



Language Learning Strategies as Predictors of Goal Orientation

Abbas Ali Zarei¹ and Mahboubeh Gilanian²

¹Associate Professor, Imam Khomeini International University, Qazvin, Iran

²MA, Islamic Azad University, Takestan, Iran

*E-mail: a.zarei@hum.ikiu.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

To investigate language learning strategies as predictors of goal orientation components (intrinsic, extrinsic, task, ability approach, and ability avoid goal orientation), 145 B.A level students majoring in English translation and English language teaching were selected. The instruments included the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire-MSLQ. Data were analyzed through stepwise multiple regression analyses. Results indicated that meta-cognitive, compensation, and cognitive strategies had predictive power on intrinsic goal orientation. There was also a significant relationship between affective strategies and extrinsic goal orientation. In addition, the relationships between affective, meta-cognitive, and compensation strategies and task goal orientation were statistically significant. The findings further showed that social and compensation strategies had predictive power on ability approach goal orientation. Likewise, social strategies were the best predictors of ability avoid goal orientation. The findings of the present study may have implications for L2 learners, teachers, and material developers.

Keywords: Intrinsic Goal Orientation, Extrinsic Goal Orientation, Task Goal Orientation, Ability Approach Goal Orientation, Ability Avoid Goal Orientation, Language Learning Strategies

INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades, researchers have tried to find ways in which students can become self-regulated and monitor the efficacy of their learning strategies in their own learning processes. According to Zimmerman (2000; 2008), self-regulated learning refers to learners' autonomy, which enables them to regulate their actions towards self-direction, setting goals, expanding expertise, self-monitoring, and self-improvement. Therefore, it helps learners to use their mental abilities in an academic performance skill (Zarei and Azin, 2013b), so that self-regulated learners can solve problems, make decisions, and become responsible for their own learning. Moreover, many researchers (e.g., Grouzet, et al., 2005; Nuttin and Lens, 1985) have considered the role of goal orientation in human achievement. Since, goal orientation is one of the components of motivational self-regulated learning (Duncan and McKeachie, 2005), many researchers have been interested in investigating the relationship between goal orientation and education. In addition, language learning strategies have received a great deal of attention in language learning and teaching. According to Oxford (1990), language learning strategies are important in language learning and teaching because they can activate self-directed involvement and results in developed communicative competence. Furthermore, Oxford and Nyikos (1989) state that learning strategies are teachable. Similarly, several researchers including O'Malley and Chamot (1990); and Ikeda and Takeuchi (2003) claim that using effective strategy instruction can improve learners' language performance, and Cohen (2005) states that it can assist poor students to be better L2 learners.

Although many educational researchers have considered language learning strategies and goal orientation separately, there seems to be a paucity of research on the relationship between language learning strategies and goal orientation in second language learning. The purpose of this study is to investigate this area and to check the predictive power of language learning strategies on the components of goal orientation. To this end, the following research questions are addressed:

1. Which language learning strategies are better predictors of intrinsic goal orientation?
2. Which language learning strategies are better predictors of extrinsic goal orientation?
3. Which language learning strategies are better predictors of task goal orientation?
4. Which language learning strategies are better predictors of ability-approach goal orientation?
5. Which language learning strategies are better predictors of ability-avoid goal orientation?

Literature review

A large number of studies on goal orientation show that goals play a major role in achievement. Dweck and Leggett (1988) claim that goals provide a framework which directs individuals' cognition, affect and

behavior. According to Ames (1992), goal orientation theory interprets the purpose of individuals in their own achievement behavior. Moreover, Dweck and Leggett (1988); Elliot and Harackiewicz (1996); Nicholls (1989); and Weiner (1990) introduce achievement goal orientation theory as a major element in motivational research. Pintrich (2000) classifies achievement goal orientation into three types: Mastery goal orientation, which is also known as learning goal or task goal orientation (Valle et al., 2007) and task involvement (Nicholls, 1984), and emphasizes improving one's capability in the tasks. De la Fuente Arias (2004) claims that whatever arouses motivation of an academic nature and makes learners to direct their classroom behavior is defined as task goal orientation. Ability-approach goal orientation places emphasis on describing one's ability or performance to others. Students who adopt this type of goal orientation try to be higher than others. Ability-avoid goal orientation has to do with avoiding one's lack of ability or performance. Students who select performance avoidance goal orientation tend not to be the weakest students in the class (Pintrich, 2000).

Both ability-approach and ability-avoid goal orientation are also called performance goal orientation (Pintrich, 2000; Valle et al., 2007), ability goal, ego involvement (Pintrich, 2000), and self-centered goal, which refers to one's performance (Valle et al., 2007).

Based on achievement theory, there are differences between mastery goal and performance goal (both avoidance and approach). This theory states that learning goal focuses on improving people's skills and abilities (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck, 1986). So, optimistic, constructive and productive habits of thoughts, ideas, acting and performing are related to the selection of task goals. Students with high levels of task goal try to find information in order to acquire, develop, and refine their knowledge and skill (Butler, 2000), while ego involvement relies upon demonstration of ability (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck, 1986). So, comparatively unenthusiastic and uncreative conduct of thoughts and acts are related to self-centered goal. Students with a high level of ability goal show less positive educational results than these who have mastery goal (Butler, 2000).

Furthermore, according to Pintrich, Smith, Garcia, and Mckeachie's (1993), Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ), self-regulation is classified into motivational and cognitive processes. It also includes intrinsic and extrinsic goal orientation as two factors of motivational scales among others. Ames (1992) holds that students' tendency toward academic success stems from intrinsic and extrinsic goals and, thus, refers to them as learning goals. Deci and Ryan (1985); Maslow (1945); Rogers (1961); and Williams et al. (2000) enumerate self-acceptance, self-development, affiliation, community feeling, community contribution, physical fitness, and health as examples of intrinsic goal which reflect individuals' innate psychological needs for autonomy, relatedness, competence, and natural growth tendencies. In contrast, extrinsic goal refers to physical attractiveness, financial success, and popularity, emphasizing creating outwards orientations (Williams et al., 2000), and it leads individuals to obtain rewards and positive evaluation of others (Kasser and Ryan, 1996; Sheldon and Kasser, 1995). On the whole, the motivation which originates from internal reason is called intrinsic goal orientation and the one which stems from external reason is called extrinsic goal orientation.

Learning strategies are another factor receiving attention in educational research, especially in second or foreign language learning. Based on Chamot's (1987) definition, language learning strategies refer to the techniques each individual uses that help them to facilitate learning and remembering linguistic and content area information. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) regard language learning strategies as thoughts that students take in bearing new information in their mind.

Oxford (1990) divides language learning strategies into two categories including direct and indirect strategies. Direct strategies, which involve mental processing in the way of understanding and producing new language, are subdivided into three taxonomies: a) memory strategies, b) cognitive strategies and c) compensation strategies. Indirect strategies, which regulate language learning without the direct engagement of new language, are subdivided into three other categories including: a) meta-cognitive strategies, b) affective strategies and c) social strategies. Oxford and Crookall's (1989) classification includes an additional type: communication strategies.

Oxford (1990) maintains that memory strategies, also called mnemonics, are used for storing and retrieving information for communication. Cognitive strategies are employed for mental processing and, consequently, understanding and producing new language. Compensation strategies compensate for learners' lack of knowledge and skills by helping them guess the meaning of unknown words or use gestures in speaking and writing. Meta-cognitive strategies enable learners to play a controller role in doing their exercise through planning, coordinating, and evaluating their own learning. Affective strategies are useful for learners in controlling emotions, motivations, and attitude during language learning through reducing anxiety, which usually stems from self-doubt. Social strategies enable learners to improve learning through asking questions and cooperating with others. According to Oxford and Crookall (1989), compensation strategies, which are used while speaking in order to compensate for any gaps in the knowledge of language, are called communication strategies.

In recent decades, the shift from teacher-centeredness to learner-centeredness in language learning and teaching has led many researchers to focus on the use of language learning strategies (Lessard-Clouston, 1997; Reiss, 1985). Such strategies can be predictors of proficiency, achievement or specific skill areas (Chamot and Kupper, 1989; Oxford, Park-Oh, Ito & Sumrall, 1993; Zarei and Shahidi Pour, 2013). In addition, from a teaching perspective, Oxford and Nyikos (1989) consider the teachable characteristic of language learning strategies. Zarei and Azin (2013b) also state that teacher's awareness of learners' learning strategies

can be helpful in planning activities and providing better instruction. Weinstein and Mary (1986) believe that the goal of learning strategy instruction is to provide motivational or affective conditions which can help learners to receive new knowledge. Furthermore, Zarei and Elekaei (2012a) conclude that the role of language learning strategies in the process of language learning is undeniable.

A number of studies have been done in the field of goal orientation and language learning strategies. Radosevich et al. (2004) studied the relationship between self-regulated learning and goal orientation of 132 students. The results showed a positive relationship between goal orientation and resources of goal and cognitive-self regulated learning and a negative relationship between ability-avoid goal orientation and cognitive self-regulated learning. Dhanapala (2007) investigated language learning strategies employed by both EFL and ESL learners. To this end, 101 Japanese and Sri Lankan learners were selected. In the next stage, a 60-item strategy questionnaire, a background questionnaire, and an English proficiency test were administered to the students. The obtained data were analyzed using the ANOVA procedure. The results showed that different cultural factors in two countries had significant relationship with language learning strategies use. Mirhassani et al. (2007) studied the relationship between learners' goal orientation and self-regulated learning and language proficiency. To this end, 127 students were selected. The participant completed the Persian version of goal orientation scale and self-regulation questionnaire and took a TOEFL test. Descriptive and inferential statistics showed that the relationship between goal orientation and language proficiency was statistically significant. In addition, the findings showed that the relationship between task goal orientation and language proficiency was significant. However, there was no significant relationship between ability-approach and ability-avoid goal orientation and language proficiency. Moreover, the relationship between self-regulation and language proficiency was statistically significant.

In another study, Zarei and Hatami (2012) examined the relationship between other components of self regulated learning (planning, self-checking, effect, and self-efficacy) and L2 vocabulary learning and reading comprehension. To this end, a sample of 250 L2 learners were selected to respond to a vocabulary and reading comprehension TOEFL test and the Persian version of 'self-regulation Trait Questionnaire'. Pearson correlation analysis indicated no significant relationship between reading and self-check; and reading and effort. However, the relationships between vocabulary and planning; vocabulary and self-check; vocabulary and self-efficacy; reading and planning; and reading and self-efficacy were statistically significant.

In another study, Zarei and Elekaei (2012b) examined the effect of motivation on the choice of language learning strategies among 108 L2 learners. Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning and Gardner's Attitude/Motivation Test Battery were used as data collection instruments. The gathered data were analyzed using six separate one-way ANOVA procedures. The results of data analysis showed that the effect of students' level of motivation on their choice of memory, compensation, and affective strategies was statistically significant; however, its effect on the choice of cognitive strategies, meta-cognitive and social strategies was not significant. Zarei and Azin (2013a) investigated the relationship between multiple intelligences and self-regulated learning components of EFL learners. To this end, 150 male and female intermediate level students majoring in English Translation and English teaching were selected. Questionnaires were used to gather data. The obtained data were analyzed using stepwise multiple regression procedures. The result indicated that the relationship between multiple intelligences and motivational self-regulation (task goal orientation, ability approach goal orientation, and ability avoid goal orientation) was not statistically significant while there were significant relationships between multiple intelligences and resource management self-regulated learning. Zarei and Elekaei (2013) considered the effect of attitude on the choice of two types of language learning strategies (compensation and meta-cognitive) by L2 learners. 108 participants completed questionnaires, and the ANOVA procedure was used to analyze the gathered data. Results revealed that the effect of attitude on the students' choice of compensation strategies was statistically significant, while attitude had no statistically significant effect on learners' choice of meta-cognitive strategies. Zarei and Shahidi Pour (2013) investigated the relationship between language learning strategy use and L2 idioms comprehension. The Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency (MTELP), an idiom comprehension test, and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) were administered to 112 participants. Multiple regression analysis showed that cognitive and affective strategies had predictive power on L2 idiom comprehension. Sadeghy and Mansouri (2014) examined the relationship between learners' goal orientation, self-regulated learning and the use of different language learning strategies. 125 male and female college students participated in this study. In order to obtain data, the participants were asked to complete the Persian versions of the goal orientation scale, self-regulated trait questionnaire, and the strategy inventory for language learning. The findings showed a significant relationship between goal orientation and language learning strategies and between mastery as well as performance goal orientation and language learning strategies. In addition, self-regulated learning was significantly associated to language learning strategies. Meanwhile, the relationship between the self-regulated learning components (planning, effort, self-efficacy, self-checking) and language learning strategies were found to be significant.

In another study, Zarei and Gilanian (2014) investigated the relationship between cognitive self-regulated learning and language learning strategies. 148 participants of the study answered the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire-MSLQ. Finally, the result of the stepwise multiple regression analysis procedures revealed that memory strategies had predictive power on rehearsal self-regulated learning. Moreover, meta-cognitive, affective, and memory strategies were predictors of elaboration self-regulated learning. The relationships between meta-cognitive and cognitive

strategies and organization self-regulated learning were statistically significant. Also, the combinations of cognitive, affective, compensation, and social strategies as well as affective, compensation, and social strategies were the predictors of critical thinking

To conclude, despite a number of studies that have been done on both goal orientation and language learning strategies, there still seems to be a gap in our knowledge of the relationship between goal orientation components (intrinsic, extrinsic, task, ability-approach, and ability-avoid goal orientation) and the use of language learning strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, meta-cognitive, affective, social, and communication strategies). The importance of this knowledge in second or foreign language learning and teaching warrants the present study, which aims to investigate the predictive power of various types of language learning strategies on goal orientation components.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The participants of the present study were initially 245 male and female B.A. level students at Imam Khomeini International University in Qazvin and Islamic Azad University in Takestan majoring in English translation and English teaching. After homogenization and the administration of the questionnaires, only 145 homogeneous participants who had answered all of the questionnaires completely were selected as the participants of the study.

Instruments

The data collection instruments utilized in this study included the following:

1) In order to homogenize the participants, a general proficiency test (MTELP) was administered. The test consisted of 100 grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension items in multiple-choice format.

2) In order to assess the general language learning strategies utilized by L2 learners, a Strategy Inventory for Language Learning with 60 strategy items on a five-point Likert scale from 'Never' to 'Always' was given to the participants. This version of SILL was designed by Oxford (1990) to collect information about seven types of strategies.

3) The third instrument used to elicit information about the participants' intrinsic and extrinsic goal orientation was "Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire-MSLQ" developed by Pintrich, et al. (1993). It included 81 items in three general sections: cognitive strategies, meta-cognitive strategies, and resource management. However, only 8 items measuring goal orientation were used.

4) The last instrument used to assess the participants' task goal orientation, ability-approach goal orientation, and performance avoidance goal orientation was the "Goal Oriented Scale" developed by Midgley, Kaplan, Middleton, and Maehr (1998). It included 18 items, every 6 items measuring one of the above-mentioned goal orientation categories.

Procedure

To achieve the purpose of the study, the following procedure was followed. First, 245 participants with the afore-mentioned characteristics were selected. Second, the Michigan language proficiency test was administered. The time duration of this test was 60 minutes. After homogenization, 145 students who scored between one standard deviation above and below the mean remained as the participants. Next, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was given to the students. The participants were required to answer the questionnaire by choosing from the five-point Likert scale. Then, the "Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire-MSLQ" developed by Pintrich et al. (1993) and the "Goal Oriented Scale" developed by Midgley et al. (1998) were administered to determine the participants' goal orientation. The former includes 81 items of which only 8 items were concerned with intrinsic and extrinsic goal orientation and the latter consists of 18 items, every 6 items measuring a different goal orientation; namely, task goal orientation, ability-approach goal orientation, and ability-avoid goal orientation. The participants were required to complete the questionnaires by choosing from among five alternatives, from 'almost never' to 'always'.

To analyse the collected data and to answer the research questions, five stepwise multiple regression analyses were used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Investigation of the first research question

The first question sought to investigate the relationship between types of language learning strategies and intrinsic goal orientation. To this end, a stepwise multiple regression procedure was run (Table 1), which showed that meta-cognitive, compensation, and cognitive strategies entered into the regression equation as the predictors of intrinsic goal orientation.

Model summary (Table 2) shows that meta-cognitive strategies and intrinsic goal orientation share over 25%, and meta-cognitive and compensation strategies together share above 32% of variance with intrinsic goal orientation. Meta-cognitive, compensation, and cognitive strategies collectively account for over 36% of the total variance in intrinsic goal orientation.

Based on Table 3, the results of the ANOVA ($F_{(1,143)} = 49.14, p < .05$; $F_{(2,142)} = 35.73, p < .05$; $F_{(3,141)} = 26.68, p < .05$) show that the predictive power of the three models is significant.

To find out how strong the relationship between the intrinsic goal orientation and each of the predictors is, the unstandardized as well as standardized coefficients of the three models, along with the observed t-values and significance levels were checked. Table 4 shows the results.

Based on Table 4, the first model shows that for every one standard deviation of change in meta-cognitive strategies score, there will be above .50 of a standard deviation positive change in intrinsic goal orientation score. The second model shows that when meta-cognitive and compensation strategies are taken together, for every one standard deviation change in meta-cognitive and compensation strategies, there will be over .41 and .29 of a standard deviation positive change in intrinsic goal orientation score, respectively. The third model shows that when meta-cognitive, compensation, and cognitive strategies are taken together, for every one standard deviation change in meta-cognitive, compensation, and cognitive strategies score, there will be above .34, .21, and .20 of a standard deviation positive change in intrinsic goal orientation score, respectively. Meanwhile, all the standardized coefficients are statistically significant.

Table 1. Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Meta-cognitive	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter \leq .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove \geq .100).
2	Compensation	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter \leq .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove \geq .100).
3	Cognitive	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter \leq .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove \geq .100).

a. Dependent Variable: intrinsic goal

Table 2. Model Summary^d

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.506 ^a	.256	.251	2.50175	.256	49.141	1	143	.000
2	.579 ^b	.335	.325	2.37351	.079	16.869	1	142	.000
3	.602 ^c	.362	.349	2.33235	.027	6.056	1	141	.015

a. Predictors: (Constant), meta-cognitive; b. Predictors: (Constant), meta-cognitive, compensation; c. Predictors: (Constant), meta-cognitive, compensation, cognitive; d. Dependent Variable: intrinsic goal

Table 3. ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	307.563	1	307.563	49.141	.000 ^b
	Residual	895.001	143	6.259		
2	Regression	402.597	2	201.299	35.732	.000 ^c
	Residual	799.966	142	5.634		
3	Regression	435.541	3	145.180	26.688	.000 ^d
	Residual	767.022	141	5.440		

a. Dependent Variable: intrinsic goal; b. Predictors: (Constant), meta-cognitive; c. Predictors: (Constant), meta-cognitive, compensation; d. Predictors: (Constant), meta-cognitive, compensation, cognitive

Table 4. Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	7.289	1.030		7.077	.000
	meta-cognitive	.198	.028	.506	7.010	.000
2	(Constant)	4.403	1.204		3.659	.000
	meta-cognitive	.163	.028	.417	5.808	.000
	compensation	.128	.031	.295	4.107	.000
3	(Constant)	3.275	1.268		2.582	.011
	meta-cognitive	.134	.030	.344	4.499	.000
	compensation	.095	.033	.218	2.833	.005
	cognitive	.098	.040	.205	2.461	.015

a. Dependent Variable: intrinsic goal

Investigation of the second research question

The second question attempted to see which types of language learning strategies are predictors of extrinsic goal orientation. To this end, a stepwise multiple regression procedure was used (Table 5), which revealed that affective strategies entered into the regression equation as the single predictor.

Based on model summary (Table 6), it can be seen that affective strategies and extrinsic goal orientation share about 4% of variance.

Table 7 gives the results of the ANOVA performed on the model. The F-value and the significance level ($F_{(1,143)} = 8.01, p < .05$) indicate that the model is significant.

Table 8 shows the Beta value and significance level of the observed t-value of the strategies that entered the regression equation. As the table shows, of the seven strategies, only affective strategies account for a statistically significant portion of the variance in the dependent variable (extrinsic goal orientation), and for every one standard deviation of change in one's affective strategies, there will be .23 of a standard deviation change in one's extrinsic goal orientation.

Table 5. Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	affective		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter \leq .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove \geq .100).

a. Dependent Variable: extrinsic goal

Table 6. Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.230 ^a	.053	.046	2.85152	.053	8.011	1	143	.005

a. Predictors: (Constant), affective; b. Dependent Variable: extrinsic goal

Table 7. ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	65.140	1	65.140	8.011	.005 ^b
	Residual	1162.758	143	8.131		
	Total	1227.898	144			

a. Dependent Variable: extrinsic goal, b. Predictors: (Constant), affective

Table 8. Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	12.297	.986		12.468	.000
	affective	.092	.033	.230	2.830	.005

a. Dependent Variable: extrinsic goal

Investigation of the third research question

The third question tried to examine the relationship between types of language learning strategies and task goal orientation. To this end, a third stepwise multiple regression was run (Table 9), based on which affective, meta-cognitive, and compensation strategies entered into the regression equation as the predictors of task goal orientation.

Based on Table 10, affective strategies and task goal orientation share 15%, and affective and meta-cognitive strategies together share over 18% of variance with task goal orientation. Affective, meta-cognitive, and compensation strategies collectively account for above 20% of the total variance with task goal orientation. Based on Table 11, the results of the ANOVA ($F_{(1,143)} = 26.48, p < .05$); $F_{(2,142)} = 17.52, p < .05$; $F_{(3,141)} = 13.24, p < .05$) show that the predictive power of the three models is significant. To find out how strong the relationship between the extrinsic goal orientation and each of the predictors is, the unstandardized as well as standardized coefficients of the three models, along with the observed t-values and significance levels were checked. Table 12 shows the results. Based on Table 12, the first model shows that for every one standard deviation of change in affective strategies score, there will be above .39 of a standard deviation positive change in task goal orientation score. The second model shows that when affective and meta-cognitive strategies are taken together, for every one standard deviation change in affective and meta-cognitive strategies, there will be about .31 and over .22 of a standard deviation positive change in task goal orientation score, respectively. The third model shows that when affective, meta-cognitive, and compensation strategies are taken together, for every one standard deviation change in affective, meta-cognitive, and compensation

strategies, there will be above .27, .18, and about .16 of a standard deviation positive change in task goal orientation score, respectively. Meanwhile, all the standardized coefficients are statistically significant.

Table 9. Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Affective		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Meta-cognitive		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Compensation		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: task goal

Table 10. Model Summary^d

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.395 ^a	.156	.150	4.55248	.156	26.485	1	143	.000
2	.445 ^b	.198	.187	4.45430	.042	7.374	1	142	.007
3	.469 ^c	.220	.203	4.40850	.022	3.965	1	141	.048

a. Predictors: (Constant), affective; b. Predictors: (Constant), affective, meta-cognitive; c. Predictors: (Constant), affective, meta-cognitive, compensation; d. Dependent Variable: task goal

Table 11. ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	548.906	1	548.906	26.485	.000 ^b
	Residual	2963.685	143	20.725		
2	Regression	695.204	2	347.602	17.520	.000 ^c
	Residual	2817.386	142	19.841		
3	Regression	772.273	3	257.424	13.245	.000 ^d
	Residual	2740.318	141	19.435		

a. Dependent Variable: task goal; b. Predictors: (Constant), affective; c. Predictors: (Constant), affective, meta-cognitive; d. Predictors: (Constant), affective, meta-cognitive, compensation

Table 12. Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	13.002	1.575	8.257	.000	
	Affective	.268	.052	.395	5.146	.000
2	(Constant)	9.429	2.026	4.653	.000	
	Affective	.209	.055	.309	3.779	.000
	meta-cognitive	.148	.055	.222	2.715	.007
	(Constant)	7.125	2.315	3.077	.003	
3	affective	.186	.056	.275	3.339	.001
	meta-cognitive	.125	.055	.187	2.260	.025
	compensation	.117	.059	.159	1.991	.048

a. Dependent Variable: task goal

Investigation of the fourth research question

The fourth question investigated types of strategies as predictors of ability-approach goal orientation. To this end, another stepwise multiple regression was used (Table 13), which indicated that social and compensation strategies entered into the regression equation.

The result of model summary (Table14), shows that the social strategies and ability- approach goal orientation share about 9% and social and compensation strategies together share over 11% of variance with ability-approach goal orientation. Based on Table 15, the results of the ANOVA ($F_{(1,143)} = 15.06, p < .05; F_{(2,142)} = 10.73, p < .05$) indicate that the predictive power of both models is significant.

Table 16 shows the Beta value and significance level of the observed t-value for each of the two strategies that entered the regression equation. As the table shows, for every one standard deviation change in one's social strategies, there will be about .31 of a standard deviation change in one's ability-approach goal orientation. When social and compensation strategies are taken together, for every one standard deviation of change in social and compensation strategies, there will be over .26 and .19 of a standard deviation positive change in the dependent variable.

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	social		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	compensation		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: ability approach

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.309 ^a	.095	.089	5.12153	.095	15.066	1	143	.000
2	.362 ^b	.131	.119	5.03609	.036	5.893	1	142	.016

a. Predictors: (Constant), social, b. Predictors: (Constant), social, compensation; c. Dependent Variable: ability approach

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	395.192	1	395.192	15.066	.000 ^b
	Residual	3750.898	143	26.230		
	Total	4146.090	144			
2	Regression	544.660	2	272.330	10.738	.000 ^c
	Residual	3601.430	142	25.362		
	Total	4146.090	144			

a. Dependent Variable: ability approach; b. Predictors: (Constant), social; c. Predictors: (Constant), social, compensation

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	14.884	1.932		7.704	.000
	social	.229	.059	.309	3.882	.000
2	(Constant)	10.919	2.505		4.358	.000
	social	.194	.060	.261	3.242	.001
	compensation	.157	.065	.196	2.428	.016

a. Dependent Variable: ability approach

Investigation of the fifth research question

This question sought to investigate the predictive power of language learning strategies types on ability-avoid goal orientation. To this end, a fifth stepwise multiple regression was used. Table 17 shows that the single predictor of ability-avoid goal orientation is social strategies.

According to (Table 18), model summary shows that social strategies and ability avoid goal orientation share about 5% of variance.

Table 19 gives the results of the ANOVA performed on the model. The F-value and the significance level ($F_{(1,143)} = 8.90$, $p < .05$) indicate that the model is significant.

Based on Table 20, the model shows that for every one standard deviation of change in social strategies score, there will be above .24 of a standard deviation change in ability avoid goal orientation score.

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	social		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: ability avoid

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.242 ^a	.059	.052	4.88090	.059	8.906	1	143	.003

a. Predictors: (Constant), social; b. Dependent Variable: ability avoid

Table 19. ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	212.161	1	212.161	8.906	.003 ^b
	Residual	3406.718	143	23.823		
	Total	3618.879	144			

a. Dependent Variable: ability void; b. Predictors: (Constant), social

Table 20. Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	14.643	1.841		7.953	.000
	Social	.168	.056	.242	2.984	.003

a. Dependent Variable: ability avoid

DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study are partially similar to those of a numbers of previous studies and different from those of some others. In line with the findings of this study, Pintrich (1989) reported a significant relationship between different kinds of goal and various types of language learning strategies used by learners. The results of the present study showed that affective, meta-cognitive and compensation strategies were predictors of task goal orientation. This contradicts the findings of Gabriele (2007), who showed that cognitive strategies had predictive power on mastery goal orientation. The findings also corroborate the findings of Kolić-Vehovec et al. (2008), indicating that mastery goal oriented students had more adaptive motivational profile. Moreover, the findings of the present study lend partial support to Radosevich, et al.,'s (2004) findings based on which there was a significant relationship between goal orientation and resources of goal. On the other hand, they are in conflict with their findings that there is a negative relationship between ability-avoid goal orientation and cognitive self-regulated learning.

Parts of findings of the present study addressing the significant relationship between meta-cognitive, compensation, and cognitive strategies and intrinsic goal orientation lend support to Chyung et al. (2010) finding's based on which intrinsic goal orientation was the predictor of students' learning. In accordance with the results of this study, the findings of Mirhassani et al. (2007) indicate that unlike ability-approach goal orientation and ability-avoid goal orientation, the relationship between task goal orientation and language proficiency is statistically significant. So, it can be concluded that affective, meta-cognitive, and compensation strategies, which are predictors of task goal orientation, can be related to language proficiency.

A number of factors might have contributed to the observed discrepancies between the findings of the present study and those of other similar studies. One such factor may have been the participants' proficiency level. The participants of the present study were BA level students' of English, whose proficiency was roughly at intermediate level. And there is enough evidence already to convince us that both strategy use and goal-orientation are influenced by the learners' proficiency level (Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Oxford et al., 1993; Zarei and Shahidi Pour, 2013).

Another factor may have been the social context in which language learning takes place. The present study was conducted in an Iranian EFL context, whereas some of the studies mentioned in the literature review section were conducted either in ESL contexts or EFL contexts other than Iran. It might be cogently argued that the essential differences between EFL and ESL contexts, as well as those among various EFL contexts may well influence learners' strategy use.

Still another factor may have been the participants' field of study. The participants of this study were all majoring in English. So they were all expected to be familiar with the concepts of goal orientation and strategy use. They might even have responded to the questionnaires consciously. This may explain the differences between this study and those conducted with non-English-major participants.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated language learning strategies as predictors of goal orientation components. The results indicated that meta-cognitive, compensation, and cognitive strategies were significant predictors of intrinsic goal orientation. Another finding of the study showed that the single predictor of extrinsic goal orientation was affective strategies. The findings also showed that affective, meta-cognitive, and compensation strategies were positive predictors of task goal orientation. Furthermore, the relationship between social and compensation strategies and ability-approach goal orientation was statistically significant. Moreover, social strategies were the best predictor of ability-avoid goal orientation.

Given the relationship between language learning strategies and the components of goal orientation, it may be concluded that to improve learners' goal orientation, attention may be focused on the more tangible and more practical notion of strategies. This means that the findings of the present study may have implications for teachers, learners and materials developers. As there was a positive correlation between language learning strategies and goal orientation, and since based on the findings of previous researches

(Cohen, 2005; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Ikeda & Takeuchi, 2003; Zarei & Shahidi Pour, 2013), they have significant relationship with instruction and students' success in education, teachers, learners and materials developers can benefit from these findings to improve language learning and teaching. Apart from this practical implication, the findings may have theoretical implication in that they may help us develop a clearer understanding of the nature of goal orientation and language learning strategies and the way the interaction between these two factors may influence language learning.

REFERENCES

- Ames C (1992). Classroom: Goal, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 261-271.
- Ames C & Archer J (1988). Achievement goal in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation process. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 80(3), 260-267.
- Butler R (2000). What Learners want to know? The role of achievement goals in shaping information, seeking learning and interest. In C. Sansone & J. M. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: The research for optimal motivation and Performance*. (pp. 161-194). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Chamot A (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning*. (pp. 71-84). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Chamot AU & Kupper L (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22 (1), 13-24.
- Cohen AD (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 112-130.
- Chyung SY, Moll AJ, & Berg SA (2010). The role of intrinsic goal orientation, self-efficacy, and e-learning practice in engineering education. *The Journal of Effective Teaching*, 10(1), 22-37.
- Deci EL, & Ryan RM (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- De la Fuente Arias, J. (2004). Recent Perspective in the Study of Motivation: Goal Orientation Theory. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 2(1), 35-62.
- Dhanapala KV (2007). Focus on language learning strategies of advanced learners in Japan and Sri Lanka. *Journal of International Development and Cooperation*, 13(1), 153-164.
- Duncan TG & McKeachie WJ (2005). The motivated strategies for learning questionnaire. *Educational Psychologist*, 40(2), 117-128.
- Dweck CS (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist*, 41(10), 1040-1048.
- Dweck CS, & Leggett EL (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256-273.
- Elliot AJ, & Harackiewicz JM (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A meditational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7(3), 461-475.
- Gabriele AJ (2007). The influence of achievement goals on the constructive activity of low achievers during collaborative problem solving. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(1), 121-141.
- Grouzet FME, Kasser T, Ahuvia A, Fernandez-Dols JM, Kim Y, Lau S, Ryan RM, Saunders S, Schmuck P. & Sheldon KM (2005). The structure of goal contents across 15 cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(5), 800-816.
- Ikeda M & Takeuchi O (2003). Can strategy instruction help EFL learners to improve their reading ability?: An empirical study. *The Japan association of College English Teachers (JACET) Bulletin*, 37, 49-60.
- Kasser T & Ryan RM (1996). Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22(3), 280-287.
- Kolić-Vehovec S, Rončević B, & Bajšanski I (2008). Motivational components of self regulated learning and reading strategy use in university students: The role of goal orientation patterns. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 18(1), 108-113.
- Lessard-Clouston M (1997). Language Learning Strategies: An Overview for L2 Teachers. *The internet TESL journal*, 3(12), 69-80.
- Maslow AH (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc.
- Midgley C, Kaplan A, Middleton M, & Maehr M (1998). The development and validation of scales assessing student achievement goal orientations. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 23(2), 113-131.
- Mirhassani A, Akbari R, & Dehghan M (2007). The relationship between Iranian EFL Learners' goal-orientation and self-regulated learning and their language proficiency. *TELL*, 1(2), 117-132.
- Nicholls JG (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological Review*, 91(3), 328-346.
- Nicholls JG (1989). *The competitive ethos and democratic education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nuttin JR, & Lens W (1985). *Future time perspective and motivation: Theory and research method*. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press.

- O'Malley JM, & Chamot AU (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford RL (1990). *Language learning strategies. What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford R, & Crookall D (1989). Research on language learning strategies: methods, findings, and instructional issues. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73 (4), 404-419.
- Oxford R, & Nyikos M (1989). Variable affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal (MLJ)*, 73(3), 291-300.
- Oxford RL, Park-Oh Y, Ito S, & Sumrall M (1993). Japanese by satellite: effects of motivation, language learning styles and strategies, gender, course level, and previous language learning experience on Japanese language achievement. *Foreign Language Annals*. 26(3), 359-371.
- Radosevich D., Vandana T, Yeo S, & Deirdre M (2004). Relating goal orientation to self-regulatory processes: A longitudinal study. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 29(3), 207-229.
- Reiss MA (1985). The good language learner: another look. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 41(3), 511-523.
- Pintrich PR (1989). The dynamic interplay of student motivation and cognition in the college classroom. In C. Ames, & M. L. Maehr (Eds.). *Advances in Motivation and Achievement: Motivation-enhancing Environments*. (pp.117- 160). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Pintrich PR (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, p. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation*. (pp: 451-502). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Pintrich P. R., Smith, D., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. (1993). Reliability and predictive validity of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53(3), 801-813.
- Rogers, C. (1961). *On Becoming a Person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sadeghy, A. R. & Mansouri, A. (2014). The relationship between learners' goal-orientated and self-regulated learning and their endorsement of L2 learning strategies. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, 5(2), 574-593.
- Sheldon, K. M. & Kasser, T. (1995). Coherence and congruence: Two Aspects of Personality Integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(3), 531-543.
- Valle, A., Cabanach, R. G., Rodríguez, S., Núñez, J. C., González-Pienda, J. A., Solano, P., & Rosário, P. (2007). A motivational perspective on the self-regulated learning in higher education. In P. B. Richards (Ed.), *Global issues in higher education*. (pp. 99-125). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Weiner, B. (1990). History of motivational research in education. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(4), 616-622.
- Weinstein, C., & Mayer, R. E. (1986) The teaching of learning strategies. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. (pp. 315-327). New York: Macmillan.
- Williams, G. C., Cox, E. M., Hedberg, V. A., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Extrinsic life goals and health-risk behaviors in adolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(8), 1756-1771.
- Zarei, A. A., & Azin, Z. (2013a). Multiple intelligences as predictors of resource management and motivational self-regulated learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistic studies (IJALS)*, 2(2), 48-54.
- Zarei, A. A., & Azin, Z. (2013b). Multiple Intelligences as predictors cognitive and metacognitive self-regulated learning. *International Journal of Management and Humanity Sciences*, 2(S), 844-853.
- Zarei, A. A., & Elekaei, A. (2012a). *Learner autonomy and language learning strategies: An empirical analysis*. Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Zarei, A. A. & Elekaei, A. (2012b). Motivation and attitude as predictors of learner autonomy. *Prime Research on Education (PRE)*, 2(9), 353-364.
- Zarei, A. A., & Elekaei, A. (2013). The effect of attitude on L2 learners' choice of compensation & meta-cognitive strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature (IJALEL)*, 2(1), 186-193.
- Zarei, A. A., & Gilanian, M. (2014). On the relationship between cognitive self-regulated learning and language learning strategies. *Journal of Social Issues & Humanities*, 2(12), 200-209.
- Zarei, A. A., & Hatami, G. (2012). On the relationship between self-regulated learning components and L2 vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2 (9), 1939-1944.
- Zarei, A. A., & Shahidi Pour, V. (2013). Language learning strategies as predictors of L2 idioms comprehension. *International Journal of Language Learning and applied Linguistics Word (IJLALW)*, 4(2), 313-330.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P.R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation*. (pp: 13-40). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Investigating self-regulation and motivation: Historical background, methodological developments, and future prospects. *American Educational Research Journal* Manth, 45(1), 166-183.