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Abstract

The present work deals with the exploration of self-regulated learning in first-year classes in the Department of English at Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-ouzou. It has two main purposes. First, it explores the strategies that are used by teachers of first-year classes to help the students be self-regulated learners. Second, it investigates the extent to what first-year students are self-regulated learners. To conduct this study, the work relied on Zimmerman’s theory of self-regulation involving developing four learning skills such as time planning and management skills, text comprehension skills, classroom note-taking skills, and writing skills. The work has adopted a questionnaire addressed to teachers of first-year classes, and a classroom observation. The results show that teachers of first-year classes use some strategies of self-regulation to help the students be self-regulated learners to develop the four learning skills. The results also show that first-year students need to be motivated.
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General Introduction

• Statement of the Problem

Learning is a lifelong process through which knowledge is acquired in different fields. So, it is unavoidable and happens all the time since it can enhance our understanding of the world around us, provide us with more and better opportunities and improve our quality of life. The ability to get knowledge mainly requires the ways and the tools permitting good learning to take place. Interestingly, learning, as it was explained by Zhou Nan-Zhao (2010), is composed of its pillars. First, learning to know is ‘a process of discovery’ which takes time and involves going more deeply into information / knowledge delivered through subject teaching. It is the development of reason and the ability to think in a coherent and critical way. It means, in this perspective the more the learner learns, the more he discovers new information about his learning area where he makes cognitive efforts and have analytical skills. Second, learning to do is the ability of the learner to apply what he has learned or known into practice, in which its value is seen in its effectiveness. The third pillar of learning is learning to live together, especially in the context of globalization, the appreciation of the diversity of the human race, awareness of the similarities, respect of other people and their cultures, and competency in working towards common objectives. Said differently, the world is formed from different societies where there are varieties of thoughts, beliefs and cultures. Then, peoples’ will to create and develop push them to share knowledge through working together to fulfill their objectives.

Academically speaking, self-regulated learning could be considered as a quality of education and a process of learning that the learners can rely on when they learn. It basically focuses on the use of strategies in order to improve the learning environment. Thus, it aims at achieving effective learning results through cooperated efforts of both teachers and students.
According to Zimmerman (2002) in self-regulation, an individual utilizes cognitive, motivational, emotional, social and volitional resources (cited in Bird, 2009:29). To clarify, self-regulated learner is the learner who is able to control himself when he feels upset or sad, and able to face problems as when he gets dissatisfactory results of his study. Similarly, the same author defines academic self-regulation as the extent to which learners are metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally active students in achieving their learning goals (Zimmerman 1989). In other words, self-regulated learners have analytical skills that enable them to think about their learning, monitor their progress, and guide their actions. As language learners, the students think about their learning strategies, and they test their effectiveness in use. As a consequence, this kind of learning allows learners to become more responsible and more independent because they gain understanding of how they learn and what does and does not work well for them.

• Aims of the Study

Our aim in conducting this research is to figure out whether first-year students in the Department of English at Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou are self-regulated learners in terms of the application of the strategies to develop time planning and management skills, text comprehension skills, classroom note taking skills, and writing process skills. To investigate this issue, the present work relies on the second phase of Self-Regulated Learning that is the performance control phase developed by Zimmerman (1998) that consists of processes that happen while learning such as “social comparisons, feedback, and use of learning strategies” (cited in Schunk and Zimmerman, 2007: 4). More precisely, our concern is to study the performance of the learners in the classrooms when using strategies to develop the four learning skills of self-regulation such as time planning and management skills, text comprehension skills, classroom note-taking skills and the writing skills. At the same time,
we explore the strategies that are used by teachers of first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO to help their students to develop the four learning skills of self-regulation.

The reason for our choice to study the development of the four learning skills in first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO is that the skills according to Zimmerman, Bonner, Kovach 1996 are considered as major elements the learners should master for proficient academic learning. Then, developing test anticipation and preparation skills, as a fifth learning skill, are considered as an essential element for promoting the learning process. Nevertheless, we have not included the skill in the study because of its study which involves classifying first-year students in the Department of English at UMMTO in a limited number in order to be able to manage them to get valid data. So, we would like to explore the issue since it is not yet studied in the Department of English at UMMTO.

•Research Questions and Hypotheses

The overall aim of this investigation could be embodied in the following questions:

Q1: What are the strategies of self-regulation that teachers of the first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO use in order to help first-year students be self-regulated learners to develop the four learning skills such as time planning and management skills, text comprehension skills, classroom note-taking skills, and writing skills?

Q2: Are first-year students self-regulated learners in applying strategies to improve time planning and management skills, text comprehension skills, classroom note-taking skills, and writing skills?

To answer the two questions, we have suggested five hypotheses which are:

Hp1: Teachers of the first-year classes use all strategies of self-regulation to help the students be self-regulated to develop the four learning skills.
Hp2: Teachers of the first-year classes use some strategies of self-regulation to help the students be self-regulated to develop the four learning skills.

Hp3: Teachers of the first-year classes use none of the strategies of self-regulation to help the students be self-regulated to develop the four learning skills.

Hp4: First-year students are not self-regulated learners in applying strategies to improve the four learning skills.

Hp5: First-year students are self-regulated learners in applying strategies to improve the four learning skills.

**Research Methodology**

The methodology of the research required two research tools are: a questionnaire and a classroom observation. The participants are English teachers of first-year classes and first-year students in the Department of English at Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-ouzou. Concerning the analysis, the research relied on mixed method which consists of the quantitative and the qualitative methods of data analysis. The former help us get quantitative data whereas the latter permit us to collect, analyze, and interpret data.

**Structure of the Dissertation**

The dissertation follows the simple traditional model which consists of a general introduction, four chapters and a general conclusion. The first chapter is a review of literature that refers to previous works dealing with self-regulated learning. The second chapter is about the methodology which involves the methods and materials through which the data are collected from the participants who are teachers of the first-year classes and their students. Additionally, the third chapter presents the findings of our study in terms of statistics displayed in pie charts and bar charts. Then, the third chapter relates to the interpretation and discussion of the results and this by relating each point to some theoretical aspects.
Finally, the general conclusion provides answers to our research question as well as confirming or disconfirming our hypotheses.
CHAPTER ONE: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This section is concerned with the review of literature in which the work gives definitions of concepts relating to the research topic according to different views. These concepts involve self-regulation, cognition, meta-cognition, management strategies, motivation and affect, and behavioral area. Then, the present work tries to shed light on a number of previous studies that have dealt with self-regulation. Finally, in this section, the explanation of Zimmerman’s approach of self-regulation, which is applied in the present work, is involved.

I.1. Definition of Concepts

I.1.1. Self-Regulation or Self-Regulated Learning

It is self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are systematically designed to affect ones’ learning of knowledge and skills (Zimmerman, 2000-2001 cited in Schunk and Zimmerman, 2007:1). Similarly to Schunk and Zimmerman, Pintrich (2000) defined self-regulated learning as an active, constructive process whereby learners set goals for their learning (cited in Moseley et al, 2005: 235). That is to say, self-regulation helps learners to be autonomous and have their way of learning by using their own and appropriate strategies to reach their instructional goals.

I.1.2. Cognition

It is one area of self-regulation. It consists of goal setting, evaluating prior knowledge, and activating meta-cognitive knowledge (Pintrich, 1999 cited in Shelton, 2013:24). Three types of cognitive strategies are included. First, rehearsal strategies which are used in simple tasks (Al-Harthy and Christopher, 2010:5) and they aid at storing information in memory through the repetition of the material. Second, elaboration strategies refer to the link of the new material used with the previous knowledge. eg: paraphrasing, summarizing, note taking (Al-
Harthy and Christopher, 2010:5). Third, organization strategies help to visualize the material to ease the learning (Mayer, 2008 cited in De Boer, 2013:5). eg: outlining, and concept mapping (Al-Harth and Christopher, 2010:5).

**I.1.3. Meta-cognition**

*It is the knowledge about and the cognition of phenomenon* (Flavell, 1979 cited in De Boer, 2013:4). Meta-cognitive strategies refer to what the strategy is, how the strategy works, and when and why a strategy should be applied (Lipson and Wixson, 1983 cited in Bird, 2009:35-36).

**I.1.4. Management Strategies**

They relate to the learning setting that refer to the learner himself (eg: effort management), to others (eg: help seeking, collaborative learning), to the physical environment (eg: using dictionaries, going to library) (De Boer, 2013:6).

**I.1.5. Motivation and Affect**

It is another area of self-regulation (Pintrich, 1999 cited in Shelton, 2013:24). It means student’s beliefs, goal orientation which include a student’s reasoning for completing a given aim and perception to help reach set goals (Shelton, 2013:24). There are two types of motivational strategies. First, formulation of a learning objective that stands for the reason why one takes a task (Harackiewicz et al, 2002 cited in De Boer, 2013:6), valuing the task in which the learner assesses the task (eg: the task is less important, important, useful…etc) (Wigfield & Eccles, 2002 cited in De Boer, 2013:6). Second, the improvement of student’s self-efficacy which refers to the student’s perception on his ability to do a task (Pintrich, 2003 cited in De Boer, 2013:6).
I.1.6. Behavioral Area

It is another area of self-regulation. It involves time and effort planning, in addition to evaluation of different methods available with which to evaluate progress towards a goal (Pintrich, 1999 cited in Shelton, 2013:25).

I.2. Previous Works

I.2.1. The Effect of Self-Regulated Strategy Development on Reading and Writing Skills

To begin with, Mansoor and Seifodin (2015) have examined the effects of self-regulated strategy development, as a model of instruction to teach writing skill, on writing performance and writing motivation of Iranian EFL learners in the Faculty of Foreign Languages at the Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah Branch in Iran (p.34). In their study, the authors have provided definitions of self-regulation according to some views such as Pintrich (2000) and Zimmerman (1999). Pintrich (2000) defined self-regulation as an active and constructive process by which learners set aims for their own and try to monitor, regulate and manage their cognition, motivation, and behavior guided by their aims and the contextual features in the environment (cited in Mansoor and Seifodin, 2015:30). In addition, according to Zimmerman (1999), self-regulated learning is represented in a cycle in which each element relates to another (cited in Ibid).

Moreover, Mansoor and Seifodin defined SRSD as an approach that refers to a number of strategies. Besides, the researchers mentioned that there are two approaches in teaching of writing. The first approach refers to a product writing. It stands for the teaching of writing skill by focusing on grammar, punctuation, spelling and correct usage. The second approach of writing is the process writing which is composed of planning, drafting, revising, and editing (Seow, 2002 cited in Mansoor and Seifodin, 2015: 31).
Thus, Mansoor and Seifodin’s study reached some findings. The first finding relates to the role of self-regulated strategy development instruction which helps to promote the writing performance and motivation of pre-intermediate EFL learners. Another finding shows that the scaffolding instructions of the teachers who teach SRL strategies play an important role in enhancing the students’ writing performance (Mansoor and Seifodin, 2015: 39).

Despite the results reached, Mansoor and Seifodin’s study recognizes some drawbacks. They relate to the need of learners for explicit instruction on certain self-regulatory, and the learners need particular writing strategies to express themselves in English as a foreign language (Mansoor and Seifodin, 2015: 40).

The second study was dealt by Chalk, Hagan-Burke & D. Burke (2005: 85-86) who examined the effects of SRSD as a strategy on the writing process for higher-school students with learning disabilities (LD) in a large suburban high school in the southeastern part of United States. The results indicate that SRSD was effective, and it helps them to develop strategies for brainstorming, semantic webbing, setting goals and revising.

Nevertheless, the study recognizes some drawbacks. They consist of the lack of the control group, and the sample was neither random nor random assignment occurred. And then; the study covers only Caucasian students. So, generalizing the results caution is needed (Ibid: 86).

The last but not least study which is concerned with the effectiveness of SRSD is dealt by Ahmed El-Sayyed Sanad (2014) who investigated SRSD strategy to develop reading and writing skills in Majmaah University. In her study, the researcher speaks about reading and writing skills with reference to some views. Among them there are Manson et al (2006) who thought that students should be capable to monitor their own comprehension and apply particular strategies when necessary. Manson et al (2006) argued that good reading is based

Similar to the previous views, Chen (2009) assumed that prior knowledge affects reading comprehension in which it helps the readers to be familiar with the concepts of the text, predict the words, ask questions, make inferences, and make a summary to the text (cited in Ahmed El-Sayyed Sanad, 2014: 84). Besides, Ibrahim (2006) stated that students make a reading and react to their reading by writing compositions. He added that reading provides students with something to write about (cited in Ibid: 82).

In the end of his study, Ahmed El-Sayyed Sanad mentioned that studies that proved positive results when using SRSD in developing writing skills depended on students’ self-evaluation, self-control and self-reinforcement (cited in ibid: 93).

I.2.2. Facilitating and Promoting SRL

To begin with, Abd Majid (2007) studied self-regulated learning to examine classroom practices that help to develop SRL environment in ESL writing classes. In his study, he mentioned some theoreticians who dealt with self-regulated learning such as Bandura (1986), Shunk (1989), and Zimmerman(1986) who thought that SRL can be referred to the ability of learner to use his/her personal processes by using strategies to regulate behavior and the learning environment. Furthermore, Brown and Campione (1994) added that in SRL the
teacher is a facilitator who helps and guides the students to identify structures and all that is related to language in their essays (cited in Abd Majid, 2007: 2-6). Consequently, the results of Abd Majid’s study show “the useful insights into the actual teaching and learning practices in the writing classes with special references to self-regulated learning” (cited in Ibid).

The second study was done by Ogawa (2011) at Stockholm University, Sweden. The title of his study was “Facilitating Self-Regulated Learning: An Exploratory Case of Teaching a University Course on Japanese Society”. Ogawa explored practical strategies that can be used by university teachers to facilitate student-centered, self-regulated learning. In fact, as a teacher, the researcher developed a strategic alignment model of teaching and learning, which is a practical instructional model that can be applied regardless of the academic discipline. So, he presented an exploratory case in which the teacher supports his students by providing them with a well-programmed teaching schedule. Said differently, the scholar, as a university teacher, liked to investigate the effective role that the university teachers can play to make their students self-regulated learners. That is to say, they looked for ways to facilitate self-regulated learning activities, and then; the attitudes that they expect from their students. Intentionally, when the teacher (Akihiro Ogawa) entered to the classroom, he did not want to inform the students that his teaching methodology will depend on the theory of self-regulated learning, but he just informed them with the following:

I am going to facilitate your study of Japanese society in any way that I can. However, at the same time, I expect you to fulfill all your study related responsibilities such as completing the assigned reading, attending lectures, self-assessing your knowledge through multiple choice questions available on the course website, and writing your final essays. All these should be undertaken as part of your independent intellectual exploration of Japan. (Ogawa, 2011: 166).

Generally speaking, the researcher’s aim is to teach the students awareness of learning following a student-centered instead of teacher-centered approach in which the students take
an active and collaborative part in fulfilling self-regulated learning. In addition, strong efforts of both teachers and students create a positive environment that promotes self-regulated learning even in a large class. Thus, in self-regulated learning classrooms there will be a great academic achievement and knowledge production by the students.

The third research was conducted by Cho (2003) at the University of Missouri-Columbia. The aim of the authors’ study is to investigate the design strategies for promoting SRL skills and performance. The research results implied three things to consider when designing SRL practice and training SRL skills in online learning environments. First, college level students’ self-regulated learning skills are not something to be improved in short time periods just by forcefully having them practice activities. Interview results of this research showed that students felt a lot of obligatory responsibility because of the mandatory participation in every designed self-regulated learning activity. This led to some students’ motivation going down and being hesitant to use self-regulated learning activities.

Second, exposing students to practice self-regulated learning is not enough to promote their self-regulated learning. The students need conscious interactions with peers or with instructors about their progress. Interview results, also, showed that many students were not able to fully understand the purpose of self-regulated learning and why they were doing the activities. The interactions with others will remind them to think continuously about their activities and progresses. This will lead the students to be self-regulated and apply the acquired skills to other contexts.

Third, autonomy and responsibility should be given to students to self-regulate their own learning while they practice designed activities. The online program was intended to give as many as possible opportunities for students to practice self-regulated learning skills and feel benefits of them. However, it did not consider how students’ self-regulated learning skills are
different. For example, some students are good at resource managements while they are not good at cognitive activities. Some students are good at meta-cognitive activities while they are not good at resource managements.

Another study was dealt by Bose and Rengel (2009) at the University of Western Australia. The study entitled “A Model formative assessment strategy to promote student-centered self-regulated learning in higher education”. In their study, the authors aimed to propose a model of formative assessment strategy that integrates external (for example, computer, peer, teacher) and internal feedback (for example, self-reflexion) in order to promote Self-Regulated Learning with minimal time input from teachers.

In order to explain the relationship between formative assessment and self-regulated learning, Bose and Rengel referred to the claim of Pintrich and Zusho (2002) that self-regulated learning refers to an extent to which students can regulate aspects of their own thinking, motivation and behavior during the learning process (cited in Bose and Rengel, 2009: 30). Additionally, to promote student-centered self-regulation, all the assessments need to be restricted as formative assessments (Sadler, 1989, Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick, 2006 cited in Bose and Rengel, 2009: 30). Formative assessments are particularly aimed at generating feedback, both internal and external, on performance to improve and reinforce self-regulated learning (Sadler, 1998 cited in ibid). To emphasize their idea, Bose and Zed Rengel have taken into consideration (Pintrich, 1995; Zimmerman and Schunk, 2001) belief that students can learn to be more self-regulated learners through formative feedback (cited in Bose and Rengel, 2009: 30).

Therefore, in their opinion, higher education teachers should focus on strengthening students’ self-assessment skills (Bond, 2000; Yorke, 2003) in order to improve their learning (cited in Bose and Rengel, 2009: 30). In a broader sense, the researchers of the study suggest
the idea of Butler and Winne (1995) that self-regulated students are able to produce better feedback internally, they are more able to use the feedback they generate to reach their goals and become high achievers (cited in Bose and Rengel, 2009: 30).

Based on the mentioned assumptions, Bose and Rengel proposed a model formative assessment strategy which can be used in any teaching and learning environment to develop self-regulation among students with minimal effort and time input from the teachers. Through their work, they evaluated this strategy against seven principles of good feedback practice that develops self-regulated learning (Nicol and Macfarlane Dick, 2006 cited in Bose and Rengel, 2009: 30).

At the end, Bose and Rengel clarified that formative assessment is the key component in promoting self-regulated learning. The suggested model strategy takes into consideration existing university teaching practices such as large teaching classes, computer aided self-assessment, self-reflexion and teacher’s assessment with specific formative feedback strategies. This model strategy permits to the students to clarify their learning objectives, encourages learning conversation among teachers, peers and students. Also, it helps teachers change their teaching approaches; provides the students with ways to make them active in their own learning. Finally, it supplies them with timely formative feedback so as to develop students’ learning skills (Bose and Rengel, 2009: 30).

In addition, another important work about self-regulated learning is Costa Ferreira and Veiga Simao’s article “Teaching Practices that foster Self-regulated Learning” (2012). In the article, the case study is an elementary school teacher who changed her practices to encourage the development of self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies in her students. The work aimed at presenting a case study of an elementary school teacher who changed her practices to encourage the development of self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies in her students.
Specifically, the study described the process of how the teacher developed her teaching strategies to promote SRL strategies such as self-evaluation, goal-setting and planning, and rehearsing and memorization. The teacher’s classroom practices promoted opportunities to encourage her students to become aware of their learning process as they used these specific SRL strategies and as they executed reading and writing tasks from the curriculum of English as a Foreign Language. The results reflected the importance of developing SRL strategies in students from early years in the classroom.

The researchers referred to the claim “students struggle to learn how to learn as an objective to reach academic objectives” (Rosario, Perez, Pienda, 2004 cited in Costa Ferreira and Veiga Simao, 2012: 2). More explicitly, teaching clearly and easily self-regulated learning strategies required teachers to acquire training. Teaching such strategies is crucial for students to develop general learning skills that cross-curriculum to any academic subject (Carneiro and Veiga Simao, 2007 cited in Costa Ferreira and Veiga Simao, 2012: 2).

For the sake of improving the teaching of the learning strategies, the researchers (Costa Ferreira and Veiga Simao) proposed the challenge to a primary school teacher teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) to Portuguese’s Children to change her teaching practices, and to encourage developing self-regulated learning in her students. According to these researchers, the role of the teacher is important when developing self-regulated learning strategies in students because there is a need for systematic and common interaction between students and a skillful model such as their teacher. From an academic point of view, the researchers consider this skillful model to be the teacher and this common interaction to include consistent periods of deliberate practice. In agreement with Ericsson (2002), when expert teachers transmit and guide students in acquiring the necessary knowledge, and, consequently, the techniques needed to obtain it, students can become expert performers in their area of performance (cited in Costa Ferreira and Veiga Simao, 2012: 2). Therefore, as
Cho(2004) exemplified in his study, teachers serve as reflective and analytical example of adaptability which students can follow by basic framework of strategies in their learning environment(cited in Ibid).

According to the Portuguese National Curriculum for Primary Education-Essential Competencies(Department of Primary Education), teachers should adopt teaching methods that will allow their students to plan and organize their own learning, as well as identify, select and apply learning strategies; self-evaluate and adapt learning strategies to learning objectives; to identify and express difficulties and to be able to transfer knowledge from one context to another(cited in Costa Ferreira and Veiga Simao, 2012: 2 ).

More importantly, Costa Ferreira and Veiga Simao believe that teachers must emphasize communication practice in a meaningful context. Otherwise, students spend their time only studying grammatical rules and memorizing vocabulary other than focusing on strategies that allow them to regulate their learning. Indeed, the teacher in the case study of the mentioned research stressed that the type of work such as using the strategy of pair work and group work helped the students to get the meaning of words and memorize them because they had each other’s help.

I.2.3. Investigating the Effectiveness of SRL Strategies

To start, Effeny, Caroll, and Bahr (2013: 68) investigated the key SRL strategies and their sources used by nine school-aged adolescent males aged 15 to 17 years in Australia. The results show that the participants who are more academically capable often use many strategies than the participants who are less academically capable. Additionally, the former prefer to use strategies related to self-directed, self-initiated processes which support the autonomy while the latter prefer SRL strategies related to social sources including help-seeking from peers, teachers, and adults.
Despite the results mentioned previously, some limitations of the study are included. They consist of the limited generalization by the small sample size, and the homogeneity of the participants that are from a single boys’ school. Moreover, the limitations are found in the use of semi-structured and structured interviews during which the participants were asked to identify and reflect upon their self-regulatory habits and strategies (Effeny, Caroll, and Bahr, 2013: 69)

I.2.4. A Comparison between Regular, Evening and Distance students

To begin with, Kirmizi in (2014) made a comparison between regular, evening and distance English Language and Literature students from Turkey. To conduct his study, the researcher takes goal setting, environment structuring, time management, help-seeking, self-evaluation and meta-cognition as measurements. In his study, Kirmizi provides explanations of the measurements according to some views. For instance, first, goal setting refers to the general aims of the learners towards a course (Pintricket al., 1991 cited in Kirmizi: 447). Moreover, Thompson (1998) demonstrated that setting clear goals is considered as a valuable element in academic performance (cited in Kirmizi, 2014: 447).

The second measurement is concerned with time management which includes making a schedule, a plan, and management of an individual’s study time (Chen, 2002 cited in Ibid: 449). Zimmerman, et al. (1994) assumed that literature shows that when an individual trains on planning and managing time tend to use his/her time in an efficient way (cited in Kirmizi, 2014: 449). In addition, Noniset et al. (2006) found that the organization and management of time are among indicators for academic success (cited in Ibid: 449). Third, help-seeking is another valuable strategy for academic achievement (Kareabenick, 1998 cited in Ibid).

Then, self-evaluation, Winne and Hadwin (1998) thought that it refers to self-assessment of an individual toward a giving task. In other words, the individual assesses the strategy
he/she applies to know if it is good, and suitable for a task or not. The other element that was measured by Kirmizi is concerned with physical and social environment management which conveys effective environment management and help-seeking (Zimmerman and Risemberg, 1997 cited in Kirmizi, 2014: 449). This means that the learners tend to choose appropriate places where they can feel comfortable while learning. The last element that is measured is related to meta-cognition which includes awareness, knowledge, and control of cognition (Kirmizi, 2014:449).

In the end, the results of Kirmizi’s study showed that regular and distance groups have high-level of self-regulation while the evening group has the highest level. In addition, the results show that in comparison with other groups, successful group use more self-evaluation and meta-cognition (Ibid: 447).

I.2.5. Students’ Perception towards their Teachers

Kozanities, Desbien and Chouinard (2007) explored the perception of students towards teacher support and reaction when they ask questions on instrumental help-seeking, in Canada. In other words, the study examines how the students perceive and see teacher when they ask for help, and how he/she reacts to their questions. The results of the study show that the perception of the students towards teacher reaction on their questions has positive effects. Additionally, motivational elements have essential mediating effects on instrumental help-seeking (p: 238).

I.2.6. Self-regulation and Constructivism

First, Bird in (2009) dealt with “Developing Self-Regulated Learning Skills in Young Students”. In her study, Bird stressed the importance of providing schools with an effective professional development model. Such model is built around action research that has a
meaningful effect on teacher learning and fosters improvements in classroom practice. In other words, Bird’s study aimed to explore how teachers introduce and develop particular self-regulated learning strategies and tools in primary classrooms to improve students’ skills in self-management of learning. Particularly, it aimed to find out: how teachers integrated self-regulated learning strategies; how could self-regulated learning strategies be introduced during the learning cycle; and how different groups of students develop these learning strategies. Hence, Bird provided her explanations and analyses of the combination of principles about learning and the social constructivist theory in order to describe the environmental elements within which self-regulated learners could be developed. In order to do that, the researcher undertook an integrated inquiry learning approach. This approach to learning is based on Vygotsky’s (1978) social constructivist theory, integrated Multiple Intelligence Theory and higher-order thinking strategies. Therefore, Bird, in her investigation explained:

> When we link Vygotsky’s thinking to learning environments we see students working together in groups towards a common goal. Students are actively exchanging ideas which will promote critical thinking and enable them to learn from each other. Collaborative learning allows students to actively reconstruct their knowledge through peer-to-peer dialogue, discussing, sharing, and re-conceptualizing (Bird, 2009: 31).

For Vygotsky, the classroom culture gives the students the cognitive tools needed for development and the teacher is actively involved. The integrated inquiry learning approach provides the students with a variety of cognitive strategies that encourage them to think deeply in about a topic, supporting, guiding, and extending their thinking processes. The teacher models the strategies and facilitates the use of them by the students in order to become actively involved in learning (cited in Bird, 2009:16).

Also, the social constructivist principles in the inquiry classroom engage the learners in activities and push them to form questions about a topic and to look for answers (cited in Bird, 2009: 32). To sum up, as the scholar Bird took the responsibility for professional
development of integrated inquiry learning approach, she realized that this learning approach could provide a conductive learning environment within which to develop self-regulated learners, who will be able to use knowledge, meet challenges, solve problems, and change their practice (Ibid).

Second, in his research on “Improving Self-Regulation Skills”, Schunk (2009) referred to Vygotsky’s theory of development which provides a social constructivist account of self-regulation. Vygotsky believed that people and their cultural environments constitute an interacting social system. Through their communications and actions, people in children’s environments teach children tools (for example, language, symbols) needed for developing competence. By using these tools within the social system, learners develop higher-level cognitive functions such as problem-solving and self-regulation. Thus, self-regulated learning includes the coordination of such mental processes as memory, planning, synthesis, and evaluation. These coordinated processes do not operate independently of the context in which they are formed. A student’s self-regulated learning processes are those that are valued and taught in the culture of the students’ home and school (cited in, Schunk, 2009).

In this research, it has been noted that improvements in self regulated learning involve cognitive development and learning. In fact, as children become older, they are better able to cognitively keep interest in self-regulatory activities, such as planning, goal setting, monitoring comprehension, evaluating progress, and adjusting strategies as needed.

Furthermore, teaching is also important because students can learn to be better self-regulators. In this context, Schunk and Ertmer (2000) shows that people from different ages can be taught self-regulated learning skills, and their use of these skills improve their learning. For instance, teaching students to use goal setting can improve their self-regulated learning (cited in Schunk, 2009).
I.3. Zimmerman’s Approach of Self-Regulated Learning

Zimmerman (2000) defined self-regulation as a ‘process’ by which learners evaluate their work. Self-regulated learners “set aims, make plans to reach these aims and control their improvement” (cited in Aouine, 2011: 23). In addition, they look for information they need and how to get it, and they try to find possible ways to master it (Borkowski, Carr, Rellinger, & Pressley, Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1986, 1990 cited in Zimmerman, 1990: 14). When self-regulated learners meet problems that may prevent them from achieving their goals such as bad learning conditions and lack of understanding by their teachers, they look for solutions (Zimmerman, 1990: 14). In addition, teachers have to be conscious of the elements which affect the learners to be able to self-regulate, and to be aware of the useful strategies that help in developing self-regulated learning in the classrooms (Zumbrunn, Tadlock, Roberts, 2011: 4).

Zimmerman (1998) provided three phases of self-regulation which are “forethought, performance control, and self-reflection”. The first phase is related to ‘Forethought’ which happens before the actual performance and it conveys processes such as goal setting and modeling (cited in Schunk, Zimmerman, 2007: 4). To explain more, in this phase, the learners examine the learning task and set particular aims to complete the task. When the learners find difficulties in setting goals when dealing with unknown subjects, teachers may give the learners advice and instructions to help them (Zumbrunn, Tadlock, Roberts, 2011: 4).

The second phase is ‘performance control’ which happens while learning and it affects attention and action. It has processes such as social comparison, feedback, and the uses of the learning strategies (cited in Shunk, Zimmerman, 2007: 4). During this phase, the learners practice strategies to develop the learning task and manage how the strategies are effective, as well as considering their motivation for keeping the same level of amelioration of the task’s aims (Zumbrunn, Tadlock, Roberts, 2011: 5).
The third phase which is ‘self-reflection’ happens after the performance where the students assess and make judgments and action of their personal work (Zimmerman, 2000 cited in Aouine, 2011: 23-24). In this phase, the learners evaluate their practice of the task in relation to the appropriateness of the strategies they had chosen. Furthermore, the learners monitor their emotions about the results of their learning experience. Reflection affects the learners when they plan and set aims in the future, this may lead to the initiation of the cycle again (Zumbrunn, Tadlock, Roberts, 2011: 5).

Relying on performance control phase of SRL which is developed by Zimmerman, the present work explores the use of the learning strategies in which we try to examine the role of teachers of first year-classes in helping first-year students to be self-regulated in applying strategies to develop the four learning skills mentioned in the introduction section, and to discover whether first-year students in the Department of English at UMMTO are self-regulated learners in developing the four learning skills of self-regulation mentioned so far.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter the present work has dealt with the review of literature in which we provided definitions of concepts having connection with our topic. These concepts involve the four learning skills; that is, goal setting, organizing, self-monitoring, and self-evaluating. In addition, in our review we gave definitions of self-regulation and help-seeking. Then, in chapter we threw light on a number of previous works that have investigated self-regulation. Finally, we explained Zimmerman’s approach of self-regulation that we apply in the present work.
CHAPTER TWO: RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology section which describes the research design followed throughout this study. The research design is divided into two sections: procedures of data collection and procedures of data analysis. They are used to carry out the analyses and the interpretation of the data collected about the investigation of self-regulated learning in the first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO.

II.1. Data Collection Procedure

It deals with the description of our data tools and techniques used to analyze and interpret the findings. The present research requires two main methods to collect the data: classroom observation and questionnaires addressed to teachers of first-year classes.

II.1.1. Classroom Observation

It is a research tool which is used in classroom, and where a researcher can gather data through observable phenomena such as behavior, events, or physical characteristics in their natural settings. Observation helps the researchers to get data in which they report what is actually happening in the classroom. The setting of our observations is the first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO at the second half of the Second Semester of the year 2015.

As regards the procedure of the observations, our research needed a structured classroom observation about which we have got the permission of the teachers and we have prepared an observation scheme including the main points we explored in our research. Actually, our classroom observations were conducted during twenty four days, from May 25th until June 17th of the same year. We have attended 16 supervised practical sessions in which teachers of the first-year classes have permitted us to attend their sessions, and the number of the students was between 15 to 30 students for each group. Also, we have got the permission of four
teachers to attend their lectures in the Amphitheaters. The latter contain 5 groups in which the number of the students was 80 to 100. Our emphasis through our attendance is the students’ learning performance in the classroom and in the Amphitheaters.

II.1.2. Questionnaire

A questionnaire is a research instrument, and is “*a relatively popular means of collecting data*” (Nunan, 1986:143). It is a “*useful ways of gathering information about affective dimensions of teaching and learning, such as beliefs, attitudes, motivation, and references*” (Richards 1996: 10).

So, a questionnaire is a research instrument which includes a series of structured questions and statements. It is used by researchers to gather data from the respondents. Through the organization of the questionnaire, the researcher may measure behavioral data, attitudinal data, and factual data. A questionnaire which is a technique for data collection has strengths because the data is organized and the researcher can get a variety of answers by asking the same questions. And, Wallace (1998: 130) argued that “*a questionnaire can save time*”. However, it has some limitations such as the uncertainty of the given answers, as some participants may refuse to collaborate or neglect answering some questions.

The data for our questionnaires were got from questionnaires addressed to 20 teachers of first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO. The questionnaire of the present research includes eleven (11) questions, eight (8) of them are closed-ended questions and the four (4) others are open-ended questions. The questions are contextualized in the strategies that the teachers use when providing the students with activities, or when they evaluate the students learning behavior in the classroom.
II.2. Methods of Data Analysis

The study is both exploratory and descriptive. It is exploratory because this is clear from the beginning that the title of this investigation is *The Exploration of Self-Regulated Learning in the First Year Classes at the Department of English at UMMTO*. It is also descriptive in the way that it deeply describes the effectiveness of teaching and learning inside the classrooms, and the learners’ learning behavior outside the classrooms with relation to the implementation of the self-regulatory approach. The data for the descriptive part of this study is collected through the questionnaires which combine closed-ended and open-ended questions that aimed at measuring the four skills mentioned previously.

II.2.1. Quantitative Analysis

The application of the statistical method for the data collection makes the research more scientific, more objective, and more reliable. In order to analyze and interpret our collected data, we relied on Microsoft office Excel program to treat data and arrange it by using tables and graphs. Regarding the results of the classroom observations, we designed a table in which we classified the elements observed and the frequency of the occurrence of the items by the students.

II.2.2. Qualitative Analysis

The data collected is analyzed from the interpretative point of view. The focus is on the open-ended data where the opinions and the feelings of the participants are taken into consideration.

To conclude, this chapter has been devoted to the research methodology used in our case study. At the beginning, it has shown the research instruments used for the data collection from the questionnaires addressed to teachers of the first year classes, in addition to our observations of the first year classes. Then, this has been followed by suitable tools for the significant data analysis which mixes two research methods; the quantitative and the
qualitative methods. Consequently, the main purpose is to get answers to our research questions.
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of our research obtained from the questionnaires we distributed to teachers of first-year students and the classroom observations. The results are presented by percentage and displayed in pie charts and bar charts. This chapter has two sections. The first section is about the presentation of the findings of the teachers’ questionnaires and the second section is concerned with the presentation of the results of the classroom observation.

Results of the Teachers’ Questionnaires

These results represent the findings reached from the analysis of the teachers’ questionnaires in the Department of English at UMMTO.
Figure 1: Strategies for Time Management

In this bar chart, we can notice that the high percentage (70%) represents the number of the teachers who use the second strategy. But, the rest strategies are only represented by 5%.

Figure 2: Strategies for Reading a Text

This pie chart shows that 65% of teachers use ‘a silent reading of the text’, and only 10% and 5% of the teachers who use the other strategies.
Figure 3: Strategies for Text Comprehension

We can notice in this pie chart that the first strategy for text comprehension takes the highest percentage (90%).

Figure 4: Evaluation of Students’ Understanding of a Text.

This pie chart shows that 55% of teachers use the second proposition, and only 15% of them use the first one.
Figure 5: Evaluation in Notes Taking

In this bar chart, we notice that the majority of the students’ level is average; they are represented with the highest percentage (60%) by teachers. 25% of the students have good level, but only 10% of them, their level is bad.

Figure 6: Strategies for Notes Taking

This pie chart shows that 50% of teachers use the first strategy, and 30% of them use the second one, but only 20% use both of them.
Figure 7. Writing Essays

In this pie chart, we observe that 60% of teachers ask their students to write essays at home. But only 10% of them ask their students to write essays in the classroom.
**Figure 8: Strategies for Writing Activities**

This bar chart shows that 45% of teachers check each student’s answer before the correction, and 40% of them ask the students to give their answers after they finish doing their activities.

**Figure 9: Strategies for Correcting Activities**

In this bar chart, we observe that 50% of teachers mention the students’ mistakes orally while correcting the activities, and 25% of them write the students’ mistakes on the board.
Figure 10: Evaluation of Students’ Mistakes

In this pie chart, we can see that 55% of teachers think that students are more aware of their mistakes when they are written on the board, and 30% of them think that the students are more aware of their mistakes when they are mentioned orally.
Figure 11: Evaluation of Students’ Essays

This pie chart shows that 75% of teachers notice an amelioration of the students when they are asked to write another essay, and only 20% of them do not notice any amelioration.

Conclusion

This chapter has been devoted to the presentation of the results of teachers’ questionnaires. The results have been presented in pie charts and bar charts.
Chapter Four: Discussion of the Findings

Introduction

This chapter is about the discussion and the interpretation of the findings which were found after our study. It aims at presenting deeper analyses through relating the important points to some theoretical aspects on which our topic of investigation is based. This part embodies more explanation and clarification to the actual events in the English first-year classrooms at UMMTO and the interpretation of the responses of the questionnaires by English teachers of the first-year classes.

IV.1. Discussing the Findings of Teachers’ Questionnaires

Firstly, regarding developing time planning and management skills, the findings of teachers’ questionnaires at the department of English at UMMTO support the second hypothesis which suggests that teachers of first year- classes in the department of English at UMMTO play an important role to help first-year students to apply strategies to improve the four learning skills. This is evident according to the results which show that in developing time planning and management skills, 70% of teachers limit a period of time to the students when providing them with an exercise, and 5% of them provide the students with a free time, and 10% of teachers do the exercise together on the board. From these results, the high percentage demonstrate that teachers of the first-year classes give importance to time planning and management skills, and they encourage first-year students to be self-regulated learners to develop the skills because when the teachers manage their time in the classroom, first-year students are aware of the value of time, and they learn how successfully they do their exercises, and tasks in a limited period of time when experiencing them alone inside or outside the classroom. More importantly, first-year students also, learn from their teachers
how to plan and manage their time in an efficient way through the use of appropriate strategies. Among these strategies, scheduling, as it was mentioned in the review of literature that scheduling and managing ones time are components of time management (Chen, 2002 cited in Kirmizi, 2014: 449). This is evident in accordance to Nonis et al., (2006) who suggested that when a learner organizes and manages his/her time, they help him/her in his/her academic achievements (cited in Kirmizi, 2014: 44).

Furthermore, the result obtained from teachers’ questionnaires are agreed with Zimmerman, et al., 1994 who thought, as it was mentioned in the review of literature, that when an individual used to control and manage his/her time, this helps him/her to succeed in his/her studies (cited in Kirmizi, 2014: 449). And this is what self-regulated learning aims to achieve. So, this may become as a habit for first-year students in their learning process. But, when the teachers do not take into account the importance of time planning and management, first-year students acquire bad habits from their teachers, and do not make efforts to plan and manage their time. To illustrate this idea, when a teacher provides first-year students with an exercise that takes 10 minutes, but the teacher does not limit the students time for the exercise as it was mentioned in results of teachers’ questionnaires that 5% of teachers of the first-year classes provide their students with free time for an exercise. Thus, the students do not do it seriously, and instead of concentrating on the exercise, the students discuss together out of topic, or do things which have no relation to learning such as playing on their mobiles. So, this is considered as a negative point for self-regulation in which it prevents the students from being self-regulated learners in developing time planning and management skills.

Secondly, regarding developing text comprehension, the results of teachers’ questionnaires show that 65% of the teachers ask first-year students for a silent reading of a text. According to the teachers’ answers, using the silent reading strategy helps first-year students to get a general idea, and have a full understanding of the text (see Appendix A).
Furthermore, a silent reading permits to each of the students to get some new information (see Appendix A) that can be added to their previous knowledge about the topic. In the review of literature, this idea is agreed with Kondrate (2009) who argued that when a learner reads well, his/her good reading leads to positive results where he/she is able to get new information, rich vocabulary, and develop the writing process (cited in Sanad, 2014: 83). As a result, from the findings reached from teachers’ questionnaires, when teachers of first-year classes use the strategy of asking their students to read a text silently, this strategy helps the students to be self-regulated learners to improve text comprehension skills through the acquisition of rich vocabulary and new information about the text.

Contrary to the use of a silent reading by the teachers, the results show that 10% of the teachers use a loud reading of a text as a strategy. Indeed, this low percentage can refer to the inability of first-year students in understanding the language used by the student who is reading a text. This lack of understanding may be due to his/her mispronunciation since, as it was stated in the review, Manson et al., (2006) argued that a good reader is familiar with structures, previous knowledge, and sufficient vocabulary (cited in Sanad, 2014:83). Yet, the loud reading strategy is still used by a number of teachers of first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO since according to their answers, they thought that a loud reading aids first-year students to participate, and check their pronunciations and their reading skills (see Appendix A).

Besides to a silent reading strategy which helps first-year students to understand a text, the results show that teachers of first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO use other strategies in developing text comprehension skills. These strategies are presented with different percentages. For instance, 90% of the teachers use the strategy of asking their students questions related to the text. And 0% of the teachers use the strategy of explaining the text themselves. According to the teachers’ answers, using the strategy of asking their
students questions related to the text aids the students to think critically; to be autonomous learners; to be able to give answers by using their own skills; and to stimulate their brain and make them express and believe themselves (see Appendix B).

Moreover, the teachers think that using the strategy of asking the students questions related to the text helps them to check their understandings of the text through the silent reading. So, the aim of using the silent reading strategy by the teachers is to assess its effectiveness on students’ understandings of texts through their answers. To argue, Davis& Gray (2007) stated that the interpretation of the text is based on the use of self-regulated strategies by the learner (cited in Sanad, 2014: 83-84). However, when teachers of the first-year classes use the other strategy which relates to the explanation of the text themselves, first-year students seem to be passive learners, and wait everything from their teachers, rather than being active learners who check their understandings themselves, and look for help from their teachers when necessary. To clarify this point, in accordance to what is mentioned in the review of literature, Manson et al., (2006) thought that students ought to be responsible for their comprehension and use corresponding strategies when needed (cited in Sanad, 2014:83).

Finally, the results of teachers’ questionnaires state that 55% of teachers of the first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO use another strategy for helping first-year students to apply strategies to develop text comprehension skills; this strategy refers to asking first-year students to summarize the text orally. Relying on the teachers’ answers, when using this strategy by the teachers, it seems as an opportunity for the students to have an immediate evaluation of their understandings by their teachers in order to help them to explain again the text when necessary. And, as another strategy, 15% of the teachers ask their students to write a summary of the text. In this case the students can do the summary in pair, or in group.
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As far as developing notes-taking skills is concerned, the results of the teachers’ questionnaires demonstrate that 60% of the teachers answer that the level of first-year students in taking notes is average. And, 25% of them answer that the level of the students is good, and 10% of them answer that the level of the students is bad. According to the teachers’ answers, the reason behind the high percentage which represents that the level of first-year students is average is that, though first-year students take notes by using brainstorming, abbreviations, and highlighting…etc which aid them to acquire knowledge and get briefly much information in a limited period of time, the students still recognize some difficulties, for instance, the students do not know how to select main ideas. In such situation, first-year students cannot be self-regulated learners to develop notes-taking, so they need their teachers to give them a help and this is what the findings of teachers’ questionnaires state in which 50% of the teachers interfere, and show the students the way they use the strategies efficiently by giving them instructions. For example, the teachers show their students how to select main ideas from a text, and the way the students have to apply appropriate strategies for them.

Finally, concerning the findings achieved from teachers’ questionnaires of first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO in helping first-year students to apply strategies to develop writing skills, the y show that 60% of the teachers ask their students to write an essay at home. According to their answers, this strategy helps the students to remember well what they have done in the classroom, and they take their time to write it at home. Also, the results show that10% of the teachers ask the students to write an essay in class. On the one hand, writing essays in the class aids first-year students to ask their teachers and their peers for something to be clarified. So, this can be considered as a positive point in self-regulation. From the other hand, writing essays in class causes insufficient time to do them properly. To illustrate this idea, it is mostly happened that many students when they write their essays in the class, they write them in a shallow way. This means that, when the
students write essays in class, the students do not take their essays into account in which they do not make efforts for them. However, when the students write their essays at home, they feel more comfortable since they have all the time to evaluate, revise and change their writings in the aim of succeeding to write coherent essays. This kind of writing, as it was mentioned in the review of literature, can be related to a process called writing approach which is composed of planning, drafting, revising, and editing (Seow, 2002 cited in Mansoor and Seifodin, 2015:31

In their writing, when first-year students do their essays at home, they sometimes find difficulties, in such situation, the students look for a help since the latter is considered as an essential strategy in academic success (Kareabenick, 1998 cited in Kirmizi, 2014: 449). This help can be from their parents, or using other materials for example books, dictionaries to improve their writing. Besides, the results of the teachers’ questionnaires show that the teachers use another strategy to help first-year students to apply strategies to develop writing skills in which 45% of the teachers check each student’s answer before the correction of the writing activities. But, there is a little difference between the teachers who apply this strategy with 40% of the teachers who use another strategy which refers to let the students finish their activities, and then; the teacher asks them to give the correct answer. According to their answers, in self-regulation, it is evident that both of the teachers, who use the two different strategies that are mentioned previously, help first-year students to learn how to give, and write answers appropriately. According to the teachers’ answers, from the one hand, using the first strategy by the teachers which is related to check each student’s answer before the correction of the writing activities is more useful since first-year students benefit from their teachers’ instructions, and have immediate correction. From the other hand, using this strategy by the teachers is very difficult because of the large classes which contain almost 20 to 30 students. Consequently, teachers of first-year classes cannot succeed to check each student’
answer because of short time. However, according to the teachers’ answers, the second strategy which is related to let the students finish their activities, and then; the teacher asks them to give the correct answer, is also useful in which the teachers can gain time when all the students do their activities and then give their answers.

Furthermore, in developing writing skills, the results of teachers’ questionnaires show that after doing the writing activities, 50% of teachers of first-year classes mention the students’ mistakes orally, and 25% of the teachers write the students’ mistakes on the board. According to the teachers’ answers, on the one hand, when teachers of first-year classes mention the mistakes of their students orally, this considered as a good strategy to make first-year students be interested in the topic, and remember the mistakes they made (see Appendix C). From the other hand, first-year students do not consider their mistakes so; they could make them in the future.

But, when the teachers write the mistakes of their students on the board, this strategy aids first-year students to check the spelling mistakes, and be aware of the effectiveness of the mistakes’ corrections. This kind of writing can be related to the second type of writing which is called: a product writing approach which relates to teaching some structures such as grammar, punctuation, spelling and correct usage in writing process (Seow, 2002 cited in Mansoor and Seifodin, 2015:31). Also, when the students write down their mistakes, they can refer to them in the future (see Appendix C).

Additionally, the results of teachers’ questionnaires show that 55% of the teachers thought that the students are more aware of their mistakes when they are written on the board, and 30% of the teachers thought that the students are more aware of their mistakes when they are mentioned orally. According to the teachers’ answers, writing the students mistakes on the board encourages self-regulation where the strategy aids the students to concentrate, and
know the type of mistakes they make in order to avoid them in the coming activities (see Appendix C). To finish with the last strategy in developing writing skills, the results of teachers’ questionnaires state that 75% of the teachers notice that first-year students show ameliorations when providing them to write another essay. According to their answers, this high percentage means that first-year students have benefited from the instructions and the strategies provided by their teachers, and know how to apply them to improve the writing skills. As it was mentioned previously in the review, this kind of assessment can be related to what Sadler (1998) referred to formative assessments which are particularly aimed at generating feedback on performance to improve and reinforce self-regulated learning (cited in Bose and Rengel, 2009: 30). To illustrate this idea, Brown and Campione (1994) thought that in SRL, the teacher facilitates the learning process, and he/she helps the students to know more about structures and all what is related to language in their essays, thus the students can show effective results from their teacher’s instructions (cited in Abd Majid, 2007:2-6).

IV.2. Discussing the Findings of the Classroom Observation

In this part we aim at analyzing the results of classroom observation. In other words, we examine whether first-year students in the Department of English at UMMTO are self-regulated learners in terms applying strategies which are developed by Zimmerman Barry, consisting of ‘social comparisons’, ‘feedback’, and ‘use of learning strategies’ (Schunk and Zimmerman, 2007: 4) in order to develop the four learning skills of self-regulation. The study also shed light on the strategies of self-regulation used by teachers to help first-year students be self-regulated in order to develop the four learning skills.

The important point that has attracted our attention in the results of the classroom observations is that there are few students who have been involved in developing the four learning skills, such as time planning and management skills, developing text comprehension
skills, developing classroom note-taking skills, and developing the writing skills, as well as being good performers in the classroom. The students’ learning behavior could be justified through the fact that such learners think of the teacher as a facilitator of the learning process, in which they take an active and collaborative part, and such learners have awareness that getting successful results is their responsibility as learning endeavors. Consequently, the learners will ameliorate their language performance. The result is in accordance with Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach (1996)’s claim that the achieved learning results is not a total matter of educators, but there could be other sources that interfere such as peers, parents, the media. This could be considered as an important factor which assists in developing self-regulated learning by first-year students.

To analyze the data of classroom observation, stress is on the four learning skills of self-regulation developed by Zimmerman (1996). Firstly, developing time planning and management skills are very important as they help the students develop their academic learning. Even though we did not have the opportunity to get the students' time recordings outside the classroom, we found it reliable to observe the students inside the classrooms. In this context, it is important to mention that we have attended sixteen (16) practical sessions for all the modules.

**IV.2.1. Developing Time Planning and Management Skills**

Through the results of our observations, we could see, on the one side, that the high percentage (85%) is the percentage of the first-year students who could be seen attentive in their planning and management time, in which they always try to be present in the located time in the classroom, and only 15% of them are not attentive at all concerning their presence in time in the classroom. On the other hand, our findings show that only 5% of the students always plan and manage their time. This means that very few students make efforts to manage
their time when they do their homework and activities in the classroom. In this concern, there are also other students who are less attentive in their time planning and management. For instance, 22% of the students often develop their time planning and management skills, 12% of the students sometimes develop their time planning and management skills, 15% rarely develop their time planning and management skills, and 46% of the students are not attentive at all when developing time planning and management skills (see the results above). So, these results are not in accordance with Ogawa’s (2011) claim that a university teacher who teaches self-regulated learning to his/her students should draw the attention of the students to show their responsibility for their own learning.

Interestingly, we have also observed that first-year students in the Department of English at UMMTO have self-regulatory problems. That is to say, the majority of the students in the classrooms seem to be slightly motivated. This is evidently noticed by the teachers in the first-year classes where they try each time to make the students active in the practical sessions through asking them questions. In this concern, Zimmerman and Martinez Pons, (1988) argued that “research suggest that most teachers are aware of their students who have self-regulatory problems” (cited in Zimmerman et al., 1996: 6). So, lack of motivation has negative effects on students’ self-regulated learning. Thus, teachers of first-year classes should train their students in practical situations, especially when conducting activities in the classroom.

It is worth indicating that the difference in the percentages concerning the students’ time planning for doing activities in the classroom may be referred to two reasons. On the one hand, the difference lies in students’ cognitive abilities and, on the other hand, the difference in the extent of the student’s being interested in doing the activities. So, this can be explained that the percentage 5% represents the students who have cognitive abilities to recognize answers of activities in an easy way; in addition, these students are those who are motivated to
and interested in developing the skills to learn the language. However, the percentage 46% represents the students who are careless to make cognitive efforts in order to be active students who finish their activities on time. In this context, Cho (2003) claimed in his study that while they practice designed activities, students should be left to feel independent and responsible so as to self-regulate their own learning. As a matter of fact, our observations of the first-year classes demonstrate that first-year students do not understand the purpose of doing some activities. That is why, this affects their understandings. As a consequence, this case has negative effects on the students’ regulation of their time.

Another fact in the first-year classes, in all the sessions that we attended the students did not show respect of time management concerning the arrival in the located time to the classroom. In fact, as the results show, in each session, there is approximately from four to five students who arrive late after the first fifteen or twenty minutes of the period of the session. Thus, this could be considered as a negative effect for the learners learning methodology. Said differently, the students who arrive late to the session, they will waste part of it. Then, they will be confused because they will not understand the lessons’ part coherently.

The findings of the data we obtained from our observations in the first-year classes demonstrate that the students do not really care about their study time. More clearly, they do not make efforts to profit from some minutes left after the teacher ends his lecture, where they have the opportunity to ask their teachers questions to get more clarifications about their lessons. But, the behavior of asking questions is rare in the first-year classes. In this case, the results are in agreement with Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons (1992)’s claim that it is important to mention that poor time management may reflect deficiencies in behavioral, environmental or personal self-regulatory processes.
Regarding the theoretical lectures, the learning atmosphere is a little bit different from the practical ones since the students feel a kind of freedom in their learning behavior. More explicitly, the students sometimes lose their concentration since they discuss topics related to their daily lives which have no relation to the lectures. That is why the students need to get instructions from their teachers in order to be aware of keeping themselves concentrated on the lectures. As to the students’ attendance time in the lectures, we found 75% of the students always arrive on time, and 25% of them never respect the arrival time to attend the lectures. Accordingly, it is important to bear in mind that the students’ awareness of the use of study time is the primary step that they should take into account to develop self-regulated learning.

Another attendance in a practical session was about teaching study skills in which the teacher asked the students to give much importance to time management. He explained the difference between weekly planning, monthly planning, and yearly planning. The teacher tries to draw the students’ attention to the importance of practicing such concepts in their academic learning. Though the explanation of the three concepts is important, no student asked a question about them, and as it is known asking questions is an important strategy for learning. To make the case clearer, it is important to refer to the Portuguese National Curriculum for Primary Education-Essential Competencies (Department of Primary Education) which was cited in the work of Costa Ferreira and Veiga Simao (2012), the methodology that is used by the teachers when teaching self-regulated learning should be built on some characteristics that will permit to the students to plan and organize their learning, as well as discover, choose, and practice learning strategies; self-evaluate and change learning strategies to fit the learning objectives, then, to discover and express difficulties and to be able to use knowledge in different contexts.
IV.2.2. Developing Text Comprehension Skills

Developing text comprehension skills is also an important part of academic learning. The results of our classroom observations of the practical sessions show that only 5% of the students often make efforts to develop their text comprehension in the classroom. 4% of them sometimes develop their text comprehension. In addition, 1% of the students rarely do. The greatest percentage of the students, represented by 89%, do not make efforts to understand texts in the classroom. The strategy used by the teachers of the first-year classes in text comprehension is asking students for a silent reading first, at the same time they ask them to use dictionaries to get the meaning of words, and then they ask for a loud reading by some students in the classroom. For example, when the teacher asks the students questions about the text, it is the same students who often raise their hands to give their answers. The other students ask their teacher for clarification of terms. Thus, the teacher interferes to provide the students with clarifications about the text. Zimmerman (1996) proposed some selected reading comprehension strategies for self-regulated learners to understand textual material. For instance, reading carefully the text, checking and rereading the meaning if it is unclear. Besides, asking themselves questions to understand the deeper meaning. Then, finding the main idea through analyzing passages.

Interestingly, other demonstrations in this context have been taken from the observations during the correction of tests, and exams in five sessions concerning the modules of reading writing comprehension and study skills. In fact, the teachers noticed a problem that is the students’ incapability to distinguish between topic sentence and main ideas, and extracting the supporting ideas from a text influences their note-taking and note-making to build spider diagram. That is to say, the teachers try to draw the students’ attention to the importance of keeping the same meaning when paraphrasing or summarizing. This fact does not incorporate
Manson et al (2006)’s idea that in developing self-regulated learning strategies, the students should monitor their own comprehension and apply particular strategies when necessary. The authors proved that an efficient reading is based on background knowledge whose mastery of vocabulary is fundamental, and motivation for reading.

Moreover, what we have noticed in our observations is that the strategy which was used by first-year students when reading texts is the use of dictionaries and digital technologies, such as mobiles…etc as learning materials in order to understand vocabulary. We also noticed that the teachers of first-year classes use the strategy of writing diagrams, brainstorming and drawings on the board to explain the lessons and the correction of activities for their students. For example, in a grammar session, the teacher was asked by the students to give the meaning of the word “to rake” on a handout. The strategy which was used by the teacher to explain the meaning of the word was drawing on the board the shape of what the word means. Similarly to the theoretical lectures, teachers of the first-year classes insist on the importance of understanding the content of the handouts they distribute for the students. Such a situation is shown in our results which reveal that 4% of the students often discuss their understanding of texts with the teacher, 93% of them rarely been seen to read the handouts, and 3% of the students never read the handouts (see the results above).

Another instance for developing text comprehension skills is concerned with our attendance in a practical session for reading writing comprehension. For instance, on June 17th, 2015, from 8 to 9:30am, the group included 21 students. The teacher has already asked each group of students to read a short story and summarize it, then expose it orally in front of the teacher and the students. Importantly, the aim of the teacher was to let the students develop their language vocabulary, reading comprehension, fluency in speaking the English language, and the appropriate use of tenses, in addition to developing their writing skills. In fact, this situation is in accordance with Costa Ferreira and Veiga Simao (2012)’s view that it
is important for the students to use strategies to regulate their own learning as, for instance, to learn grammar rules and to memorize vocabulary. However, this is not enough to have communicative competence. Thus, teachers have to contextualize the language they teach their students in order to give meaning to their communication. In addition, the teacher in the case study of Costa Ferreira and Veiga Simao’s research (2012) stressed that pair work and group work which help the students to get the meaning of words and memorize them relying on each other’s help. Teachers of the first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO use this type of strategy in their teaching. Such a strategy helps the students to be motivated in the classroom because group work is very beneficial to the students. So, this has positive effects on the students’ learning process because it enhances their self-regulated learning.

Importantly, our analysis of the observations of first-year classes have also drawn our attention to Bird (2009)’s work on the combination of principles about learning and the social constructivist theory in order to describe the learning environments where self-regulated learning could be developed. So, in Bird’s opinion, involving students in group work permits them to share knowledge through discussing their ideas. Consequently, the students can promote their own thinking. As a matter of fact, we have noticed in first-year classes that the levels of the students’ learning competencies are different, and this was shown in their performances in the oral expression and their participation in the classroom. Also, we noticed that the students were given a group work or an individual work, their motivation in practice was not the same. For example, when exposing a group work in classroom, each member of that group tries to play an active role in expressing his/her own understanding of the work. But, when it was an individual work, there was a kind of hesitation by some students to collaborate effectively. So, the students’ learning behavior when involved in group work is in agreement with Bird’s (2009) thought we explained above.
Another fact in first-year classes is that in each group of a practical session, we found that about four or five students are confident in their performances. That is to say, they answer the teachers’ questions; they are motivated and participate in the correction of activities in the classroom without hesitation. In addition, they express themselves and give their opinions about different subjects in different situations. By contrast, we observed other students who did not participate in the correction of written activities or in the oral sessions. For instance, through our attendance to three oral sessions on May 16th, June 2nd and June 16th, we noticed that the teachers try to facilitate their communication with the students. Said differently, they always try to make them feel psychologically at ease. So, the teachers give the learners opportunities to talk about free topics as a strategy for teaching the learners the oral skill. There were students who liked to talk about themselves such as their journeys, hobbies, but there were others who did not speak at all even they were asked by the teacher, and they could not express themselves. In this case, the students’ hesitation may be referred to psychological factors such as shyness, anxiety, and lack of motivation or other factors such as the lack of vocabulary.

As we have also seen, vocabulary was not considered by some students as a problem which prevents them from expressing their ideas in the classroom. For instance, in the group of oral session (13 students) that we have attended on June 16th from 8 am to 9:30 am, there were three students who were not good at vocabulary, but they tried to talk about the subjects they chose, and the teacher interrupted them from time to time to correct their language errors and find the appropriate terms to express their ideas. However, the other students who are found in more percentage are hesitant to speak. So, they seem passive performers in the oral sessions. Hence, the students should be prepared and guided by the teachers to be self-regulated learners since self-regulated learning was defined by Ogawa (2011), as the students’ awareness of learning as being a student-centered instead of the teacher-centered where the
students take an active and collaborative part in fulfilling self-regulated learning. This means that self-regulated learning process involves the efforts of both teachers and the students.

A point worth mentioning about our classroom observations is that the teachers draw the attention of students to focus on the important points that they have already studied in the lectures to prepare themselves for exams. Such an instance shows that teachers of the first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO provide their students with ways to learn. For example, our observation of study skills session on June 16th from 11 am to 12:30 am (20 students), just after his arriving to the classroom, the teacher asked the students if they have read short stories and summarized them. He advised them to read the novel which is entitled *Animal Farm*. Then, he told them to learn the deeper meaning of stories they read. Since it was a study skills session, the teacher found it interesting to remind the students about the importance of reading, in which he encouraged them to do trainings in order to enlarge their understandings of the language. In brief, reading is considered as a good strategy for learners to develop their language competence; something which is closely related to self-regulated learning. Kondrate (2009) in Sanad (2014) added that effective reading promotes the acquisition of new information, rich vocabulary and improves the writing process. In other words, reading will help first-year students and push them to write because they gain vocabulary which let them express their thinking.

**IV.2.3. Developing Classroom Note-taking Skills**

It is to be indicated that in our observations of first-year students’ behavior in both the practical and the theoretical sessions, we found that the percentages of the students who take notes are less than those who do not. On the one hand, we found that in the practical sessions 6% of the students always take notes while the teacher explains orally or by writing on the board, and 6% of them often take notes, 14% of the students sometimes do, 6% of them are
rarely interested in taking notes, and 65% of the students never do (see the results above). This means that first-year students are not aware of classroom note-taking process. Accordingly, in relation to the principle of note-taking, self regulated learning is to be found only in the minority of the first-year students.

Moreover, we noticed that during the sessions, the teachers of first-year classes remind their students of the importance of taking notes when the teacher explains his lesson. As soon as the students hear that from the teacher, they will follow him, but they do not use their cognitive strategies to take down notes. This means that the students could not distinguish the main ideas from the supporting ones. That is to say, the learners need to use cognitive learning strategies and training on self-regulatory strategies in the classroom. As it is stated by Garcia and Pintrich (1994) that the self-regulation strategies involve cognitive learning strategies and self-regulatory strategies to control cognition. The first type of strategies composed of elaboration and organizational strategies. Paraphrasing or summarizing the material to be learned, creating analogies, generative note-taking and connecting ideas in students’ notes are part of elaboration strategies. The second type of strategies consist of behavior such as extracting the main idea from a text, outlining the text or material to be learned, and using a variety of specific techniques for selecting and organizing the ideas in the material (cited in Nikos Mousoulides & George Philippou, 2005: 322).

Another point to stress is that the results of the theoretical lectures show that only 2% of the students always take notes, 6% of them often take notes, 5% of the students sometimes do, 23% of them rarely do, and 63% of the students never take notes. The low percentages of the students who develop note-taking are concerned with the theoretical sessions we have attended such as Linguistics, Anthropology, Literature, and Civilization in which we have found that most learners were following the lectures, but they do not take notes while the teacher is explaining, they just take down what the teacher dictates. In fact, we have seen that
many teachers repeated for the students from time to time the statement “please, you take notes!” Sometimes, as we have noticed, the learners do not know what should be and what should not be written down. Noticeably, the problem for the students is the recording process. This case could be justified by the fact that the majority of the students follow the teacher, but they do not take notes.

Another teaching strategy that is used by teachers of the first year classes is asking the students at the end of the session if they have questions, but the students rarely ask them. In this context, it is important to indicate that it is very interesting for first-year classes during the practical sessions, to create ‘self-regulatory exercise’ where learners work in small peer groups to exchange notes and compare them. Consequently, as it has been stated by Zimmerman et al (1996) the students will develop their own ‘recording strategies’ and ‘revision strategies’ of note-taking that will effect positively their performance on tests, then help them to achieve successful results in their own learning.

**IV.2.4. Developing Writing Skills**

Finally, the results for the development of writing skills demonstrate that only 3% of the students often develop their writing skills as regards their capability to do activities well in the classroom. 7% of the students sometimes do, and 7% of the students rarely participate in the classroom. More importantly, 83% of the students never participate in the classroom. So, these results about first-year students are contextualized in homework and classroom activities concerning paragraph writing and sentence combining. To illustrate the idea, teachers whom we attended their practical sessions for teaching the writing skills ask their students to write paragraphs in the classroom. In this concern, we noticed that first-year students use the strategy of discussing the topic between them; they help each other in suggesting the vocabulary, for instance. Later, after fifteen or twenty minutes, the teachers ask a student to
write his/her own paragraph to correct it on the board, and ask the other students to carry on writing their paragraphs at home. But sometimes, in the following session, they will not come back to the correction. So, first-year students were not given opportunity to assess the effectiveness of their writing strategy. Actually, the 3% and the 7% of the students are found motivated in the classroom in which they get the feedback of the teacher. For instance, our attendance in the first-year classroom on May 31st of the module of reading writing comprehension from 12:30am to 14:00pm where there were 29 students, we found that the teacher gave them an exercise to do about the combination of sentences by using comparison and contrast conjunctions in a limited period of time. The correction was after 10 minutes. But, she asked for the correction just after 7 minutes. What we have noticed was that the teacher corrected the exercise on the board with the students where she focused on the structure of the sentence and its meaning. For example, she asked a student to write a sentence on the board. He wrote: Unlike Italy has only one major spoken language, Haiti has two. The teacher draws the students’ attention to a missing word in the sentence which is “that”. Then, she corrected it on the board: Unlike Italy that has only one major spoken language, Haiti has two. Teachers of the first-year classes write the students’ mistakes on the board and circle spelling mistakes as a strategy to draw the students’ attention to their mistakes which they should avoid next time. In the same context, when the first-year student is asked by the teacher to write his/her own paragraph on the board, the teacher asks the other students in the classroom to correct mistakes or to suggest appropriate terms or expressions to express the meaning. Through this strategy, the teacher aims at giving opportunities to other students to participate. Therefore, the strategy involves self-regulated learning.

The analysis demonstrated that the role which the teachers of the first-year classes play is in accordance with Seow (2002)’s claim in (Mansoor and Seifodin, 2015) that in the context of applying Self-Regulated Strategy Development Approach, it exists two approaches of
teaching writing which are product and process writing. The first means teaching of writing skills that focus on grammar, punctuation, spelling and correct usage. The second refers to writing which is formed by different parts such as planning, drafting, revising and editing. Teachers teach their students writing systematically. Yet, the negative aspect of the results is that the percentage of 83% of the students who are not motivated in their performance reflects negatively their self-regulation in learning. About improving self-regulation skills, Dale Schunk (2009) emphasized that allowing students to regulatory evaluate their learning capabilities raises their self-efficacy, motivation to use self-regulated learning strategies.

It is necessary to mention that first-year students did not appear interested in evaluating their learning capabilities. To clarify, during the correction of tests and exams, it was the teachers who tried each time to get the students’ attention to the importance of following carefully the correction to avoid their mistakes in the future. Schunk (2009) insists on the importance of providing the students with instructions and demonstrations in the classroom to help them ameliorate their self-regulated learning strategies, and create their own effective strategies. That is why, it is very interesting for first-year students to write down their mistakes during the correction as a strategy to remember and develop their writing skills.

To sum up, through the discussion and the analysis of the classroom observation results we intended to figure out whether the first-year students are self-regulated learners in implementing strategies to develop the four skills which are mentioned in “Self-regulatory Cycle” designed by Zimmerman Barry (1996). Also, we have examined whether the teachers of first-year classes help the students in applying strategies to develop the four skills.

Conclusion

Through the analysis of the results of the teachers’ questionnaires and the data collected from the classroom observations, we deduce that teachers of first-year classes use some
strategies of self-regulation to help students to develop the four learning skills. Nevertheless, the students need to be motivated in applying strategies to develop the four learning skills.
General Conclusion

The present work has explored self-regulated learning strategies in the first-year classes in the Department of English at UMMTO. To investigate this issue, the dissertation includes a general introduction, four chapters and a general conclusion.

In the general introduction, we have explained the aim of our work which first refers to the investigation of the strategies of self-regulation used by teachers of the first year classes in the Department of English to help first year students be self-regulated to develop time planning and management skills, classroom note-taking skills, text comprehension skills, and writing skills. Second, it concerns whether first year students are self-regulated in applying strategies to develop the four learning skills.

To carry out our research, we have asked two research questions. The first research question relates to the strategies of self-regulation that teachers of the first-year classes use in order to help their students be self-regulated learners to develop the four learning skills. The second research question relates to whether first-year students are self-regulated learners in applying strategies to develop the four learning skills. To answer these two questions, we have suggested five hypotheses. The first hypothesis suggests that teachers of the first-year classes use all strategies of self-regulation to help their students be self-regulated to develop the four learning skills. The second hypothesis suggests that teachers of the first-year classes use some strategies of self-regulation to help their students be self-regulated to develop the four learning skills. The third hypothesis suggests that teachers of first-year classes use none of the strategies of self-regulation to develop the four learning skills. As to the fourth hypothesis, it suggests that first-year students are not self-regulated learners in applying strategies to develop the four learning skills. The fifth hypothesis suggests that first-year students are self-regulated learners in applying strategies to develop the four learning skills.
As regards the first chapter, it is devoted to the review of the literature. Indeed, we have given some definitions of concepts in relation to our topic including self-regulation, cognition, meta-cognition, management strategies, motivation and affect, and behavioral area. Also, we have mentioned a variety of works which have been conducted by many researchers about self-regulated learning. In addition, in this chapter, we have explained the theory followed in the current study which is Zimmerman’ theory of self regulated learning (1998) in which we have mainly focused on the second phase of self-regulated learning; *Performance control* by exploring one of its processes which is the learning strategies (Shunk and Zimmerman,2007:4).

The second chapter of our research is concerned with the research design in which we have explained the methods adopted and the research tools used for data collection. To be clearer, we have adopted both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The quantitative method is used to collect statistical data by using numbers, and the qualitative method is used to collect non-statistical data such as the opinions of the participants. Also, we have used two research tools which are a questionnaire addressed to twenty two teachers of first-year classes, and classroom observations where we have attended all first-year classrooms as concerns all the modules.

Moreover, the third chapter presents the findings of the present work. Contrary to the first and the third hypotheses, the results support the second hypothesis that suggests that teachers of the first-year classes in the Department of English use some strategies of self-regulation to help first-year students to develop the four learning skills; that are, time management, reading comprehension, note-taking, writing skills. This is evident according to the results obtained from teachers’ questionnaires that the teachers use some strategies for instance; first, in developing time management skills 70% of teachers give free time for exercises. Second, in developing notes taking skills, half of teachers let their students use their own strategies.
Third, in developing text comprehension skills, 65% of teachers ask their students for a silent reading, and 90% of them ask questions related to the text. Finally, in developing writing skills, 45% of teachers check each student’s answer before the correction. Besides, according to our attendance of classroom observation, we have found that most teachers basically use other strategies such as drawing on the board for more explanation, translation, repetition, asking for the use of dictionaries. More importantly, the results of the present work disconfirms the fourth and the fifth hypotheses, they show that first-year students need to be motivated in applying strategies to develop the four learning skills. This is reflected in the results of the classroom observations that show the low percentages (see Appendix D). For instance, percentages 46%, 89%, 65%, 83% represent the frequency ‘never’ and the percentage 63% represents the frequency rarely about students’ use of self-regulated learning strategies that mainly include arriving on time, doing exercises in pair, asking teachers for explanation and clarification, highlighting, ask each other for clarification, and revising their wittings.

The last chapter is concerned with discussion. In this chapter we have deeply discussed and analyzed the results of teachers’ questionnaires and the classroom observations. Our discussion has been carried out relying on Zimmerman’s theory of self-regulation. In addition, recourse to the review of the literature has been made in order to be clearer in our analysis of the findings.

Finally, the last section is concerned with a general conclusion in which we have summarized all the chapters of our work.

Interestingly, we hope our study will contribute to find ways of understanding of learning and applying self-regulation in learning to improve the teaching-learning process for both
teachers and students in the Department of English at UMMTO. At the end, we hope that there will be more experimental studies about this issue.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Strategies for Reading a Text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st question</th>
<th>What strategies do you follow when asking your students to read a text?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The number of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for a silent reading?</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>people read silently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-To acquire knowledge and vocabulary in their understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-Most of time texts are for reading not listening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-As we are dealing with a foreign language, the silent reading is also a moment where diction is going to be clarified, check up alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for a loud reading?</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You start your own reading?</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use all of them</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Strategies for Text Comprehension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd question</th>
<th>You help your students understand the text by</th>
<th>The reason behind their use of the strategy (s)</th>
<th>The number of teachers who do not give answers about the open-ended question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asking them questions related to the text?</td>
<td>The number of teachers</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-To think critically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-To be active not passive students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-To be able to answer reading comprehension skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-To be autonomous learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-To give answers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5%</th>
<th>by using their own skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- To increase self-reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- To warm them up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- To make unclear things more clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- To see how far are they with the ideas vehicle by the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- To stimulate their brain and make them express and believe in themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- To deepen their understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining the text yourself?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use all of them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Evaluation of Students’ Mistakes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd question</th>
<th>Do you think that the students are more aware of their mistakes when</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The number of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The reason behind their use of the strategy (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The number of teachers who do not give answers about the open-ended question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are written on the board?</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>down and refer to them later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>They are mentioned orally?</strong></td>
<td>- It depends on the learning style of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- To make them interested in the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- The mistakes should be corrected but they should not be identified and attributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- Writing the mistakes on the board takes much time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- The students laugh at their</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>mistakes, but they correct themselves and remember them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- In terms of memory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>- The majority of time the explanation of rules (grammar) is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>done orally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use all of them</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Results of the Classroom Observation

1. A Table showing the Results of the Supervised Practical Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Elements Observed</th>
<th>The Frequency of The occurrence of the items</th>
<th>The Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercises</td>
<td>- Developing Time Planning and Management Skills</td>
<td>- Students attendance in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>- Always</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>- Always</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>- Often</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>- Sometimes</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>- Never</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students attendance in the classroom</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>- Often</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>- Sometimes</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>- Rarely</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>- Never</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing text comprehension skills</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>- Always</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>- Often</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>- Sometimes</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>- Never</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing classroom notes taking skills</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>- Always</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>- Often</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>- Sometimes</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>- Never</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing writing skills</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. A Table showing the Results of the Theoretical Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Elements Observed</th>
<th>The Frequency of The occurrence of the items</th>
<th>The Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercises</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Time Planning and Management Skills</td>
<td>Students attendance in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing text comprehension skills</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing classroom notes taking skills</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing writing skills</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Never 83%
Teachers’ questionnaire

This questionnaire is part of a research study on self-regulated learning in first-year classes at the department of English (MMUTO). You are kindly requested to answer the following questions. Your answers will be kept for academic purposes. So, you can tick the appropriate box or provide complete answers when necessary.

1/ when you provide your students with an exercise:

a) Do you give them free time to do it? □

b) Do you limit them a period of time? □

c) Do you do it together on the board? □

2/ what strategies do you follow when asking your students to read a text?

a) Ask for a silent reading? □

b) Ask for a loud reading? □

c) You start your own reading? □

Why?.................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

3/ You help your students understand the text by:

a) Asking them questions related to the text? □

b) Explaining the text yourself? □
4/ You check your students’ understanding of the text by:

a) Asking them to write a summary for the text?  

b) Asking them to summarize the text orally?  

5/ In taking notes, do you find your students:

a) Excellent  

b) Good  

c) Average  

d) Bad  

6/ In case you find your students have difficulties in taking notes:

a) Do you provide them with instructions?  

b) Do you let them use their own strategies (e.g. using brainstorming, abbreviations, highlighting…etc)  

7/ At the end of the lesson, do you ask your students to write an essay?

a) In the class  

b) At home  

8/ When doing their writing activities in the class:

a) Do you check each student’s answer before the correction?  

b) Do you let the students finish their activities, and then you ask them to give the correct answer?  

9/ during the correction of activities:

a) Do you write your students’ mistakes on the board?  

XIV
b) Do you mention the mistakes orally? □

10/ Do you think that the students are more aware of their mistakes when:

a) They are written on the board? □

b) They are mentioned orally? □

Why?........................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................

11/ when asking your students to write another essay, do you notice any amelioration in their level of writing?

   a) Yes □      b) No □

Thank you for your collaboration!