

AN EXPLORATION OF SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS FOR SELF-REGULATED
LEARNING AND PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY FOR ENGLISH LEARNING
OF EFL STUDENTS IN A TURKISH UNIVERSITY

A Master's Thesis

by
MEHTAP ÖZKASAP

The Department of
Teaching English as a Foreign Language
Bilkent University
Ankara

July 2009

To my husband Bülent, who is the spirit of my life

AN EXPLORATION OF SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS FOR SELF-REGULATED
LEARNING AND PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY FOR ENGLISH LEARNING
OF EFL STUDENTS IN A TURKISH UNIVERSITY

The Graduate School of Education
of
Bilkent University

by

MEHTAP ÖZKASAP

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

July 2009

BILKENT UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

July 15, 2009

The examining committee appointed by the Graduate School of Education for the
thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Mehtap Özkasap

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title: An Exploration of Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Self-Regulated Learning and Perceived Responsibility for English Learning of EFL Students in a Turkish University

Thesis Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters
Bilkent University MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Visiting Asst. Prof. Dr. Philip Durrant
Bilkent University MA TEFL Program

Dr. Craig Dicker
English Language Officer
US Embassy, Ankara, Turkey

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Assist. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters)
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Visiting Asst. Prof. Dr. Philip Durrant)
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Dr. Craig Dicker)
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

(Vis. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sands)
Director

ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATION OF SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS FOR SELF-REGULATED
LEARNING AND PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY FOR ENGLISH LEARNING
OF EFL STUDENTS IN A TURKISH UNIVERSITY

Mehtap Özkasap

M.A. Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters

July 2009

The educational importance of the connection between self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for learning has been widely recognized in the literature in recent years. However, the relationship between these two constructs has not been specifically investigated in an English as a foreign language (EFL) context. Taking this gap as an impetus, this study aimed to explore the extent to which Turkish university EFL students feel efficacious in regulating their English learning and the extent to which they assume responsibility for their English learning processes, and how these two constructs relate to each other.

The study was conducted at Yıldız Technical University, School of Foreign Languages, with the participation of 503 students from four different English proficiency levels (i.e. elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate, and advanced).

The data were collected through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, and analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively.

Analysis of the quantitative data revealed that Turkish university EFL students were moderately self-efficacious in regulating their English learning and perceived themselves to be slightly more responsible than their teachers for their English learning processes. It was also revealed that there is a positive correlation between these two constructs. Analysis of the qualitative data contributed to the study by revealing that there might be other constructs than self-efficacy beliefs that relate to students' perceptions of responsibility, such as motivation and interest.

This study implied that Turkish university EFL students need to be provided with educational opportunities that promote their self-efficacy to regulate their English learning and their sense of control over their English learning.

Key words: self-efficacy, self-regulated learning, self-regulatory efficacy, perceived responsibility

ÖZET

TÜRKİYE’DE BİR ÜNİVERSİTEDEKİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENEREN ÖĞRENCİLERİN ÖZ-DÜZENLEMELİ İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENİMİNE YÖNELİK ÖZ-YETERLİK İNANÇLARI İLE İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENME SORUMLULUK ALGILARI ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA

Mehtap Özkasap

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. JoDee Walters

Temmuz 2009

Öz-düzenlemeli öğrenmeye yönelik öz-yeterlik inançları ile öğrenme sorumluluk algıları arasındaki ilişkinin eğitimsel öneminin son yıllarda literatürde oldukça farkına varılmıştır. Ancak, bu kavramlar arasındaki ilişki hususi olarak yabancı dil olarak İngilizce eğitimi bağlamında araştırılmamıştır. Bu durumdan yola çıkarak, bu araştırma yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen Türk üniversite öğrencilerinin kendi İngilizce öğrenimlerini düzenlemeleri hususunda ne derece yeterli hissettiklerini ve İngilizce öğrenme süreçlerine yönelik kendilerine ne derece sorumluluk atfettiklerini ve bu iki kavramın birbiriyle nasıl bağlantılı olduğunu incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Bu araştırma, dört farklı İngilizce yeterlik seviyesinden (başlangıç, orta seviye öncesi, orta, ve ileri) toplam 503 öğrencinin katılımıyla Yıldız Teknik

Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu'nda gerçekleşmiştir. Veriler, anketler ve mülakatlar aracılığıyla toplanmış olup, nicel ve nitel veri analizleri yapılmıştır.

Nicel veri analiz sonuçları, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen Türk üniversite öğrencilerinin, İngilizce öğrenimlerini düzenlemede kısmen öz-yeterli hissettiklerini ve İngilizce öğrenme süreçlerine yönelik kendi sorumluluklarını öğretmenlerinden birazcık daha fazla olarak algıladıklarını göstermiştir. Ayrıca, bu iki kavram arasında pozitif korelasyon olduğu belirlenmiştir. Nitel veri analiz sonuçları, bu çalışmaya, öz-yeterlik dışında motivasyon ve ilgi gibi diğer kavramların da öğrencilerin sorumluluk algılarıyla ilişkili olabileceğini göstererek katkıda bulunmuştur.

Ayrıca bu çalışma, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen Türk üniversite öğrencilerinin İngilizce öğrenimlerini düzenlemelerine yönelik öz-yeterlik inançlarını ve İngilizce öğrenimleri üzerindeki kontrol duygularını kuvvetlendirecek eğitimsel fırsatlara ihtiyaç duyduklarına işaret etmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: öz-yeterlik, öz-düzenlemeli öğrenme, sorumluluk algısı

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For most MA students, the thesis stage is generally the longest and hardest; mine was no exception. Finally, I have the chance to express my sincere gratitude to those people who provided encouragement, support, patience, and understanding as I tackled this endeavor.

First, I owe a tremendous amount of gratitude to my thesis advisor Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters for her constant support and encouragement in every single step of this study. I am particularly indebted to her for being more than a supervisor and for being such an approachable person, without which writing an MA thesis would not have been such an enjoyable, enthusiastic, and motivating experience for me. This thesis would not have been completed without her endless advice, directions, comments, and patience.

I would also express my sincere thanks to Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı not only for her invaluable help in writing the first chapter of this thesis but also for her being always approachable and supportive whenever I needed her.

I am thankful to Asst. Prof. Dr. Philip Durrant for teaching how to analyze quantitative data through SPSS. I always felt lucky to have an SPSS expert whenever I was stuck. I would also like to express my appreciation to both Dr. Durrant and Dr. Craig Dicker, the examining committee members, for providing with constructive and detailed feedback, which helped make necessary additions to my study.

I am thankful to the former director of Yıldız Technical University School of Foreign Languages (YTUSFL), Prof. Dr. Nüket Öcal, and the former chair of the Department of Basic English, Hande Abbasoğlu, for giving me permission to attend

the MA TEFL program. I would also like to thank the current director of YTUSFL, Prof. Dr. Fatma Tiryaki, and the chair of the Department of Basic English, Dr. Aydın Balyer, and the chair of the Department of Modern Languages, Şükran Dağ, for giving me permission to collect data for this study from YTUSFL. I also appreciate all the students' help who participated in the study.

I owe a special debt to Prof. Dr. Barry J. Zimmerman for kindly responding to my emails and graciously giving me permission to use and adapt the self-efficacy and responsibility questionnaires he developed with Assoc. Prof. Dr. Anastasia Kitsantas.

My special thanks go to my colleagues and friends, Dr. Aylin Alkaç Kutlukan, Cemile Güler, and Kathryn Henderson for contributing to this study with their tremendous help all through the back translation process of the questionnaires.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues and friends at YTUSFL, Ayten Davutoğlu, Burcu Varol, Cemile Güler, Ebru Demirtaş Osborne, Emre Erbatur, Esin Yörük Erbatur, Halil Efe Öney, Hande Abbasoğlu, Hande Güner, Hatice Özata, Münevver Kalaz, Nihal Yurtseven, Nilcan Limon, Nurgül Demirdöven, Pınar Aytekin Özkan, Seda Burçak, Seyhan Haydar, Sibel Elverici, and Şükran Dağ, who contributed to this study by kindly agreeing to allocate their time for quantitative data collection.

My sincere thanks go to my sister-in-law, Gaye Özkasap, who always supported me in this challenging process by providing me help and encouragement when I needed. My bosom friend, Münevver Kalaz, also deserves special thanks as she was always there for me in any difficulty I face in my life and during my studies. I feel very lucky to have her as a close friend.

Without my classmates' friendliness, graduating from the program would have been more difficult. I would like to thank specifically one of these friends, Gülnihal Şakrak. My dear roomie, thank you for making this year joyful with your endless energy and smiling face.

I want to extend my gratitude to my precious friend Aslı Karabıyık, who was just a phone call away from me throughout this challenging process whenever I needed suggestions and assistance.

Last but not least, my thanks from the deepest corner of my heart go to...

... My dear friends Emre & Dilek Özaydın, for never letting my husband feel lonely and for making my short visits to Istanbul much more enjoyable than I could imagine;

... My Mom, for her dedication and unconditional love, without which I would just be lost somewhere in the world;

... My husband, Bülent Özkasap, for his being a unique lover and a quick problem-solver, and for his unconditionally supporting me in continuing academic studies... Thank you for always being right behind me in every step I take... Without your support, my name would not be in the MA list of this department...

Thank you all...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background of the Study.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	7
Significance of the study.....	10
Conclusion	11
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	12
Introduction.....	12
Social Cognitive Theory	12
Self-Efficacy Beliefs	13
Differences in Self-Efficacy.....	14
Sources of Self-Efficacy	15
Academic Self-Efficacy	18
Self-Regulated Learning	21
Self-Regulated Learning Strategies	23

Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning	25
Group Differences in Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning	29
Gender	30
Academic Level	31
Responsibility for Learning	34
Conclusion	38
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	39
Introduction	39
Setting	40
Participants	41
Instruments	44
Questionnaires	44
A Personal Data Questionnaire	44
The Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire	45
The Perceived Responsibility for Learning Questionnaire	47
Interviews	49
Data Collection Procedure	50
Data Analysis	51
Conclusion	53
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS	54
Introduction	54
Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Self-Regulated Learning of the Respondents	55

Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Level of English Proficiency	71
Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Academic Level.....	72
Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Level of Success in English	73
Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Gender.....	75
Perceived Responsibility for Learning of the Respondents	76
Differences in Perceived Responsibility According to Level of English Proficiency	85
Differences in Perceived Responsibility According to Academic Level.....	86
Differences in Perceived Responsibility According to Level of Success in English	86
Differences in Perceived Responsibility According to Gender	87
The Relationship between Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Self-Regulated Learning and Perceived Responsibility for English Learning Outcomes	88
Conclusion	90
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....	92
Introduction.....	92
Discussion of the Findings.....	93
Discussion of the Findings Related to Participants' Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Self-Regulated Learning	93
Discussion of the Findings Related to Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Level of English Proficiency.....	100
Discussion of the Findings Related to Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Academic Level	101

Discussion of the Findings Related to Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Level of Success in English	103
Discussion of the Findings Related to Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Gender	103
Discussion of the Findings Related to Participants' Perceptions of Responsibility for English Learning Outcomes	104
Discussion of the Findings Related to Differences in Perceived Responsibility According to Level of English Proficiency, Academic Level, Level of Success in English, and Gender	110
Discussion of the Findings Related to the Relationship between Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Self-Regulated Learning and Perceived Responsibility for English Learning	112
Pedagogical Implications	114
Limitations of the Study	117
Suggestions for Further Research	118
Conclusion	120
REFERENCES.....	121
APPENDIX A: CUTOFF SCORES FOR SUCCESS LEVELS	130
APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM	131
APPENDIX C: BİLGİLENDİRME FORMU.....	132
APPENDIX D: PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE	133
APPENDIX E: KİŞİSEL BİLGİ ANKETİ.....	134

APPENDIX F: ORIGINAL SELF-EFFICACY FOR SELF-REGULATED LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE	135
APPENDIX G: ADAPTED VERSION OF THE SELF-EFFICACY FOR SELF- REGULATED LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE	137
APPENDIX H: ÖZ-DÜZENLEMELİ İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENİMİNE YÖNELİK ÖZ- YETERLİK ANKETİ	139
APPENDIX I: ORIGINAL PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE	141
APPENDIX J: ADAPTED VERSION OF THE PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE	142
APPENDIX K: İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENME SÜRECİNE YÖNELİK SORUMLULUK ALGISI ANKETİ.....	143
APPENDIX L: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	144
APPENDIX M: ÖRNEK MÜLAKATTAN BİR BÖLÜM	145
APPENDIX N: A PORTION OF A SAMPLE INTERVIEW IN ENGLISH	146

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Characteristics of the study participants	42
Table 2 - Distribution of the interviewees.....	43
Table 3 - Characteristics of the interviewees	57
Table 4 - Participants' perceptions of self-efficacy for self-regulated learning.....	62
Table 5 - Level of self-efficacy across proficiency levels	72
Table 6 - Level of self-efficacy across academic levels	73
Table 7 – Success levels.....	74
Table 8 - Level of self-efficacy across success levels.....	74
Table 9 - Gender differences in perceived self-efficacy	75
Table 10 - Participants' perceptions of responsibility.....	78
Table 11 - Level of responsibility across proficiency levels.....	85
Table 12 - Level of responsibility across academic levels.....	86
Table 13 - Level of responsibility across success levels.....	87
Table 14 - Gender differences in perceived responsibility	87
Table 15 - Relationship between self-regulatory efficacy beliefs and perceived responsibility	89

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 - Categories of SRL strategies	25
Figure 2 - Students who are being held responsible versus those who are being responsible	36

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The age of information we are in can be characterized by the rapid expansion and transmission of information and knowledge through English, which is the current lingua franca of technology, business, and science. This growth has required families, schools, and curriculum designers to motivate students of all ages to learn English. However, like any other learning in this modern era, language learning demands a great deal of self-regulatory skills and strategies from students so that they can be active participants who are responsible for their own learning. As students move up in the educational system, more self-regulation is required, but students tend to lose confidence in their abilities to direct their own learning to meet increasingly demanding and challenging academic requirements (Caprara, et al., 2008; Usher & Pajares, 2008; Zimmerman, Bonner, & Kovach, 1996). Research has also shown that the level of perceived self-efficacy and the level of responsibility students assume for their own learning are positively correlated (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2005; 2007; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1992). These studies have also led research on the self-efficacy beliefs of EFL/ESL students in relation to some constructs such as self-regulation, motivation, and academic achievement (Chen, 2007; Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2007; Shen, 2002; Wang & Pape, 2005, 2007).

It is not in dispute that there is a great amount of interest in student responsibility for learning, not only in the field of teaching in general, but also in the domain of language teaching. We, language teachers, all dream of having learners realize the importance of taking responsibility for their own learning. However, it is

essential to know what can help us achieve this objective. The first step would be learning about the profile of our students in terms of their confidence in their ability to regulate their learning and their perceptions of responsibility. Considering this, this study aims to explore Turkish university EFL students' self-regulatory efficacy beliefs and their perceptions of responsibility for their English learning.

Background of the Study

Humans are not passive observers of their lives. Rather, they hold authority over their lives through the power they have to control the course of events, at least to some extent. As Bandura points out in his social cognitive theory (1997, 1995), people are able to predict and shape the course of events in their lives. People's beliefs in their capabilities allow them to have this power. According to Bandura (1997), this perceived self-efficacy can be defined as "the beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (p. 3). In social cognitive theory, beliefs of personal efficacy are considered to be the major impetus for action. If people judge themselves to be capable of accomplishing a task in terms of time, energy, and effort, they tend to persevere with the task in the face of difficulties, unlike those who lack this confidence in carrying out the task (Bandura, 1997, 1995).

Efficacy beliefs are not only crucial in human lives in general. They play a vital role for students in their educational lives as well. According to Zimmerman (1995), the influence of perceived self-efficacy on students' educational development is so considerable that it affects the eventual level of academic achievement. Zimmerman (1995, p. 203) offers this definition of perceived academic self-

efficacy: “personal judgments of one’s capabilities to organize and execute courses of action to attain designated types of educational performances”. The higher the level of academic self-efficacy students possess, the more persistent, engaged, and competent they become in their academic activities (Zimmerman, 1995; Berry & Schunk as cited in Zimmerman, 1995). In other words, students’ confidence in their ability to learn and understand a specific subject matter and to do well in the related course enables them to be more cognitively involved in learning (Pintrich & Schrauben, 1992). This provides evidence in support of the effect of academic self-efficacy beliefs on three forms of academic achievement: basic cognitive skills, performance in academic course requirements, and standardized achievement tests (Zimmerman, 1995).

In his social cognitive theory, Bandura (1986) places self-regulatory factors at the center of human functioning. He explains that human behavior is not solely determined by external factors. Rather, people are endowed with the ability to causally contribute to their own feelings, actions, and thoughts through self-directedness. According to the theory, reciprocal interactions between personal, behavioral, and environmental variables operate in self-regulation, which is acquired through the use of three processes: self-observation, self-judgment, and self-reaction. Self-observation refers to people’s attentiveness to observe how they are behaving. Self-judgment means measuring one’s own performances against personal or internal standards and environmental circumstances. Self-reaction is responding evaluatively to self-judgment. Thus, upon observing their behaviors, individuals judge their performances in relation to their self-set goals. Then, they adjust their behaviors accordingly so that they can achieve these goals (Bandura, 1986). Hence, self-

regulation is defined as “self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are planned and cyclically adapted to the attainment of personal goals” (quoted from Zimmerman, 2000, p. 14, cited in Wang & Pape, 2005, p. 77). In addition, social cognitive theory emphasizes the importance of one’s self-efficacy beliefs in one’s self-regulatory skills. In the light of this view, several researchers have been concerned with academic self-regulated learning (Caprara, et al., 2008; Usher & Pajares, 2008; Zimmerman, 1989; 1990; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1988). These studies highlight the relationship between students’ academic achievement and their efficacy beliefs to manage and to successfully use the self-regulatory strategies they have and develop. Zimmerman (1990) defines academic self-regulation as the process through which students self-direct their learning to attain academic goals. Self-regulated learners are those who are metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally active controllers of their academic attainments (Zimmerman, 1990). This definition holds some basic traits that can be attributed to self-regulated learners. Those students are capable of designing ways to acquire information. They are aware of academic requirements and goals. Moreover, they are apt learners who are not dependent on their teachers, peers, or parents (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1998; Usher & Pajares, 2008; Zimmerman, 1989; Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmerman, et al., 1996; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1988). Thus, as Zimmerman explains (1989; 1990) these qualities of self-regulated learners involve three basic elements: students’ awareness and use of self-regulated learning strategies, self-efficacy perceptions of performance skill, and commitment to academic goals. Self-regulated learning strategies (self-evaluation, organization and transformation of information, goal setting and planning, information seeking, record keeping, self-monitoring,

environmental structuring, giving self-consequences, rehearsing and memorizing, seeking social assistance, and reviewing) are used to acquire information and skills. However, as self-efficacy affects many aspects of human life, it also plays a central role in getting students to apply those strategies under any circumstances (Usher & Pajares, 2008; Zimmerman, 1989, 1995). Hence, Usher and Pajares (2008) state that possessing self-regulatory skills does not guarantee successful and systematic use of them. They further explain that successful use of self-regulatory skills and strategies largely depends on the extent to which one believes that one can use them effectively.

The importance of having self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning cannot be denied as its major impact can be discerned and observed in academic achievement and in the level of responsibility students assume for their learning outcomes (Usher & Pajares, 2008; Zimmerman, 1990; 1995; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1992). In one study, high school students' beliefs in their ability to regulate their own learning were investigated. The results indicated that the higher the students' self-regulatory efficacy beliefs, the higher perceived self-efficacy they had for academic achievement, which in turn enhanced their academic success by enabling them to set more challenging academic goals (Zimmerman, Bandura, & Martinez-Pons, 1992).

Additionally, Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1992) and Zimmerman and Kitsantas (2007; 2005) emphasize that self-regulatory efficacy is a reliable indicator of students' acceptance of responsibility for learning. Zimmerman and Kitsantas (2005) explain that self-efficacious students hold themselves accountable for their academic outcomes rather than their teachers, as those students are efficient actors in

their learning. Similarly, Anderson and Prawat (1983) state that perceptions of accountability and control are essential factors in students' accepting responsibility for their own behavior. They explain that behaving responsibly in the classroom requires self-regulation of learning and self-control over the outcomes of learning actions on the part of the students. Thus, as Bacon (1991) points out, this indicates that those who hold themselves responsible for their own learning are more concerned with improving knowledge than fulfilling academic and external requirements.

In the light of the studies mentioned above, self-efficacy beliefs in language learning contexts have also been investigated in relation to other constructs such as self-regulation, academic achievement, motivation, strategy use, language ability, learning outcome, and previous learning experience (Chen, 2007; Chularut & DeBacker, 2004; Elbaum, Berg, & Dodd, 1993; Gahungu, 2007; Mills, et al., 2007; Shen, 2002; Şen, 2006; Wang, 2004; Wang & Pape, 2007; Wu, 2006). For example, in their case study examining three Chinese boys' self-efficacy beliefs in learning English as a second language across language learning activities in home-based and school-based contexts, Wang and Pape (2007) found that certain factors such as students' self-awareness of English proficiency, their content knowledge, their interest in the activity, their attitude toward English and the English-speaking community, and the level of task difficulty, which were all considered unique in language learning contexts, exerted a strong influence on the participants' self-efficacy beliefs. Additionally, Mills, et al. (2007) aimed to investigate the influence of self-efficacy for self-regulation, self-efficacy to obtain grades in French, French anxiety in reading and listening, and French learning self-concept on the

achievement of college intermediate students. In the light of the findings, they concluded that self-efficacy for self-regulation was the most significant predictor of intermediate French language achievement. Furthermore, in a recent study on the effects of goal orientations, self-efficacy, and self-regulation on EFL college students' course achievement, it was found that course grade was predicted by mastery goal orientation, which was improved by self-efficacy (Wu, 2006).

In summary, a number of studies on self-efficacy in language learning contexts exist in the literature. However, to the knowledge of the researcher, the relationship between self-efficacy for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for learning in the EFL context has remained uninvestigated.

Statement of the Problem

The past two decades have seen the rapid growth of studies on the concepts of self-efficacy and self-regulated learning (e.g. Bandura, 1986, 1997, 1995; Caprara, et al., 2008; Schunk & Zimmerman, 1998; Usher & Pajares, 2008; Zimmerman, 2000; Zimmerman, et al., 1996; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2005). These studies demonstrate that students' self-efficacy beliefs and their confidence in their ability to regulate their learning is significant for their academic success. Students with high self-efficacy for self-regulation believe in their ability to learn subject matters and to acquire necessary academic skills, while students who lack that confidence doubt their ability to meet academic requirements (Bandura, 1995). In addition, research has claimed that children who possess confidence to self-regulate their learning are more likely to perceive themselves as responsible for their academic failure or low performance (Zimmerman, 1995). A considerable amount of research has been

conducted on self-efficacy beliefs, self-regulation, academic achievement beliefs, and responsibility for learning among primary and secondary school students (Bacon, 1993; Pajares & Valiante, 1997; Wang & Pape, 2007; Zimmerman, 1990). However, the field lacks research studies at the pre-tertiary or tertiary levels on the relationship between students' perceived capability to use a variety of self-regulatory learning strategies and their perceived responsibility for learning in the domain of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Therefore, the current study aims at filling the gap by exploring that relationship.

Most universities in Turkey, including Yıldız Technical University (YTU), provide students with compulsory intensive English language education before they start studying their majors. The School of Foreign Languages at YTU not only aims to prepare students for the proficiency exam they have to pass to finish the school, but also gives importance to improving students' self-regulatory learning strategies so that they can meet the demands of the modern era to be lifelong learners. However, to the knowledge of the researcher, based on personal observation and on conversations with students and colleagues, most lower-achievers - the students who tend to get lower grades - feel inadequate to coordinate their English learning processes. Furthermore, they do not appear to feel responsible for their learning when their performance is found insufficient according to the specific objectives of the syllabus. Rather, they tend to blame their teachers, the curriculum, or the materials. However, this does not seem to be the case with the high-achievers. Thus, this study aims to provide an in-depth understanding of self-regulatory efficacy and perceived responsibility for learning in an EFL context by investigating the relationship between these two concepts among Turkish university EFL students. If

we want to guide our students in their journey of becoming self-directed learners who assume responsibility for their own learning, we first need to explore the extent to which they feel capable of regulating their own learning and the extent to which they take responsibility for their learning processes.

Research Questions

This study attempts to address the following research questions:

1. How confident are Turkish university EFL students in their ability to regulate their own learning? Does the level of confidence change according to the students'
 - a) level of English proficiency,
 - b) academic level, (pre-tertiary vs. tertiary students)
 - c) level of success in English, and
 - d) gender?
2. What is the level of perceived responsibility for language learning outcomes of Turkish university EFL students? Does the level of perceived responsibility change according to the students'
 - a) level of English proficiency,
 - b) academic level, (pre-tertiary vs. tertiary students)
 - c) level of success in English, and
 - d) gender?
3. How do Turkish university EFL students' self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for language learning outcomes relate to each other?

Significance of the study

Due to the lack of research in university EFL contexts on the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for learning, this study might contribute to the literature by revealing whether the relationship changes across different groups of students according to their level of English proficiency and success, academic level, and gender. In addition, this study extends the prior research by particularly investigating the relationship in an EFL context.

At the local level, this study will be the first exploratory study in Turkey on the relationship between the constructs stated above. It attempts to investigate whether students' perceived self-efficacy for self-regulated English learning and their perceptions of responsibility for their successes or failures in English learning are related to each other. This study also intends to draw administrators' and university EFL teachers' attention to the importance of perceived self-regulatory efficacy and how those beliefs are related to students' perceptions of responsibility for learning. Thus, part of the aim of this study is to provide enlightening implications for the purpose of promoting students' self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning, which opens the way to self-directedness. In addition, this study is significant in that it provides information and implications about how it is possible to enable students to assume responsibility for pursuing their own learning.

Conclusion

In this part, an overview of the literature on self-efficacy, self-regulation, and perceived responsibility for learning has been provided. The statement of the problem, research questions, and the significance of the study have also been presented. In the second chapter, the relevant literature is reviewed in more detail. In the third chapter, the methodology of the study is described. In the fourth chapter, the results of the study are presented, and in the last chapter, conclusions are drawn from the data in the light of the literature.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter, the literature on students' self-efficacy for self-regulated learning and its possible relationship with perceived responsibility for learning will be reviewed. First, social cognitive theory, which is a perspective for understanding the nature and function of human cognition, behavioral patterns, and motivation, will be presented (Bandura, 1986). In the following section, self-efficacy beliefs will be described. The subsequent section will focus on the influence of academic self-efficacy beliefs on students' academic lives. Next, the importance of self-regulated learning and the strategies that are necessary to regulate learning will be discussed. Then, self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning, including group differences in those beliefs, will be reviewed. Lastly, from the perspective of social cognitive theory, responsibility for learning will be presented.

Social Cognitive Theory

Social cognitive theory is based on an agentic perspective, meaning that "people are producers as well as products of social systems" (Bandura, 2001, p. 1). That is, people proactively and intentionally regulate their motivations and actions. The theory emphasizes that people have the capacity to take courses of action in order to achieve desired ends (Bandura, 1986, 1989, 1997, 2001, 2002; Bandura & Locke, 2003). According to the theory, there are three modes of agency: personal, proxy, and collective (Bandura, 2001, 2002). Personal agency refers to people's direct and individual influence over their lives. However, there are some cases in which people, through the use of proxy agency, rely on others who can act on their

behalf. The use of this mode has two main reasons. First, it is not possible for people to manage directly all aspects of their lives. For example, a victim of a crime consults legislative authorities to sue the perpetrator. Second, in some cases, people turn to someone even if they can directly influence the result, either because they have not gained the skills to do it or because they want to save time and effort and to avoid the demands of responsibility. In collective agency, the third mode of human agency, people have the collective power to act interactively and in coordination to attain common goals (Bandura, 2001, 2002). Individuals' power to make causal contribution to their development, adaptation, and change forms the basis of all these three modes of human agency (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2001, 2002). In the centre of the mechanisms in human agency are self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1986). Therefore, the following section emphasizes the importance of self-efficacy beliefs in social cognitive theory.

Self-Efficacy Beliefs

Self-efficacy beliefs are considered to be the most pertinent mechanism in human agency. They constitute the basis of human agency. People are led to act to achieve their goals by their beliefs of personal efficacy. Perceived self-efficacy refers to people's judgments of their capabilities to accomplish particular tasks. Individuals' confidence in their capabilities to achieve desired outcomes and to cope with the challenge of tasks stimulates them to succeed in those tasks in spite of the difficulties they might encounter. Depending on their perceived self-efficacy, people exercise choice over what activities they deal with. This suggests that people undertake the tasks they think they can perform successfully, whereas they tend to

avoid the ones whose demands are beyond their capabilities. Efficacy beliefs influence the amount of effort, energy, and time people devote to activities they choose, and how long they hold on to succeed under baffling circumstances. In addition, self-efficacy beliefs not only affect the level of stress people experience in dealing with a demanding task but also shape the ways people follow to meet those challenges. In conclusion, self-efficacy beliefs affect people's performances (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1989, 1997, 2001, 1995; Pajares, 1996). The following sub-section summarizes the qualities that differentiate people with high self-efficacy from those with low self-efficacy, and the other sub-section after that presents the sources of self-efficacy beliefs.

Differences in Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997, 1995) is largely concerned with the differences between people who have a high sense of self-efficacy and those who are just the opposite. According to Bandura, it is beyond human power to acquire and improve the skills that are required to accomplish all areas of knowledge. Therefore, different people develop skills in different areas of interest, or different people with similar skills differ from each other in terms of the level of cultivation of those skills. This explains why people have different levels of self-efficacy in the same skills and areas.

People with low self-efficacy beliefs have difficulty in motivating themselves to carry out a difficult task as they do not trust in their ability to deal with it. They do not put much effort into the task, and they prefer to quit when their success is hampered because they tend to worry too much about their incapability and the

difficulty of the task. They create scenarios of failure and they cannot summon up the courage and confidence to struggle again. As a result, they feel stressed and even depressed. However, people with high self-efficacy beliefs are heavily involved in activities, and they view difficult tasks as motivating. When they encounter difficulties, they concentrate on how they can overcome those challenges, and they can easily feel efficacious again. According to them, they fail because they have not put enough effort into the activity they are engaged in, rather than blaming external and environmental factors, with the result that they become successful and invulnerable. Furthermore, they aim to achieve more challenging goals for their future performance (Bandura, 1997, 1995).

Overall, people differ from each other in terms of their level of self-efficacy beliefs for the same or different tasks, and it is possible for a person to feel self-efficacious for some tasks but not for others (Bandura & Locke, 2003). For this reason, it is particularly important to know the sources from which different efficacy beliefs arise in various activities.

Sources of Self-Efficacy

Beliefs in one's confidence to accomplish specific tasks or activities are formed from four sources (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997, 1995; Zimmerman, 2000). These are enactive mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal (social) persuasion, and physiological and affective states.

Enactive mastery experiences, which are personal experiences of success regarding past performances, are considered to be the most influential source because they provide real evidence in support of whether one can successfully fulfill the

requirements of a task. Successful experiences tend to promote self-efficacy, whereas failures lower it if they precede the formation of firm efficacy beliefs. After achieving challenging tasks, especially under extremely difficult and demanding conditions, a positive sense of self-efficacy is developed. Trust in one's capacity to overcome obstacles nurtures perseverance and endurance in spite of the difficulties faced. On the other hand, if individuals have become accustomed to experiencing easy and quick successes that do not require much effort or involvement, they tend to have false beliefs regarding their capabilities, which in turn cause them to have a desire to achieve every task without considering whether the task demands further skills, more patience and persistence. As a result, discouragement easily occurs (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 1995).

Self-efficacy beliefs are also influenced by vicarious experiences, which refer to social comparisons made between the self and those who are similar in terms of capabilities or failures (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997, 1995). Although enactive mastery experiences have direct, and the strongest, influence on people's sense of self-efficacy, vicarious experiences sometimes seem to play an even more influential role in shaping people's self-efficacy, especially when people doubt their capabilities, as they lack prior experience on which they can draw to assess their capabilities (Bandura, 1997). When people watch the successes of other people who are similar to themselves in terms of possessing the same capabilities, they infer that as they have the same abilities and skills, there is no obvious reason why they cannot also be successful. The key element in this explanation is the extent to which people are similar to each other (Bandura, 1997). This suggests that if models are considered to be similar, then self-efficacy beliefs are influenced; however, if people observe the

performances of people who are in different positions, there will not be much influence on their beliefs of personal efficacy. Similarly, witnessing the failures of similarly competent people despite their perseverance and high effort might lead to a decrease in self-efficacy beliefs (Brown & Inouye, 1978). For instance, students who cannot write a coherent paragraph in English may have low confidence in their ability to do the task. However, when they observe classmates who can do the same task successfully, there will probably be an increase in the level of their self-efficacy because they are at the same age, in the same class, and being taught by the same teacher with the same syllabus. On the other hand, comparing their capabilities to do the task to those of their elder siblings will produce no significant change in those students' self-efficacy beliefs.

Positive or negative comments and feedback from others can also affect self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997, 1995). If people are encouraged and persuaded to carry out a task by others whose positive appraisals are highly valued, their confidence in dealing with that task is likely to increase. Social persuasion is effective only to the extent that required skills and knowledge for the successful completion of the task are already possessed. However, discouraging and demotivating verbal indications that cast doubt over one's capabilities might have a stronger but negative influence on one's personal efficacy beliefs. For the same reason, it is inevitable for people to quit in the face of obstacles if they are unrealistically persuaded that they are capable of overcoming the demands of the task. This will in turn weaken their self-efficacy when they have to face failure and disappointment. As a result, they might distrust their persuaders and tend to avoid trying again.

Finally, Bandura (1977, 1986, 1997, 1995) posits that physiological, affective, and mood states such as increased heart rate, profuse sweating, fast breathing, high anxiety, nervousness, and tiredness can influence self-efficacy. However, the influences do not always seem to be negative. Those reactions either increase or decrease self-efficacy depending on their interpretation. Those who doubt their self-efficacy tend to interpret those physical and emotional signals as signs of vulnerability and lack of capability, whereas self-efficacious people are likely to feel that they are indicators of energizing excitement. For example, if some students feel that they are feeling nervous and anxious while giving a presentation before their teachers and classmates because they are not skilled in this task, they will feel more uncomfortable, which results in a decrease in self-efficacy, which in turn might end in task failure.

Given the differences in self-efficacy and its sources, it can be said that self-efficacy is crucial to the successful completion of human activities. Among the essential domains of human life is the academic context. Hence, there is a need to understand the causal and mediational role of perceived self-efficacy on students' academic achievement, which will be the focus of the next section.

Academic Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy beliefs have been found to be influential in students' academic life (Bandura, 1997; Bandura & Barbaranelli, 1996; Bassi, Steca, Fave, & Caprara, 2007; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; Pajares & Miller, 1994; Zimmerman, 1995). Academic self-efficacy refers to a student's belief in his/her ability to accomplish academic tasks at different levels (Zimmerman,

2000). Bandura (1997) states that low performance in academic tasks may be due to either the lack of required skills or low self-efficacy beliefs. In other words, high self-efficacy beliefs help students do their best with the knowledge and skills they possess (Bandura, 1986). However, Schunk (1991) points out that there are other variables that influence achievement. Students must acquire necessary skills for designated tasks, have outcome expectations, and value those outcomes in order to successfully carry out given academic tasks.

When compared to students who have low self-efficacy, self-efficacious students have proven to possess the following characteristics:

- able to self-evaluate their academic performance accurately,
- able to manage their time more effectively,
- determined to sustain their efforts in the face of difficulties (Bandura, 1997),
- more engaged in the classroom in terms of behavior, cognition, and motivation (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003),
- more flexible in the use of learning strategies (Bouffard-Bouchard, 1990),
- able to cope with anxiety (Bandura, 1986; Bandura & Barbaranelli, 1996),
- more motivated to deal with challenging tasks (Zimmerman, 2000),
- enthusiastic to devote more time and effort for school work (Bassi, et al., 2007),
- better self-regulators (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1990).

Considering that self-efficacy beliefs are domain specific (Bandura, 1997) and have a substantial effect on academic functioning as stated above, several studies in the field of language learning have investigated the influence of self-efficacy

beliefs on performance in different domains. For example, Mills, Pajares, and Herron (2006) examined the relationship between self-efficacy, anxiety, and gender on the listening and reading proficiency of 95 college students enrolled in third and fourth semester French courses at a university in the southeastern United States. The study revealed that there was a positive relationship between reading self-efficacy and reading proficiency, whereas it was found that reading anxiety was not related to reading proficiency. Interestingly, the results also demonstrated that there was a significant relationship between listening self-efficacy and listening proficiency only for the female participants, but there was a positive relationship between listening anxiety and listening proficiency for both male and female participants.

Similarly, Chen (2007) investigated the influence of English listening self-efficacy, English anxiety, and perceived value of English language and culture on EFL learners' English listening performance. For this purpose, 277 non-English major students at a private university in northern Taiwan were asked to fill out an English listening self-efficacy questionnaire, which was composed of four self-report measures (English Listening Self-efficacy Measure, English Listening Anxiety Measure, Perceived Value of English Language and Culture Measure, and Source of English Listening Self-efficacy Measure). The results showed that English listening self-efficacy was a stronger predictor of English listening performance than were English listening anxiety and perceived value of English language and culture.

Pajares and Valiante (1997) tested whether writing self-efficacy, writing apprehension, perceived usefulness of writing, and writing aptitude determine essay-writing performance. Participants of this study were 218 fifth-grade students in three public elementary schools in the States (two schools in the South and one school in

the Southwest). It was found that self-efficacy beliefs predicted writing performance, writing apprehension, and perceived usefulness of writing.

In another study (Magogwe & Oliver, 2007), the relationship between language learning strategies and proficiency, and self-efficacy beliefs was investigated in an English as a second language context (ESL). Four hundred eighty students from primary schools, secondary schools, and a tertiary institution in Botswana, southern Africa participated in the study. The results indicated that there was a positive and significant but weak relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and use of overall language learning strategies across all proficiency levels.

From these four studies, it can be concluded that self-efficacy beliefs play both a direct and a mediational role in influencing students' language learning processes. Based on these findings, it is clear that promoting students' domain specific self-efficacy beliefs are crucial for successful language learning. However, it should be highlighted that achievement also requires successful use of self-regulatory skills and strategies (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Hence, the following section deals with the significance of self-regulated learning.

Self-Regulated Learning

The construct of self-regulation forms the basis of human functioning in social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986). Bandura (1986) emphasizes that humans are capable of contributing to their own lives through self-directedness that operates on reciprocal interactions between personal, behavioral, and environmental variables.

Since the mid-1980s, theoretical and implicational research studies have been deeply interested in self-directed learning, which requires students to become

controllers of and contributors to their own learning processes. This characteristic is unique to human beings (Zimmerman, 2001). Self-regulated learners are identified as metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally proactive controllers of personal, behavioral, and environmental factors during their goal-oriented learning processes (Zimmerman, 1994, 2001). Self-regulation is defined as “self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are planned and cyclically adapted to the attainment of personal goals” (quoted from Zimmerman, 2000, p. 14, cited in Wang & Pape, 2005, p. 77). Self-regulation operates on three processes: self-observation, self-judgment, and self-reaction (Bandura, 1986). As self-regulation is a goal-directed mechanism and academic self-regulation is the process through which students self-direct their learning to attain academic goals (Zimmerman, 1990), these processes of self-regulation function to assess whether a student is attaining his or her academic goals (Schunk, 1994). Students need to observe their actions regularly and immediately after the instances of behavior so that they can evaluate their behaviors and goals through the process of self-judgment. Following this, they compare their performances either to fixed standards such as grading systems or to their ambitions or to models they observe. As a last stage, students respond evaluatively to their self-judgments, the process called self-reaction. If they believe that they have attained their goals and reached their anticipated consequences, they feel motivated and gain confidence in their ability to attain their future goals and to make further progress. This can get them to reward themselves with something tangible such as shopping or going out. On the other hand, if they doubt that they can achieve their goals even if they make more effort or use better strategies, their motivation may decrease (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1994).

In summary, the three subprocesses of self-regulation – self-observation, self-judgment, and self-reaction – function interactively, and self-regulation involves “triadic reciprocity” (Bandura, 1986, p. 23) through which personal, behavioral, and environmental factors and influences function as determinants of each other. Furthermore, having self-set goals and feeling motivated and efficacious enough are crucial for effective self-regulation. As long as students are aware of the fact that their success depends on their ability, effort, and use of strategies, rather than believing that they fail because of luck or tasks, they can hold an optimal amount of motivation and self-efficacy for learning (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1994). Based on this view of human functioning, it can be inferred that there is a causal and reciprocal interaction between students’ self-regulated behaviors and their confidence in their ability to attain their goals. Thus, before discussing self-efficacy for self-regulated learning in detail, it is necessary to describe self-regulated learning strategies.

Self-Regulated Learning Strategies

Zimmerman (1989) structured self-regulated learning (SRL) on the basis of Bandura’s (1986) theory of triadic reciprocity, suggesting that self-regulated learners are competent to exert initiative control over their learning activities and performance. Such students concentrate their efforts and attention on achieving their academic goals, and their selection and use of strategies are influenced by their perceptions of academic efficacy (Zimmerman, 1989; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1990). Three key elements are of great importance to this framework: “students’ self-regulated learning strategies, self-efficacy perceptions of performance skill, and commitment to academic goals”. Based on this framework, self-regulated learning

strategies are defined as “actions and processes directed at acquiring information or skill that involve agency, purpose, and instrumentality perceptions by learners” (Zimmerman, 1989, p. 329). Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1986) proposed 14 types of SRL strategies: self-evaluation, organizing and transforming, goal setting and planning, seeking information, keeping records and monitoring, environmental structuring, self-consequences, rehearsing and memorizing, seeking peer assistance, seeking teacher assistance, seeking adult assistance, reviewing tests, reviewing notes, and reviewing texts. Figure 1 below presents the description of each category with examples (adapted from Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1986, cited in Wang & Pape, 2005, pp. 88-89).

It should be noted that some self-regulated learning strategies, such as organizing and transforming, monitoring, and self-evaluation, are similar to metacognitive strategies, which can be perceived as actions that help learners control and manage their own learning (Oxford, 1990). In addition, some of the self-regulated learning strategies, such as keeping records, seeking information, and rehearsing and memorizing, can be associated with cognitive strategies, and one of the self-regulated learning strategies -seeking peer/teacher/adult assistance- can be linked to social-affective strategies. Based on this suggestion, it can be said that self-regulation of learning underlies the entire concept of learning strategies.

Category definition	Examples of ESL children
1. Self-evaluation: Self-initiated evaluations of the quality or progress of students' work.	Check the writing before turning it in to the teacher.
2. Organizing and transforming: Self-initiated overt and covert rearrangement of instructional materials to improve learning.	Translate English into their native language to help memorize the word.
3. Goal-setting and planning: Setting educational goals or subgoals and planning for sequencing, timing, and completing activities related to the self-set goals.	Adjust what to write in a journal entry by checking how much time is left.
4. Seeking information: Self-initiated efforts to secure further task information from nonsocial sources.	Look for the meaning of a word in a dictionary.
5. Keeping records and monitoring: Self-initiated efforts to record events or results.	Take down an unknown word to ask for help later.
6. Environmental structuring: Self-initiated efforts to select or arrange the physical setting to make learning easier.	Study in one's own room.
7. Self-consequences: Student arrangement or imagination of rewards or punishment for success or failure.	Jump up and down when one gets good results of study.
8. Rehearsing and memorizing: Self-initiated efforts to memorize learning materials by overt or covert practice.	Write the word many times on paper in order to memorize it.
9./10./11. Seeking peer/teacher/adult assistance: Self-initiated efforts to solicit help from peers/the teacher/adults.	Ask a friend/the teacher/parents for help.
12./13./14. Reviewing tests/notes/texts: Self-initiated efforts to reread tests/notes/texts.	Reread the past test/the notes/the textbook.

Figure 1 - Categories of SRL strategies

Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning

Self-efficacy for self-regulation refers to students' beliefs in their ability to apply necessary strategies to direct their own learning (Bandura, 1993). Bandura (1995) points out that possessing self-regulatory skills does not guarantee that one

can use them firmly and continually despite difficulties or obstacles. In the same vein, although students might have confidence to cope with the content of what they are learning, they may not feel efficacious to direct their academic activities. (Zimmerman, et al., 1992). This supports Bandura's (1986) statement, "Self-regulatory capabilities require tools of personal agency and the self-assurance to use them effectively" (p. 435). Thus, applying various subfunctions of self-regulation – goal setting, self-evaluation, self-monitoring, time planning and management, and strategy use – depends on one's perceived self-efficacy (Bandura, 1995; Zimmerman, 2000). Below is a brief review of some studies that demonstrate how self-efficacy beliefs are related to use of various self-regulated learning strategies and how self-efficacy for SRL is associated with academic success.

Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1990) hypothesized that there was a strong correlation between students' perceptions of their academic efficacy and their use of SRL strategies. To test this hypothesis, the participants for this study were selected from two kinds of schools. The first group of 90 students was randomly selected from a highly selective school for intellectually gifted children in New York. The second group consisted of the same number of students from three regular schools. In both groups of students, there were fifth, eighth and eleventh graders, and 45 boys and 45 girls. The students in both groups generally came from middle-class homes and from various racial backgrounds. The students' use of the 14 classes of SRL strategies developed by Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1986) was assessed with a structured interview, and the students' academic self-efficacy was assessed with two scales. The Mathematics Efficacy scale was conducted to assess the students' mathematical problem solving efficacy, and The Verbal Efficacy scale was used to

assess the students' efficacy beliefs in defining selected words. The findings supported the researchers' hypothesis. That is, students' perceptions of both mathematical and verbal efficacy were positively correlated with their efforts to strategically regulate their learning. The researchers conclude that students' perceptions of academic efficacy can help teachers, educators, and parents understand individual differences in learning. Considering the differences between high self-efficacious and low self-efficacious students in this study in terms of their academic self-efficacy, it can be said that high self-efficacious students tended to employ more SRL strategies than low self-efficacious students.

In another study, Wang and Pape (2005) researched the question of whether there was a relationship between self-efficacy, SRL strategies, and success in learning English by conducting a case study that involved four fifth-grade children from Chinese or Taiwanese family background, and one parent of each. All of the children attended the same elementary public school in a Midwest urban area. At the time of the study, two of them had been in the United States for at least four years and had achieved native-like English proficiency, while the other two had been in the United States for about half a year. The children were asked to report how well they performed specific language tasks in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing and the strategies they used to accomplish particular language learning tasks. The children and the parents were interviewed to collect information regarding the children's use of English at home, self-efficacy beliefs, and their strategic behavior in relation to learning English. The children were also observed in their classroom setting and during their playtime. The study revealed that the children with high self-efficacy for learning ESL reported that they used more SRL strategies and

experienced more success in learning English than the children with lower self-efficacy for learning English. Considering the results, the researchers suggested that the strategies children chose to learn English and their success in learning the language might be influenced by their self-efficacy beliefs for learning English, which is in line with Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons's (1990) claim. The researchers further argued that there might be a positive relationship between the level of English proficiency and employing a wide variety of strategies for learning the language.

Lastly, Mills, Pajares, and Heron (2007) examined the influence of French grade self-efficacy (i.e. self-efficacy beliefs about the grades students would obtain), French learning anxiety, French learning self-concept, self-efficacy for self-regulated learning, and perceived value of French language and culture on intermediate-level French students' achievement. The participants were 303 college students from one urban public and two urban private universities in the United States. To collect data, participants were given a survey that was composed of five measures to evaluate the five constructs listed above. Students' French achievement was assessed with their semester grades. It was found that students' self-efficacy for self-regulation was a stronger predictor of intermediate French language achievement than were the other motivation constructs. This study revealed that self-efficacy for self-regulation was important for the achievement of intermediate French students.

The studies on the association between self-efficacy and SRL presented above reveal that students who are able to employ various SRL strategies outperform those who cannot get themselves to use self-regulatory strategies, as more self-regulated learners perceive themselves as more capable of managing their learning processes and of attaining their academic goals. It can also be inferred from the

studies on academic self-efficacy and on self-regulatory efficacy reviewed so far that there might be a reciprocal relationship among academic self-efficacy, use of SRL strategies, and success. If students observe that they can use various strategies effectively, their self-regulatory efficacy can be boosted, and in turn they keep using more strategies, which help them become more successful, which might in turn increase their academic efficacy. This inference is in line with the argument of Zimmerman, et al. (1992). That is, the higher students' self-regulatory efficacy, the higher perceived self-efficacy they had for academic achievement, which in turn enhanced their academic success by enabling them to set more challenging academic goals.

As one of the aims of this study is to examine how students' confidence in their ability to regulate their own learning changes across gender and academic level, the next section focuses on some discussion related to group differences in self-regulatory efficacy.

Group Differences in Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning

In addition to the importance of self-efficacy for self-regulated learning in academic achievement, several researchers have examined the possibility of its variance according to gender and the academic level (grade) of students (Caprara, et al., 2008; Klassen & Georgiou, 2008; Mills, et al., 2007; Pajares, 2002, 2008; Pajares & Valiante, 2002; Pape & Wang, 2003; Usher & Pajares, 2008; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1990). This section therefore provides research findings related to those group differences in self-regulatory efficacy.

Gender

Gender differences in students' self-efficacy for self-regulation have been investigated in the literature (Pajares, 2002, 2008). It has been stated that female students have reported higher self-regulatory efficacy than do male students (Usher & Pajares, 2008). For example, Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1990), interviewed fifth, eighth, and eleventh grade students by asking questions regarding their use of the 14 self-regulatory learning strategies that were identified by the researchers in a previous study (1986). The findings demonstrated that female students reported using certain strategies such as goal-setting, planning, record keeping, structuring their environment for optimal learning, and self-monitoring more frequently than did males.

Similarly, Mills, et al. (2007), with their study involving college intermediate French students (see the previous section, p. 28), found that female students reported significantly stronger self-efficacy for self-regulation than did male students.

Caprara, et al. (2008) researched the question whether there was a variance in the initial level of self-regulatory efficacy and in the degree of decline across gender when students advanced through the educational system from junior to senior high schools. The study involved 412 children from two public junior high schools in Italy. The self-regulatory efficacy beliefs of the children were measured with the Perceived Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Scale, which was composed of eleven items that measured children's self-efficacy to plan and organize their academic activities, to structure environments conducive to learning, and to motivate themselves to do their school work. The findings revealed that female students exhibited higher perceived efficacy to regulate their academic activities and a lesser

decline as they advanced through the educational system. Moreover, the study demonstrated that as students moved up through school, that gender gap became bigger.

The studies above are in line with the findings of other studies that showed that gender differences favored girls on self-efficacy for self-regulation during elementary school (Pajares, Miller, & Johnson, 1999) and during middle school (Pajares, Britner, & Valiante, 2000; Pajares & Valiante, 2001). Girls' confidence in their capability to finish homework assignments on time, to study when there are distractions, to remember the information covered in class and in textbooks, and to participate in class discussions is also greater than boys' (Pajares & Valiante, 2002).

However, the literature also emphasizes that the difference between female and male students in terms of their confidence in their capability to regulate their learning might stem from gender orientation, "the stereotypic beliefs about gender that students hold" (Pajares, 2002, p. 119). As femininity might be associated with self-efficacy for self-regulation (Pajares & Valiante, 2001), girls may be more likely to express higher confidence in their ability to use SRL strategies. This issue therefore calls for the need for further research on gender differences in self-regulatory efficacy in different academic contexts in order to determine whether this difference can be attributed to gender stereotypic beliefs rather than gender itself.

Academic Level

The variance in the use of self-regulatory skills in terms of academic or grade level have also been investigated. For example, the study by Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1990), which was touched upon above (see p. 30), also revealed that

some self-regulatory learning strategies such as reviewing texts and help-seeking from adults declined across grade levels; however, eighth and tenth graders used other strategies, such as record keeping, monitoring, and organizing, more frequently than did the fifth graders.

Additionally, Caprara, et al. (2008) (see p. 30) also aimed to investigate whether the level of perceived self-efficacy for self-regulated learning changed from junior high to high school. The results showed that there was a progressive decline in self-regulatory efficacy as students moved up in the educational system. This study supports the findings of another study that was carried out by Usher and Pajares (2008). The researchers assessed the self-regulatory efficacy beliefs of 3,760 students from grade four to grade eleven. The students were from schools in middle-class socioeconomic settings in the suburban northeastern and southeastern United States. The ages of the students ranged from eight to eighteen. Considering the results, the researchers claimed that students' confidence in their ability to employ self-regulatory strategies decreased as they advanced through school. In other words, elementary school students reported higher confidence in their ability to use self-regulatory strategies than did middle and high school students.

By the same token, Pajares and Valiante (2002) aimed to provide a developmental perspective on students' self-efficacy in their self-regulatory learning strategies. For this purpose, they assessed the self-regulatory efficacy beliefs of 1,257 students ranging in grades four to eleven. The students were attending public elementary, middle, and high schools in the south or in the northeast United States. Most of the students were from middle-class socioeconomic status. The ages of the participants ranged from nine to seventeen. The results of the study showed that

students' self-efficacy for self-regulated learning strategies decreased as they progressed from elementary school to high school. From these results, Pajares and Valiante (2002) concluded that on the one hand, as students grow up and learn, they acquire various self-regulatory strategies and become more competent in terms of academic skills, but on the other hand their confidence in their competence to regulate their learning decreases.

Several researchers in the literature (Caprara, et al., 2008; Pajares & Valiante, 2002; Usher & Pajares, 2008) explained that this decline in self-regulatory efficacy in grade levels might be attributed to the fact that academic activities or requirements become increasingly demanding, challenging, competitive, and stressful. As a result, this might lead to a decrease in students' sense of efficacy. In addition, students' attention might be attracted to other interesting activities during the transition period from childhood to late adolescence and young adulthood. As a result, they might feel they cannot manage their learning when they are occupied with distractions (Zimmerman, et al., 1992). Furthermore, in lower grades, teachers provide students with more guidance and they are more attentive to students' progress (Pajares & Valiante, 2002; Usher & Pajares, 2008). Lastly, as older students are expected to manage their academic lives on their own, it is possible for them to lose their confidence in their ability to use self-regulatory learning skills when they have to face dealing with increasing challenges (Usher & Pajares, 2008) .

Considering the discussions of the studies reviewed above, it should be highlighted that according to social cognitive theory, one's confidence in carrying out a task leads him or her to achieve his or her goals. As long as individuals believe in their skills, capacity, and knowledge to exercise control over their lives, they feel

responsible for what they experience in the trials of life (Bandura, 1977, 1986). Thus, the next section deals with how self-efficacy beliefs and self-regulatory efficacy shape students' perceptions regarding academic responsibility.

Responsibility for Learning

Referring to Bandura's (1997) social cognitive theory, which proposes that self-efficacious students view themselves as individuals who are able to take actions and to make changes in their school lives, Zimmerman (1994) hypothesized that students who are self-regulated, which means that students who are "metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally active participants in their own learning" (p. 3), take responsibility for regulating their own learning without any external demands. As a result, even if they face difficulties or failures, they are more likely to accept responsibility for their unsatisfactory academic performance rather than blaming such external factors as teachers, luck, or materials. In other words, the extent to which students view themselves to be responsible for their learning outcomes depends on the extent to which they feel capable of engaging in goal-setting, planning, organizing, monitoring, evaluating, and employing various strategies during learning and studying (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2005).

In order to understand the concept of responsibility for learning, it is essential to define it. Anderson and Prawat (1983) define responsibility for learning by emphasizing its components such as self-regulation and self-control:

Responsibility is a complex concept involving a number of related issues, such as accountability and control... Individuals who feel in control are more willing to accept responsibility for their own behavior. In the classroom, responsible behavior involves self-regulation and self-control by students. Students behave appropriately in large part because they have internalized standards of conduct and know how to meet those standards. (p. 62)

Zimmerman (2006) provides a similar definition for academic responsibility:

“Academic responsibility refers to students’ acceptance of accountability for their successes and failures in school” (p. 179).

Both definitions can be linked to what the views of self-efficacy and self-regulated learning in social cognitive theory emphasize. The more students hold positive beliefs in their ability to get tasks done and to direct their learning, the more active they become in their learning, which opens the way to accountability for and having control over their learning outcomes no matter how unsatisfying their learning outcomes are (Bandura, 1977).

Anderson and Prawat (1983) also point out that it may not be easy for teachers to differentiate the students who are responsible from those who are not, as responsibility for learning involves both observable and non-observable components. The observable aspect of responsibility refers to behaving appropriately, which does not always guarantee behaving responsibly. For example, students can finish in-class tasks without demonstrating any misbehavior or can do their homework on time because they may want to complete the tasks or assignments to have more free time. On the other hand, the non-observable component of academic responsibility includes cognitive aspects such as beliefs, knowledge, and strategies. Responsible and self-regulated students study not because they are externally required to do so,

but because they believe that what they are dealing with in and out of the classroom is worth being involved in. That is, their behavior is not consequences-oriented.

Bacon (1991) makes a similar point in depicting the qualities that characterize responsible students. Referring to Morris (1961, as cited in Bacon, 1991), the researcher elaborates on two different cases of responsibility for learning: being held responsible or being responsible. Based on what Bacon (1991, 1993) and Anderson and Prawat (1983) have discussed regarding academic responsibility, the table below presents the basic differences between the students who are being held responsible and those who are being responsible.

Students who are being held responsible	Students who are being responsible
are compelled or demanded to engage in the learning process by the teacher or other adults.	are engaged in the learning on their own account and willingly to acquire more knowledge.
are extrinsically motivated: They are less concerned with learning, but more with meeting objectives, external demands such as passing a course or earning a degree, or with pleasing the teacher.	are intrinsically motivated: They are concerned with learning because they value what they learn.
view learning as a means to something else.	view learning as an end in itself.
complete their assignments to satisfy the demands imposed on them by the teacher or the school.	view the assignments as a chance to acquire expertise in a particular subject matter.
need external impetus for learning and doing their work.	take the initiative to learn and study and do their work independently and stay on task (self-control of attention and on-task behavior).

Figure 2 - Students who are being held responsible versus those who are being responsible

It should be noted that the characteristics listed above do not aim to put students into two distinct categories. Neither do they imply that a student is always oriented towards being held responsible or being responsible. The orientation of the

same student may differ within the same subject matter or across similar or different activities depending on such factors as time, the teacher, the curriculum, or the syllabus (Bacon, 1991). Accordingly, as Zimmerman (2006) points out, academic responsibility depends on the extent to which students hold themselves accountable for their successes and failures in school. From this explanation, it can be inferred that students need to be aware of their capabilities that help them become successful. They need to be aware of the fact that they have the power to control their own learning despite hindering external factors. This inference is in line with Bandura's (1997) social cognitive theory, which claims that students' use of self-regulatory strategies and their beliefs in their efficacy to use them effectively are highly influential in students' perceptions of academic responsibility (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2007). Those who can regulate their learning are more likely to attribute their failures or successes to their effort rather than blaming the teacher, their luck, or task difficulty (Anderson & Prawat, 1983; Zimmerman, 1995; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2005).

This is to say that from the perspective of social cognitive theory, academic responsibility can be associated with self-efficacy, self-regulation, and attributing success or failure to effort and strategies used (Zimmerman, 2006). Responsible learners perceive the effort they put into academic activities and the strategies they use to obtain knowledge to be crucial for their academic success. It should also be noted that this perception requires students to have confidence both in their ability to accomplish academic tasks at different levels and in directing their own learning. Considering this, the literature has provided us with valuable insights into the nature of self-efficacy beliefs, self-regulatory learning, and academic responsibility in many

subject areas and in many learning contexts. For example, Zimmerman and Kitsantas (2005; 2007) investigated the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility learning with regard to general academic learning. However, no previous study has investigated the relationship between these two constructs in Western or Asian EFL contexts.

Conclusion

This literature review provides an overview regarding self-efficacy beliefs, self-regulatory efficacy, and responsibility for learning. The studies reviewed here not only show that perceived responsibility for learning is shaped by students' beliefs in their capabilities to use self-regulated learning strategies, but also reveals the fact that there has been no research that explores the relationship between efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and academic responsibility in an EFL context. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap in the literature with an attempt to measure both perceived self-regulatory efficacy and perceived responsibility of EFL students to see the association between these two variables. The next chapter will cover the methodology used in this study, including participants, instruments, data collection, and data analysis procedures.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory and interpretative study was to investigate whether there is a relationship between self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for learning in university EFL students. The research questions addressed for the study were as follows:

1. How confident are Turkish university EFL students in their ability to regulate their own learning? Does the level of confidence change according to the students'
 - a) level of English proficiency,
 - b) academic level, (pre-tertiary vs. tertiary students)
 - c) level of success in English, and
 - d) gender?
2. What is the level of perceived responsibility for language learning outcomes of Turkish university EFL students? Does the level of perceived responsibility change according to the students'
 - a) level of English proficiency,
 - b) academic level, (pre-tertiary vs. tertiary students)
 - c) level of success in English, and
 - d) gender?
3. How do Turkish university EFL students' self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for language learning outcomes relate to each other?

This chapter introduces the methodology of the present study. The following subsections review the setting, participants, instruments, data collection procedure, and data analysis.

Setting

The study was conducted at Yildiz Technical University, School of Foreign Languages (YTUSFL), Istanbul, Turkey. YTUSFL was established to provide compulsory intensive English language education. The school consists of two departments: the Department of Basic English, which is responsible for teaching English to preparatory classes, and the Department of Modern Languages, which is responsible for offering Advanced English courses to the students who study in their departments. YTUSFL conducts a proficiency test at the beginning of every academic year, and the students who score 60 or higher in this proficiency exam and the students who have been exempted from preparatory classroom education are required to attend advanced English courses simultaneously with their departmental studies, whereas those who cannot score at least 60 are required to register for the preparatory school. Following the proficiency test, the Department of Basic English gives a placement test to students who score lower than 60, and according to the results, students are placed in elementary, pre-intermediate, or intermediate classes, where students have 27, 23, and 20 class hours of English per week respectively. The department runs a two-semester program, and it aims to help the students at all levels offered in the program reach the upper-intermediate level of English at the end of the academic year. Assessment is based on portfolios, in-class assignments, four mid-terms, one mid-year examination, and a final examination. In order to be considered

successful at the end of the academic year, students are required to both score at least 50 on the final examination and to have a cumulative grade average of at least 60. Although unsuccessful students can enroll in their departments, they cannot take advanced English courses from the Department of Modern Languages unless they pass the proficiency exam administered at the beginning of either Fall or Spring terms by the YTUSFL, or unless they get the required score from some internationally accepted English tests such as TOEFL or IELTS. The Department of Modern Languages offers Advanced English Reading and Writing, Advanced English Reading and Speaking, and Business English courses. These are compulsory courses, and students can attend these classes as long as they have passed the proficiency test of YTUSFL or have proven to be exempt from the proficiency test.

Participants

There were two groups of participants involved in the study. The first group was comprised of 305 pre-tertiary students from 20 preparatory classes, with eight classes from elementary, six classes from pre-intermediate, and six classes from intermediate level. The students in the second group were tertiary students who were taking advanced English courses from the Department of Modern Languages. The total number of the students in this group was 198 and consisted of the students in five advanced English Reading and Writing classes and five Business English classes. The classes in both pre-tertiary and tertiary groups were chosen because the teachers of these classes volunteered to allocate 15-20 minutes of their class time for the questionnaires to be administered. The pre-tertiary students' level of success was determined by calculating the average of their first term scores from two mid-terms,

one mid-year exam, two quizzes, and four portfolio assessments. Then, the students were grouped according to their averages. As the cutoff score for passing an English course at YTU is 60, the participants with scores lower than 60.00 fell into the low achievers group, and the cutoff scores for each group were determined according to the grading system at YTU (see Appendix A). That is, the group of low achievers was in the range of 0 – 59.9, the group of moderate achievers was in the range of 60 – 79.9, and the group of high achievers was in the range of 80 – 100. The tertiary students' level of success was determined by their previous English course grade. A, A-, and B+ indicated a high level of success, B, B-, C+, and C indicated a moderate level of success, and C-, D+, D, F, and F0 indicated a low level of success. The characteristics of the sample participating in the present study are shown in Table 1.

Academic Level	Proficiency Level	N	Gender		Level of Success		
			Male	Female	Low	Moderate	High
Pre-Tertiary (N: 305)	Elementary	104	79	25	14	52	38
	Pre-Intermediate	99	68	31	23	69	7
	Intermediate	102	59	43	6	76	20
Tertiary	Advanced	198	87	111	33	90	75
Total		503	293	210	76	287	140

Table 1 - Characteristics of the study participants

From among the students who responded to the questionnaires, eight interviewees, six participants from the pre-tertiary level and two participants from the tertiary level, were chosen. In choosing the participants for the interviews, the

participants were divided into groups according to their level of self-regulatory efficacy and their proficiency level in English. In addition, the participants within a particular proficiency level were of the same gender in order to minimize any differences between them. The participants who scored higher than the mean value of the whole sample within a proficiency level were considered to have relatively high self-regulatory efficacy and those who scored lower were considered to have relatively low self-regulatory efficacy. The participants within a proficiency level who had higher or lower self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning scores than the others in that level were invited for the interview. Those who both accepted to be interviewed and were available on the interview day were the interviewees in this study. The distribution of the interviewees according to the grouping criteria is shown in the table below.

		High Level of SESRL	Low Level of SESRL
Pre-Tertiary level	Elementary (Males)	1	1
	Pre-intermediate (Females)	1	1
	Intermediate (Males)	1	1
Tertiary level	Advanced (Females)	1	1

Note. SESRL: Self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning
Table 2 - Distribution of the interviewees

Instruments

Two types of data collection instruments, questionnaires and interviews, were used in this study. Each instrument is described in separate sections below.

Questionnaires

Data were collected using questionnaires, due to the fact that questionnaires require a relatively shorter period of time to collect a great amount of data from a large number of participants (Dörnyei, 2007). The three questionnaires used in this study are: 1) a Personal Data Questionnaire, 2) the Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire, and 3) the Perceived Responsibility for Learning Questionnaire. Questionnaires were accompanied by a cover letter in Turkish which explained the purpose of the study, enumerated participants' rights, and thanked the participant for his/her help (see Appendix B for the English version of the informed consent form, and also see Appendix C for the Turkish version of the informed consent form).

A Personal Data Questionnaire

This questionnaire was developed by the researcher to obtain demographic information about the participants. The questionnaire includes items regarding the participants' gender, class names (proficiency level), and student numbers (to allow the researcher to get their semester point averages or previous English course grades from the administrative coordinators at YTUSFL in case they did not remember their grades.) (see Appendix D and Appendix E for the questionnaire in English and in Turkish respectively). The questions in this section were prepared in Turkish to

eliminate any comprehension problems since the participants were not native speakers of English.

The Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire

In the literature, the questionnaires that have been used to measure self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning (Chen, 1995; Landry, 2003) were designed according to self-regulated learning strategies proposed by Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1986). They involved general self-regulatory strategic learning behaviors, and they allowed researchers to adapt the items for any subject matter. However, the items in these questionnaires did not include participants' conditional self-efficacy beliefs. As self-efficacy beliefs can be affected by variations in academic tasks, such as challenging academic problems and contexts (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1988), measuring participants' beliefs about using self-regulatory strategies by using questionnaires that require participants to report their certainty about coping with learning obstacles can be thought to provide more reliable information about participants' beliefs for using self-regulated learning strategies. The questionnaire that was originally developed by Zimmerman and Kitsantas (2005; 2007) to measure perceived self-efficacy for self-regulated learning was chosen for this study, as this questionnaire includes items that involve adapting to difficult learning contexts, and that include participants' conditional self-efficacy beliefs.

This study aimed to investigate each participant's perceived self-efficacy regarding their self-regulation processes during English learning, so the questionnaire was adapted for university EFL students by the researcher. For the adaptation, the word "English" was inserted into the appropriate phrase in each item.

In addition, some phrases in some items were reworded so that these items could specifically ask about English learning (see Appendix F for the original questionnaire, and also see Appendix G for the adapted version of the questionnaire). The researcher received permission from Professor Barry J. Zimmerman on November 24, 2008 to use and adapt the questionnaire for the study.

This questionnaire has 18 items, which focus on note-taking, studying, and test preparation. Originally, the questionnaire had 19 items, but in this study one of the items, the first item in the adapted version of the questionnaire, was eliminated after the actual study was conducted because the reliability analysis revealed that this item negatively affected the reliability of the instrument. The participants responded to each item using a scale that ranged from 0 to 100 points, in 10-unit increments. Written descriptions were provided beside the following points on the scale: 0 (definitely cannot do it), 30 (probably cannot do it), 50 (maybe), 70 (probably can), and 100 (definitely can do it). Higher scores on this scale reflect more positive self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning. The reliability coefficient for students' scores on the original 19-item scale in the study by Zimmerman and Kitsantas (2007) was .97. The items in this questionnaire were translated into Turkish to eliminate any comprehension problems since the participants were not native speakers of English. This was accomplished through a back translation process (see Appendix H for the translated version). First, the questionnaire was translated into Turkish by a colleague who is a native speaker of Turkish and has a teaching position at YTUSFL. Then, a native speaker of Turkish, who is a fulltime faculty member at Bogazici University, Department of Western Languages and Literature, was asked to back-translate the items into English, without being given the original English version. Both of the

translators are at a higher advanced level of English proficiency. Finally, the original English version and the translated English version were compared by a native speaker of English who has a teaching position at YTUSFL, and necessary changes were made to eliminate any differences.

The questionnaire was piloted by the researcher on the fourth and fifth of March at YTUSFL, with a group of 16 preparatory students at elementary level and another group of 21 tertiary students at advanced level. The participants in the pilot study were chosen randomly. The purpose of the pilot study was to ensure that all of the items in each questionnaire were clear enough for the participants to respond to. It took about 5-7 minutes for the participants to fill out the questionnaire. The participants were requested to mark the items they had difficulty in understanding and to note the reason(s) for the problem. However, the students stated that all of the items were clear, so there was no need to make any changes in the questionnaire. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to examine the reliability of the questionnaire, and it was .88.

The Perceived Responsibility for Learning Questionnaire

This third questionnaire was originally developed by Zimmerman and Kitsantas (2005; 2007). In these studies, it was used as one of the scales measuring the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for learning. To the knowledge of the researcher, in the literature, there are no research studies that explore the relationship between these two constructs in EFL or ESL contexts. Taking this fact into account, this questionnaire was used in this study in order to compare the results obtained in the

present study with the results obtained in the studies by Zimmerman and Kitsantas (2005; 2007).

This questionnaire is a 19-item 7-point scale that assesses whether students hold themselves or teachers more responsible for various features of the learning situations such as their motivation, learning processes, and doing well on tests. This questionnaire too was adapted for university EFL students by the researcher. The researcher received permission from Professor Barry J. Zimmerman on November 24, 2008 to use and adapt the questionnaire for the study. As the studies mentioned above do not provide the questionnaire in their appendices, the researcher also requested Prof. Zimmerman to send the questionnaire. In the questionnaire sent were 20 items. One of the items were eliminated before the pilot study by the researcher as the adapted version of the item was thought to cause comprehension problems in a language learning context. The remaining 19 items were used both in the pilot and actual studies. Regarding the adaptation, the word “English” was inserted into the appropriate phrase in each item (see Appendix I for the original questionnaire, and also see Appendix J for the adapted version of the questionnaire). The respondents answered the questionnaire using the following scale: 1 = mainly the teacher, 2 = definitely more the teacher, 3 = slightly more the teacher, 4 = both equally, 5 = slightly more the student, 6 = definitely more the student, and 7 = mainly the student. A higher score on this scale represents a higher degree of responsibility attributed to the student for the learning outcome in question. The reliability coefficient of the scale used in the study by Zimmerman and Kitsantas (2007) was .90. The items in this questionnaire were translated into Turkish to eliminate any comprehension problems since the participants were not native speakers of English

(see Appendix K for the translated version). The previously described back-translation process was also followed for this questionnaire. However, the translator who translated the self-efficacy questionnaire from English to Turkish was asked to translate the responsibility questionnaire from Turkish to English, and the translator who translated the responsibility questionnaire from English to Turkish was asked to translate the self-efficacy questionnaire from Turkish to English. In this way, neither of the translators saw both original English versions of the questionnaires.

This questionnaire was piloted at the same time as the self-efficacy questionnaire with the same groups of participants. It took about 5-7 minutes for the participants to fill out the questionnaire. The participants were requested to mark the items they had difficulty in understanding and to note the reason(s) for the problem. However, the students stated that all of the items were clear, so there was no need to make any changes in the questionnaire. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to examine the reliability of the questionnaire, and it was .85.

Interviews

Interviews provide researchers with in-depth information (Cohen & Manion, 1994; Dörnyei, 2007), and they are explanatory devices to explore variables and relationships (Cohen & Manion, 1994). Semi-structured interviews were conducted to gather qualitative data in this study, as such interviews enable the interviewer to create new questions and elaborate on new issues that emerge in the course of the interview (Brown, 2001). The purpose of collecting qualitative data was to explore in depth the participants' self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for learning, and the possible relationship between the two.

The interviews were conducted after the quantitative data were collected and analyzed in order to select the participants according to the criteria described in the participants section in this chapter. In the interviews, the students answered seven questions that helped the researcher obtain information about the interviewees' self-regulatory efficacy beliefs and five questions that provided information about the interviewees' perceived responsibility regarding their English learning processes (see Appendix L for the questions that guided the interviews).

Data Collection Procedure

After the research questions were formed in late October, the institution where the study would take place and the participants from whom the data would be obtained were determined. Following that, preparations for conducting the study were made. First, written permission for carrying out both the pilot and actual study was requested from the Head of Yıldız Technical University School of Foreign Languages. Then, the Personal Data Questionnaire was designed, and the Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Scale and the Perceived Responsibility for Learning Scale were adapted to suit university EFL students and were translated into Turkish.

The actual study was conducted in the last two weeks of March. The researcher prepared a packet of questionnaires for each class in advance and gave enough packets to each teacher. The teachers distributed the questionnaires at the beginning of class or in the last fifteen minutes of class and provided supervision until each student completed the questionnaires. The researcher did not provide supervision while the students were completing the questionnaires, as it was felt that

the researcher's presence might cause discomfort to the students. The teachers chose the lesson in which they distributed the questionnaires according to their course schedules and pacing, and for this reason, data were collected over the course of two weeks.

Following the analysis of the survey data, a schedule of interview questions and prompts was drawn up for the semi-structured interviews. The interviews were conducted by the researcher on April 24 (with three of the interviewees) and 27 (with five of the interviewees). In order to determine the interview times, the interviewees' preferences and course schedules were considered. Once the interview time was set, the interviews were carried out, in approximately 20-minute slots, in Turkish. The responses to the interview questions were tape-recorded, transcribed, and translated into English (see Appendix M and Appendix N for a portion of a sample interview in Turkish and in English respectively).

Data Analysis

In this study, two data analysis procedures were followed. The data from both the actual and pilot study were statistically analyzed using the Statistics Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 11.5, and the interviews were analyzed by means of qualitative data analysis procedures. First, the researcher entered the data collected from the pilot study into SPSS to evaluate the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of reliability for each questionnaire. The same procedure was followed for the data collected from the actual study.

With regard to statistical methods, research question 1, which aimed to explore the extent to which the participants were efficacious in regulating their

English learning, was analyzed using descriptive statistics. Frequencies, means and standard deviations of the participants' responses to the individual items on the Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire were calculated. Research question 2, which aimed to investigate the participants' perceptions of responsibility with regard to their English learning outcomes, was analyzed using frequencies and medians of the participants' responses to the individual items on the Perceived Responsibility for Learning Questionnaire.

Research questions 1a and 1c were analyzed using one-way ANOVAs, and questions 2a and 2c were analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis tests, as there were three different groups responding to same items. Research questions 1b and 1d were analyzed through independent-samples t-tests, and questions 2b and 2d were analyzed through Mann-Whitney U tests, as there were two different groups responding to same items.

The data from the interviews were analyzed by means of qualitative data analysis procedures. After transcribing the interviews, the transcripts of each efficacy group were read thoroughly. The key concepts that occurred frequently or commonly in the interviews within the same group were highlighted and coded with color pens, and the concepts that showed variance between the two efficacy groups were highlighted and coded with different colors. Then, the links between the codes were used to form common themes. While giving examples from the responses, direct quotations from the participants were used to stay as close as possible in the analysis to the intended meaning.

In order to analyze the third research question, first, self-regulatory efficacy scores and responsibility for learning scores, from the second and third questionnaire

respectively, were assigned to each student. Then, the correlation between the students' self-regulatory efficacy beliefs and their perceived responsibility for learning was calculated using Spearman's rho.

Conclusion

This chapter on methodology gives general information about the aim of the study, the research setting, participants, instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis methods. In the next chapter, the results will be presented, and the data analysis done using the above-mentioned statistical and qualitative methods to answer the research questions will be described in detail.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This study was designed to investigate whether there is a relationship between self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for learning in university EFL students. The following research questions were addressed in the study:

1. How confident are Turkish university EFL students in their ability to regulate their own learning? Does the level of confidence change according to the students'
 - a) level of English proficiency,
 - b) academic level, (pre-tertiary vs. tertiary students)
 - c) level of success in English, and
 - d) gender?
2. What is the level of perceived responsibility for language learning outcomes of Turkish university EFL students? Does the level of perceived responsibility change according to the students'
 - a) level of English proficiency,
 - b) academic level, (pre-tertiary vs. tertiary students)
 - c) level of success in English, and
 - d) gender?
3. How do Turkish university EFL students' self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for language learning outcomes relate to each other?

This study gathered data from 503 university students at Yıldız Technical University School of Foreign Languages (YTUSFL) (Istanbul). Three hundred and five of the students were at the pre-tertiary level and 198 were at the tertiary level. The data were collected through three questionnaires, which were analyzed quantitatively, and through semi-structured interviews with eight of the participants, which were analyzed qualitatively.

In this chapter, the analysis of the questionnaires will be presented in three sections. The first section focuses on the analysis of the respondents' self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning, with regard to the variables defined in the first research question. The second section presents the analysis of the responsibility scale according to the variables mentioned in the second research question. The third section presents the relationship between self-regulatory efficacy beliefs and perceived responsibility for learning. The qualitative results obtained from semi-structured interviews (see Appendix L for the interview questions) will be presented along with the quantitative results when they are relevant to the quantitative data.

Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Self-Regulated Learning of the Respondents

The second questionnaire, the Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire, had 18 items (see Appendix G). This questionnaire was used to investigate the self-regulatory efficacy beliefs of the participants. The participants responded to these 18 items using an 11-point Likert scale ranging from 0 points (*definitely cannot do it*) to 100 points (*definitely can do it*) in 10-unit increments in order to indicate their certainty about their ability to perform and cope with the activity stated in each item. The data from this questionnaire were entered into SPSS

11.5., and the internal consistency of the questionnaire was checked. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .90. Statistical tests for normal distribution were conducted, and the data were found to be normally distributed. Following this, frequencies, means and standard deviations of the participants' responses to the individual items were calculated. Self-regulatory efficacy beliefs mean responses ranged from 13.89 to 92.78 in the whole sample, with a mean value of 57.94 (SD = 14.87). Taking into consideration the possible minimum and maximum efficacy scores (i.e. 0 -100), it can be said that the participants in this study were *moderately self-efficacious* in regulating their English learning.

In order to shed additional light on what the survey data revealed about the participants' overall sense of self-efficacy, qualitative data results obtained from semi-structured interviews with eight interviewees will be presented below. In choosing the participants for the interviews, the participants that responded to the questionnaires were sorted into groups by their mean scores for the self-regulatory efficacy questionnaire, their proficiency level in English, and their gender. The interviewees who scored higher than the mean value of the whole sample within a proficiency level were labeled as HSE (relatively high self-efficacy) and the ones who scored lower were labeled as LSE (relatively low self-efficacy). The interviewees within a particular proficiency level were of the same gender in order to minimize any differences between them. The interviewees were those who both accepted to be interviewed and were available on the interview day. The characteristics of the interviewees are as follows:

	Academic Level	Proficiency Level	Gender	Self-Regulatory Efficacy Mean
HSE-1		Elementary	Male	71
HSE-2	Pre-tertiary	Pre-intermediate	Female	78
HSE-3		Intermediate	Male	65
HSE-4	Tertiary	Advanced	Female	84
LSE-1		Elementary	Male	51
LSE-2	Pre-tertiary	Pre-intermediate	Female	46
LSE-3		Intermediate	Male	24
LSE-4	Tertiary	Advanced	Female	38

Table 3 - Characteristics of the interviewees

To explore the interviewees' self-efficacy beliefs regarding learning English, they were asked a question about the extent to which they believe they can learn English (see Question 9 in Appendix L). In the interviews, however, the term 'confidence' was used in place of 'efficacy' because the term 'efficacy' might be unfamiliar to the interviewees.

The analysis of the interview data from both the low and high self-regulatory efficacy group indicated that the participants, regardless of their self-efficacy beliefs, did not differ from one another in terms of their confidence in learning English. That is, all interviewees appeared to feel confident in learning English, which is interesting. However, the interviewees in the high self-efficacy group reported that they needed to study more, as learning English better was one of their long-term academic and/or career related goals. As setting goals is one of the self-regulated learning strategies (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1986), this can be treated as

evidence for the assumption that these interviewees' confidence in their ability to learn English might promote their ability to set academic goals. The following extracts exemplify how the interviewees in the high self-efficacy group approached this issue. Here and in the subsequent quotations, the most relevant parts of the interviewees' responses to the issue under discussion are presented in boldface.

(HSE-1) I really have **much confidence** in learning English. ...I **can** comfortably speak English, and I **can** easily communicate with foreign people. However, **in order to fully practice speaking, I definitely need to live in a foreign country for a while.** For this reason, **I am thinking about applying to the ERASMUS program.**

(HSE-4) ... A student of average intelligence who studies enough can do it [learn English]. ... This [learning English better] is **important** for me and it is **a goal that needs to be achieved as I am planning to apply to a graduate program.**

The low self-efficacy group, in contrast, mentioned that they could learn English if they wanted to but they had no wish to do so or they did not like English. Bassi, Steca, Fave, and Caprara (2007) explain that students' academic interest and motivation can be affected by their self-efficacy. Considering this, it may be that these interviewees' lack of interest in learning English might be affected by their negative self-efficacy beliefs to regulate their English learning. The extracts below illustrate how two interviewees from this group responded to the question.

(LSE-3) I think **I can do it if I want** ... I have got ahead in my school life, I am a student in such a university. I can [learn English], why can't I, **but I don't want to do so.**

(LSE-4) ... **If I want, if I want to study hard,** I know I **can** do. ... I want to do my best, **but I don't like English.**

The interview data presented above suggest that the high self-efficacy group has a tendency to set learning English better as an academic goal. This suggestion

can be considered to be the main difference between the high and low self-efficacy group in terms of their confidence in learning English.

To further explore the issue of goal-setting, all interviewees were also asked whether they set long and/or short-term goals to improve their English (see Question 3 in Appendix L). Below are the explanations HSE-1, HSE-2, LSE-2, and LSE-3 gave about this issue.

(HSE-1) Yes, I set goals. I try **to finish all the exercises in our workbooks, worksheets [materials]**. I am thinking about **applying for the ERASMUS program**. Besides, I am trying **to improve my English as much as possible**.

(HSE-2) I have lots of [goals]. I am thinking about **applying for the ERASMUS program**. I think **going abroad** is necessary to improve English. For this reason, I study very hard. Regularly.

(LSE-2) My goal for this year is **to finish the prep school, to pass the proficiency exam**. My plan to improve my English is to **go to an English language course** during the next school year [academic year], and then **to go to America** in the following summer **to practice**. I have such plans.

(LSE-3) Sometimes I think I should do this and that for my English, I should definitely do. I myself make decisions, but they don't come true. **I don't have any goals for the future. It will be enough for me to get over this year [prep school]**.

All the interviewees in the high self-efficacy group stated that they had both long and short-term goals, whereas among the four interviewees in the low self-efficacy group, only two participants reported that they had long term goals along with their short-term goals. Another interesting result is that three of the four interviewees in the low self-efficacy group explained that their primary concern is to pass the proficiency exam successfully. This implies that the interviewees with relatively lower self-efficacy mean scores set short-term goals that are generally oriented towards passing tests.

Another question asked in the interviews was whether the participants evaluated their performance in English learning (see Question 4 in Appendix L). Although this question was not specifically related to Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire items, possible responses to this interview question were believed to help shed additional light on the quantitative data, as students' self-evaluations of their own performance contribute to their academic progress by helping them adjust their learning activities accordingly to reach their academic goals (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1994). All the interviewees answered this question by stating that they evaluated their improvement by looking at the exam results. They also gave some examples in what skills they thought they had improved. The extracts below illustrate how one interviewee from each group responded to the question.

(LSE-2) Yes, I do. **It is already obvious from exams. ... I don't think I'm good at grammar.** I make many mistakes in exams, but I think I won't use grammar in daily language [English for daily communication]. However, **I have some confidence in my pronunciation.** I think I will be able to speak in English.

(HSE-3) **I only look at my exam papers.** I look at them carefully to see what I did correctly and what I didn't. I have foreign friends, so I can see that **I was speaking hesitantly before, but now I can speak more comfortably.**

In line with the responses illustrated above, the other interviewees also did not mention whether they were assessing the extent to which their short and/or long-term goals were met, although they were asked further prompting questions. This indicates that self-evaluation is not a familiar concept to the interviewees. This may be related to their experience in the Turkish educational system, which is mainly teacher-directed and product-oriented.

The items in the Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire were also analyzed separately, and Table 4 below shows the mean and standard deviation of each item in descending order.

As can be seen in the table, the means of the items range between 37.79 and 68.21. This indicates that the items are clustered between *probably cannot* and *probably can*, which suggests that, overall, most of the participants tended to refrain from choosing the extremes for their certainty about regulating their English learning. Thus, it appears that the participants generally did not consider themselves to be absolutely certain about their ability or inability to regulate their English learning.

Table 4 also shows the minimum and maximum scores for each question in the self-efficacy questionnaire. It is interesting that Item 6, which has the second highest mean, did not attain the minimum score (0), *definitely cannot do it*. This indicates that none of the participants feel completely incapable of making associations when they are trying to understand something new about English. For all of the other items, in contrast, the lowest possible score (0) was observed. Another interesting result shown in Table 4 is that the highest possible score 100 was observed on all items. This shows that each question was answered by at least one participant who believed that (s)he could definitely do the activity stated in the question.

Items	N	Min.*	Max.*	Mean	SD*
12 When you have trouble recalling an abstract concept in English, can you think of a good example that will help you remember it on the test?	503	0	100	68.21	23.141
6 When you are trying to understand something new about English, can you associate the new information with what you already know sufficiently well to remember the new information?	503	10	100	67.14	20.369
13 When you have to take an English test, can you find a way to motivate yourself to earn a good grade even if you don't like what you are being tested on?	503	0	100	65.03	21.837
7 When another student asks you to study English together, can you be an effective study partner even if you are experiencing difficulty with English?	503	0	100	64.41	22.967
16 When you are struggling to remember a complicated concept for an English test, can you find a way to associate its details that will ensure recall?	503	0	100	64.33	22.135
5 When you are taking an English course covering a huge amount of material, can you condense your notes down to just the essential facts?	503	0	100	63.92	24.429
15 When you failed your last English test, can you figure out potential questions before the next test that will improve your score greatly?	503	0	100	63.42	21.261
17 When you think you did poorly on an English test you just finished, can you go back to your notes and locate all the information you had forgotten?	503	0	100	61.95	24.155
14 When you are feeling depressed about your forthcoming English test, can you find a way to motivate yourself to do well on it?	503	0	100	61.49	22.208
10 When you find yourself getting increasingly behind in your English course, can you increase your study time sufficiently to catch up?	503	0	100	59.34	23.696
18 When you find that you had to "cram" at the last minute for an English test, can you begin your test preparation much earlier so you won't need to cram the next time?	503	0	100	58.95	25.551
4 When you have trouble studying your English class notes because they are incomplete or confusing, can you revise and rewrite them clearly after every lesson?	503	0	100	53.98	28.795
11 When you discover that your English homework assignments are much longer than expected, can you change your other priorities to have enough time for studying?	503	0	100	53.26	25.711
8 When problems with friends conflict with your English assignments, can you keep up with these assignments?	503	0	100	52.13	27.128
3 When you have trouble understanding your English teacher's lesson, can you clarify the confusion before the next class meeting by comparing notes with a classmate?	503	0	100	52.01	26.460
1 When your English teacher's lesson is very complex, can you write an effective summary of your original notes before the next class?	503	0	100	51.23	26.186
9 When you feel moody or restless while studying English, can you focus your attention well enough to finish your English assignments?	503	0	100	44.27	25.022
2 When an English lesson is especially boring, can you motivate yourself to keep good notes?	503	0	100	37.79	26.848
Valid N (listwise)	503				

Min* = Minimum / Max* = Maximum / SD* = Standard Deviation

Table 4 - Participants' perceptions of self-efficacy for self-regulated learning

The five items that had the highest mean scores were *thinking of a good example that will help remember an abstract concept on an English test* (Item 12), *associating new information with what it is known sufficiently well to remember it* (Item 6), *finding a way to motivate oneself to get a good grade on an English test even if the content of the test is not appealing* (Item 13), *being an effective study partner despite experiencing difficulty with English* (Item 7), and *finding a way to associate a complicated concept with its details that will ensure its recall on an English test* (Item 16). As can be seen in the table, the means of these items range between 64.33 and 68.21. This shows that, overall, the participants' certainty about coping with the activities stated in these items is very close to *probably can* (70) on the scale. It is interesting that three of these five top items, Items 12, 6, and 16, are about self-initiated efforts to learn, remember, or recall a new concept or new information either for an English test or for self-study. To provide additional information about the relationship between the level of self-efficacy beliefs and self-regulated learning strategy use to acquire information presented in class and in course materials, some data obtained from the interviews are presented, as can be seen below.

The interviewees were asked one question (see Question 5 in Appendix L) concerning how they learn, study, and remember the information presented in class and in course materials. Their answers show differences between the low and high self-efficacy groups in terms of the frequency of studying English and of reviewing what they have learned. The following extracts illustrate how three interviewees in the high self-efficacy group approached this issue.

(HSE-1) ... **Before an English class**, I read the information presented in the handouts. The handouts explain everything in detail. Following this, I do the exercises on our worksheets. I **frequently** try to do this. Our teachers check the answers [of the exercises on the worksheets] by explaining them in detail. I aim to catch up. Then, I **review** the handouts. ... I go to English class **prepared**. ... I **constantly** study the worksheets.

(HSE-2) We have handouts. While studying English, first, I read the information in the handout, and then I **self-instruct**. If I don't understand, I read it again. ... **After almost every English class**, I first **make a list of the new words** we have learned that day. Then, I **review** the information in the handouts. ... I study **regularly**. I generally do **revision**, not day to day but **certainly every weekend**. I have **pages of lists of words**. **Every night before I go to bed**, I study 2-3 pages.

(HSE-4) In order to learn new words by heart, I generally **associate new words** or the Turkish meanings of the new words with something familiar to me. ... While reading a text, I **relate the information** in the text to my opinions about the topic. I mean while reading a text, **we surely find something in the text that we have thought about before**. I use this: The text tells this and that about the topic but I think this way. ... Texts tell us new things and I think about the topic from my point of view. I **relate the information** in the text **to my own life** when possible.

As can be observed in the extracts above, making associations, doing revision, preparing word lists, getting prepared for class, and relating new information to personal life and opinions are the strategies used by these three interviewees to help them acquire new information. In contrast to what these three interviewees stated, participant HSE-3 did not mention any of these strategies, but he explained that it is enough for him to do revision before exams as he trusted himself in doing well on tests. This might suggest that students' perceptions of their capabilities can have an influence on their study habits.

When the extracts from the low self-efficacy group are analyzed, it can be observed that these participants do not study English regularly, and only one of them, LSE-1, mentioned a specific technique he used only to learn new vocabulary items. It

is also interesting to note that although participant LSE-4 talks about a useful technique, she does not make use of it for self-study.

(LSE-1) I **don't study English much but as needed**. We have workbooks, worksheets. I study them. In addition, I **make lists of words and study them**. I don't study grammar subjects but words because words [knowing words is] are important. **I write new words on a piece of paper and put them up on the wall where I can always see them. Every time I pass by them, I read them so that I can keep them in my mind.**

(LSE-2) I know if I do revision at home, then learning becomes more effective and long lasting, but **I don't study regularly. ... I only try to do my homework assignments.**

(LSE-3) **I don't make an effort** to do these things [to learn, remember, and study the information presented in class and in the materials]. **English and I are two different worlds. I don't study English, unless I have a test.**

(LSE-4) Our English teacher asks us to do a thing like this, which I find very useful: We work on a text, talk about it. Then, (s)he asks us to write a response paragraph about a part of the text (s)he chooses by using the words we have learned in that class. Using such a technique helps a lot. ... **I don't do the same thing at home. I don't use it [the strategy] while studying myself.**

The interview data presented and analyzed above regarding the participants' study habits to learn and remember the information presented in class and in course materials suggest that students who believe in their capabilities to regulate their English learning activities might outperform those with relatively low self-regulatory efficacy for English learning in applying varied techniques more regularly to study English.

The quantitative results for items 12 and 16, which are related to test-taking, are also supported by the interview data. Test-taking can be considered to be an academic context in which students with different perceptions of efficacy regarding their self-regulation of academic functioning can perform differently in terms of

employing self-regulated learning strategies (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2005).

Considering this, the interviewees were asked two questions about the time they allot and the techniques and strategies they used for test preparation (see Questions 7 and 8 in Appendix L). Regarding the time allotted for test preparation by both groups, it can be said that the participants in the high self-efficacy group tend to allot more time for studying for an English test than those in the low self-efficacy group. The extracts below illustrate how two interviewees from each group plan their time for test preparation.

(LSE-2) I don't start to study in the week before the test. I mostly study **the night just before the test**.

(LSE-3) I start to study **one or two days before the test**, and I study for **one or two hours**. I am not such a student who plans ahead and studies days before a test.

(HSE-1) I study **throughout the week before the test by dividing the subjects** [into groups].

(HSE-2) As I already study **regularly**, I **don't leave anything to study to the last night before a test**. ... I try to pay attention to study regularly, and the last week before a test is **a review week** for me.

As can be observed in the extracts above, planning ahead and studying regularly for English tests are two strategies that appear to differentiate the high self-efficacy group from the low self-efficacy group.

The interviewees also gave detailed information regarding how they prepare for an English test. The responses of the interviewees in the high self-efficacy group are provided in the extracts below.

(HSE-1) I do not spend much time on the grammar subjects I know but I **write down the points that were emphasized in class on a piece of paper**. I take my textbook and I **note down the grammar subjects I do not know**. **Then, I read them**. I **do the related exercises** in the worksheets.

(HSE-2) I do the same things I do for self-study [**reviewing, self-instructing, studying words from the lists of words**] (see the extract from this interviewee's response on p.64). I also **make a connection between a word that has association with another one**. For example, the word "ensure". This word has "sure" in itself, and I remember its meaning as I know the meaning of "sure". Or, the words like "immature-premature". I **guess their meanings by keeping them in my mind together**.

(HSE-3) I have a **vocabulary notebook**, in which I write Turkish equivalents of English words, but I don't always have the notebook with me. I have a look at the words on the bus, while commuting. I **finish writing the words two or three days before a test**. Then I have a look at them one hour before the test because **I trust in my short-term memory**. I study grammar by writing, too because **I learn best by writing. I write things a few times**.

(HSE-4) Generally, if I need to understand a text [for an exam], I **summarize the text in my own words by using the [target] words in the text**. I summarize the text to see both whether I understand the text and **to synthesize my ideas into it**. Then, **I make a list of the words, memorize the words, and tick them**.

These extracts suggest that, overall, the interviewees in the high self-efficacy group appear to be aware of the techniques that help them retain and recall information for a test such as reviewing, doing exercises, self-instructing, using associations, making lists of words, keeping a vocabulary notebook, reading, writing, memorizing, and summarizing. However, the interviewees in the low self-efficacy group do not mention any techniques other than reviewing, making list of words, doing exercises, reading, and writing, as can be seen in the extracts below.

(LSE-1) I **review** our books, workbooks, worksheets a little bit. Then, I have a look at the **lists of words** I have made. That is already enough.

(LSE-2) I **make lists of words** from our book. I try to **memorize** them. I **review** the exercises we have done in class, in the workbooks and worksheets, not all of them, but the ones that I can and can finish that night. ... **I don't use the words in sentences**. I know it is the way real learning takes place, but I don't do so. **If I studied words day to day, I could use them in sentences**.

(LSE-3) I study some topics in reading. For example, referrals. We have them in our reading workbook. I **have a look at them** and **try to remember** what they are used for. Then, I study some grammar, I mean, I **have a look at the grammar exercises I can't do**. I **do the exercises** in the handouts, two or three pages. Then, I study writing. I **have a look at paragraph patterns of essays** and for example where rhetorical questions are used. Such a **revision**. **I am done with these in one or two hours**.

(LSE-4) I **write the words two or three times**. Then, I **read the sentences that have these words**. If I don't read them in sentences, then I can't keep them in my mind. We are given sample sentences for the words [target words]. I read these sentences and **try to understand them [the sentences]**. I **erase the words in the vocabulary exercises** in the worksheets, too. I **try to fill in the gaps again**. By doing this, I can easily do the vocabulary section in the exams. I **read the text, underline the sentences** that the teacher paid attention in class. I **read them several times**.

When the responses above are analyzed, it can be suggested that although some test preparation strategies such as using lists of words, reviewing materials, reading, writing, and doing exercises, are common in both groups of interviewees, the participants in the high self-efficacy group appear to have more systematic, planned, and varied test preparation strategies than those in the low self-efficacy group. This suggests that higher self-efficacy beliefs in regulating the activities for English learning might help students prepare for a test by making use of varied strategies; alternatively, the use of varied self-regulated learning strategies might enhance self-efficacy.

Turning now to the items at the bottom of Table 4 (see p. 62), it is important to note that three of the items, Items 8, 9, and 2, relate to being able to motivate oneself to concentrate on studying English when internal/personal factors arise such as problems with friends (Item 8), feeling moody or restless (Item 9), or a boring English class (Item 2). The perceptions of the participants in this study appear to

range from *probably cannot* to *maybe*, indicating that the participants tend to feel uncertain about their ability to motivate themselves to study and learn English when these situations arise. In-depth information about the interviewees' perceptions of motivation is provided in the responsibility section of this chapter, as the interview question related to motivation was linked to perceptions of responsibility as well.

Regarding items 3 and 1 at the bottom of the table, it can be said that both items fall into the category of organizing information/note-taking. The participants, overall, appear to be unsure whether they can clarify any confusion related to the content of an English lesson by comparing notes with a classmate before the next class meeting or whether they can write an effective summary of their original notes of a very complex English class before the next class. It is strikingly interesting that Item 2, which has the lowest mean score among all the items in the questionnaire, is about both motivating oneself and note taking.

Question 6 in the interviews (see Appendix L) provided in-depth information about how note taking is used as a strategy to learn and remember the information presented in class. The data from this question were used to explore whether there are similarities and/or differences between the interviewees from the high and low self-efficacy groups in terms of taking class notes and how they make use of the notes they take down while studying. The interviewees' answers showed that none of the interviewees had a special notebook for taking class notes; however, seven out of eight interviewees noted down the things they considered to be important on their textbooks, worksheets, or handouts. The reason the interviewees did not take detailed class notes might be that textbooks, extra packs, and handouts at Yıldız Technical

University, School of Foreign Languages (YTUSFL) provide students with necessary information. Below are the explanations given by four participants about this issue.

(LSE-1) I take notes **on my books, worksheets, and handouts. I don't have a special notebook to take notes.** ... **While reviewing** the worksheets and handouts, I read my notes as well.

(LSE-3) **No, I don't take notes in class. Sometimes, I note down on handouts.** I don't write explanations or details. I look at my notes **a day before exams.**

(HSE-1) **I don't take notes during classes because** our handouts explain everything clearly and in detail.

(HSE-2) Yes, I take notes. **On my books and worksheets.** I put stars or write "very important" beside the things teachers find important. **Then, I rewrite my notes** on A4 size white papers, and use them **for studying** the subjects I forget. I use them while studying **for exams.**

The data presented above also show that class notes are generally used for test preparation rather than for self-study. This might suggest that no matter how efficacious students feel in regulating their English learning, they tend to take notes in class in order to earn good grades for English tests.

The quantitative and qualitative data analyses presented so far have shed light on the main part of the first research question. Considering the results from the quantitative analyses, it can be suggested that the participants in this study were neither very efficacious nor very inefficacious in directing the tasks and activities that regulate their English learning. In addition, the quantitative data revealed that, overall, the participants felt more efficacious in using techniques to learn, remember, or recall new or complicated concepts for English tests or for self-study than performing the activities stated in other items in the questionnaire. In contrast, the participants appeared to have lower efficacy for motivating themselves to study and learn English and to take class notes.

The qualitative data results indicated that some differences can be observed between the interviewees in the high and low self-efficacy groups. That is, although the participants in both groups appear to trust themselves to learn English better, the participants who have relatively higher self-regulatory efficacy appear to set both short and long-term goals, whereas those with relatively lower self-regulatory efficacy appear to set short-term goals that are generally oriented towards passing tests. However, overall, the interviewees in both groups appear not to self-evaluate their performance in English by monitoring their English learning activities or by assessing the extent to which they have achieved their goals. The qualitative data also revealed that the interviewees in the high self-efficacy group appear to regularly apply more techniques for studying English, allot more time, plan ahead and study regularly for English tests than the interviewees in the other group. Lastly, overall, the participants appeared not to make effective use of class notes for improving their English except for using them for English tests.

In the next sections, differences in self-regulatory efficacy beliefs in terms of level of English proficiency, academic level, level of success in English, and gender will be explored.

Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Level of English Proficiency

The relationship between the level of self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and the level of proficiency in English was explored through a one-way ANOVA. The independent variable, the level of English proficiency, had four dimensions: elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate, and advanced. The mean

scores of the participants' self-regulatory efficacy at each proficiency level of English can be seen in Table 5 below.

Proficiency Level	N	Mean	SD*	Min.*	Max.*
Elementary	104	55.41	14.642	23	93
Pre-Intermediate	99	57.19	13.775	25	93
Intermediate	102	57.23	16.464	14	92
Advanced	198	60.00	14.493	14	92
Total	503	57.94	14.873	14	93

SD* = Standard deviation / Min.* = Minimum / Max.* = Maximum

Table 5 - Level of self-efficacy across proficiency levels

The descriptive statistics presented in the table above reveal that the level of self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning appears to increase as the proficiency level increases. A one-way ANOVA revealed that the differences between elementary level ($M = 55.41$, $SE = 1.44$), pre-intermediate level ($M = 57.19$, $SE = 1.38$), intermediate level ($M = 57.23$, $SE = 1.63$), and advanced level ($M = 60.00$, $SE = 1.03$), $F(3, 499) = 2.45$, approached significance ($p < .063$), with a large effect size $\omega = .77$.

Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Academic Level

The relationship between self-regulatory efficacy beliefs and the academic level of the respondents was analyzed through an independent-samples t-test. The independent variable, the academic level, had two dimensions: pre-tertiary and tertiary. The mean scores of self-regulatory efficacy of the participants at the pre-tertiary and tertiary level were found to be 56.60 and 60.00 respectively, as shown in

Table 6 below. Considering this, it can be said that the participants at the tertiary level appeared to have slightly higher self-efficacy ($M = 60.00$, $SE = 1.03$) than the participants at the pre-tertiary level ($M = 56.60$, $SE = .86$). This difference was found to be significant $t(501) = -2.52$, $p < .05$, but with a small effect size $r = .11$.

Academic Level	N	Mean	SD*	Std.* Error Mean
Pre-tertiary	305	56.60	14.986	.858
Tertiary	198	60.00	14.493	1.030

SD* = Standard deviation / Std.* = Standard

Table 6 - Level of self-efficacy across academic levels

Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Level of Success in English

The results of the second questionnaire were also analyzed to find whether there was a difference in the level of self-efficacy as the participants' success in English increased. In order to provide an answer to this question, first, the participants were grouped into three levels of success, low-achievers, moderate achievers, and high achievers. The cutoff score for passing an English course at YTU is 60, so the participants with scores lower than 60.00 fell into the low achievers group. The table below shows the range of scores for each level of success. The cutoff scores for each success level for pre-tertiary and tertiary level participants were determined considering the grading system at YTU (see Appendix A). The success levels of the pre-tertiary level students were determined according to their first term English course average scores, and those of the tertiary students were determined by their previous English course grade, as explained in the participants section of Chapter III.

Level of Success	The Range of Scores
Low Achievers	0-59.9
Moderate Achievers	60-79.9
High Achievers	80-100

Table 7 – Success levels

Table 8 below shows that the mean scores of the participants' self-regulatory efficacy appear to increase as the level of success increases. The results obtained from a one-way ANOVA revealed that there were significant differences among low achievers ($M = 48.84$, $SE = 1.42$), moderate achievers ($M = 57.74$, $SE = .88$), and high achievers ($M = 63.28$, $SE = 1.16$), $F(2,500) = 25.55$, ($p < .001$), with a large effect size $\omega = .98$.

Success Level	N	Mean	SD*	Min.*	Max.*
Low Achievers	76	48.84	12.401	26	82
Moderate Achievers	287	57.74	14.842	14	93
High Achievers	140	63.28	13.733	14	93
Total	503	57.94	14.873	14	93

SD* = Standard deviation / Min.* = Minimum / Max.* = Maximum

Table 8 - Level of self-efficacy across success levels

In addition, LSD post-hoc tests revealed a statistically significant difference among all levels of success ($p < .001$). This suggests that the more successful students are in English, the more efficacious they tend to feel in regulating their English learning.

Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Gender

It was also investigated whether self-efficacy beliefs differed based on gender. The mean scores of the participants' self-regulatory efficacy according to gender can be seen in the table below.

Gender	N	Mean	SD*	Std.* Error Mean
Male	293	54.96	14.358	.839
Female	210	62.09	14.613	1.008

SD* = Standard deviation / Std* = Standard

Table 9 - Gender differences in perceived self-efficacy

The results obtained from an independent-samples t-test revealed that female participants had higher self-efficacy beliefs ($M = 62.09$, $SE = 1.00$) than the male participants ($M = 54.96$, $SE = .84$). This difference was found to be statistically significant $t(501) = -5.45$, $p < .001$, with a small effect size $r = .24$.

In this section, it has been shown that the most striking factor that appears to be involved in the level of self-regulatory efficacy is the level of success in language learning. It was seen that the higher the achievement level, the higher the level of self-efficacy for self-regulated learning. In terms of the difference in the level of self-regulatory efficacy according to gender, it can be said that female participants tend to perceive themselves to be more able to regulate their English learning than the male participants. It was also observed that the level of self-regulatory efficacy is slightly higher at the tertiary level than it is at the pre-tertiary level. Lastly, the level of self-regulatory efficacy does not vary according to level of proficiency in English although a trend was observed in this direction.

In the following section, the main part of the second research question, participants' level of perceived responsibility for English learning outcomes, will be explored.

Perceived Responsibility for Learning of the Respondents

The third questionnaire, the Perceived Responsibility for Learning Questionnaire, had 19 items (see Appendix J). The questionnaire was used to explore the participants' perceived responsibility for English learning outcomes. The participants responded to these 19 questions using a 7-point scale that ranged from 1 (mainly the teacher) to 7 (mainly the student) in order to indicate whether they held themselves or English teachers more responsible for various features of the English learning situation, such as their motivation, learning processes, and performance on tests.

The data from this questionnaire were entered into SPSS 11.5., and the internal consistency of the questionnaire was checked. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .86. Statistical tests for normal distribution were conducted, and the data were found to be not normally distributed, indicating that non-parametric statistical methods should be used. Following this, frequencies and medians of the participants' responses to the individual items were calculated. Perceived responsibility mean responses ranged from 1.42 to 7 in the whole sample, with a median value of 4.63. Taking into consideration where the median falls along the range of 1 to 7, the participants in this study appear to perceive themselves to be *slightly more responsible than their teachers* for their successes and failures in English.

In order to explore the interviewees' overall perceptions of responsibility, the last question in the interview directly asked them who they think is more responsible for a student's improvement in English: the teacher or the student. Out of eight participants, five of them stated that the student is more responsible, and three of them explained that both the teacher and the students are equally responsible. Based on these responses, it can be suggested that none of the interviewees seemed to feel that learning English is a teacher-dependent process. This suggestion is in line with the overall questionnaire result, which revealed that the participants appeared to perceive themselves to be slightly more responsible than their teachers for their English learning outcomes.

The items in this questionnaire were also analyzed separately, and Table 10 on page 78 shows the frequencies, percentages, and medians of each item in descending order. In the last column is given the sum of the percentages of each item for the points on the scale *definitely more the student (DMS)* and *mainly the student (MS)*. As shown by the data, for items 18, 7, 17, and 3, the participants, overall, gave more responsibility to themselves. These items include the responsibilities for seeing English as important for future success (Item 18), not valuing good grades for English class (Item 7), not really trying in English class (Item 17), and not finishing English homework assignments (Item 3). Based on the data, it can be suggested that participants believed that the teacher's influence on students' attitudes towards learning English and expending enough effort to learn English is limited. However, in three out of nineteen items, students gave more responsibility to their teachers, i.e. Item 9, Item 14, and Item 2. It is interesting that all three of these items are related to

Who is more responsible	MT*	DMT*	SMT*	BE*	SMS*	DMS*	MS*	Mdn*	% DMS+MS
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Item 18 for a student seeing English as important to his or her future success?	1.6	1.8	5.2	11.1	13.9	22.1	44.3	6.00	66.4
Item 7 for a student not valuing good grades for English class?	3	3.6	7.4	13.9	18.5	25.2	28.4	6.00	53.6
Item 17 for a student not really trying in English class?	1.4	1.6	5	18.5	24.7	26.6	22.3	5.00	48.9
Item 3 for a student not finishing English homework assignments?	1.2	2.6	4.4	17.7	26.4	19.3	28.4	5.00	47.7
Item 1 for a student being unprepared for an English test?	0.6	1	2.8	25.8	28.8	25.6	15.3	5.00	40.9
Item 8 for a student putting extra effort into learning English when needed?	3	4	11.7	20.5	20.7	20.5	19.7	5.00	40.2
Item 10 for a student not taking notes in English class?	2.6	4.6	9.1	21.9	24.9	19.3	17.7	5.00	37.0
Item 15 for a student remembering information from assigned English readings?	0.8	3	9.1	22.5	33	21.5	10.1	5.00	31.6
Item 5 for a student being unprepared to participate in English class?	3	6.4	11.7	22.3	26.4	17.3	12.9	5.00	30.2
Item 12 for a student being interested in English?	4.6	8.7	10.9	31.2	15.5	14.5	14.5	4.00	29.0
Item 11 for a student understanding assigned English homework texts?	2.4	5.6	12.1	32.6	27.2	13.1	7	4.00	20.1
Item 16 for a student not understanding a class discussion in English class?	1.6	5.2	15.7	31	27.6	13.5	5.4	4.00	18.9
Item 13 for a student writing assigned English papers well?	2.8	4.2	12.3	35.8	26.4	13.1	5.4	4.00	18.5
Item 6 for a student doing English homework assignments correctly?	2	4.4	11.5	38.8	24.9	13.3	5.2	4.00	18.5
Item 19 for a student failing English class?	1	1.8	5.8	46.1	28.8	12.1	4.4	4.00	16.5
Item 4 for a student doing well on an English test?	0.2	1.4	5.6	51.5	26	11.9	3.4	4.00	15.3
Item 9 for a student not paying attention in English class?	6.4	12.9	19.3	34.6	14.7	6	6.2	4.00	12.2
Item 14 for a student not being able to concentrate in English class?	7	12.3	25	34.2	13.9	4.8	2.8	4.00	7.6
Item 2 for a student being motivated to learn English?	10.5	19.5	24.5	29.6	9.1	4.6	2.2	3.00	6.8

MT* = Mainly the teacher / DMT* = Definitely more the teacher / SMT* = Slightly more the teacher / BE* = Both equally

SMS* = Slightly more the student / DMS* = Definitely more the student / MS* = Mainly the student

Table 10 - Participants' perceptions of responsibility

the affective domain of language learning, such as interest, concentration, and motivation.

In order to shed additional light on what the survey data revealed about the participants' perceptions of motivation, qualitative data results obtained from the semi-structured interviews will be presented below.

The interviewees were asked questions about the extent to which they believed the teacher had a role in stimulating students' interest in English (see Question 1 in Appendix L) and in motivating students to learn English (see Question 2 in Appendix L). The results obtained from the responses to Question 1 revealed that all of the participants who had relatively lower self-efficacy for self-regulated learning¹ appeared to believe that it is the teacher who makes a student interested in English. When the answers from the interviewees with relatively higher self-efficacy were analyzed, it was found that two of these participants believed that a student's interest in learning English is related to the student himself/herself to a large extent. The other two participants stated that it is the teacher who arouses interest in English among students. The extracts below present the opinions of two participants regarding the teacher's role in stimulating interest in students.

(LSE-3) The teacher definitely affects a student's interest in English. ... If you start to learn it [English] at a young age, the teacher who teaches you is very influential. You start [to learn the language] when you are a child, the teacher teaches you, but it [how much you learn] depends on how the teacher teaches.

¹ Participants will continue to be referred as either HSE or LSE in the following analyses, as students' perceptions of personal responsibility for learning have been hypothesized to be shaped by their self-efficacy beliefs about their learning processes (Zimmerman, 1994).

(HSE-2) I think **the teacher has a very small role in a student's interest** in English. For example, I like Mathematics but not Physics. It has nothing to do with the teacher. It [Whether I like a lesson] is only related to whether I find it easy or difficult.

This data suggests that students with low self-efficacy beliefs tend to hold their teachers more responsible for their interest in learning English than the students with relatively higher self-regulatory efficacy beliefs. However, it should also be noted that the participants with high self-efficacy beliefs appeared to be split over this issue.

Questionnaire item 12 is related to the issue discussed above (i.e. the role of the teacher in a student's interest in English). As shown in Table 10, the median value of the item indicates that, overall, the participants had a tendency to share the responsibility with the teacher in stimulating their interest in English. However, when the frequency values are examined, it can be said that the participants share the responsibility by assuming students to be somewhat more responsible than the teacher.

With regard to motivation, two of the interviewees in the low self-efficacy group explained that students feel interested in the language as long as the teacher motivates students to learn English. This indicates that these participants appear to relate students' interest in the language to the teacher's role in motivating students. The other two interviewees in this group stated that both the student and the teacher have an influential role in motivation. However, one of these two participants added that it is the teacher who triggers the motivation of the students. Below are the explanations given by two participants about this issue.

(LSE-1) **Both** the student and the teacher are important, but the **teacher has an influence on** the motivation the student already has. The teacher **activates the motivation of the student.**

(LSE-3) **The teacher should care about it [the student's motivation], should be good at teaching,** at transmitting what (s)he knows. Every school subject has a different way of techniques to teach I think. The teacher **should know about these techniques.** (S)he should first **make students like English. The teacher should like his/her subject and then make you like it.**

Regarding the interviewees in the high self-efficacy group, one of them explained that motivation is in the hands of the student to a great extent, one of the participants stated that both the teacher and the student have a role in students' motivation, and two of the participants believed that the teacher affects motivation greatly. Below are the extracts from two participants about their opinions regarding the teacher's role in motivation.

(HSE-1) I think it is up to **the student** to motivate him(her)self. I mean **the student is much more responsible** [than the teacher]

(HSE-2) The teacher can increase motivation, can do anything. I think **the teacher affects motivation very much.**

As similarities can be observed in both efficacy groups in terms of perceptions of motivation, it can be said that other constructs than self-efficacy might be related to students' perceptions of responsibility for motivation in English learning.

Returning now to Table 10, it can be said that the participants generally perceive both the teacher and themselves as responsible for carrying out in- and out-of-class assignments successfully (items 11, 16, 13, and 6) and for their success in English (items 19 and 4). Participants' perceptions of responsibility for the activities in items 11, 16, 13, and 6 might be linked to the suggestion that the participants

recognize the contribution of the teacher in helping students make sense of class discussions and in-class assignments and meet the criteria for correct in- and out-of-class assignments. Regarding items 19 and 4, it can be suggested that the participants associate success on tests and classes not only with the effort they put into class but also with grades given by teachers.

The qualitative analyses made so far aimed to provide more information about the participants' perceptions of responsibility for the activities and situations presented in the items in the responsibility questionnaire. However, the interviews also included other two questions that were not specifically related to the items in the responsibility questionnaire but were believed to provide additional information about the interviewees' responsibility beliefs (see Questions 10 and 11 in Appendix L). These questions were about interviewees' perceptions of students' responsibilities for improving their English and their perceptions of the teacher's responsibilities for helping students with this. The participants in both groups, the high and low self-efficacy groups, overall, mentioned similar things. The participants appeared to believe that a student is responsible for listening to lessons attentively, participating in class, making use of the sources of information available such as the Internet and English songs, movies and soap operas, trying to make friends with foreign people through instant messaging clients or social networking websites, and reading newspapers, books, and magazines. In terms of the teacher's responsibilities, the participants pinpointed the following activities: encouraging students to improve their speaking skills, providing opportunities that help students improve their speaking skills, guiding students in accessing sources of information that can help them improve their English, making classes interesting, arousing interest in English

among students, and motivating students. The extracts below illustrate two participants' opinions about these issues.

(LSE-2)

Students' responsibilities – If a student, a conscious student wants to improve his/her English, there are lots of **websites [for learning English]on the Internet**. There are sites for every level.

Teachers' responsibilities – The teacher should **motivate** students, recognize visual and auditory learners and teach them accordingly.

(HSE-4)

Students' responsibilities – **Attending classes and listening to the teacher carefully**. There are lots of **sources of information** around us. For example, a student can watch movies, read books, read the news on the Internet. Some people write to each other.

Teachers' responsibilities – Maybe, **making students like English and making students be aware of interesting things**. I mean, (s)he can say "Guys, there is something here, there, I suggest you have a look at it if you have time."

The ideas presented above suggest that both the participants who had high self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and those who had relatively low self-efficacy hold students responsible for engaging in activities that can help them make progress outside English class. In addition, it can be suggested that both groups of interviewees believe that teachers are responsible for helping students develop positive attitudes towards learning English and for providing guidance when necessary.

This section presented the results regarding the students' perceptions of responsibility for their English learning activities obtained from both quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures. Considering the quantitative results, it can be said that the participants in this study appear to hold themselves to be slightly more responsible for their English learning outcomes than their teachers. In addition, they

gave more responsibility to themselves for seeing English as important to their future success, for not valuing good grades for English class, for not really trying in English class, and for not finishing English homework assignments. On the other hand, they appeared to believe that the teacher is more responsible for students' level of interest in and motivation for learning English. Lastly, they appeared to consider both students and teachers to be responsible for their success in in-class and out of class assignments and for their success in the language course in general. With regard to qualitative results, it can be suggested that the similarities between the low and high self-regulatory efficacy groups outnumber the differences. The similarities are that, overall, the interviewees appeared to assume more responsibility for improving their English and engaging in out of English class activities that can help them make progress. However, they appeared to believe that it is the teacher's responsibility to motivate students to learn and to develop positive attitudes toward English. Regarding the differences between the responsibility perceptions of the participants in the high and low self-regulatory efficacy group, it can be said that the interviewees in the low self-efficacy group appeared to have a tendency to hold the teacher responsible for a student's lack of interest in learning English more than the students with relatively higher self-regulatory efficacy beliefs.

The following sections present the quantitative findings for differences in perceptions of responsibility in terms of level of English proficiency, academic level, level of success in English, and gender.

Differences in Perceived Responsibility According to Level of English Proficiency

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to explore the relationship between the level of English proficiency and the participants' perceived responsibility for their English learning outcomes. The median scores of the participants' perceived responsibility at each proficiency level of English can be seen in the table below.

Proficiency Level	N	Median
Elementary	104	4.68
Pre-Intermediate	99	4.68
Intermediate	102	4.50
Advanced	198	4.63
Total	503	

Table 11 - Level of responsibility across proficiency levels

The descriptive statistics presented in the table above reveal that the level of responsibility for English learning does not appear to increase or decrease according to proficiency level. It is also interesting to note that there appears to be no difference between the participants from the elementary level ($Mdn = 4.68$) and those from the pre-intermediate level ($Mdn = 4.68$). These two groups of students appear to have the highest level of perceptions of responsibility for English learning. In addition, the table shows that the participants from the intermediate level ($Mdn = 4.50$) had the lowest responsibility median score among the four proficiency levels. However, the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that perceived responsibility for English learning did not significantly differ according to the level of proficiency in English ($H(3) = 6.55$, $p < .088$).

Differences in Perceived Responsibility According to Academic Level

In order to analyze whether perceived responsibility for English learning outcomes changes according to academic level (i.e. pre-tertiary and tertiary), a Mann-Whitney U test was performed. The median scores of perceived responsibility of the participants were found to be 4.63 at both academic levels when descriptive statistics were analyzed.

Academic Level	N	Median
Pre-tertiary	305	4.63
Tertiary	198	4.63
Total	503	

Table 12 - Level of responsibility across academic levels

The results obtained from the Mann-Whitney U test confirmed that there was not a significant difference ($U = 28043.00, p < .176$) between the students at the pre-tertiary level and the students at the tertiary level in terms of their level of perceived responsibility for English learning. In other words, the participants' level of perceived responsibility for their successes and failures in English did not vary according to academic level.

Differences in Perceived Responsibility According to Level of Success in English

The results of the third questionnaire were also analyzed to find whether there was a difference in the level of perceived responsibility as the participants' success in English increased. The descriptive statistics presented in Table 13 below reveal that the level of responsibility for English learning does not appear to increase or decrease as the level of success increases or decreases.

Success Level	N	Median
Low Achievers	76	4.71
Moderate Achievers	287	4.63
High Achievers	140	4.68
Total	503	

Table 13 - Level of responsibility across success levels

The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that perceived responsibility for English learning, as with English proficiency level and academic level, did not significantly differ according to the level of success in English ($H(2) = .30, p < .860$).

Differences in Perceived Responsibility According to Gender

In order to investigate the difference in perceived responsibility between males and females, first, the median scores of the level of perceived responsibility of the two groups were calculated. The median scores were found to be the same ($Mdn = 4.63$) for both female and male participants, as shown in the table below. A Mann-Whitney U test confirmed that there was no significant difference ($p < .603$) in the level of perceived responsibility according to gender ($U = 29928.50$). These medians suggest that both females and males perceive themselves to be *slightly more responsible than their teachers* for how well they study and learn English.

Gender	N	Median
Male	293	4.63
Female	210	4.63
Total	503	

Table 14 - Gender differences in perceived responsibility

The results obtained from the quantitative data analysis presented in this section show that unlike self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated language learning, the level of perceived responsibility for learning English outcomes does not vary according to students' level of proficiency in English, academic level, level of success in English, or gender. The following section explores the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for English learning outcomes with quantitative data analysis.

The Relationship between Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Self-Regulated Learning and Perceived Responsibility for English Learning Outcomes

As stated in Chapter Two, to the knowledge of the researcher, no research exists about the relationship between self-regulatory efficacy beliefs and perceived responsibility for learning in EFL/ESL contexts. According to previous research, students who believe in their ability to regulate their learning are more likely to accept responsibility for their learning outcomes, whether those outcomes are favorable or not (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2007). Thus, the third research question of this study aimed at exploring this relationship in the context of YTUSFL, which is an EFL context in Turkey.

In order to provide an answer to this question, the participants' self-regulatory efficacy scores gathered by the Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire were correlated with the participants' perceived responsibility scores measured by the Perceived Responsibility for Learning Questionnaire. As the data from the responsibility questionnaire were not normally distributed, Spearman's rho was calculated in order to explore whether the two constructs measured by the questionnaires are related. The results are presented in the table below.

			Self-regulatory efficacy	Perceived responsibility
Spearman's rho	Self-regulatory efficacy	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.186(**)
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	503	503
	Perceived responsibility	Correlation Coefficient	.186(**)	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	503	503

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

Table 15 - Relationship between self-regulatory efficacy beliefs and perceived responsibility

The results presented in the table above indicate that there is a *weak, positive correlation* between self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated English learning and perceived responsibility for English learning. The relationship between the two variables was statistically significant ($p < .001$), but with a small effect size ($r_s = .186$). This finding suggests that the more self-efficacious students feel for regulating their English learning, the more responsibility they assume for their English learning outcomes. However, the small effect size and the weakness of the correlation indicate that the factors involved in self-regulatory efficacy and those involved in perceived responsibility for learning might be different. This finding is a little surprising as similar studies conducted in different contexts by Zimmerman and Kitsantas (2005, 2007) found the relationship between these constructs to be stronger. Possible reasons for this difference will be discussed in the following chapter.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the analyses of the data collected through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were presented. The quantitative data revealed that the participants perceived themselves to be moderately self-efficacious in performing the activities and tasks that can help them regulate their English learning. Additionally, the qualitative data revealed some differences between the interviewees with relatively higher self-regulatory efficacy and those with relatively lower self-regulatory efficacy in terms of goal-orientation and techniques and allotment of time for studying English. It was also found that self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning change according to academic level, level of success in English, and gender, but not according to level of English proficiency; however, a trend towards differences in self-regulatory efficacy according to English proficiency levels was observed.

In terms of perceived responsibility, the quantitative results indicated that the participants in this study perceived themselves to be slightly more responsible than their teachers. However, it was found that participants held the teacher more responsible for their interest and motivation for learning English, a result confirmed by the data obtained from the interviews. The qualitative results also indicated that there was little difference between the responses of the interviewees in the high and low self-efficacy groups. That is, overall, the interviewees appeared to hold themselves more responsible for improving their English and engaging in activities that can help them make progress outside class. However, one difference found between these two groups of interviewees was that the participants in the low self-efficacy group appeared to believe that a student's lack of interest in learning English

is more related to the teacher than the student. Additionally, the quantitative data revealed that the level of perceived responsibility for English learning outcomes does not vary according to level of English proficiency, academic level, level of success in English, and gender.

Lastly, correlation analyses were presented in order to explore the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for learning. A significant positive correlation was found between these two constructs; however, the results also indicated that the correlation was weak.

The next chapter will further discuss the findings of this study in light of the relevant literature. It will also discuss pedagogical implications, suggestions for further studies, and limitations.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study explored university EFL students' self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and their perceived responsibility for English learning outcomes. It also sought to find out whether there was a relationship between these two constructs.

The study was conducted at Yıldız Technical University School of Foreign Languages (YTUSFL), in Istanbul, Turkey. Data were collected through three questionnaires from 503 students and through semi-structured interviews with eight of these participants. The first questionnaire was used to collect demographic information about the participants. The second questionnaire aimed to investigate participants' confidence in their ability to regulate their English learning processes. The third questionnaire aimed to explore participants' perceptions of student and teacher responsibilities. The interviews aimed to provide in-depth information about the interviewees' self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for learning. The questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively, and the interviews were analyzed qualitatively.

This chapter presents and discusses the findings of the study in light of the relevant literature. Following the discussion of the findings, the pedagogical implications of the study are discussed. After that, the limitations of the study are described, and suggestions are made for further research. Finally, overall conclusions are presented.

Discussion of the Findings

Discussion of the Findings Related to Participants' Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Self-Regulated Learning

The quantitative and qualitative data gathered from the participants' responses to the Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire and semi-structured interviews respectively yielded some information about the participants' perceptions of their abilities in regulating their English learning. The mean value (57.94) of the responses to the questionnaire items revealed that the participants were *moderately self-efficacious* in regulating their English learning. It is important to note that this mean value (57.94) falls within points 50 and 70 on the scale. Point 50 would indicate that participants are unsure of their ability to perform and cope with the activities stated in the items, and point 70 would indicate that participants believe that they probably can perform and cope with the activities stated in the items. The separate analysis of the items also revealed that, overall, the responses clustered between points 30 (probably cannot) and 70 (probably can). Therefore, these results might indicate that the participants in this study appeared to have confidence in directing the tasks and activities that regulate their English learning *to a limited extent*. The participants' being self-efficacious for self-regulated English learning to a limited extent might be caused by the fact that there are other capabilities involved in efficacy beliefs such as "management of thought, affect, action, and motivation" (Bandura, 1997, p. 45). The separate analysis of the items also shed light on these possible factors. That is, the activities for which the participants had the lowest level of self-efficacy beliefs that ranged from 37.79 (probably cannot) to 44.27 (maybe) were related to their ability to focus their attention to finish assignments and to

motivate themselves to take class notes when some internal or personal factors occur, such as feeling moody or restless, or finding an English lesson boring. It is possible that motivational abilities and self-efficacy are interrelated and that they have a crucial role in self-regulation. This finding supports what the literature indicates about motivational constructs in self-regulation. Zimmerman and Schunk (2008) emphasize that there is a reciprocal interaction between self-regulated learning processes and motivational beliefs. Similarly, Zimmerman (1994, 2001) states that self-regulation of learning requires students to be not only metacognitively and behaviorally but also motivationally proactive controllers of personal, behavioral, and environmental factors during their goal-oriented learning processes.

The fact that the participants in this study appeared to be not quite sure of their ability to regulate their English learning could also be associated with their interest in learning English. As these students attend this school because they have to, by the rules and regulations of the university and the Council of Higher Education of Turkey (YOK), it is possible that they have little self-generated interest in learning English. Although there are controversial ideas about whether being involved in interesting activities could increase self-efficacy or experiencing success dealing with even boring activities are likely to influence interest positively, development in interest and self-efficacy has been reported to be reciprocal, and it has been also found that self-efficacy beliefs have been positively correlated both with interest and self-regulation (Hidi & Ainley, 2008; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). The interview data in this study also support the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and interest. The interviews demonstrated that, although all the interviewees in both relatively low and high self-regulatory efficacy groups appeared to believe that they

could learn English, the interviewees with relatively low self-regulatory efficacy additionally reported that they did not like or want to learn English. Their lack of wish to learn the language can be taken as an indication that these participants' interest in learning English has not yet developed, and this situation could be one of the factors in their relatively low self-regulatory efficacy scores in the study. In the area of interest research, it has been stated that, as interest plays an important role in academic performance, and as it is a factor in motivational beliefs, it has been found to enhance self-efficacy and to facilitate the development of self-regulation (Hidi & Ainley, 2008).

The quantitative data also revealed information about the self-regulated English learning activities for which the participants had higher and lower self-efficacy beliefs. The range of the means of the top five activities shows that, overall, the participants appeared to believe that they could probably (70) perform and cope with the following activities: thinking of a good example that will help remember an abstract concept in English on an English test, associating new information with what it is known sufficiently well to remember it, finding a way to motivate oneself to get a good grade on an English test even if the content of the test is not appealing, being an effective study partner despite experiencing difficulty with English, and finding a way to associate a complicated concept with its details that will ensure its recall on an English test. The similarities among these activities provide us with an interesting result. That is, three of these items are about self-initiated efforts to learn, remember, or recall a new or complicated concept either for an English test or for self-study. It can be suggested that the participants' relatively higher level of self-regulatory efficacy for learning, remembering, or recalling new or complicated concepts might

be related to their engaging with these strategies that have proved to be of benefit to their learning. This suggestion is in line with a previous study (Chularut & DeBacker, 2004), which provided evidence that experience with a strategy (concept mapping) increased students' self-efficacy and self-regulation.

The suggestion that students' learning experiences are related to their strategy use and beliefs might also explain why organizing information/note-taking was found to be among the activities the participants in this study, overall, appeared to feel unsure of performing when the quantitative data were analyzed. The qualitative data also revealed that note taking was not used as a strategy for self-study by any of the interviewees but was used only for preparing for English tests. Note-taking and organizing notes can be considered to be closely related to *keeping records and monitoring*, which is one of the self-regulated learning strategies (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1986). The quantitative data finding that the participants, overall, appeared to doubt their ability to keep notes and monitor their learning by using their notes, as well as the qualitative data finding that all the interviewees seemed not to prefer note taking as a learning strategy, could be related to these students' learning styles or personality types. It could also be linked to their previous learning experience. In the Turkish education system, students have to take the national university entrance exam (OSS) in order to study at university. This exam is a multiple choice exam, so it requires students to learn the strategies necessary to deal with multiple choice questions. In addition, in order to score as high as possible, students generally go to *dershanes* (i.e. private courses that prepare students for the exam) where courses and materials are designed according to the exam system and students are provided with almost every necessary class note written in packs or

books. As a result, it can be suggested that students did not feel the need to take class notes of their own in their previous learning processes. Therefore, students might not have a clear idea of the effectiveness of note taking for studying school subjects in their native language, which might cause them to find it difficult to apply the strategy for learning a foreign language. Taking all of this into account, it can be concluded that the participants of this study probably went through learning experiences that did not provide them with the opportunities to use the strategy *keeping records* before they started their education at university. This suggests that participants' previous learning experiences have affected their beliefs regarding their ability to take class notes and to make use of them. In other words, it can be suggested that their confidence in using note taking as a keeping records method was not boosted, as they were not exposed to a learning context in which taking class notes would enhance their learning. This suggestion could also be supported by a study in the literature (Elbaum, et al., 1993) which pointed out that one of the factors in differences in students' strategy beliefs was previous learning experience, with opportunities offered for using different learning strategies.

The qualitative data also shed additional light on the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and strategy use. In the interviews, some differences emerged between students with high and low self-regulatory efficacy in terms of their study habits to learn, study, and remember the information presented in class and in course materials. In other words, interviewees with higher levels of self-regulatory efficacy appeared to study English more frequently by applying varied strategies more regularly, such as making associations, doing revision, preparing word lists, getting

prepared for class, and relating new information to personal life and opinions, than those with relatively low self-regulatory efficacy.

The difference between the students with high and low self-regulatory efficacy in terms of study habits was also confirmed by the analyses of other two interview questions that were related to test taking. The interviewees' responses to two questions about the time they allot and the techniques and strategies they used for test preparation revealed that the interviewees with relatively high self-regulatory efficacy allotted more time, planned ahead, and studied regularly, unlike those with lower self-regulatory efficacy. Moreover, the responses of the participants with higher self-regulatory efficacy indicated that they used varied test preparation techniques, such as reviewing, doing exercises, self-instructing, using associations, making lists of words, keeping a vocabulary notebook, reading, writing, memorizing, and summarizing, unlike those with relatively low self-regulatory efficacy, who only reported using reviewing, making lists of words, doing exercises, reading, and writing.

Based on the results presented above, it can be suggested that students with higher self-efficacy beliefs are more likely to use more strategies and put more energy into their academic learning than those with lower self-efficacy beliefs. This suggestion may also be supported by social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1977), which explains that individuals' self-efficacy beliefs influence their choice of activities, their effort and persistence. Research has also provided evidence for the positive relationship between self-efficacy and use of strategies by showing that students who believed in their capability to perform tasks used more learning strategies than those who did not (Mills, et al., 2007; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1990).

With regard to the differences between relatively efficacious and inefficacious students, the results of the qualitative analysis also revealed that there were differences between high and low self-efficacious students in terms of goal-setting. Goal-setting is essential to self-regulation, as the three components of self-regulation (i.e. self-observation, self-judgment, and self-reaction), as described in Chapter II, reciprocally interact with each other in the service of goal attainment (Bandura, 1986, 2001; Zimmerman, 1989). This indicates that self-regulation is oriented towards the attainment of goals, and the goals students set for their academic learning and effort they expend on these goals are influenced by their self-efficacy beliefs and self-regulatory knowledge (Schunk, 1990). According to the qualitative data in this study, the students with relatively high self-regulatory efficacy appeared to have both short and long-term goals, such as learning English better for their academic learning and/or for their future career, but the students with relatively lower self-regulatory efficacy appeared to be test-oriented, stating that they mainly aimed to pass English tests. Based on this, it can be suggested that efficacious students are more likely to be goal-oriented self-regulators, and this suggestion could be supported by the literature as well (Zimmerman, 1995; Zimmerman, et al., 1992), which states that the more capable students perceive themselves to be, the more challenging goals they set for themselves.

It was also explored whether the interviewees self-evaluated their progress in learning English. The interview data indicated that the interviewees did not self-evaluate their performance while learning English by monitoring the strategies they used for achieving their goals or by assessing the quality or progress of their work. They reported only looking at their test results or being aware of the skills they were

good or bad at. Being one of the self-regulated learning strategies, self-evaluation promotes strategy use, enhances success, and boosts efficacy (Zimmerman, et al., 1996), and it helps students judge whether they are using appropriate learning activities to reach their goals (Schunk, 1994). In addition, it is stated in the literature that students need to be provided with opportunities to practice self-regulated learning strategies; otherwise, they may not always be aware of the usefulness of them for their academic learning (Lan, 1998). Considering the results and what is stated in the literature, it can be suggested that self-monitoring was novel to the interviewees in this study as they were not taught or given time to self-evaluate and reflect on their performances.

In this section of the discussion, quantitative and qualitative findings related to participants' self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning have been discussed in the background of the relevant literature. The following four sections will discuss the findings related to differences in self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning according to level of English proficiency, academic level, level of success in English, and gender.

Discussion of the Findings Related to Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Level of English Proficiency

The findings of the quantitative analysis have revealed that a significant change in the level of self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning was not observed among proficiency levels (i.e. elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate, and advanced); however, a trend towards higher self-regulatory efficacy at higher proficiency levels was observed, which was found to be approaching significance.”

To the knowledge of the researcher, no study has analyzed differences in self-regulatory efficacy beliefs of EFL learners across proficiency levels. The literature only provides evidence for the positive relationship between self-efficacy, use of self-regulated learning strategies, and the English speaking proficiency of elementary school students in the ESL context (Wang & Pape, 2005). That is, the study conducted by Wang and Pape (2005) approached proficiency in English as the ability to communicate through the use of the language. Therefore, it can be said that this study has contributed to the area of self-regulatory efficacy by finding that the relationship between self-efficacy and language proficiency only approaches significance, rather than finding a significant and positive relationship. This result signals the need for further research that investigates whether that difference is due to the difference in context, the difference in measure of proficiency, or the difference in age.

Discussion of the Findings Related to Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Academic Level

When it was analyzed whether students' self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning varied according to academic level (i.e. pre-tertiary and tertiary level), it was found that, overall, the participants at the tertiary level had a slightly higher level of self-regulatory efficacy than those at the pre-tertiary level. This difference was found to be statistically significant. This finding does not support what the literature indicates about this issue. Several researchers in the literature (Caprara, et al., 2008; Pajares & Valiante, 2002; Usher & Pajares, 2008) explained that there was a progressive decline in self-regulatory efficacy as students moved up in the educational system. It was pointed out that the reason for this decline might be

academic activities' and requirements' becoming increasingly demanding, challenging, competitive, and stressful, and students' being attracted to more interesting activities as they grow up, which might cause them to feel they cannot manage their learning. However, it should be noted that the studies mentioned above examined differences in perceived efficacy for self-regulated learning with regard to the developmental course of the construct either over a period of time from childhood to early adulthood, or among the participants ranging from school grades four to eleven.

One of the reasons the participants at the tertiary level were found to be more efficacious than those at the pre-tertiary level may be that the participants at the tertiary level either went through the extensive two-semester English preparatory program or had proven to be exempt from the program via some internationally accepted English tests, such as TOEFL or IELTS, before they started to study in their majors. The participants' successful completion of the program or their being proficient enough in English when they entered the university might be taken as indications that the participants' self-regulatory efficacy was boosted with their language learning experiences that proved them to be successful. This suggestion can also be supported by the notion that enactive mastery experiences are one of the sources of self-efficacy beliefs, as presented in the previous section.

It is also important to note that this study investigated the participants' self-efficacy beliefs with regard to language learning, at which the tertiary students had most likely been successful. The studies in the literature that showed a decline in self-efficacy, as students moved up in the educational system, looked at general academic self-efficacy. It is possible that if the tertiary students' general academic

self-efficacy beliefs, for coping with their studies in their majors, had been investigated, their general academic self-efficacy might have been found to be lower than their self-efficacy beliefs for regulating their language learning.

Discussion of the Findings Related to Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Level of Success in English

The findings of the quantitative analysis have revealed that there was a significant relationship between self-regulatory efficacy beliefs and the level of success in English (i.e. high achievers, moderate achievers, and low achievers). That is, as the level of success increases, so does the level of self-efficacy for self-regulated learning. Based on this, it can be suggested that students' success is a predictor of their efficacy beliefs. This finding is in line with the literature (Wang & Pape, 2005; Zimmerman, 1990) which indicates that students who experience more academic accomplishments in learning tend to be more self-regulated learners than those who are comparatively lower achievers. This discussion suggests that "performance accomplishments" (i.e. personal mastery experiences) may enhance self-efficacy, which, in turn, may predict performance in similar or more challenging tasks (Bandura, 1977, p. 195).

Discussion of the Findings Related to Differences in Self-Efficacy Beliefs According to Gender

The results obtained from the quantitative analysis also showed that the female participants in this study seemed to be more efficacious in regulating their English learning than their male counterparts. This difference was found to be significant. This finding is also consistent with the findings of many research studies

(Caprara, et al., 2008; Mills, et al., 2007; Pajares, et al., 2000; Pajares, et al., 1999; Pajares & Valiante, 2001; Usher & Pajares, 2008; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1990). However, drawing on the findings of this and previous studies in the literature, it would be wrong to suggest that this difference between female and male students in terms of their confidence in their capability to regulate their learning is because female students are better self-regulators than male students. The difference might stem from gender orientation, as described in Chapter II. That is, some academic subjects, such as mathematics and science, might be considered as a masculine domain, whereas language arts tasks and activities might be perceived as stereotypically feminine tasks by parents, teachers, or educators (Pajares, 2002). Therefore, this issue calls for further research on differences in self-regulatory efficacy according to gender to investigate the influence of home, culture, and education on males' and females' judgments of self-efficacy for regulating their English learning activities.

The discussion of the findings presented so far aimed to answer how confident the participants were in their ability to regulate their own learning, and whether the level of confidence changes according to the participants' level of English proficiency, academic level, level of success in English, and gender. The following section deals with the participants' perceptions of responsibility.

Discussion of the Findings Related to Participants' Perceptions of Responsibility for English Learning Outcomes

The second research question, which was related to participants' perceptions of responsibility regarding their English learning processes and outcomes, was addressed through the Perceived Responsibility for Learning Questionnaire and the

semi-structured interviews. The median value (4.63) of the responses to the questionnaire items falls within the points 4 and 5 on the scale, which would indicate “both equally” and “slightly more the student” respectively. Drawing on this result, it can be said that the participants seemed to perceive themselves to be *slightly more responsible than their teachers* for their successes and failures in English. The qualitative data also provided information that can help explore perceptions of responsibility. Being asked who they thought was more responsible for a student’s improvement in English, the teacher or the student, most of the interviewees in this study appeared to hold students more responsible for improving their English than the teacher. The fact that the interviewees’ responses are consistent with the median value (4.63) of the overall questionnaire responses can be taken as an indication that English was not considered to be a teacher-dependent process by the participants in this study. However, based on both quantitative and qualitative analyses, it can be suggested that, overall, the participants still seemed to assign a fair amount of responsibility to the teacher for their English learning outcomes.

One of the reasons participants did not seem to take a greater degree of responsibility than they did could be that they might not have engaged in activities that could provide them with the opportunity to feel they had the power to self-control and self-regulate their own learning in their previous language learning activities, which, in turn, could have contributed to students’ development of academic responsibility. This suggestion is in line with what is stated in the literature. Anderson and Prawat (1983) point out that self-regulation and self-control are the components of responsibility. Similarly, Zimmerman (1995) emphasizes that in order for students to assume responsibility for their learning, they need to be given

both the training and opportunity to self-regulate their learning. These statements indicate that teachers or educators need to create necessary conditions to encourage students to take more responsibility for their own learning.

Another reason the participants in this study appeared to believe that they were only slightly more responsible than the teacher could be their beliefs about language learning and about teacher and student roles, as argued by Cotterall (1995). Based on this notion, it can be suggested that the participants in this study might have believed that students are not supposed to have control over their learning because the teacher is in a superior position in terms of control. As a result, this belief might have inhibited them from realizing that students should be able to have more control over and bear more responsibility for their own learning than the teacher.

Lastly, another reason could be that the participants in this study might not be intrinsically motivated to learn and study English. In the literature, it is stated that students' intrinsic motivation to learn any subject matter or valuing what they are learning is crucial for them to hold themselves accountable for their successes and failures in school (Bacon, 1991). This suggestion can be supported by the separate analysis of the items in the responsibility questionnaire. That is, the activities for which the participants had the lowest level of assumed responsibility were found to be related to the affective domain of language learning, such as interest, concentration, and motivation. The fact that the participants seemed to believe that the teacher was more responsible for students' motivation and interest can be taken as an indication of their lack of intrinsic motivation to learn English. This might be related to their self-efficacy beliefs and use of self-regulated learning strategies. As

discussed previously in this chapter, the activities for which the participants had the lowest self-regulatory efficacy beliefs were related to motivating themselves to study and learn English when adverse factors arise (see p. 93). Consequently, all of these in turn might have an impact on their development of responsibility for their English learning outcomes. This suggestion is in accordance with the literature (Cogan, Sternberg, & Subotnik, 2006; Zimmerman, 2006), which states that among the key processes enhancing students' development of academic responsibility are self-motivation beliefs (i.e. self-efficacy and intrinsic interest) and self-regulation.

The qualitative data also shed additional light on the relationship among motivation, perceived responsibility, and self-regulatory efficacy. Interviewees' responses indicated that there were similarities between students with high and low self-regulatory efficacy in terms of their perceptions of the role of the teacher in motivation. That is, in both self-regulatory efficacy groups, there were interviewees who reported that the teacher has an influential role in motivation or those who reported that students share the responsibility with the teacher. Although there was one interviewee with high self-regulatory efficacy who seemed to believe that it is students' responsibility to motivate themselves, similarities can be observed in the perceptions of the interviewees with high and low self-regulatory efficacy regarding the role of the teacher and students in motivation for learning English. This indicates that there might be other constructs than self-efficacy beliefs that relate to students' perceptions of responsibility for motivation. For example, attributions are considered to be highly influential on students' motivation for self-regulated learning (Schunk, 2008). That is, students' belief that their low performance is due to the factors they have control over, such as their effort, or the strategies, techniques, or methods they

have used for learning, helps increase their personal responsibility for learning. However, their beliefs that they perform poorly because of factors beyond their control, such as low ability, might diminish their motivation, which might cause them to fail to take responsibility for their academic outcomes (Schunk, 2008; Zimmerman, 2006).

With regard to the participants' perceptions of the responsibility of the teacher and students for students being interested in English, the separate analysis of item 12 (see Table 10 on p. 78), which aimed to investigate this issue, revealed that, overall, the participants appeared to share the responsibility with the teacher. However, drawing on the frequency values of the responses to the item, it can be suggested that the participants shared the responsibility, with the higher proportion of responsibility attributed to themselves. Regarding the same issue, further in depth qualitative analysis based on the semi-structured interviews revealed that although the interviewees with relatively lower self-regulatory efficacy seemed to hold the teacher more responsible than those with relatively higher self-regulatory efficacy beliefs, the interviewees with high self-regulatory efficacy were observed to be split over this issue. In other words, two of them appeared to believe that students have control over their interest in learning English, whereas the other two interviewees appeared to give more responsibility to the teacher. These results gained from the interviews can support the idea that there is a reciprocal relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and interest, as described previously in this chapter (see p. 94). This relationship mediates self-regulation by increasing students' level of engagement with the task or activity without any external demands (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2008), and self-regulation enhances responsibility for learning outcomes by

helping students view learning as a strategic process that needs to be directed by their own self-regulated efforts (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1992).

In terms of the activities for which the participants hold themselves more responsible than the teacher, the separate analysis of the questionnaire items revealed that, overall, the participants appeared to believe that the teacher does not have much to do with students' attitudes towards learning English (e.g. seeing English as important for their future success or not valuing good grades for English class) and with the amount of the effort they put into learning English (e.g. not really trying in English class or not finishing English homework assignments). The interviewees' responses about their beliefs regarding their responsibilities for improving their English and the teacher's responsibilities for helping them with this issue cast additional light on the findings. That is, the interviewees, overall, appeared to assume more responsibility for engaging in activities that can help them make progress outside English class, such as making use of the sources of information available, such as the Internet and English songs, movies and soap operas, trying to make friends with foreign people through instant messaging clients or social networking websites, and reading newspapers, books, and magazines. In addition, they considered students to be responsible for listening to lessons attentively and for participating in class. This finding somewhat supports the quantitative finding that participants gave themselves more responsibility for the effort they make for learning English. On the other hand, the interviewees appeared to consider the teacher to be responsible for such activities as encouraging students to improve their speaking skills, providing opportunities that help students improve their speaking skills, guiding students in accessing sources of information that can help them improve

their English, making classes interesting, arousing interest in English among students, and motivating students. These activities can be grouped as the teacher's responsibilities for helping students develop positive attitudes towards learning English, which is contradictory with the quantitative finding (i.e. separate analysis of the questionnaire items 18 and 7 revealed that the participants believed that the teacher's influence on students' seeing English as important to their future success or not valuing good grades for English class is limited), and for providing guidance when necessary. Based on these findings, it can be suggested that the participants perceive the teacher as the source of motivation, encouragement, and information, and as a facilitator, and they perceive students as independent of the teacher when it comes to out-of-class learning activities. This finding is somewhat consistent with those of a thesis study on Turkish university EFL students' readiness for autonomy (Karabıyık, 2008), which reported that students assumed more responsibility for their out-of-class learning processes, but they gave more responsibility to the teacher for methodological aspects of learning.

In the following section, the findings related to differences in perceived responsibility according to the participants' level of English proficiency, academic level, level of success in English, or gender will be discussed.

Discussion of the Findings Related to Differences in Perceived Responsibility According to Level of English Proficiency, Academic Level, Level of Success in English, and Gender

The findings of the quantitative analysis have revealed that there was no significant difference in the level of perceived responsibility according to level of English proficiency, academic level, level of success in English, or gender.

One of the reasons this construct does not vary according to any of the variables listed above could be that, according to the quantitative analysis of the distribution of the responses to the responsibility questionnaire, there appears to be relatively less overall variation in the participants in terms of overall perceptions of responsibility. That is, when the standard deviation ($SD = .74$) is taken into consideration, 67% of the participants fall between 3.9 and 5.35, or roughly 1.5 points (from 4 to 5.5), on the scale, which suggests that there is not much variability in the participants on the scale.

One reason for the lack of variability in the responses to the responsibility scale could be that the setting in which the study is conducted was a technical university, which has mostly science and mathematics related departments, such as engineering, chemistry, economics, and architecture. For this reason, the vast majority of the participants were from faculties of engineering, arts and science, or economic and administrative sciences. The fact that there was little variation in the educational background and majors of the participants might be one of the reasons the participants' perceptions of responsibility did not appear to change according to level of English proficiency, academic level, level of success in English, or gender. Therefore, this issue calls for further research on perceptions of responsibility in different school contexts with greater diversity of students.

Lastly, one of the reasons perceptions of responsibility did not appear to vary according to level of English proficiency, academic level, level of success in English, or gender could be that perceptions of responsibility are dependent on several constructs, such as attributions, self-efficacy, self-regulation, motivation (Zimmerman, 2006), learner beliefs regarding learning, language learning, and

teacher and students roles (Cotterall, 1995). This indicates that responsibility does not stand alone as a construct; rather, the constructs listed here may reciprocally interact with one another before they influence perceptions of responsibility for learning. Perceptions of responsibility might be an outcome of the reciprocal interaction of all those constructs. Based on this information, it can be suggested that it would be more helpful to investigate whether these constructs vary according to the variables than investigating perceptions of responsibility independently.

Discussion of the Findings Related to the Relationship between Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Self-Regulated Learning and Perceived Responsibility for English Learning

The last research question was related to the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceived responsibility for English learning. This study investigates the relationship between these two constructs as students' self-efficacy beliefs regarding their learning processes have been hypothesized to influence their perceptions of responsibility for learning (Zimmerman, 1994). That is, self-efficacious students can be characterized as proactive directors of their learning experiences, who should view themselves to be more responsible for academic outcomes than their teachers (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2005).

The research question was explored through Spearman's rank correlation coefficient. The finding indicated that there is a statistically significant positive correlation between these two constructs. This indicates that as students feel more self-efficacious for regulating their English learning, they are more likely to assume responsibility for their English learning processes and outcomes. However, the relationship between the constructs was found to be weak. The weakness of the

correlation may suggest that self-regulatory efficacy is not the only variable involved in perceived responsibility, and there can be other variables interfering with the development of assumed responsibility for learning, such as attributions and motivation (Zimmerman, 2006).

The relationship between these two constructs was found to be stronger in other studies conducted in different contexts (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2005, 2007). The reason for the difference between the strength of the correlation found in this study and that found in the studies mentioned could be that this study investigated the relationship in a language learning context, unlike the other studies. In the literature it has been stated that language learning is different from learning other kinds of subject matters in terms of requiring more time and practice and different mental processes (Cotterall, 1995). Based on this notion, it can be suggested that language learners' beliefs regarding language learning and their and the teacher's role (Cotterall, 1995) and their knowledge of self-regulated learning or language learning strategies (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1994) might have been some factors that influenced their perceptions of self-regulatory efficacy and responsibility.

The difference between the strength of the correlation found in this study and that found in the studies mentioned above could also be due to lack of variability on the responsibility scale in terms of the participants' overall perceptions of responsibility.

This interesting and somewhat contradictory finding regarding the relationship between self-regulatory efficacy beliefs and perceived responsibility for language learning outcomes calls for further in depth research that investigates the relationship by also taking into account the possible factors mentioned here.

Pedagogical Implications

The analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data revealed important pedagogical implications that can inform future teaching practices in secondary, pre-tertiary, and tertiary EFL contexts in Turkey.

Regarding self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning, this study revealed that students with relatively high self-regulatory efficacy outperform their counterparts in terms of applying various strategies to acquire and recall information, planning their study time and setting goals. Research has also shown that positive and high self-efficacy beliefs help students to be engaged in the classroom in terms of behavior, cognition, and motivation (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). Based on the findings of this study and what the literature states, it should be noted that students' self-regulatory efficacy needs to be enhanced, and this can be achieved by such practices as developing students' goal-setting and self-evaluation skills, and providing instruction in effective learning strategies (Schunk, 2003).

In order to help students build and maintain reasonable self-efficacy, students need to experience success by taking on challenging tasks that are followed with support in the form of encouraging feedback specific to the task and to the skills needing to be improved (Goldman, 2006; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). Additionally, incorporating self-regulatory strategy training into the class should not be overlooked by teachers. This could be done by providing models. Teachers or peers can act as models who explain and demonstrate skills such as self-monitoring, setting appropriate goals, and selecting strategies accordingly. Training students to use self-regulated learning strategies can help shift responsibility for learning from the teacher towards students (Schunk, 2003; Zimmerman, et al., 1996). That is, when

students are endowed with self-regulated learning strategies, they could feel self-efficacious about their effectiveness as learners, which, in turn, would lead to an increased sense of perceived responsibility.

This study has also revealed that students have not been aware of the usefulness of goal-setting and self-evaluation skills. In terms of goal-setting, providing direct instruction could help teachers get students to set realistic goals for themselves. Zimmerman (2008) implies that teachers need to train students to self-set goals that are challenging but reasonable as such academic goals can keep students motivated to stay on task, unlike easy or arbitrary goals. With regard to self-evaluation, students need to learn how to react to their performances by acting evaluatively in order to judge whether the goals they have set are challenging according to their current level of skills, and in order to assess the strategies they have used to determine their effectiveness. Teachers also should help students realize that self-evaluation is an on-going process, which helps them adjust their goals, strategies, and effort accordingly (Zimmerman, et al., 1996).

Another finding this study revealed is that there is a link between self-efficacy beliefs, self-regulation, interest, and motivation. In order to develop interest, teachers should create a learning environment that facilitates positive feelings towards tasks. This can be achieved by providing students with task choices, creating or activating content-related knowledge, and promoting peer or group work (Hidi & Ainley, 2008). With regard to motivation, such motivational practices as scaffolding, promoting autonomy and cooperation, providing opportunities for group and pair work, arousing interest, encouraging creativity, designing tasks with tangible products, providing effective and encouraging feedback, and teaching motivational

strategies could help increase language learner's motivation (Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008).

The findings of this study could also be drawn on for promoting student responsibility in the language learning classroom. This study revealed that students appeared not to take the responsibility for their lack of motivation for, interest in, and positive attitudes towards learning English. In accordance with the implicational suggestions presented above, it is important to make all efforts to give students a sense of control and power over their learning by creating a learning environment in which students can make their own decisions (Bacon, 1991). In addition, having student-centered lessons, employing alternative assessment tools, allowing students to exercise choice over due dates for projects, test types, using contracts for long term assignments, and supporting students with self-help programs, such as time and stress management (Jacob & Eleser, 1997), and team-based learning (White, 1998) could be effective ways of promoting learner responsibility, as they can help students explore new roles in the language learning class and improve their skills and boost their confidence to use these skills. Moreover, allowing students to participate in the formulation of a curriculum by articulating their questions, needs and values can foster students' sense of responsibility (Howell, 2002). Lastly, it is possible to teach students to attribute their success or failure to their effort instead of luck, ability, or the task itself. By this way, students' attributions of personal responsibility can be improved (Anderson & Prawat, 1983; Zimmerman, 2006).

Limitations of the Study

This study has four noteworthy limitations. First, the study included a limited number of interviewees because it would have been difficult to handle more qualitative data in the period of time allocated for the study. For this reason, the result of the qualitative data analyses cannot be taken as evidence to make strong claims about the differences between students with relatively high and relatively low self-regulatory efficacy.

Second, the study may not be generalizable to other schools at the university level because it reflects the perceptions of participants from a technical university. Data from various regions of Turkey or different universities with a diversity of majors could have provided more generalizable findings.

Third, questionnaires were selected as the main research instruments in this study as they require a relatively shorter period of time to collect a great amount of data from a large number of participants (Dörnyei, 2007). However, while the participants were filling in the questionnaires, some of them might have reported what they believed the researcher expected to see or what reflected positively on their own abilities and knowledge. In addition, the fact that the items of the Self-Efficacy for Self-regulated Learning Questionnaire were in the format of long statements might have caused participants to feel fatigue or boredom while they were responding to the items. For these reasons, results should be treated with caution.

Fourth, as explained in Chapter III and Chapter IV, while choosing the interviewees for the relatively high and relatively low self-regulatory efficacy groups, both proficiency level and gender were taken into consideration in order to minimize any differences between the interviewees within a proficiency level. In

addition, the interviewees were chosen on voluntary and availability bases. These factors did not make it possible to choose the interviewees who were among the participants with the highest or lowest self-regulatory efficacy scores. For these reasons, interpretation of the interview results should include the consideration of the possibility that the splits among the interviewees within the same group may not have been observed, or that differences between the groups of interviewees may have been observed more clearly if the gap between the two groups of interviewees in terms of their self-regulatory efficacy scores had been wider.

Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the findings of this study, six important areas can be suggested for further research. First of all, this study should be replicated with more diverse samples of EFL students from both state and private universities in Turkey, to gain a broader picture of EFL students' perceptions of their self-regulatory efficacy and responsibility for English learning.

A second research area would be to carry out an intervention study for self-regulated learning strategies training to explore the effect of training on students' self-efficacy for self-regulated learning. It could be an experimental study with participants having low self-regulatory efficacy. Training aiming to increase students' efficacy could be given to the students in the experimental group. The efficacy levels of students in the control and experimental groups can be compared after the training. As a result, the possible changes in those two groups of students in terms of their efficacy for regulating their English learning can be seen and the effectiveness of the training can be determined.

Further research into the relationship between self-regulatory efficacy beliefs and perceived responsibility for language learning outcomes by exploring language learners' motivation, attributions, interest, and beliefs regarding language learning and their and the teacher's role would also contribute valuable information to the literature.

This study revealed that the differences in self-regulatory efficacy among proficiency levels approached significance. Based on this, it can be suggested that investigating differences in self-regulatory efficacy beliefs of EFL learners across proficiency levels in different school contexts with more diverse samples of students or in different EFL contexts could make it possible to compare the result of this study with those of other studies.

In addition, research specifically on self-regulatory efficacy according to gender, to investigate whether Turkish EFL students' self- efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning are influenced by gender-orientation beliefs, could also prove to be helpful.

Lastly, research into differences in self-regulatory efficacy beliefs or perceived responsibility for learning according to the majors of the participants by investigating the relationship between students' orientation towards learning or subjects of special interest to them and their self-efficacy beliefs or responsibility perceptions could also contribute valuable information to the literature.

Conclusion

The present study has provided information about Turkish university EFL students' self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated learning and perceptions of responsibility for their language learning processes and outcomes. The relationship explored in this study has not been explored in any EFL contexts prior to this study, to the knowledge of the researcher. The results revealed that self-efficacy beliefs for self-regulated English learning and perceived responsibility for English learning are influenced by several factors, such as language learners' interest, motivation, the beliefs they hold for the teacher's and students roles, and the attitudes they have towards language learning. In this respect, teachers, administrators, and program developers should seek solutions to promote student responsibility in the language learning classroom by taking into account students' affective domains and by enabling students to acquire a broad repertoire of self-regulated learning strategies and by boosting their sense of self-efficacy.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, L. M., & Prawat, R. S. (1983). Responsibility in the classroom: A synthesis of research on teaching self-control. *Educational Leadership, 40*(7), 62-66.
- Bacon, C. S. (1991). Being held responsible versus being responsible. *Clearing House, 64*(6), 395-398.
- Bacon, C. S. (1993). Student responsibility for learning. *Adolescence, 28*(109), 199-212.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist, 44*(9), 1175-1184.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2), 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 1-26.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 51*(2), 269-290.
- Bandura, A. (Ed.). (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A., & Barbaranelli, C. (1996). Multifaceted impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning. *Child Development, 67*(3), 1206-1222.

- Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(1), 87-99.
- Bassi, M., Steca, P., Fave, A. D., & Caprara, G. V. (2007). Academic self-efficacy beliefs and quality of experience in learning. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 36*(3), 301-312.
- Bouffard-Bouchard, T. (1990). Influence of self-efficacy on performance in a cognitive task. *Journal of Social Psychology, 130*(3), 353-363.
- Brown, I., & Inouye, D. K. (1978). Learned helplessness through modeling: The role of perceived similarity in competence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*(8), 900-908.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caprara, G. V., Fida, R., Vecchione, M., Del Bove, G., Vecchio, G. M., Barbaranelli, C., et al. (2008). Longitudinal analysis of the role of perceived self-efficacy for self-regulated learning in academic continuance and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(3), 525-534.
- Chen, H.-Y. (2007). *The relationship between EFL learners' self-efficacy beliefs and English performance*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, The Florida State University, Florida, USA.
- Chen, J.-H. (1995). *Metamotivation and self-regulated second language learning*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, The University of Texas, Austin, USA.
- Chularut, P., & DeBacker, T. K. (2004). The influence of concept mapping on achievement, self-regulation, and self-efficacy in students of English as a second language. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 29*(3), 248-263.
- Cogan, J. C., Sternberg, R. J., & Subotnik, R. F. (2006). Integrating the other three Rs into the curriculum: A model for improving academic achievement. In R. J. Sternberg & R. Subotnik, F. (Eds.), *Optimizing student success in school with the other three Rs: Reasoning, resilience, and responsibility*. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System*, 23(2), 195-205.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elbaum, B. E., Berg, C. A., & Dodd, D. H. (1993). Previous learning experience, strategy beliefs, and task definition in self-regulated foreign language learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 18(3), 318-336.
- Gahungu, O. N. (2007). *The relationships among strategy use, self-efficacy, and language ability in foreign language learners*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Northern Arizona University, Arizona, USA.
- Goldman, S. R. (2006). The other 3 Rs: Implications for the design of learning environments, research, and policy. In R. J. Sternberg & R. Subotnik, F. (Eds.), *Optimizing student success in school with the other Rs: Reasoning, resilience, and responsibility*. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Guilloteaux, M. J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(1), 55-77.
- Hidi, S., & Ainley, M. (2008). Interest and self-regulation: Relationships between two variables that influence learning. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Howell, C. L. (2002). Reforming higher education curriculum to emphasize student responsibility waves of rhetoric but glacial change. *College Teaching*, 50(3), 116-118.
- Jacob, S. W., & Eleser, C. (1997). Learner responsibility through 'presence'. *College Student Journal*, 31(4), 460-466.

- Karabiyik, A. (2008). *The relationship between culture of learning and Turkish university preparatory students' readiness for learner autonomy*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Klassen, R. M., & Georgiou, G. K. (2008). Spelling and writing self-efficacy of Indo-Canadian and Anglo-Canadian early adolescents. *Journal of International Migration & Integration*, 9(3), 311-326.
- Lan, W., Y. (1998). Teaching self-monitoring skills in Statistics. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning: From teaching to self-reflective practice*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Landry, C. C. (2003). *Self-efficacy, motivation, and outcome expectation correlates of college students' intention certainty*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Louisiana State University, Lafayette, USA.
- Linnenbrink, E., & Pintrich, P. (2003). The role of self-efficacy beliefs in student engagement and learning in the classroom. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 119-137.
- Magogwe, J. M., & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *System*, 35(3), 338-352.
- Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2006). A reevaluation of the role of anxiety: Self-efficacy, anxiety, and their relation to reading and listening proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(2), 273-292.
- Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2007). Self-efficacy of college intermediate French students: Relation to achievement and motivation. *Language Learning*, 57(3), 417-442.
- Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38(1), 30-38.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(4), 543-578.
- Pajares, F. (2002). Gender and perceived self-efficacy in self-regulated learning. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(2), 116-125.
- Pajares, F. (2008). Motivational role of self-efficacy beliefs in self-regulated learning. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.
- Pajares, F., Britner, S. L., & Valiante, G. (2000). Relation between achievement goals and self-beliefs of middle school students in writing and science. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(4), 406-422.
- Pajares, F., & Miller, M. D. (1994). Role of self-efficacy and self-concept beliefs in mathematical problem solving: A path analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*(2), 193-203.
- Pajares, F., Miller, M. D., & Johnson, M. J. (1999). Gender differences in writing self-beliefs of elementary school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(1), 50-61.
- Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (1997). Influence of self-efficacy on elementary students' writing. *Journal of Educational Research, 90*(6), 353-360.
- Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (2001). Gender differences in writing motivation and achievement of middle school students: A function of gender orientation? *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26*(3), 366-381.
- Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (2002). Students' self-efficacy in their self-regulated learning strategies: A developmental perspective. *Psychologia: An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient, 45*(4), 211-221.
- Pape, S. J., & Wang, C. (2003). Middle school children's strategic behavior: Classification and relation to academic achievement and mathematical problem solving. *Instructional Science, 31*(6), 419-449.

- Pintrich, P. R., & Schrauben, B. (1992). Students' motivational beliefs and their cognitive engagement in classroom academic tasks. In D. H. Schunk & J. L. Meece (Eds.), *Student perceptions in the classroom*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Schunk, D. H. (1990). Goal setting and self-efficacy during self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 25(1), 71-86.
- Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 26(3-4), 207-231.
- Schunk, D. H. (1994). Self-regulation of self-efficacy and attributions in academic settings. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational applications*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Schunk, D. H. (2003). Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modeling, goal setting, and self-evaluation. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 159-172.
- Schunk, D. H. (2008). Attributions as motivators of self-regulated learning. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1994). Self-regulation in education: Retrospect and prospect. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational applications*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (Eds.). (1998). *Self-regulated learning: From teaching to self-reflective practice*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Shen, H.-J. (2002). *Motivational and self-regulated learning components in relation to language learners' self-assessment, reading strategy use and reading achievement*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Seattle Pacific University, Washington, USA.
- Şen, M. (2006). Effects of English lessons, based on multiple intelligence theory, on students' motivation, self-efficacy, self-esteem and multiple intelligences. Unpublished master's thesis. Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.

- Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). Self-efficacy for self-regulated learning: A validation study. *Educational & Psychological Measurement, 68*(3), 443-463.
- Wang, C. (2004). *Self-regulated learning strategies and self-efficacy beliefs of children learning English as a second language*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, The Ohio State University, Ohio, USA.
- Wang, C., & Pape, S. J. (2005). Self-efficacy beliefs and self-regulated learning strategies in learning English as a second language: Four case studies. *The CATESOL Journal, 17*(1), 76-90.
- Wang, C., & Pape, S. J. (2007). A probe into three Chinese boys' self-efficacy beliefs learning English as a second language. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 21*(4), 364-377.
- White, L. F. (1998). Motivating students to become more responsible for learning. *College Student Journal, 32*(2), 190-196.
- Wu, P.-C. (2006). *The effects of goal orientation, self-efficacy, and cognitive/metacognitive self-regulatory strategy use on EFL college students' course achievement*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, California, USA.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*(3), 329-339.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational Psychologist, 25*(1), 3-17.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1994). Dimensions of academic self-regulation: A conceptual framework for education. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational applications*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 82-91.

- 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.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2006). Enhancing students' academic responsibility and achievement: A social-cognitive self-regulatory account. In R. J. Sternberg & R. Subotnik, F. (Eds.), *Optimizing student success in school with the other three Rs: Reasoning, resilience, and responsibility*. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Goal setting: A key proactive source of academic self-regulation. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zimmerman, B. J., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(3), 663-676.
- Zimmerman, B. J., Bonner, S., & Kovach, R. (1996). *Developing self-regulated learners: Beyond achievement to self-efficacy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2005). Homework practices and academic achievement: The mediating role of self-efficacy and perceived responsibility beliefs. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 30(4), 397-417.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2007). Reliability and validity of self-efficacy for learning form (SELF) scores of college students. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology*, 215(3), 157-163.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1986). Development of a structured interview for assessing student use of self-regulated learning strategies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23(4), 614-628.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1988). Construct validation of a strategy model of student self-regulated learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(3), 284-290.

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. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Perceptions of efficacy and strategy use in the self-regulation of learning. In D. H. Schunk & J. L. Meece (Eds.), *Student perceptions in the classroom*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2008). Motivation: An essential dimension of self-regulated learning. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

APPENDIX A: CUTOFF SCORES FOR SUCCESS LEVELS

LOW	0 – 39 = F 40 – 49 = D 50 – 54 = D+ 55 – 59 = C-
MODERATE	60 – 64 = C 65 – 69 = C+ 70 – 74 = B- 75 – 79 = B
HIGH	80 – 84 = B+ 85 – 89 = A- 90 – 100 = A

APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Dear Student,

I have been working at Yıldız Technical University, School of Foreign Languages, the department of Basic English since the 2004-2005 academic year. Currently, I am in the process of completing my Master's Degree at Bilkent University, Graduate School of Education, in Teaching English as a Foreign Language Program.

This set of questionnaires was prepared as an instrument for a study that aims to investigate the beliefs of Turkish university students who learn English as a foreign language regarding learning English. The data for the study is being collected with three different questionnaires.

The questionnaire has three parts:

The first questionnaire has questions about participants' background information

The second questionnaire has questions about participants' confidence in learning English

The second questionnaire has questions about participants' responsibilities for English learning

By completing the questionnaire, it is assumed that you give permission to use your answers in this study. **All responses will be strictly confidential.** If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, or my advisor. I would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation and contribution.

Best regards,

Mehtap Özkasap
Yıldız Technical University
School of Foreign Languages
Department of Basic English
Esenler/Istanbul
Phone: 0533 359 27 27
E-mail: senturkmehtap@yahoo.com

Dr. JoDee Mae Walters
(Thesis Advisor)
Bilkent University
Graduate School of Education
Bilkent/ANKARA
Phone: 0312 290 15 59
Email: walters@bilkent.edu.tr

APPENDIX C: BİLGİLENDİRME FORMU

Sayın Öğrenci,

2004-2005 akademik yılından bu yana Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu Temel İngilizce Bölümü'nde öğretim görevlisi olarak çalışmaktayım. Bilkent Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü'nde Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi bölümünde yapmakta olduğum yüksek lisans çalışmamı tamamlamak üzereyim.

Bu anket, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen Türkiye'deki üniversite hazırlık ve bölüm öğrencilerinin İngilizce öğrenmeye yönelik inançlarını incelemek için araştırma aracı olarak hazırlanmıştır. Araştırma için gerekli olan veri, üç ayrı anketle toplanmaktadır.

İlk ankette katılımcıların özgeçmişini ile ilgili sorular vardır.
İkinci anket, İngilizce öğrenimiyle ilgili özgüven üzerinedir.
Üçüncü anket, İngilizce derslerindeki sorumluluklarla ilgilidir.

Bu anket grubundaki soruları yanıtlayarak cevaplarınızın bu araştırma için kullanılmasına izin vermiş olacaksınız. **Vereceğiniz cevaplar kesinlikle gizlilik ilkeleri içerisinde ele alınacaktır.** Herhangi bir sorunuz olduğu takdirde, benimle ya da tez danışmanımla irtibata geçebilirsiniz. Katkılarınız ve yardımınız için şimdiden teşekkürler.

Saygılarımla,

Mehtap Özkasap
Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi
Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu
Üniversitesi Esenler/İSTANBUL
Telefon: 0533 359 27 27
E-mail: senturkmehtap@yahoo.com

Dr. JoDee Mae Walters
(Tez Danışmanı)
Bilkent Eğitim Bilimleri Ens.
Bilkent ANKARA
Telefon: 0312 290 15 59
E-mail: walters@bilkent.edu.tr

APPENDIX D: PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

Please choose the appropriate option or complete the blanks.

1. Gender:

- a) Female b) Male

2. Class: _____**3. Student Number (Your answer to this question allows the researcher to get your previous English course grade from the administration):**

APPENDIX E: KİŞİSEL BİLGİ ANKETİ

Bu bölümde kişisel bilgi içeren bir dizi soru vardır. Lütfen sizin için doğru olan şıkkı işaretleyiniz ya da boşlukları doldurunuz.

1. Cinsiyetiniz:

- a) Bayan b) Bay

2. Sınıfınız: _____**3. Öğrenci Numaranız (Bu soruyu cevaplamanız, araştırmacının**

İngilizce ders notunuzu idareden öğrenmesine izin verir):

**APPENDIX F: ORIGINAL SELF-EFFICACY FOR SELF-REGULATED
LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE**

Key:

Definitely cannot do it 0%	10%	20%	Probably cannot do it 30%	40%	Maybe 50%	60%	Probably can 70%	80%	90%	100%	Definitely can do it
-------------------------------------	-----	-----	------------------------------------	-----	--------------	-----	------------------------	-----	-----	------	-------------------------

QUESTIONS												
1. When you miss a class, can you find another student who can explain the lecture notes as clearly as your teacher did?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
2. When your teacher's lecture is very complex, can you write an effective summary of your original notes before the next class?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
3. When a lecture is especially boring, can you motivate yourself to keep good notes?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
4. When you had trouble understanding your instructor's lecture, can you clarify the confusion before the next class meeting by comparing notes with a classmate?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
5. When you have trouble studying your class notes because they are incomplete or confusing, can you revise and rewrite them clearly after every lecture?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
6. When you are taking a course covering a huge amount of material, can you condense your notes down to just the essential facts?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
7. When you are trying to understand a new topic, can you associate new concepts with old ones sufficiently well to remember them?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
8. When another student asks you to study together for a course in which you are experiencing difficulty, can you be an effective study partner?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
9. When problems with friends and peers conflict with schoolwork, can you keep up with your assignments?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
10. When you feel moody or restless during studying, can you focus your attention well enough to finish your assigned work?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	

Key:

Definitely cannot do it		Probably cannot do it			Maybe			Probably can			Definitely can do it	
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%		

QUESTIONS												
11. When you find yourself getting increasingly behind in a new course, can you increase your study time sufficiently to catch up?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
12. When you discover that your homework assignments for the semester are much longer than expected, can you change your other priorities to have enough time for studying?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
13. When you have trouble recalling an abstract concept, can you think of a good example that will help you remember it on the test?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
14. When you have to take a test in a school subject you dislike, can you find a way to motivate yourself to earn a good grade?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
15. When you are feeling depressed about a forthcoming test, can you find a way to motivate yourself to do well?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
16. When your last test results were poor, can you figure out potential questions before the next test that will improve your score greatly?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
17. When you are struggling to remember technical details of a concept for a test, can you find a way to associate them together that will ensure recall?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
18. When you think you did poorly on a test you just finished, can you go back to your notes and locate all the information you had forgotten?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
19. When you find that you had to "cram" at the last minute for a test, can you begin your test preparation much earlier so you won't need to cram the next time?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	

APPENDIX G: ADAPTED VERSION OF THE SELF-EFFICACY FOR SELF-REGULATED LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE

Please, read each question below very carefully and **circle only one percentage** for each item **which best indicates your certainty** about performing and coping with the activity stated in each question. There are no correct or incorrect answers. Your responses will remain confidential.

Key:

Definitely cannot do it	Probably cannot do it			Maybe		Probably can			Definitely can do it	
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

QUESTIONS											
*1. When you miss an English class, can you find another student who can explain the lecture notes as clearly as your teacher did?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
2. When your English teacher's lesson is very complex, can you write an effective summary of your original notes before the next class?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
3. When an English lesson is especially boring, can you motivate yourself to keep good notes?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
4. When you have trouble understanding your English teacher's lesson, can you clarify the confusion before the next class meeting by comparing notes with a classmate?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
5. When you have trouble studying your English class notes because they are incomplete or confusing, can you revise and rewrite them clearly after every lesson?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
6. When you are taking an English course covering a huge amount of material, can you condense your notes down to just the essential facts?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
7. When you are trying to understand something new about English, can you associate the new information with what you already know sufficiently well to remember the new information?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
8. When another student asks you to study English together, can you be an effective study partner even if you are experiencing difficulty with English?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
9. When problems with friends conflict with your English assignments, can you keep up with these assignments?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
10. When you feel moody or restless while studying English, can you focus your attention well enough to finish your English assignments?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

Key:

Definitely cannot do it			Probably cannot do it		Maybe			Probably can			Definitely can do it	
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%		

QUESTIONS												
11. When you find yourself getting increasingly behind in your English course, can you increase your study time sufficiently to catch up?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
12. When you discover that your English homework assignments are much longer than expected, can you change your other priorities to have enough time for studying?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
13. When you have trouble recalling an abstract concept in English, can you think of a good example that will help you remember it on the test?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
14. When you have to take an English test, can you find a way to motivate yourself to earn a good grade even if you don't like what you are being tested on?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
15. When you are feeling depressed about your forthcoming English test, can you find a way to motivate yourself to do well on it?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
16. When you failed your last English test, can you figure out potential questions before the next test that will improve your score greatly?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
17. When you are struggling to remember a complicated concept for an English test, can you find a way to associate its details that will ensure recall?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
18. When you think you did poorly on an English test you just finished, can you go back to your notes and locate all the information you had forgotten?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
19. When you find that you had to "cram" at the last minute for an English test, can you begin your test preparation much earlier so you won't need to cram the next time?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
* This item was eliminated after the actual study was conducted because the reliability analysis revealed that it negatively affected the reliability of the instrument.												

APPENDIX H: ÖZ-DÜZENLEMELİ İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENİMİNE YÖNELİK ÖZ-YETERLİK ANKETİ

Lütfen aşağıdaki her soruyu dikkatlice okuyunuz ve her soruda bahsedilen durumu **gerçekleştirebileceğinize** ve o durumla **başta çıkabileceğinize** yönelik **inancınızı en net** şekilde gösteren **yüzdeyi daire içine alınız**. Her bir soru için **yalnızca tek bir yüzde** seçmeniz gerekmektedir. Bu sorular için doğru ya da yanlış cevap bulunmamaktadır. Vereceğiniz cevaplar gizli tutulacaktır.

Anahtar:

Kesinlikle yapamam	Muhtemelen yapamam				Belki yapabilirim	Muhtemelen yapabilirim				Kesinlikle yapabilirim
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

SORULAR	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
*1. Bir İngilizce dersini kaçırdığınızda, ders notlarını öğretmeninizin anlattığı kadar net bir biçimde açıklayabilecek bir öğrenci bulabilir misiniz?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
2. İngilizce öğretmeninizin anlatmış olduğu ders çok karışık olduğunda, o derste tutmuş olduğunuz ders notlarından, bir sonraki dersten önce etkin bir özet çıkartabilir misiniz?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
3. İngilizce dersiniz çok sıkıcı olduğunda, derste iyi not tutmak için kendinizi motive edebilir misiniz?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
4. İngilizce öğretmeninizin anlattığı dersi anlamada güçlük çektiğinizde, bir sonraki dersten önce başka bir arkadaşınızın ders notlarıyla kendi ders notlarınızı karşılaştırarak kafanızdaki karışıklığı giderebilir misiniz?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
5. İngilizce ders notlarınıza çalışırken notlarınız eksik ya da karışık olduğu için sorun yaşadığınızda, her dersten sonra tutmuş olduğunuz notları bir kez daha gözden geçirip, tekrar yazabilir misiniz?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
6. İngilizce dersiniz çok sayıda materyal kullanımını gerektirdiğinde, ders notlarınızı sadece önemli bilgileri içerecek şekilde özetleyebilir misiniz?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
7. İngilizce ile ilgili yeni bir konuyu anlamaya çalışırken, o konuyu hatırlayabilmek için yeni bilgilerle önceden bildikleriniz arasında yeteri kadar iyi çağrışım kurabilir misiniz?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
8. Başka bir öğrenci sizinle beraber İngilizce çalışmak istediğinde, İngilizce ile ilgili bazı sorunlar yaşamanıza rağmen etkin bir çalışma arkadaşı olabilir misiniz?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
9. Arkadaşlarınızla yaşadığınız problemler İngilizce ödevlerinizle çakıştığında, ödevlerinizi yapmaya devam edebilir misiniz?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
10. İngilizce çalışırken kendinizi gergin ya da huzursuz hissettiğinizde, ödevlerinizi bitirmek için dikkatinizi yeterli ölçüde toplayabilir misiniz?	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

Anahtar:

Kesinlikle yapamam	Muhtemelen yapamam				Belki yapabilirim		Muhtemelen yapabilirim				Kesinlikle yapabilirim	
	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	

SORULAR												
11. İngilizce dersinde gitgide daha fazla sınıfın gerisinde kaldığınızı fark ettiğinizde, aradaki açığı kapatmak için çalışma sürenizi yeterince artırabilir misiniz?	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	
12. İngilizce ödevlerinizin tahmininizden daha fazla zaman alacağını fark ettiğinizde, çalışmak için yeterli zamanı yaratabilmek için diğer bazı önceliklerinizi değiştirebilir misiniz?	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	
13. İngilizcedeki soyut bir kavramı hatırlamada güçlük çektiğinizde, bu kavramı sınavda hatırlamanızı kolaylaştıracak bir örnek bulabilir misiniz?	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	
14. Bir İngilizce sınavına girmek zorunda olduğunuzda, sınavda sorulacak konuları sevmesenez dahi iyi bir not almak için kendinizi motive edecek bir yol bulabilir misiniz?	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	
15. Yaklaşan bir İngilizce sınavınız için kendinizi depresif hissediyorken, bu sınavda başarılı olmak için kendinizi motive edecek bir yol bulabilir misiniz?	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	
16. En son girdiğiniz İngilizce sınavında başarısız olduğunuzda, bir sonraki sınavdaki notunuzu önemli ölçüde yükseltecek muhtemel bazı soruları tahmin edebilir misiniz?	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	
17. Bir İngilizce sınavı için zor bir kavramı hatırlamak için çabalıyorken, o kavramın detaylarını çağrışım yoluyla hatırlamanızı garantileyecek bir yol bulabilir misiniz?	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	
18. Yeni girmiş olduğunuz bir İngilizce sınavının iyi geçmediğini düşündüğünüzde, tekrar ders notlarınıza geri dönüp, unutmuş olduğunuz bilgileri bulabilir misiniz?	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	
19. Bir İngilizce sınavı için son dakikada birçok şeye çalışmak zorunda kaldığınızı fark ettiğinizde, bir sonraki sınav çalışmasında da sıkışmamak için çalışmaya çok daha erken başlayabilir misiniz?	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %	
*Bu soru maddesi, asıl araştırma gerçekleştirildikten sonra, güvenilirlik analizinin bu soru maddesinin anketin güvenilirliğini olumsuz yönde etkilediğini göstermesi sebebiyle anketten çıkarılmıştır.												

**APPENDIX I: ORIGINAL PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEARNING
QUESTIONNAIRE**

Key:

Mainly the teacher 1	Definitely more the teacher 2	Slightly more the teacher 3	Both equally 4	Slightly more the student 5	Definitely more the student 6	Mainly the student 7
-------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------

Who is more responsible							
1. for a student being unprepared for a test?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. for a student being motivated to learn in school?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. for a student not finishing homework assignments?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. for a student doing well on a test?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. for a student being unprepared to participate in class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. for a student doing homework assignments correctly?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. for a student not valuing good grades in school?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. for a student giving extra effort when needed?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. for a student fooling around in class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. for a student not taking notes in class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. for a student understanding assigned homework readings?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. for a student being interested in school?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. for a student writing assigned papers well?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. for a student not being able to concentrate in class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. for a student remembering information from assigned readings?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. for a student not understanding a class discussion?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. for a student not really trying in class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. for a student seeing school as important to his or her future success?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. for a student receiving poor grades in school?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**APPENDIX J: ADAPTED VERSION OF THE PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY
FOR LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE**

The questions below are about responsibilities for English class. Next to each of the activities listed below, **circle only one** of the following numbers indicating who is more responsible: the teacher or the student. There are no correct or incorrect answers. Your responses will remain confidential.

Key:

Mainly the teacher	Definitely more the teacher	Slightly more the teacher	Both equally	Slightly more the student	Definitely more the student	Mainly the student
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Who is more responsible							
1. for a student being unprepared for an English test?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. for a student being motivated to learn English?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. for a student not finishing English homework assignments?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. for a student doing well on an English test?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. for a student being unprepared to participate in English class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. for a student doing English homework assignments correctly?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. for a student not valuing good grades for English class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. for a student putting extra effort into learning English when needed?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. for a student not paying attention in English class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. for a student not taking notes in English class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. for a student understanding assigned English homework texts?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. for a student being interested in English?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. for a student writing assigned English papers well?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. for a student not being able to concentrate in English class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. for a student remembering information from assigned English readings?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. for a student not understanding a class discussion in English class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. for a student not really trying in English class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. for a student seeing English as important to his or her future success?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. for a student failing English class?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**APPENDIX K: İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENME SÜRECİNE YÖNELİK SORUMLULUK
ALGISI ANKETİ**

Aşağıda İngilizce derslerindeki sorumluluklarla ilgili ifadeler vardır. Lütfen her bir durum için **SİZCE** kimin (**öğretmen** ya da **öğrenci**) **daha çok sorumlu olduğunu** ifade eden rakamlardan **sadece bir tanesini daire içine alınız**. Bu sorular için doğru ya da yanlış cevap bulunmamaktadır. **Vereceğiniz cevaplar gizli tutulacaktır.**

Anahtar:

Tamamen öğretmen	Kesinlikle daha fazla öğretmen	Biraz daha fazla öğretmen	Yarı yarıya öğretmen, Yarı yarıya öğrenci	Biraz daha fazla öğrenci	Kesinlikle daha fazla öğrenci	Tamamen öğrenci
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Kim daha sorumlu							
1. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce sınavına hazırlıksız olmasından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce öğrenme motivasyonundan?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce ödevlerini yapmamasından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Bir öğrencinin bir İngilizce sınavındaki başarısından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce dersine katılmaya hazırlıklı olmamasından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce ödevlerini doğru yapmasından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce dersinden iyi not almaya önem vermemesinden?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Bir öğrencinin gerektiğinde İngilizce öğrenmeye daha fazla gayret etmesinden?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce dersine dikkatini vermemesinden?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce dersinde not tutmamasından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Bir öğrencinin ödev verilen İngilizce okuma metinlerini anlamasından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Bir öğrencinin İngilizceye olan ilgisinden?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce yazma ödevlerindeki başarısından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce dersinde konsantre olamamasından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce okumalarındaki bilgileri hatırlayabilmesinden?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce dersindeki bir sınıf tartışmasını anlamamasından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce dersinde gerçekten çaba harcamamasından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Bir öğrencinin İngilizceyi gelecekteki başarısı için önemli görmesinden?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Bir öğrencinin İngilizce dersinden başarısız olmasından?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX L: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Do you think the teacher has a role in /an effect on stimulating your interest in English? If so, how?
2. Do you think the teacher has a responsibility to motivate students to learn English?
3. Do you have self-set long term and/or short term goals to improve your English? If so, what are they?
4. Do you self-evaluate your progress in English/your performance in learning English?
5. What do you do to learn and remember information presented in English class and in your English course materials?
6. Do you take notes in English class? If so, how do you study your notes? If not, why not/what do you do instead?
7. When do you start to study for an English test? (The night before? 2-3 days ago? A week ago?)
8. How do you study for an English test?
9. How confident are you in learning English?
10. What, do you think, are a student's (in-class and out-of-class) responsibilities to improve his/her English?
11. What, do you think, are an English teacher's (in-class and out-of-class) responsibilities to help students improve their English?
12. Who is more responsible for a student's improvement in English? The teacher or the student?

APPENDIX M: ÖRNEK MÜLAKATTAN BİR BÖLÜM

1. Araştırmacı: Sence öğretmenin İngilizceye karşı ilgini arttırmada, kuvvetlendirmede rolü var mıdır? Şunu demek istiyorum. Öğretmen öğrencilerin ilgisini, yani İngilizceye olan ilgisini, etkiler mi etkilemez mi? Bu konuyla ilgili ne düşünüyorsun?

Öğrenci: Bence öğretmenin çok az bir etkisi var bir öğrencinin İngilizceye olan ilgisine.

Araştırmacı: Biraz açıklayabilir misin?

Öğrenci: Mesela, matematiği çok severim ama fiziği tercih etmem. Bunda öğretmenin etkisi yok. Sadece bana zor veya kolay gelmesiyle alakalı.

2. Araştırmacı: Pekiii... Bir İngilizce öğretmenin öğrencilerin motivasyonundaki rolü ile ilgili ne düşünüyorsun? Şunu demek istiyorum. Bir öğretmenin öğrencileri İngilizce öğrenmeleri için motive etmek gibi bir sorumluluğu var mıdır?

Öğrenci: Motivasyonu yükseltebilir, her şeyi yapabilir. Bence öğretmen motivasyonu çok etkiler. Sevdirmeye açısından belki bazı öğrencilere sevdirebilir, ama öğrenciye göre değişir bu. Ama motivasyonu çok etkilediğini düşünüyorum.

3. Araştırmacı: Kendi koyduğun, İngilizcenin geliştirmek için, kısa ve uzun vadeli hedeflerin var mı?

Öğrenci: Çok var aslında.

Araştırmacı: Biraz bahsedebilir misin?

Öğrenci: Tabi. Ben ERASMUS'u düşünüyorum, başvurmayı. İngilizcemin gelişmesi için yurt dışının gerekli olduğunu düşünüyorum. O yüzden baya çalışıyorum. ... Düzenli olarak yani.

Araştırmacı: Başka hedeflerin var mı?

Öğrenci: Genelde hep yurt dışı alakalı. Bir de kurslardaki speaking derslerine gitmek istemişimdir hep. English Time mesela. Oraya gitmeyi düşünüyordum ama sonra vazgeçtim.

Araştırmacı: Neden vazgeçtin peki?

Öğrenci: Okul yüzünden. Okulla beraber başka bir şey yapmak zor olurdu.

Araştırmacı: Peki kısa vadeli hedeflerin için ne söyleyebilirsin? Var mı hiç?

Öğrenci: Yeterlik sınavını geçmek istiyorum. Başarmak istiyorum.

Araştırmacı: Peki başka?

Öğrenci: (Bekleme) Yok. Hepsi bu.

4. Araştırmacı: Tamam. İngilizcede ilerleme performansını, İngilizce öğrenme performansını değerlendiriyor musun? Şunu demek istiyorum. İngilizcede bir şey başarmak istediğinde, bir şey öğrenmek istediğinde performansını nasıl değerlendirirsin?

Öğrenci: Sınav sonuçlarıma bakıyorum genelde. Ben düz liseden mezun olduğum için kelime bilgim çok azdı. Üniversiteye başladığımda, gramer biliyordum, ortaokuldan. Ama kelime bilgim hiç yoktu. Ama şimdi baya bir kelime biliyorum. .

Araştırmacı: Peki kelime bilgini, dağarcığını nasıl geliştirdiğini düşündün mü hiç?

Öğrenci: Imm. Çok çalışıyorum. Kelime listeleri hazırlıyorum.

Araştırmacı: Yani, şunu sormak istiyorum. İngilizcede ilerlemeni gözlemliyor musun?

Öğrenci: Daha önce de söylediğim gibi sınav sonuçlarıma bakarım.

APPENDIX N: A PORTION OF A SAMPLE INTERVIEW IN ENGLISH

1. Researcher: Do you think the teacher has a role in stimulating your interest in English? I mean does the teacher affect students' interest or not? What do you think about this issue?

Student: I think the teacher has a very small role in a student's interest in English.

Researcher: Can you explain it more?

Student: For example, I like Mathematics but not Physics. It has nothing to do with the teacher. It ... is only related to whether I find it easy or difficult.

2. Researcher: Well... What do you think about an English teacher's role in students' motivation? I mean do you think the teacher has a responsibility to motivate students to learn English?

Student: The teacher can increase motivation, can do anything. I think the teacher affects motivation very much. Maybe the teacher can make some students like English, but this changes from one student to another. But I think the teacher influences motivation a lot.

3. Researcher: Do you have self-set long term and short term goals to improve your English?

Student: I have lots of [goals].

Researcher: Can you tell me about them?

Student: Yes, of course. I am thinking about applying for the ERASMUS program. I think going abroad is necessary to improve English. For this reason, I study very hard. ... Regularly, I mean.

Researcher: Do you have other goals?

Student: Generally, they are all about going abroad. Iumm. I have always wanted to go to speaking classes at private courses. English Time for example. I was thinking about going there but then I gave up the idea.

Researcher: Why did you give up?

Student: Because of school. It would have been difficult to do something else with school.

Researcher: What about your short-term goals? Do you have any?

Student: I want to pass the proficiency exam. I want to achieve it.

Researcher: What else?

Student: (Pause) None. That's all.

4. Researcher: Ok. Do you self-evaluate your progress in English/your performance in learning English? I mean when you want to achieve something in English or learn something, how do you evaluate your own performance?

Student: I generally look at my exam results. I am a graduate of a general high school, so my vocabulary knowledge was very very limited. Imm. When I started university, I knew some grammar from my secondary school, but I didn't know any words. But now I know a lot of words.

Researcher: Have you ever thought about how you have improved your vocabulary knowledge?

Student: Imm. I study hard. I prepare lists of words.

Researcher: Well... I want to ask this, how do you monitor your improvement in English?

Student: As I've said before, I look at my exam results.