (2006), consisting of two parts. The first part examines strategies for coping with speaking problems, including eight categories consisting of 32 specific strategies, and the second part examines strategies for coping with listening problems, including seven categories consisting of 26 specific strategies. The inventory is a 5-likert scale from never or almost never true of me to always or almost always true of me.

The third instrument used to measure self-regulation of EFL students was the self-regulated learning scale developed by Magno (2010) that was within the context of their learning in higher education. Each item is responded by a four-point Lickert scale (Strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree). The scale is composed of seven factors: Memory strategy (14 items), goal-setting (5 items), self-evaluation (12 items), seeking assistance (8 items), environmental structuring (5 items), learning responsibility (5 items), and planning and organizing (5 items). The whole scale, therefore, entailed 54 items. High internal consistencies were attained for each factor (.73 to .87). The last instrument used to explore the students' perspectives of the relationship between the main variables entailing oral communication strategies and self-regulated learning was the semi-structured interview questions including a number of interview questions that were designed by the researcher of the current study. Two experts in the field of ELT who were teaching English courses at Islamic Azad University of Quchan checked the content validity of the questions.

3.3 Procedure and Data Analysis

The pertinent data was gathered from 112 EFL students in five weeks from the participants. The researcher tried to make use of more samples since in correlational studies, the number of the participants should be large enough in order to generalize the findings (Dörnyei, 2007). During the

first session, the researcher administered NELSON Test to the participants. Students' whose scores were one standard deviation above and below the mean were selected for the study. Next, the researcher administered oral communication strategies questionnaire to the students and they were informed about the way they should answer it and the given time. Then, the researcher administered self-regulation learning questionnaire to the students and they were informed about the way they should answer the test and the given time.

From the second session to the sixth session, the researcher first familiarized the students with the oral communication strategies including speaking strategies and listening strategies and trained the students how to use these strategies in practice. The strategies for coping with speaking problems included eight categories: 1) *social affective*, 2) *fluency-oriented*, 3) *negotiation for meaning while speaking*, 4) *accuracy-oriented, 5) message reduction and alternation*, 6) *nonverbal strategies while speaking*, 7) *message abandonment*, and 8) *attempt to think in English*. The strategies for coping with listening problems included seven categories: 1) *negotiation for meaning while listening*, 2) *fluency-maintaining*, 3) *scanning*, 4) *getting the gist*, 5) *nonverbal strategies while listening*, 6) *less active listener*, and 7) *word-oriented*.

Following this, the teacher held two sessions for the students to make them familiar with self-regulated learning and during the treatment, she worked with the students on the self-regulation components that they could use in their learning processes including Memory strategy, self-evaluation, seeking assistance, environmental structuring, learning responsibility, and planning and organizing. During the seventh session, the researcher administered the questionnaires of oral communication strategies and self-regulated learning to the students and they were informed about the way they should answer the test and the given time. Some of the students answered by means of email and telegram since the pandemic spread of Coronavirus Covid-19 restricted the students.

Finally, in the eighth session, to gather the participants' responses to the interview regarding their perceptions towards the use of oral communication strategies and self-regulated learning, she wrote the questions in English Language and the students were required to reply to the questions precisely. Using a simple writing task for data collection is most likely the best way to get the students express their thoughts about the issues mentioned above. The writing task resembles a semi-structured interview, in which subjects could express their thinking with very little interference.

To find an answer for the first research question, the researcher performed Pearson Correlation Coefficient Formula to determine the relationship between oral communication strategies including listening and speaking strategies and SRL for EFL learners. To find an answer for the second research question regarding the best predictor of oral communication strategies in self-regulated learning components for EFL learners, the researcher opted for Multiple Regression. To answer the last research question about the students' thought about the role of oral communication strategy use in self-regulated learning, the researcher used constant comparison analysis to analyze data. With reference to constant comparison analysis, she followed the three

major stages of the constant comparison analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). During the first stage (i.e., open coding), the data were chunked into small units. The researcher attached a descriptor, or code, to each of the units. Then, during the second stage (i.e., axial coding), these codes were grouped into categories. Finally, in the third stage (i.e., selective coding), she developed one or more themes expressing the content of each of the groups.

4. Results
4.1 Oral Communication Strategies and Self-regulated Learning

As for the first research question of the study concerning the significant relationship between oral communication strategies and self-regulated learning for EFL learners, the researcher ran Descriptive Statistics and Pearson Correlation Coefficient Formula since the two variables yielded interval data. The researcher performed the preliminary analysis to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality (i.e., skewness and kurtosis which were between +2 and _2 for the variable). The results showed the means and standard deviations of the scores for self-regulated learning (M= 159.51; SD=17.45) and oral communication strategies (M= 202.52, SD=16.66).

Table 1
Correlations between the Variables

		self-regulated learning	oral communication strategies
self-regulated learning	Pearson Correlation	1	.72**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.00
	N	112	112

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As shown in Table 1, after performing the preliminary analysis to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, the results obtained from Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient showed the relationship between scores of self-regulated learning and oral communication strategies for university EFL students. There was a large, positive correlation between self-regulated learning and oral communication strategies [r=.72, n=112, p<.05], with higher scores on self-regulated learning was associated with higher scores on oral communication strategies, based on the guideline proposed by Cohen (1992).

4.2 The Best Predictor of Oral Communication Strategies in Self-regulated Learning

The second research question of the study concerned with the predictors of oral communication strategies in self-regulated learning components. The researcher performed for Multiple Regression and the results obtained from the statistical analyses are reported as follows:

The researcher initially checked Multicollinearity and the result showed that the seven independent variables showed at least some relationship with the dependent variable which is oral communication strategies (above .3 preferably). As for the possibility of multi-collinearity, the researcher used cut-off points for determining the presence of multi-collinearity (tolerance value of less than .10, or a VIF value of above 10). In this study, the tolerance value for each independent variable were not less than .10; therefore, there was no violation of the multi-collinearity assumption. This was also supported by the VIF value, which were well below the cut-off of 10. Therefore, there was no violation. These assumptions were checked by analyzing the Normal Probability Plot of the regression standardized residuals that was accounted as part of the analysis. In the Normal Probability Plot the points should lie in a reasonably straight diagonal line from bottom left to top right which would suggest no major deviations from normality.

Following this, the model summary value was .168. Expressed as a percentage (multiply by 100, by shifting the decimal point two places to the right), it implies that the model (which included scores on memory strategy, goal-setting, self-evaluation, seeking assistance, environmental structuring, learning responsibility, and planning and organizing components) explained 55.7 percent of the variance in oral communication strategies scores.

Table 2
ANOVA test

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	23901.62	7	3414.51	18.65	.00[a]
	Residual	19038.29	104	183.06		
	Total	42939.92	111			

a. Predictors: (Constant), planning and organizing, seeking assistance, self-evaluation, learning responsibility, Memory strategy, environmental structuring, goal-setting

b. Dependent Variable: oral communication strategies

As shown in Table 2, to assess the statistical significance of the results, it was necessary to run the ANOVA Test. This tested the hypothesis that multiple R in the population equals zero (0). The model reached statistical significance (F=18.65, Sig = .00, this really means p<.05).

Table 3

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	79.43	12.75		6.22	.00		
	Memory strategy	.89	.29	.37	3.06	.00	.28	3.49
	goal-setting	3.82	2.59	.35	1.47	.14	.17	9.54
	self-evaluation	.40	.54	.07	.75	.45	.40	2.47
	seeking assistance	.55	.57	.09	.96	.33	.49	2.02
	environmental structuring	2.79	2.14	.25	1.30	.19	.11	8.85
	learning responsibility	-2.10	1.52	-.19	-1.37	.17	.22	4.54
	planning and organizing	-.98	1.23	-.08	-.79	.42	.35	2.83

As shown in Table 3, to know which of the variables included in the model contributed to the prediction of the dependent variable, the researcher checked the column labeled Beta under Standardized Coefficients in the output box labeled Coefficients. *Comparing* the contribution of each independent variable, the researcher referred to the beta values. Looking down the Beta column, she found that the largest beta coefficient was .37, which was for memory strategy. This means that this variable made the strongest contribution to explaining the dependent variable, when the variance explained by all other variables in the model was controlled. The Beta value for other variable was not significant since the Sig values for them were larger than .05 so that they made no significant contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable.

4.3 Results of the Responses Emerged from the Interviews

As for the last research question concerning the students' reactions to the role of oral communication strategy use in self-regulated learning, they were asked to reply to the questions in either English or Persian Language since using their native language, they could express themselves more easily and precisely. In this case, their writings were then translated into English,

analyzed, coded and categorized. The pupils received the instructions both orally and in writing. The pupils had approximately twenty minutes to write down their answers.

To this end, more qualitative data were gathered from the semi-structured interviews conducted with six students who were exposed to the application of strategies. They were interviewed to gain a deeper understanding of the students' reactions to oral communication strategy use and self-regulated learning. After transcription of the interviews, the researcher read them several times, highlighting and annotating major common themes. Initially, the researcher asked the participants to introduce themselves. Then, she asked some questions about their majors, and their universities. The main themes extracted from the interviews are reported below:

The teacher could see that the student was motivated to learn the strategies including both listening strategies and speaking strategies and were interested to know more about self-regulation strategies the teacher felt that they were not already familiar with the strategies. One of the students, majoring in English language at term seven, mentioned that he felt happy with the usefulness of oral communication strategies. His comments included:

"I always thought of oral communication strategies as a matter of trial and error and I constantly listened to the speech segment for many times to improve my listening ability in this way; nevertheless, I have found that listening strategies are techniques that not only improve my listening performance but also facilitate the process of learning for me."

Another student who was at semester eight believed that self-regulated strategies are really challenging and new experience that help her maintain the information in the mind and find out the gist of the message sooner. She commented:

"In my view, when the teacher explained to us what self-regulation strategies are, I found them effective since I already had no focus on strategies such as self-evaluation or seeking assistance and planning. Actually, having exposed to these strategies, I became interested to them and I tried to use them in listening and at first, it was hard because I was used to listen to and understand the message without resorting to strategies. I am now more able to understand the message by means of strategy use."

Another student, majoring in ELT at fifth term, who had many problems in speaking skills, but she could cope with speaking problems while engaging in speaking skills. She said:

"I was low self-efficacious to involve in speaking activities because I thought that if I initiate my speech I could not finish it but as I became familiar with message reduction and alternation strategies, I tried to replace the original message with another message because of feeling incapable of executing my original intent."

Finally, another student said that improving memory strategy as one of the self-regulation strategies could empower me to anticipate and see the listener's reaction while speaking. It seems that most of the students had no idea of self-regulation strategies in practice.

In sum, students were fond of oral communication strategies as well as self-regulation strategies and they find them effective and useful. They were fortified to work on listening skills as well as speaking skills employing strategies as these strategies inspire them to overcome their

listening and speaking problems. The most common themes emerged from the students' responses to the interview questions regarding the role of oral communication strategies and self-regulation strategies included: challenging, interesting, new, useful, practical, effective, supportive and facilitative.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The results of this rather large-scale research are fruitful and enlightening in any learning situation. Indeed, the findings of the study showed that the association between self-regulated learning and oral communication strategies for university EFL students was statistically significant. Furthermore, the results of the study confirmed that the best predictor of oral communication strategies in self-regulation components is memory strategy. Finally, the emerged from the interviews with the students revealed that the students themselves recognized the effectiveness of oral communication strategies and self-regulation strategies in their learning processes and they found them novel, interesting and practical.

The results showed that working on self-regulation components is effective which is in agreement with the statement remarked by Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) who suggested that memory strategies are helpful for acquisition and they facilitate language acquisition. The study of the study showed that working on self-regulation would demotivate the students and improve their emotional intelligence since, as concluded by Mortiboys, (2005), creating emotionally enhancing learning environments will increase the likelihood of learners' satisfaction, motivation and collaboration. Similarly, Gardner (2000) explains that motivated individuals express effort in attaining a goal, show persistence, attend to the tasks that are necessary to achieve the goals, have a strong desire to attain their goal, enjoy the activities necessary to achieve their goal, are aroused in seeking their goals, and have expectancies about their learning independency. By the same token, the results provide empirical evidence for the argument that self-regulation strategies interact with listening and speaking skills which is in line with the previous study conducted by Teng and Zhang (2018) who found that motivation regulation and behavioral, cognitive and personal factors all operate as determining factors in academic achievement. In line with finding of the present study, Ehrman, Leaver and Oxford (2003) found that the higher the students' level of proficiency in speaking, reading, and listening skills, the more frequently they chose to use learning strategies.

The results of the present study are consistent with the study conducted by Liu (2008) who concluded that the use of oral communication strategies and particularly listening strategies facilitate the learning process and use of second language in real context. The finding of present study is also aligned with noticing hypothesis by Schmidt (1990) because getting the gist strategy allows the learners to pay more attention to essential points and to devote less attention to trivial details (Robinson, Katayama, Odom, Beth, Hsieh, & Vanderveen, 2006). Finally, the present study focused on role of oral communication strategies in improving self-regulation strategies and this is in line with Output hypothesis put forward by Swain (2005). Swain (2005) states that being

involved with output or meaning expression leads to better attention and focus on the target language and mere input is insufficient for developing language system.

The present study reinforces the conclusion that the line of research on the impact of self-regulation in the past two decades is not country-specific because similar pattern and also different patterns has been found in some other countries (Dörnyei, 2005). This can be taken as an indication of the fact that such research has external validity. Indeed, the use of strategies to cope with problems of listening and speaking make the teaching more interesting and meaningful for the students because they could participate actively in the classroom activities and discussion and they feel that they are involved in the classroom programs and this would promote their language development. These findings highlight the potential usefulness of the motivational factors that contribute to the present situation and prospective future of the students and the students who are successful in their career can pursue some aspects of motivation; meanwhile, the emotional feedback from the teacher is can be the reason for integrating students to the EFL learning situation and help them to regulate their own progress with resort to the self-regulation strategies.

The study offers major practical implications for language teachers and language students. EFL teachers are recommended to equip the students with motivational strategies that, in turn, could involve them in problem-solving activities and provoke their positive self-evaluation. They are expected to put emphasis on oral communication strategies and experience the new activities they are exposed by the teachers. They should know that learning English language is not just being successful in the final examinations. They must work on oral proficiency with their classmates at the classroom environment by means of various activities and try to reproduce the language outside the classroom and benefit from the strategies to cope with listening and speaking problems in order to deviate from the contrived conversations and approach the actual situations in using language. Regarding EFL teachers, they are recommended to make use of and apply the strategies whenever needed, and they should participate in oral communication skills. Actually, they must work on oral proficiency with their classmates at the classroom environment by means of various activities and try to reproduce the language outside the classroom and benefit from the strategies to cope with listening and speaking problems in order to deviate from the contrived conversations and approach the actual situations in using language. Self-regulation is a valuable source for the learner to assess and add to their language knowledge but it also helps them develop effective learning strategies like self-evaluation, seeking assistance, and planning and organization.

Finally, more research is needed to be done for strategy training and use in relation to other factors such as willingness to communicate and communication anxiety. Furthermore, another research may examine the extents to which these influences vary according to the gender and major of the participants. Another study can examine the relationship between oral communication strategies (including listening and speaking strategies) and self-regulated learning with respect to emotional factors.

References

Amirian, S. M. R., & Mallahi, O., & Zaghi, D. (2015). The relationship between Iranian EFL learner's selfregulatory vocabulary strategy use and their vocabulary size. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 2 (1), 29-46.

Bakracevic Vukman, K., & Licardo, M (2010). How cognitive, metacognitive, motivational and emotional self-regulation influence school performance in adolescence and early adulthood. *Educational Studies, 36* (3), 259-268.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Beishuizen, J., & Steffens, K. (2011). A conceptual framework for research on self-regulated learning. In R. Carneiro, P. Lefrere, K. Steffens, K. & J. Underwood (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning in technology enhanced learning environments: A European perspective* (pp. 212-245). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Buck, G. (2001). *Assessing listening*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Celce-Murcia, M., & McIntosh, L. (1991). Teaching English as a second or foreign language. Los Angeles: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Clennel, C. (1995). Communication strategies of adult ESL learners: A discourse perspective. *Prospect, 10,* 4–20.

Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative methods in psychology. *Psychological Bulletins*, *112* (1), 155-159.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. New York: Routledge.

Ehrman, M. E., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System*, *31*, 313-330.

Erdogan, T. (2018). The investigation of self-regulation and language learning strategies. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(7), 1477-1485.

Ferris, D., & Tagg, T. (1996). Academic listening/speaking tasks for ESL students: Problems, suggestions, and implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, *30* (2), 297-320.

Fowler, W., & Coe, N. (1978). *Quick check test*. London: Thomas Nelson.

Gardner, R. C. (2000). Correlation, causation, motivation, and second language acquisition. *Canadian Psychology 41*, 1-24.

Green, M. J., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly, 29,* 261–297.

Hasan, A. S. (2000). Learners' perceptions of listening comprehension problems. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, *13*(2), 137-153.

Hashemian, M., Roohani, A., & Fadaei, B. (2012). On the cognitive style of field (in)dependence as a predicator of L2 learners' performance in recognition and text-based tests of metaphor. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3 (5)*, 876-887.

Karami, H. (2012). The development and validation of a bilingual version of the vocabulary size test. *RELC Journal*, 43 (1), 53-67.

چهارمین کنفرانس ملی نوآوری و تحقیق در
فرهنگ، زبان و ادبیات فارسی
**The 4th National Conference on Innovation and
Research in Persian culture, language and literature**

Kitajima, R. (1997). Influence of learning context on learners' use of communication strategies. *JALT Journal, 19,* 7–23.

Kolen, M. J., & Brennan, R. L. (2004). *Test equating, scaling and linking: Methods and practices* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Lado, R. (1961). *Language testing: The construction and use of foreign language tests.* London: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. Longman: London.

Liu, H. J. (2008). A study of the interrelationship between listening strategy use, listening proficiency levels, and learning style. *RARECLS, 5*(1), 84-104.

Magno, C. (2010). Assessing academic self-regulated learning among Filipino college students: The factor structure and item fit. *Int. J. Edu. Psycho. Assess. 5*, 61-76.

Meltzer, L. (2007). *Executive function in education: From theory to practice*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Miller, G. Galanter, E., & Pribram, K. (1960). *Plans and the structure of behavior*. New York: Henry Holt and Co.

Mortiboys, B. (2005). *Teaching with emotional intelligence*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an oral communication strategy inventory. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 151-168.

Özcan, M., Yaman, S. (2014). Oral Communication strategies used by Turkish students learning English as a foreign language. In M. Pawlak, & E. Waniek-klimczak (Eds*.) Issues in teaching, learning and testing speaking in a second language* (pp. 143-158). Berlin: Springer, Heidelberg.

Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review, 16*(4), 385-407.

Powers, W. T., Clark, R. K., & McFarland, R. L. (1960). A general feedback theory of human behavior: Part I. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 11, (1), 71-88.

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). United Kingdom: Pearson Education.

Robinson, D. H., Katayama, A. D., Odom, S., Beth, A., Hsieh, Y. P., & Vanderveen, A. (2006). Increasing text comprehension and graphic note-taking using a partial graphic organizer task. *Journal of Educational Research, 100*(1), 103-111.

Rost, M. (2002). Listening tasks and language acquisition. *JALT Journal, 18,* 18-28.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics 11*, 17-45.

Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Eds.). *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 471-483). Mahwa, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tavakolinzadeh, J., & Ebrahimi-Qavam, S. (2011). Effect of teaching self-regulated learning strategies on self-efficacy in students. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29*, 1096-1104.

Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2018). Effects of motivational regulation strategies on writing performance: a mediation model of self-regulated learning of writing in English as a second/foreign language. *Metacognition Learning, 13*(2), 213-240.

Tsang, H. W., Fung, K. M., Chan, A. S., Lee, G., & Chan, F. (2006). Effect of a qigong exercise programme on elderly with depression. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry: A Journal of the Psychiatry of Late Life and Applied Sciences*, vol. 21, no. 9, p. 890-897.

Tutyandari, C. (2005). *Breaking the silence of the students in an English language class*. In 53rd TEFLIN International Conference, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Ur, P. (1999). *A Course in Language Teaching, Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ushioda, E. (2008). Motivation and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp. 19-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vandergrift, L. (2003). From Prediction Through Reflection: Guiding Students: Through the Process of L2 Listening. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*(3), 425-440.

Vandergrift, L. (2006). Second language listening: Listening ability or language proficiency? *he Modern Language Journal, 90*(1), 6-18.

Williams, J., Inscoe, R., & Tasker, T. (1997). Communication strategies in an interactional context: The mutual achievement of comprehension. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies* (pp. 304–322). Essex, UK: Longman.

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., pp. 1-38). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2005). The hidden dimension of personal competence: Self-regulated learning and practice. In A.J. Elliot, C.S. Dweck, & S. Carol (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 509-526). New York: Guilford Publications.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1990). Student differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 51-59.

Zimmerman, B., & Schunk, D. (2001). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.