

**THE INFLUENCE OF MOTIVATION ON LEARNING STRATEGIES
USED BY ESL LEARNERS**

ROWENA AWALI ENSANAH

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

2014

**THE INFLUENCE OF MOTIVATION ON LEARNING STRATEGIES
USED BY ESL LEARNERS**

ROWENA AWALI ENSANAH

**DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER IN ENGLISH AS A
SECOND LANGUAGE**

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

2014

UNIVERSITI MALAYA

ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION

Name of Candidate: Rowena Awali Ensanah

Registration/Matric No: TGB- 080050

Name of Degree: Master in English as a Second Language

Title of Project Paper/Research Report/Dissertation/Thesis ("this Work"):

"The Influence of Motivation on Learning Strategies Used by ESL Learners"

Field of Study: Cognitive Linguistics

I do solemnly and sincerely declare that:

- (1) I am the sole author/writer of this Work;
- (2) This Work is original;
- (3) Any use of any work in which copyright exists was done by way of fair dealing and for permitted purposes and any excerpt or extract from, or reference to or reproduction of any copyright work has been disclosed expressly and sufficiently and the title of the Work and its authorship have been acknowledged in this Work;
- (4) I do not have any actual knowledge nor do I ought reasonably to know that the making of this work constitutes an infringement of any copyright work;
- (5) I hereby assign all and every rights in the copyright to this Work to the University of Malaya ("UM"), who henceforth shall be owner of the copyright in this Work and that any reproduction or use in any form or by any means whatsoever is prohibited without the written consent of UM having been first had and obtained;
- (6) I am fully aware that if in the course of making this Work I have infringed any copyright whether intentionally or otherwise, I may be subject to legal action or any other action as may be determined by UM.

Candidate's Signature

Date

Subscribed and solemnly declared before,

Witness's Signature

Date

Name:
Designation:

ABSTRACT

This study examines the learning strategies used by Pre-university students of different nationalities at Centre for Languages and Pre- University Academic Development (CELPAD) in Malaysia and the influence of motivation on these strategies. In this study the researcher examine how respondents of different gender, proficiency level, nationality and cultural background affect the choices of strategies used in an ESL/ EFL setting and if there is a significant relationship between motivation constructs of these English language learners and their nationality and gender. Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire was employed to assess learners' strategies together with a modified version of Attitude/ Motivation Battery Test (AMBT) questionnaire by Gardner to measure the motivation constructs of these English language learners. Pearson correlation together with descriptive statistics were also utilized to investigate any significant relationship between students' language learning strategies and their motivations. The result showed that metacognitive strategy category was the most predominant strategy used, while memory and affective strategies were the least used. This study also observed that the overall frequency use of learning strategies were in the medium or average. Based on the SILL results, differences were positive but minimal in relation to proficiency level and gender, although there are no statistically significant relationships on strategies in relation to gender, proficiency level and nationality. This study also discovers that motivation does have a positive correlation on learners' strategies. This study would be beneficial to educators, curriculum designers and learners as knowledge and understanding of one's cultural background/ nationality may influence motivation and language learning strategy choice which are crucial in aspiring better learning performance and communicative competence.

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini meneliti tentang strategi-strategi pembelajaran yang diaplikasikan oleh pelajar-pelajar Pra- Universiti di CELPAD, UIAM, yang terdiri dari pelbagai bangsa dan pengaruh motivasi ke- atas pemilihan strategi-strategi tersebut. Dalam kajian ini, penyelidik mengkaji sejauhmana perbezaan jantina, tahap kemahiran, kewarganegaraan, latarbelakang kebudayaan mempengaruhi pemilihan strategi-strategi pembelajaran untuk diaplikasikan dalam program pembelajaran B. Inggeris sebagai Bahasa Penghantar Ke Dua/ B. Inggeris Sebagai Bahasa Penghantar Bangsa Asing. Kajian ini mencadangkan keberangkalian wujudnya kolerasi di antara motivasi yang di konstruk kepada pelajar-pelajar dalam pembelajaran B. Inggeris dengan kewarganegaraan dan jantina mereka. Soal selidik Oxford (1990) Inventori Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa telah digunakan untuk menilai strategi pembelajaran, selain itu soal selidik AMBT oleh Gardner dalam versi baru juga telah digunakan untuk mengukur konstruk motivasi di kalangan pelajar-pelajar B. Inggeris ini. Kaedah Kolerasi Pearson dan Deskriptif Statistik juga telah digunakan untuk mengenalpasti pentingnya kolerasi di antara pemilihan strategi-strategi pembelajaran dan motivasi di kalangan pelajar-pelajar dalam pembelajaran B. Inggeris. Hasil kajian memperlihatkan bahawa kaedah metacognitive merupakan kaedah yang paling utama digunakan dalam kategori strategi. Manakala kaedah strategi memori dan efektif adalah yang paling minimum digunakan dalam kalangan pelajar-pelajar dalam pembelajaran B. Inggeris. Secara keseluruhannya, kajian ini mendapati bahawa penggunaan strategi-strategi pembelajaran adalah sederhana atau kekerapan purata yang pelbagai. Berdasarkan keputusan SILL, hanya terdapat perbezaan positif yang minimum di antara tahap kemahiran dan jantina. Statistik juga tidak menunjukkan sebarang hubungan penting di antara pemilihan strategi-strategi pembelajaran dengan jantina, tahap kemahiran dan kewarganegaraan.

Walaupun, kajian ini mendapati motivasi mempunyai hubungan positif kepada pemilihan strategi-strategi pembelajaran di kalangan pelajar. Akhirnya, kajian ini diharapkan dapat memberi manfaat kepada para pendidik, penggubal kurikulum dan pelajar memandangkan pengetahuan dan kefahaman tentang latarbelakang kebudayaan seseorang mampu mempengaruhi motivasi dan pemilihan strategi dalam pembelajaran bahasa seterusnya merangsang prestasi pembelajaran dan kebolehan berkomunikasi.

University of Malaya

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Allah for the guidance, strength and mercy provided to me during this journey. Without His endless Mercy, this work would have not been accomplished.

My deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Hjh. Norafidah Tajuddin, for the supervision, time, great encouragement, help and for her valuable advice all throughout the journey of completing my thesis. Her observant comments on my work has kept on reminding me to explore and stimulated me to further success of my work.

My appreciation also to my relatives and friends in one way or the other who supported and encouraged me to complete my work. I also wish to acknowledge the direct and indirect help of the Faculty of Languages & Linguistics staff for answering my constant queries right through this journey.

Last but not the least, my sincere and deepest gratitude to my beloved ones. To my beloved husband for the constant support, encouragement, love and of course, patience for my weaknesses during this academic journey. And, to my children for giving me happiness and the reason to smile amidst all these. You all have served as an inspiration in my life and have made my life more meaningful and joyful!

This work is also dedicated to my beloved mother (May Allah have mercy on her soul). Ameen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	
Abstract	iii
Abstrak	iv
Acknowledgement	vi
Table of Contents	vii
List of Tables	x
List of Appendices	xii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION **1**

1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background of the Study	3
1.3 Statement of the Problem	5
1.4 Objective of the Study	7
1.5 Research Questions	8
1.6 Significance of the Study	8
1.7 Scope and Limitations of the Study	9

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW **11**

2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Motivation	12
2.2.1 Motivation as a Contributing Factor in Second Language Learning	13
2.2.2 Integrative Motivation	14
2.2.3 Instrumental Motivation	15
2.2.4 Integrative vs. Instrumental Motivation	16
2.3 Studies on Motivation by Dörnyei	18
2.4 Background of Language Learning Strategy	19
2.4.1 Definition of Language Learning Strategy	20
2.4.2 Oxford's Classification of Language Learning Strategy	22
2.4.3 Studies on the Influence of Different Variables in the Utilization of Language Learning Strategies	25
2.5 Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)	28
2.6 Attitude/Motivation Battery Test (AMBT)	29
2.7 Motivation and Language Learning Strategy	29

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	32
3.1 Introduction	32
3.2 Research Context	33
3.3 Research Questions and Hypotheses	34
3.4 Methodological Issues and Consideration	36
3.4.1 Quantitative Research Methods	36
3.4.2 Qualitative Research Methods	37
3.5 Respondents of the Study	38
3.5.1 Nationality	39
3.5.2 Distribution of EPT Score	40
3.5.3 Gender	42
3.6 Instruments	43
3.6.1 Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)	44
3.6.2 Attitude Motivation Battery Test	47
3.6.3 Validity and Reliability of Instruments	47
3.7 Data Collection Procedures	50
3.8 Data Analysis	52
CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	55
4.1 Introduction	55
4.2 Purpose of the Study	56
4.3 Findings and Discussions	57
4.3.1 Findings of Section 1: Demographic Profile	57
4.3.1.1 Duration of time Studying English at CELPAD	58
4.3.1.2 Self-rate Proficiency in English as compared to Classmates	59
4.3.1.3 Self-Rate Proficiency in English compared to Native Speakers	60
4.3.1.4 Importance of Becoming Proficient in English	62
4.3.1.5 Reasons Why Students Want To Learn English	62
4.3.1.6 Favourite Experiences while Learning English	64
4.4 Implications of Findings to Research Questions and Hypotheses	66
4.4.1 Overall Language Learning Strategy Use	67
4.4.2 Proficiency Level and Learning Strategies Use	73
4.4.3 Gender and Language Learning Strategies Use	76
4.4.4 Nationality and Language Learning Strategies Use	79
4.5 The Relationship between Motivation and their Nationality.	98
4.5.1 Summary of Significant Relationship between Motivation constructs and Nationalities	98
4.6 The Relationship between Motivation and Gender	99
4.6.1 Summary of Significant Relationship between Motivation constructs and Gender	99
4.7 Correlation between Language Learning Strategy and Motivation	102
4.8 Further Findings on the Different LLS use between Malaysian and International students.	105

4.9 Summary of the Findings of the Analyses	107
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	108
5.1 Introduction	108
5.2 Overall	108
5.3 Proficiency and Language Learning Strategy Use	110
5.4 Gender and Language Learning Strategy Use	112
5.5 Nationality and Language Learning Strategy Use	114
5.6 Motivation Constructs and English Language Learners' Nationality	116
5.7 Motivation Constructs and English Language Learners' Gender	117
5.8 Correlation between LLS Use and Motivation	118
5.9 Further Findings	119
5.10 Implications and Recommendations	120
REFERENCES	124
APPENDIX A	135
APPENDIX B	137
APPENDIX C	139
APPENDIX D	140
APPENDIX E	143
APPENDIX F	144

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Features of Language Learning Strategy	25
Table 3.1	Distribution of Nationality	39
Table 3.2	Distribution of EPT Score	40
Table 3.3	Gender	42
Table 3.4	Reliability Statistics for SILL	49
Table 3.5	Reliability Test for AMBT	50
Table 4.1	Duration of time Studying English at CELPAD	58
Table 4.2	Self- Rate Proficiency in English as compared to Classmates	60
Table 4.3	Self-rate Proficiency in English compared to Native Speakers	61
Table 4.4	Importance of becoming Proficient in English	62
Table 4.5	Reasons on why Students want to learn English	63
Table 4.6	Favourite Experiences Learning English	65
Table 4.7	Summary Differences between the Six Strategy Categories Use	68
Table 4.8	Summary of Differences in the Use of Language Learning Strategies by Proficiency Level	75
Table 4.9	Summary of Gender differences on Language Learning Strategy Use	78
Table 4.10	Summary of Differences in the use of Memory Strategies by Nationality	81- 82
Table 4.11	Summary of Differences in the use of Cognitive Strategies by Nationality	82- 83
Table 4.12	Summary of Differences in the Use of Compensation Strategies by Nationality	84- 85
Table 4.13	Summary of Differences in the Use of Metacognitive Strategies by Nationality	86- 87
Table 4.14	Summary of Differences in the Use of Affective Strategies by Nationality	88- 89
Table 4.15	Summary of Differences in the Use of Social Strategies	90- 91

Table 4.16	Summary of Nationality Differences on Language Learning Strategies (SILL) Use	95- 96
Table 4.20	Summary of Differences on Language Learning Strategy Use by International students vs. Malaysian students	106

University of Malaya

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	135
Appendix B	137
Appendix C	139
Appendix D	140
Appendix E	143
Appendix F	144

University of Malaya

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

In the domain of second language acquisition (SLA), sustainable research on language learning strategy (LLS) has been conducted in different learning contexts. With the trend towards globalization, in most countries' industries require people to be English proficient. In the field of English acquisition, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) or English as a Second Language (ESL), a lot of studies are done on language: language teaching to language learning. It was Rubin and Stern (1975) who initially introduced the good learner tradition and categorized characteristics of successful language learners (Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975; Naiman et al., 1978). This notion has induced interests to comprehend individual differences and the various variables that employ influence on language learner outcome. From then on, several studies have emerged significantly on language learning. Apparently, many studies about learning and learners have been conducted to get a holistic image of a good learner tradition.

Over the past decades, there has been an increased concern on how learners facilitate their learning tasks in a second/ foreign language. As part of the learning process, English language learners face tremendous stress in acquiring the language and more so in mastering the English language. Research continues to prove that learners, despite the learning strategies they may have used unconsciously, learning the language proves to be still less interesting to some learners. As a teacher the researcher finds it difficult for learners to deal with learning English and obviously taking initial semesters in learning English may not mean that they can understand or say something efficiently as observed during classes. For instance they may fumble with sentence construction and struggle to pronounce even the basic sounds of English.

So, what makes learners successful at learning something? Many researches attempt to find solution on how learners should go about learning English or any subjects. As English language learners, they must enhance and use a wide range of learning strategies to succeed. Consequently, a number of studies arise and indicate that learning strategies play a significant role in successful language learning. Learning strategies are steps taken by students to enhance their own learning (Oxford, 1990). It was also emphasized by Oxford that strategies are important for language learning because they are tools for active, self-directed involvement, which are essential for developing communicative competence. Understanding the relationship between learning and strategies, as well as variables that may affect these choices could help determine barriers to learning and create interventions to improve students' learning experience. Therefore, the kinds of language learning preferences used by different learners may vary according to several variables.

Aside from these direct benefits in L2 acquisition, such as communicative competence, Language learning strategies (LLS) are closely related to learning motivation and learners' beliefs (Yang, 1999). One of the conclusive points made by Oxford and Nyikos (1989) is that "high strategy use probably leads to high motivation as well" (p. 295), and in another study exploring motivation, Pintrich (1989; cited in Chan, 2009) suggests that the use of strategies engender a higher motivation.

Motivation is an instrument to influence individual's goals. It is an important variable on second language learning, which, combined with other factors, influences a learner's success. According to Dörnyei (1994), motivation is generally believed to be one of the most important determinants in L2 learning. As researched from multiple perspectives, human motivation is a complex construct and when linked to L2 learning process, becomes even more intricate (Dörnyei, 2001). And the latter is the main variable to be investigated in my study that affects strategy preferences.

As pointed out by Root (1999) it is still vague how motivation affects continued interests or success or failure in language learning and it is also not clear how motivation especially affects choices in the utilization of the learning strategies. Hence this leads to the researcher's interest that despite research into learning strategies and motivation over the past three decades, as one of the variables of learning strategies, a holistic picture of motivation has not been adequately presented, and that despite calls for investigation of links between L2 motivation and applied language in use, (Dörnyei, 2003 and cited in GU Mingyue, 2008), parallel research is still limited.

1.2 Background of the Study

Based on a study conducted by Dörnyei, Z. (2001), a learner's self-sufficiency is defined as the process of a learner accepting and learning about their own learning practices and how it influences decision making in the overall learning process. In an ESL classroom, learner-centered approaches focus on the learner's learning to gain learner's independence. According to Ellis and Sinclair (2000) and Nunan (1997), problems in language learning arising from the differences among learners can be addressed if the learners are taught to be self-dependent. This can be done if learners are exposed to different learning strategies and the best practice to implement this is learning how to learn strategies. Holec (1981) emphasizes that an independent learner is the one who takes responsibility of his/her own learning. This is not hereditary but gained throughout the process of formal learning. Much research has been done to address the question on why some language learners succeeded but others do not try to explore the strategies used by successful learners.

Oxford (1990, p. 17) accentuated six basic strategies in language learning which "are steps taken by the learner in making the learning process easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective and more transferable to new

circumstances”. Those six strategies were Memory, Cognitive and Compensation, Meta-cognitive, Affective and Social Strategies. Indeed, it is proven that there are strategies which help language learners achieve their goals, and good language learners sometimes use different strategies than poor language learners (Gass & Selinker, 2001). Indeed, research in language learning strategies suggested that numerous factors could influence strategy choice and use, however, motivation is regarded as the most important one (Gardner, 1985).

Motivation and the right attitude in learning a language is essential as it can influence a student’s perspective on the importance of learning a language like English. If one lacks these elements, the learning process can be affected. As a teacher, the researcher fully comprehends the environment in a learning context. Thus, the researcher believes that teachers/ instructors/ facilitators have a vital role to play so that students can benefit from their experience and knowledge in sustaining educational transformation. If the teachers know their students well, they might be able to respond to students’ needs and strengths and thus can increase teaching effectiveness. Therefore, it is essential for a teacher to take on the role of a facilitator and/or instructor to allow learners to manage their own self-directed learning. This can give a broader picture on ‘how to learn’ instead of ‘what to learn’ (Ellis and Sinclair, 2000).

Motivation factors, on the other hand, can be useful when a student explores his own motivational trigger in learning languages and implement them in the learning process. The students will need to learn how to learn first for them to benefit from learning the language.

In promoting the concept of using language learning strategies and using motivation as an influencing method, the teacher needs to know the learners’ view and opinion on how learners can make the learning process more appropriate and consequential. However, prior to that, one should consider individual differences, needs,

interests, goals and motivation for learning. Therefore, language learners should be helped to facilitate the learning process by introducing and equipping them with new learning strategies.

Henceforth, this study came into light and seeks to investigate the learning strategies used by second/ foreign language learners and the motivational factors influencing the acquisition of the target language.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Previous research showed that the use of language learning strategies have a great impact on students' academic success, as such the studies conducted on the strategies used by successful language learners; to name a few: Griffiths, 2003, Takeuchi, 2003; Rubin & Stern, 1975. Language learners will be successful in the tasks due to the use of an appropriate language learning strategies (Richard, 1994). Studies have been conducted for over three decades and directed at proficiency levels, gender, age (Green & Oxford, 1995; Shmais, 2003; Hong- Nam & Leavell, 2006), ethnicity (Grainger, 1997) , nationality (Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006), career choices and psychological type (Oxford & Ehrmann, 1989), etc.

Motivation, on the other hand, is related to language learning purpose, which is another key to strategy use (Oxford, 1990). Motivation, as one variable that affects strategy choice, also influences a learner's success. Many studies have found that motivation is the strongest predictor of strategy use (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989). According to Gardner, highly motivated learners are active and successful language learners (Oxford, 1996a).

However, studies on the use of learning strategies and motivation as a variable have not been fully explored in an English learning environment where English language learners are of mixed nationality and culture in background. Unlike many previous studies, the English language learners in this study who are studying in Centre for Languages and Pre-University Academic Development (CELPAD), at International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), come from different countries and cultural background such as Africa, Middle East and Asian nationals such as Malaysians, Indonesians, Pakistani and Bangladeshis.

The pressing need for further research is to examine the link between motivation and LLS use by learners of different backgrounds. What is the role of the different nationality and cultural background in their LLS preferences? What is the role of proficiency and gender in their choice of LLS use among mixed nationality group? Whether or not English language learners from diverse background are limited in the use of strategy? Is there a unique strategy used by each nationality group or if proficiency levels from different nationalities and gender have similar or different strategy preferences? Aside from that, as per observance, ESL/ EFL learners appear to be driven by motivation at the initial stage of and tend to lapse during the learning process and not motivated anymore. Having said that, the main trajectory in this study is not centered on motivation alone but to examine the relationship between motivation and learning strategies with learners of mixed background and gender. Therefore, the aim of this study is to examine if learners from different countries and cultural background use similar or different learning strategies. In addition, the researcher also wants to examine if these high and low levels English language learners from different nationality utilize similar or different learning strategies. More importantly, this current study is directed to investigate if they have coincidental motivation constructs affecting these strategies or if this variable i.e. motivation is significantly related to language

learning strategy use. In addition, the researcher is also concern whether motivation really works on learning strategies. Ultimately, this study will examine if motivation have an impact or a positive association in acquiring English proficiency. Thus this sets the significance of this study.

1.4 Objective of the Study

The objectives of this study are as follow:

1. To investigate the language learning strategies (LLS) used by high proficiency and low proficiency English language learners in CELPAD.
2. To examine if there is a significant difference between male and female learners on the use of LLS.
3. To explore the utilization of learning strategies used by the Pre-university IIUM English language learners belonging to different nationalities.
4. To examine the motivation constructs of the learners of CELPAD from different nationalities
5. To examine the motivation constructs of the learners of CELPAD by different gender.
6. To investigate if motivation has a positive association with language learning strategies.

Henceforth, based on the above research objectives, research questions are stated below and the corresponding hypotheses are formulated in chapters 3 & 4.

1.5 Research Questions

The research objectives above lead to the following research questions.

1. What are the learning strategies used by high and low proficiency English language learners?
2. Is there a significant difference between male and female learners on the use of language learning strategies?
3. What learning strategies are used by the Pre-university IIUM English language learners of different nationalities?
4. What are the motivation construct of these English language learners of different nationalities?
5. What are the motivation construct of these English language learners of different gender?
6. Is there a significant relationship between language learning strategies and their motivation construct?

1.6 Significance of the Study

As a teacher the researcher believes in learners' autonomy to boost learning transformation. Based on the researcher's experience as an ESL/ EFL teacher, English language learners do use some common learning strategies (LS), but do not know how to fully utilize LS effectively.

This study is an attempt to analyse the influence of motivation on learning strategies used by English language learners. It is hoped that this study might instigate other researchers to conduct similar study as it is important for these language learners of different backgrounds to be exposed to various strategies. This research would also help language learners identify the right strategies which would directly and indirectly help them in their life-long learning process.

Thus the findings could provide useful information for English teachers in the university where the research is being carried out. Both teachers and students would benefit from the research as it would encourage learner's self- autonomy and self-directed methods in language acquisition.

This study would also enable English language learners to know the effectiveness of motivation as it would provide some recommendations for further enhancement of language acquisition. Teachers would then be able to understand their students' affective domains and students would ultimately become independent foreign/second language learners.

Lastly, this study would also be able to encourage teachers and/ or curriculum designers in various institutions of higher education, even across Malaysia, to further explore how English language learners can use various language learning strategies with prior assessment of their motivation orientation. Teachers would also become more aware of their learners' learning strategies or encourage the use of these methods appropriately.

1.7 Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study explores only the English language learners of CELPAD at International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM) in the utilization of learning strategies based on Oxford's framework. The sample size of 183 students might not provide a sufficient collective data support that may be directly representative of the whole population of English language learners. Nevertheless, the results can provide useful insights in encouraging the use of language learning strategies among ESL/ EFL learners of different background or nationalities. However, the researcher has taken into account individual capabilities and thus the sample selected are representative of a normal English Speaking classroom in a Malaysian atmosphere, that is, their

proficiency in English ranges from good to fair to poor and these learners were able to respond appropriately during the course of the study.

Although effort was made to remind the learners to give their honest perceptions in the implementation of the research instruments used, such as in the informal interviews and observations, it is not possible to do away the biasness that the students may have. Thus to minimise this, the respondents were not allowed to discuss with each other their perceptions and ideas before documenting the findings of the study.

Lastly, the study also examines the learning motivation of these learners based on the two scales framework of motivation by Gardner: Instrumental and Integrative motivation. This does not give privilege for the researcher to modify most of the items and questions were directed at gathering information on motivation, which are centred on instrumental and integrative constructs. Thus, a mini- AMBT was formulated and conducted.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The vigorous economic and cultural globalization in the past three decades has resulted in gaining significant importance in learning English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL). The growing trend in learning ESL / EFL is fuelled by desires for personal growth and enrichment as well as for increasing employment opportunities. Not to mention the empirical growth in the research and development field which demands sharing of information across different language barriers. From economic and cultural globalization perspective, it is inclusive of language globalization, particularly, in advancing the role of English as a Universal lingua franca (Crystal, 2003) and in a global language system. English stands at the very center and continues to entrench this dominance in a self-reinforcing process (Held et al., 1999). English as a lingua franca elaborately discussed by David Crystal (2003) in his publication 'English as a global language' contains state of the art information. In this publication, he stressed on how the advances in internet and information technology encompass affected and accelerated the globalization of English language.

Learning English as a second/ foreign language has received widespread attention and the learning strategies employed are widely analyzed for various needs in the field of education and research. Thus, as mentioned in chapter 1, a significant shift has occurred and the focus has shifted from teachers and teaching to learners and learning. The shifts to learners and learning have resulted in development of research in language learning strategy. This has led to a widespread attention on learners and educators to explore language and linguistics further. The role of learners in their learning process has changed from typical learners to prospect learners in identifying

various language learning strategies. Research has shown that learners have certain judgments and are capable of becoming aware of their mental processes during the learning phase. This has been proven in an extensive study of educational psychology.

On the other hand, previous research have commended that preferences and use of learning strategies are influenced by several factors, however, motivation is considered as the most important (Gardner, 1985).

2.2 Motivation

By terminology, motivation means the act or an instance of motivating or providing with a reason to act in a certain way. For example, person B do not understand what person A's motivation for quitting her job. Motivation is a word used to refer to the reason or reasons for engaging in a particular behavior - especially human behavior. These reasons may include a drive, a need, a desire to achieve a goal, a state of being, or an ideal. In human beings, motivation involves both conscious and subconscious drives. The researcher ultimately defines motivation as simply our desires, efforts, and attempts to be as satisfied as possible. It is what gets us focus and get it done!

As aspired by Gardner (1985), "motivation is a term which is often used with respect to second language learning as a simple explanation of achievement." Gardner (1985, p. 10) describes second language (L2) motivation as "the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity". Three components are incorporated in this definition: the effort expended to achieve a goal, a desire to learn the language, and the satisfaction with the task of learning the language. Therefore, this can be summarized into this notion "motivation refers to a complex of three characteristics (effort, satisfaction and desire) which may or may not be related to any particular orientation"

(Gardner, 1985, p. 54). Brown (1994) further defines motivation as “the extent to which you make choices about goal to pursue and the effort you will devote to the pursuit”. Besides that, accordingly, high strategy can lead to high motivation as pointed out by Oxford & Nyikos (1989).

2.2.1 Motivation as a Contributing Factor in Second Language Learning

Motivation is considered by many researches to be one of the main determining factors in the success of developing a second or foreign language. As Dörnyei (1994) points out motivation is generally believed to be one of the most important determinants in second language (L2) learning. Motivation represents one of the most appealing, yet complex variables used to explain individual differences in language learning (McIntyre et al., 2001, p.462). The complexities of motivation have been studied in various researches and studies since the late 1950's. Many studies conducted by R.C. Gardner and his colleagues and many researchers in different parts of the world found that motivation is persistently a strong predictor of successful language learning.

Motivation is also widely addressed in behavioral psychology. Accordingly, the aspirations, desire of one and reinforcement are emphasized, and motivation is defined as “the anticipation of reinforcement” (Brown, 1994).

Dörnyei (2001a) also added that as researched from diversified perspectives, human motivation is a complex construct that, when linked to the L2 learning process, becomes even more intricate. The complex nature of L2 motivation has spawned a variety of theories and approaches, including quantitative or qualitative research into L2 motivation in various contexts. Over the past four decades, the number of factors involved in motivating persons to acquire a foreign language has increased enormously. Explicitly motivation has been defined as the motivated individual expends effort, is persistent and attentive to the task at hand, has goals, desires and aspirations, enjoys the

activity, experiences reinforcement from success and disappointment from failure, makes attributions concerning success and or failure, is aroused, and makes use of strategies to aid in achieving goals (Dörnyei, 2003, p. 173).

Gardner (1979, cited in Skehan, 1993), quoted by Norris-Holt (2001), suggest that expectation towards bilingualism, combined with attitudes towards the target language and its culture, form the basis of an individual's attitude towards language learning. There are two types of motivational constructs that Gardner designed: Integrative and Instrumental dichotomy.

Integrative orientation as defined by Gu (2008) "reflects a desire to learn a foreign/ second language in order to identify with and have contact with the members of the target community or even enter it". On the other hand, instrumental orientation reflects "an open and positive regard for outside groups who speak L2" (McIntyre, Baker, Clement, & Conrad, 2001, p.373; cited in Gu, 2008). Gu (2008) also describes a group of factors concerned with the motivation to learn a language emerging from the pragmatic value of language proficiency, such as better career opportunity or better commendation.

2.2.2 Integrative Motivation

Integrative motivation is characterized by the learner's positive attitudes towards the target language group and the desire to integrate into the target language community. Motivation has been identified as the learner's orientation with regard to the goal of learning a second language (Crookes and Schmidt, 1991). It is thought that students who are most successful when learning a target language are those who like the people that speak the language, admire the culture and have a desire to become familiar with or even integrate into the society in which the language is used (Falk, 1978). This form of motivation is known as integrative motivation. When someone becomes a

resident in a new community that uses the target language in its social interactions, integrative motivation is a key component in assisting the learner to develop some level of proficiency in the language. It becomes a necessity, in order to operate socially in the community and become one of its members. It is also theorized that "integrative motivation typically underlies successful acquisition of a wide range of registers and a native like pronunciation" (Finegan, 1999, p. 568). This seems to be an appropriate finding since learning a target language requires the adoption of word sounds, pronunciations, word orders and other behavioral and cognitive features that are parts of other culture. For example, there are individuals who are willing to learn new languages to identify with the other language group.

2.2.3 Instrumental Motivation

Instrumental motivation underlies the goal to get some social or economic compensation through L2 achievement, thus referring to a more purposeful reason for language learning. This is generally characterized by the desire to obtain something practical or concrete from the study of a second language (Hudson, 2000). With instrumental motivation the purpose of language acquisition is more utilitarian, such as meeting the requirements for school or university graduation, applying for a job, requesting higher pay based on language ability, reading technical material, translation work or achieving higher social status. Instrumental motivation is often characteristic of second language achievement, where little or no social integration of the learner into a community using the target language takes place, or in some instances is even desired.

2.2.4 Integrative vs. Instrumental Motivation

While both integrative and instrumental motivations are essential elements of success, it is integrative motivation which has been found to sustain long-term success when learning a second language (Taylor, Meynard and Rheault, 1977; Ellis, 1997; Crookes et al., 1991; cited in Norris-Holt, 2001). In some of the early research conducted by Gardner and Lambert, integrative motivation was viewed as having more weight in a formal learning environment than instrumental motivation (Ellis, 1997). In later studies, integrative motivation continued to be emphasized, although the importance of instrumental motivation is also stressed. However, it is important to note that instrumental motivation has only been recognized as a significant factor in some research, whereas integrative motivation is continually linked to successful second language acquisition. It has been found that majority students select instrumental reasons more frequently than integrative reasons for the study of a target language. Nevertheless those who do support an integrative approach to language study are usually more highly motivated and overall more successful in language learning.

One area where instrumental motivation can prove to be successful is in the situation where the learner is provided with no opportunity to use the target language and therefore, no chance to interact with members of the target group. A clear example of such a case of instrumental motivation, is Armando Rodriguez. He was a Mexican born immigrant and lives in Los Angeles, California. He, as a native Spanish speaker, could not speak fluent English. Nevertheless, he became fluent in English. During an interview by Silverstein (1999), he reported that Rodriguez, who worked in a restaurant as a dishwasher and kitchen assistant, was keen in learning English through chatting with co-workers and customers. Silverstein, who is not a linguist, psychologist or educator, ascribed Rodriguez's financial needs as the force driving his language success when he stated, "Picking up a few words in a foreign language, or in exceptional cases,

advanced conversational skills, sometimes is a way to get ahead economically. Rodriguez, for instance, worked his way up from dishwasher to manager because he became fluent in English". This may have played as a motivational role by encouraging Rodriguez to remain gainfully employed by continuously practicing and thus improving his English. This is a good example of instrumental motivation construct.

Likewise, Lukmani (1972) found that an instrumental orientation was more important than an integrative orientation in non-westernized female learners of L2 English in Bombay. The social situation helps to determine both what kind of orientation learners have and what kind is most important for language learning. Braj Kachru (1977; cited in Brown, 2000) also points out that in India, where English has become an international language, it is not uncommon for second language learners to be successful with instrumental purposes being the underlying reason for study.

Brown (2000) makes the point that both integrative and instrumental motivations are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Learners rarely select one form of motivation when learning a second language, but rather a combination of both orientations. He cites the example of international students residing in the United States, learning English for academic purposes while at the same time wishing to become integrated with the people and culture of the country.

In short, motivation is an important factor in L2 achievement. For this reason, it is important to identify the type and combination of motivation that assists in the successful acquisition of a foreign/ second language. At the same time it is necessary to view motivation as one of the number of variables in an intricate model of interrelated individual and situational factors which are unique to each language learner.

2.3 Studies on Motivation by Dörnyei

Dörnyei's (2002) study proved that the investigation of the effect of motivation and its co-construction by the participants on task-performance is a worthwhile endeavour. The shortcoming of these studies, however, was, that they were only concentrated on the quantity of speech produced by the participants and did not analyse other linguistic variables. He also believes that "the spectrum of other potentially more useful motivational strategies is so broad that it is hard to imagine that none of them would work." The central question in designing a construction of motivational strategies is to decide how to systematize them into detach themes. The following taxonomy is based on the process-oriented model by Dörnyei and Otto (1998). The key units in this taxonomy are as follows:

- Creating the basic motivational conditions, this involves setting the scene for the use of motivational strategies. This can assist the researcher in identifying the strategies used in learning languages despite the countries of origin. This was done by collecting information from various country background respondents and analyzing the feedback.
- Generating students' motivation, which roughly corresponds to the pre-actionable phase in the model. The respondents motivation constructs were identified with the modified AMBT survey.
- Maintaining and protecting motivation, which corresponds to the actionable phase.
- Encouraging positive self-evaluation, which corresponds to the post-actionable phase.

Since the instrument to be used here is based on Gardner's motivation scale: Instrument and Integrative, it would be important to cite Dörnyei's concept on this. According to Dörnyei (1994), in his study on integrative and instrumentality, Gardner's motivation construct has been strongly related to the two components. The integrative and instrumental motivations are very important components in finding positive disposition among the language learners group and the value would become similar. The motivation construct will later be used by those students to gain pragmatic competence in looking for better job, higher salary or boost career. An individual's actions and behaviours cannot be measured with one panaceaic approach (Dörnyei, 2000 & 2001).

2.4 Background of Language Learning Strategy

Language Learning Strategies (LLS) refer to the conscious or unconscious mental steps that are employed by learners' to aid in the acquisition of a target language. Language learning strategies also refers to the explicit introduction of language learning strategies during lessons where learners are exposed to and these strategies can be used to facilitate the learning process.

In the 1960's research on language learning strategy began to take shape and was influenced by rapid economic and cultural globalization. Researches focusing on language learning strategy was greatly influenced by the development of cognitive psychology (Williams and Burden, 1997, p. 149). Rubin and Wenden (1987, p. 19) indicate that the main concern in language learning strategies has been "identifying what a good language learner report they do to learn a second or foreign language" or, in some cases, are observed doing while learning languages. Aaron Carton article entitled 'the method of inference in foreign language study' made it the the pioneer research on learner strategies(1966). This is followed by another publication by Carton

in 1971, and subsequently led to Rubin's research on strategies used by successful learners. In 1975, Rubin classified processes contributing directly or indirectly to language learning. Rubin, who was a pioneer in the field of strategies, distinguished the processes to learning strategies, communication strategies and social strategies. There were two types of learning strategies contributing directly to the development of the language system: cognitive learning strategies and metacognitive language strategies. Accordingly, communication strategy was less directly related to language learning since the main focus is on the process of participating in conversations and getting the meaning across. Social strategies are those activities learners actively engage in, which provide them the opportunities to be exposed to and practice their knowledge. Although these strategies provide exposure to the target language, they contribute indirectly to learning since they do not lead directly to the obtaining, storing, retrieving, and using of language.

2.4.1 Definition of Language Learning Strategy

Language learning strategies was first defined by Tarone (1983) as “an attempt to develop linguistics and socio linguistic competence in target language to incorporate these into one's interlanguage competence”. Then it was followed by Rubin (1987, p. 19), who defined learning strategies as “any sets of operations, steps, plans used by learners to facilitate the obtaining, storing, retrieval and use of information. While Wenden (1987) refers to LLS as learning behaviours that learners are actually engage in, strategic knowledge, to learn and regulate a second language learning. In a helpful survey article, Weinstein and Mayer (1986) differentiate learning strategies as “behaviors and thoughts that a learner engages in during learning”. This was identified in influencing the learner's encoding process. Moreover, Chamot (1987) defined LLS as

techniques, approaches, or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate learning and recall of both linguistic and content area information.

Later on Mayer (1988) in his writings specifically defined learning strategies as the learning tools of a learner that are intended to influence on how the learner processes information. Educators like Wenden (1987) throughout his research recognized that the awareness of the language learning strategies has been exploited by learners and the idea that language learners are individuals who can take charge of their own learning and achieve autonomy in using learning strategies which have been initialized in their inner selves. Whereas, O' Malley & Chamot (1990, p.1) viewed LS as "the special thoughts or behaviours that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn or retain new information." (also cited in Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006).

These initial studies have gained focus in the behaviors and thoughts that learners use and ultimately brought more focus on language learning strategy. Studies on Language Learning Strategies (LLS) have progressed rapidly for the past three decades. On the other hand, Richards and Platt (1992, p. 19) observed that learning strategies are known as an intentional behavior and thought of learners to better understand new information. A more broad and in-depth definition by Stern (1992, p. 261) summarizes that language learning strategy depends on learners consciously engaging in activities to achieve goals and conceived as intentional directions and learning techniques. Moreover, consciously or unconsciously, language learning strategies are in use when language learners are processing new information and performing tasks in the language classroom. Since teaching and learning activity is like a problem-solving process, using language learning strategies is unavoidable for students to find the quickest or easiest way to provide new input for the difficult tasks given by their instructors.

Oxford expanded the definition that learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective and more transferrable to new situations (1990). Also, Chamot (2004) mentioned that learning strategies are the conscious thoughts and actions that learners take in order to achieve a learning goal. In the field of fundamental research in second or foreign language acquisition, it accommodates identification and description of learning strategies used by language learners and the correlation of these strategies with other learner variables such as age, gender, level of proficiency, motivation and the other elemental variables (Chamot & El-Dinary, 1999; El-Dib, 2004; Green & Oxford, 1995; Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995).

The above definitions illustrate that the focus has shifted from the product of linguistic or sociolinguistic competence, and moved towards greater emphasis on the processes of language learning strategy. In summary, language learning strategy in second/ foreign language learning can be defined as steps and actions which are pursued and used by learners. These are comprised of steps of retrieval, rehearsal, and communication strategies.

Indeed, Language Learning Strategies have been classified by many scholars. However, most of these attempts to classify language learning strategies reflect more or less the same categorizations of language learning strategies without any radical changes in early research of LLS. Based on three decades of study, the Oxford's classification is acknowledged as the most comprehensive classification and widely used in strategy inventory for language learning.

2.4.2 Oxford's Classification of Language Learning Strategy

Oxford's (1990) classification is acknowledged as the most extensive and accurate classification of learning strategies such as "operations employed by the

learner to aid acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information” and is fundamental in Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). This was supported by O'Malley et al. (1985, p. 582-584).

Language learning Strategy classifications were seen as an instrument to measure competences in communication development. Oxford's classification is similar to Rubin's classification in dividing learning strategy into direct and indirect categories. However, Oxford's classification is more comprehensive and further subdivided into six groups. According to Oxford (1990), learning strategies help learners participate actively in authentic communication. These strategies if implemented, encourage development of communicative competences. Oxford's classification of strategies is divided into two extensive classes: direct and indirect. These two classes are subdivided into 6 groups (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social).

Under the direct class or strategies are memory, compensation and cognitive strategies while metacognitive, affective and social strategies are grouped under indirect strategies. Memory strategies include creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds, reviewing well and employing action, for instance, using imagery and structured review. Cognitive strategies include practicing, receiving and sending messages, analyzing and reasoning and creating structure for input and output of the language learning strategies, such as reasoning deductively, using contrastive analysis and strengthen grammatical accuracy. Another direct strategy is the compensation strategy which involves steps such as guessing intelligently and overcoming limitations in speaking and writing, such as acting out, gesturing to express meaning of unknown word or expressions.

The indirect strategies stipulated by Oxford (1990) are composed of metacognitive, affective and social strategies. The metacognitive strategy focuses on centering one's learning, arranging and planning one's learning and evaluating one's

learning- “help learners to regulate their own cognition and to focus, plan, and evaluate their progress as they move toward communicative competence” (Oxford, 1990, p.20). Furthermore, the affective strategy encompasses factors such as lowering anxiety, encouragement and monitoring emotional temperature and to regulate emotions. This helps develop learner’s self- confidence and perseverance in language learning. Finally, the social strategies are inclusive of asking questions, cooperating with others, empathizing with others and learning with others, and becoming culturally aware of the natives. This will strongly help learner’s sociolinguistic competence.

It is significant to mention that all suitable language learning strategies are conformed toward the broad goal of communicative competence. Oxford (1990) stressed learning strategies help learners to actively participate in such authentic or successful communication such as one-to-one or in group. These strategies should be performed in general or specific ways to instigate the development of communicative competence.

It should be emphasized that with the correct selection of learning strategies and accession of its importance, learners are able to create effective learning competence. With better understanding of the relationship between LLS and learners, conscious selection of strategies suitable for learners with different learning style preferences is made possible, and this may lead to optimal learning effectiveness (Griffiths, 2007; Nyikos & Oxford, 1993). Oxford (2003) remarks that language learners adopting appropriate LLS may be encouraged to extend themselves beyond their style preferences, leading to more robust language-related experimentation and positive learning effects (cited in Chan, 2009).

Table 2.1 Features of Language Learning Strategies

Language Learning Strategies:
1. Contribute to the main goal, communicative competence. Allow learners to become more self-directed.
3. Expand the role of teachers.
4. Are problem-oriented.
5. Are specific actions taken by the learner.
6. Involve many aspects of the learner, not just the cognitive.
7. Support learning both directly and indirectly.
8. Are not always observable.
9. Are often conscious.
10. Can be taught.
11. Are flexible.
12. Are influenced by a variety of factors.

Adapted from Oxford, 1990

The table above summarized the features of Language Learning Strategies which are characteristics of certain strategies or strategy groups. Communicative competence is the chief objective where all applicable LLS are formulated. Learning strategies aid language learners cooperate actively in any authentic conversations, thereby enhancing communicative competence (Oxford, 1990).

2.4.3 Studies on the Influence of Different Variables in the Utilization of Language Learning Strategies

Early research into language learning strategies was mostly focused on examining what strategies learners used without considering the link between strategy used and success (e.g. Stern, 1975; Rubin & Wenden, 1987). In basic research on

learning strategies in second/ foreign language acquisition, its fundamental research is centered on the identification and description of learning strategies used by learners and the influence of variables in their usage. Current studies, are also investigating on the effect of the task itself on the selection and use of learning strategies, including the influence of the target language (Chamot & Keatley, 2004; Oxford, Cho, Leung & Kim, 2004).

Over the past decades, studies on LLS have focused on the association of the different variables to language learning strategies, such as proficiency, gender, cultural background/ nationality and motivation. Most of these researches identify the relationship between learning strategies used by ESL learners with a wide variety of factors and generally investigate the strategies used by successful language learners (such as Griffiths, 2003; Rubin & Stern, 1975; Takeuchi, 2003). As prototype, Oxford & Nyikos (1989) probed the relationship between language learners' proficiency and their use of learning strategies. Griffiths (2003) reported and ascertained a positive association between proficiency level and self-reported frequency use of LLS by 348 students in a private language school in New Zealand. In addition, Van & Abraham (1987, 1990) revealed that unsuccessful learners use strategies that are considerably useful, and they employed similar strategies as successful learners. The difference is, however, in the usage of appropriate strategies between successful learners and unsuccessful learners in appropriate situations. For instance, Wharton (2000) reported that students who self- rated their proficiency as "good" or "fair" used more SILL strategies predominantly than those who rated their proficiency as "poor". It is also revealed in Watanabe's (1990) study of university and EFL college students in Japan that, generally, students who had higher self-rated proficiency used more SILL strategies than those with lower self-rated proficiency.

Studies produced a great deal of evidences on gender in the utilization of LLS. For example, Hong-Nam & Leavell (2006) reported there was no statistical significant difference on LS in connection with gender on 55 ESL students in an IEP (Intensive English Program) at Southern Western University, except for affective strategies used by women. Previous studies (Green& Oxford, 1995; Dryer & Oxford, 1996; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Lee & Oh, 2001; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; Lee & Oxford, 2008) also revealed the same conclusion. Kim's (1995) also found that there was no significant difference on language learning strategy use between males and females in his study on Korean adult ESL learners (cited in Quadir, 2010).

Politzer & McGroarty (1985), on the other hand, mentioned that many LLS may be based on ethnocentric assumptions about effective language learning. Other studies also have extensively investigated the effects of cultural background in identifying strategy choice at different level of frequency (Politzer & McGroarty, 1985 ; Bedell, 1993; Hong- Nam & Leavell, 2006). Indeed, numerous studies have been published that nationality or cultural profile has a great association with language learning strategy use (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995; Bedell &Oxford, 1996; Grainger, 1997; Politzer, 1983; Reid, 1987 and Wharton, 2000). Moreover, Asian students were found to utilize LLS which are discordant and distinct from those of other students of different cultural backgrounds (e.g. Politzer & McGroarty, 1985; Oxford, 1994; O'Malley & Chamot , 1990; O'Malley et al., 1985; Huang & Van Naerssen, 1987; Tyacke & Mendelsohn, 1986; Noguchi, 1991, Lee, 2003).

Lastly, motivation is one of the most primary variable in language learning. A number of studies were also conducted to investigate the relationship between motivation and LLS. As mentioned earlier, Oxford & Nyikos (1989) connote that learners with high motivation will most likely use a variety of strategies. For instance, Wharton (2000) who conducted a study on Singaporean Bilingual Foreign language

learners, recorded that the extent of intensity of motivation had the most significant fundamental effect on the use of language learning strategies. Also, Mochizuki (1999) reported in his study that motivation has the highest influence on learners' choice of strategy.

Thus in this present study, motivation is the ultimate variable to be examined as it strongly affects strategy preferences among language learners.

2.5 Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Extensive research as discussed above shows that successful learners and unsuccessful learners learning ability are determined by many different aspects and factors. Rebecca Oxford (1990) postulates the most comprehensive language learning strategy scheme. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) divides strategies into six categories or classifications. These are memory, cognitive, compensation strategies, metacognitive, affective strategies and social strategies. Hence the questions in SILL are organized into six (6) groups representing each classification: memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies and lastly, social strategies.

Many questionnaires were designed to assist language learning strategy and Oxford's (1990) instrumentation is predominantly utilized (Macaro, 2001). This instrument has been used extensively to collect data in large numbers of mostly foreign language learners (Cohen, Weaver & Li, 1998; Nyikos & Oxford, 1993; Olivares-Cuhat, 2002; Oxford, 1990; 1996; Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995; Wharton, 2000, cited in Chamot, 2004). Other questionnaires enables data collection but with some loopholes and are incomplete (Burry-Stock, 1995).

2.6 Attitude/Motivation Battery Test (AMBT)

The role of motivation as described in section 2.2 and 2.3 is significant in the learning process and learning strategy. Many researchers agree that motivation is the principal determinant. Hence, there are many theoretical framework and instruments used to measure the variable. Over the past 30 years many scales have been developed such as AMBT by Gardner, Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) by Pintrich et. al. and Action Control Scale (ACS -90) by Kuhls to measure motivation. Each of these instruments has advantages and disadvantages that is pertinent to the individual research objectives.

By far Gardner's AMTB method is the most standardized and widely acknowledged method for assessing motivation. During the time the survey instrument/tool was developed for the use of learning French and French Canadians, it was modified to refer to attitudes toward learning English and English speakers. Attitude/Motivation Battery Test (AMBT) is a tool to measure and assess five factors that contribute to language learning.

The researcher feels that it is greatly important to determine learners' attitude and motivation towards learning the English language, because this is an elemental variable which drives the learners to move forward and to be at their best while learning the language.

2.7 Motivation and Language Learning Strategy

Research on language learning has been a criterion of social psychology. Most researchers believe that motivation is a key factor for success and contributes to whether one is a successful or unsuccessful learner in language learning. Dornyei (1996) identified that motivation plays an important role in every different psychological perspective in a human behavior. A substantial amount of research has been carried out

on motivation and its impact on language learning in the past few decades (e.g. Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 1985; Dörnyei, 1990; Strong, 1984; Sawhney, 1998; Vaezi, 2008; Wang, 2009). Since motivation is entwined in every aspect, Gardner (1985) concludes that motivation is a broad concept and difficult to define. Most researchers study the concept of motivation without stipulating whether it is affective, cognitive or behavioral nature. The need of identifying correct and appropriate motivation enable the learners or educators to enhance the learning strategies applied. Gardner and Lambert (1972) categorized motivation into two categories as integrative motivation and instrumental motivation.

On top of that Gardner (1985) and Deci and Ryan (2000) postulated intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation theories. Intrinsic motivations drive learners to learn as a challenge or fun activity rather than external motivation rewards. Intrinsic motivation is part of natural human behavior since birth, as humans are continually exploring and curious in a playful manner.

Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, refers to doing something because it provides a separable outcome either as a reward or punishment. For example, a student who does his homework out of fear of parental sanctions for not doing is extrinsically motivated because he only does it to attain the separable outcome of avoiding sanctions. Similarly, a student who does the work because he/she personally believes it is valuable for his/her chosen career is also extrinsically motivated because he/she is doing it too, for its instrumental value rather than interest. According to De Charms (1968), people must not only experience perceived competence (or self-efficacy), they must also experience their behavior to be self-determined if intrinsic motivation is to be maintained or enhanced.

Having said that, this study concludes that motivation is a significant tool for students to achieve their communicative competence and for teachers to help the

learners to be effective in their learning by accommodating LLS in their teaching for students to use during the learning period. Hence, this study examines the relationship between motivation and the use of learning strategies and how motivation has positive association with language learning strategies.

Motivation seems to be an essential tool and important point in our role in helping students to learn the language (Lightbrown & Spada, 1993; Dörnyei & Csizer, 1998; Cheng & Dörnyei, 2007; Dörnyei, 2006). That being said, this research attempts to investigate if motivation has a positive impact on the learners' utilization of learning strategies in learning the target language.

The present study has the assumption to affirm the crucial role of motivation in language learning and duplicate a good number of researches on motivation and LLS. Considering the immense variety of factors that might influence language learning motivation, hence, the present study will explore the correlation between language learning motivation and the utilization of learning strategies.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the design of the current research. In this chapter, the researcher sets two main goals: first, to explain the fundamental methods used in the data analysis aspect and check the appropriateness of the study's reliability and validity of the results. Secondly, the researcher hopes the study can be replicable for prominent studies in the future. To achieve the goals, the researcher has set out the research questions and hypotheses on the study before presenting the research design itself. The researcher also explains the processes used in creating the instruments designed for this study and summarize the data collection procedures. The analyses procedures are mentioned in this chapter as well.

According to previous studies on motivation by Li, Y., & Wang, C. (2010), proficiency and gender are some factors which affect strategy choice in language learning. Thus this study will investigate the learning strategies used by the English language learners of Centre of Language and Pre- University Academic Development (CELPAD) in relation to the gender of the respondents. Also, this study does not only focus on the use of the strategy but also examines the differences and types of language learning strategies used by high and low proficiency English language learners. Also, there might be a few motivation aspects that would influence a student's learning strategy during the learning curve. Thus in this study, the researcher hopes to understand what the motivation constructs are and how motivation can be considered an advantage in influencing interest in a learner's self- esteem in learning the language.

3.2 Research Context

The study is conducted in CELPAD (Centre of Language and Pre-university Academic Development) at International Islamic University of Malaysia, which has four divisions or departments offering courses in proficiency and language for academic and occupational purposes. For the purpose of this study, the researcher will be analyzing students from the English language department. One of their main goals is to provide the necessary language skills to the students of multi-cultural backgrounds to help them enter the academic programmes of IIUM, which is persistent with the vision and mission of International Islamic University of Malaysia (IIUM). This language centre and university itself where the study is conducted caters students who come from diverse nationality, social background and linguistics disposition and these students are the respondents in this study.

In CELPAD, it is compulsory for students to attend 20 hours of English class weekly over an eighteen -week semester. They then sit for their English proficiency placement test at the end of the semester. Their English exam scores determine the placement of their level of language proficiency. The curriculum comprises the basic components of learning : listening, reading, speaking and writing. Basically CELPAD is implementing a Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) method and not skill based. TBLT is also known as TBLL (Task Based Language Learning).

TBLT is a method in teaching which is based on the use of task which is the key to planning and instruction. It is an approach which allows students to work somewhat at their own pace (velocity within their own level) to actively engage in the processing of group or individual activities in order to accomplish a task such as error analysis on sentence structure, listening tasks and essay writing task. Using language as the target, learners will be instructed to focus on the use of authentic language. Brown (2001) points out that TBLT distinguishes the process of communicative tasks in learning that

are straightly connected to the educational program goals they serve. It is also important to note that CELPAD's curriculum method is congruent to the communicative needs of the learners, if purpose is served effectively.

The study design was conceived to examine the respondents' attitudes towards language learning strategies and identifying their motivation orientations. It was based on two crucial conjectures: (1) that the language learning strategies of the respondents could make a difference and may effectively be used when learners are aware of their purpose and importance to fulfill their learning orientations, and (2) that motivation constructs of respondents be recognized and be set as an instrument to encourage learner to be goal-driven in learning the language despite their own mother tongue.

The first part of the analysis will examine the possible relationships between SILL and the learning motivations. The second phase of analysis will be on the students' learning motivations in relation with the language strategies used. This analysis will also investigate if these strategies and motivations are significant among the different gender, language proficiency and nationality. The quantitative analysis will be carried out to identify learners' strategies use and learning motivations as well.

3.3 Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study was designed to examine whether there is a statistically significant difference in the learning strategies use between high proficiency and low proficiency English language learners, of learners from different nationalities as well as difference in reference to gender. In addition, it is conducted to obtain findings on how motivation affects their learning strategy choice and the use of these learning strategies. The questions and hypotheses are stated as follow:

(1) What are the strategies use by high proficiency and low proficiency English language learners?

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in the mean of language learning strategy use of high proficiency and low proficiency English language learners of various backgrounds.

H₀₂: High proficiency learners may not use different or more strategies than low proficiency learners.

(2) Is there a significant difference between male and female learners on the use of language learning strategies?

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in the mean of language learning strategy use of female and male English language learners of various backgrounds.

H₀₄: Female learners use more language learning strategies than male learners.

(3) What learning strategies are used by the Pre-university IIUM English language learners of different nationalities?

H₀₅: There is no significant relationship in the uses of the six classifications of learning strategies of CELPAD English language learners in connection with their nationalities or backgrounds.

(4) What are the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD of different nationalities?

H₀₆: There is no significant relationship in the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their nationality.

(5) What are the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD of different Gender?

H₀₇: There is no significant relationship in the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their gender.

H_{07a}: There is a significant relationship in the motivation constructs of these learners of CELPAD and their gender.

(6) Is there a significant relationship between English language learners' learning strategy use and their motivation constructs?

3.4 Methodological Issues and Consideration

3.4.1 Quantitative Research Methods

In the social sciences, quantitative research refers to the systematic empirical investigation of quantitative properties and phenomena and their relationships. The objective of quantitative research is to develop and employ mathematical models, theories and/or hypotheses pertaining to this study. The process of measurement is central to quantitative research because it provides the fundamental connection between empirical observation and mathematical expression of quantitative relationships (Turner, J. C, 2001). Quantitative research is used widely in social sciences such as sociology, anthropology, and political science. Quantitative research is generally done using scientific methods, which can include: (1) The generation of models, theories and hypotheses, (2) the development of instruments and methods for measurement, (3) experimental control and manipulation of variables, (4) collection of empirical data, (5) modeling and analysis of data and (6) evaluation of results.

Usually in motivational researches, the quantitative research methods have been emphasized in learning second language or foreign languages. This is due to the initial influence of social psychology and concomitant emphasis on the results that are reliable, replicable and generalized accordingly to different types of language learner population. Osanai, D. (2000) further explains that as the language learning strategies researchers have traditionally implemented on targeting the more general and stable aspects in learning language motivation, cross sectional surveys have been widely used in their researches. The cross sectional survey is an example of surveys administered at a single point in time, involving self report questionnaires with mainly close-ended questions.

The most efficient ways in implementing quantitative research methods are the data collection and data processing as they are relatively inexpensive, fast and economical in terms of labor. The survey approach with no open ended items may seem to be reliable, but the disparaging aspect of it is the investigation of the language learners' motivational skills which are basically constrained by the constructs; researchers have imposed rather than derived from the respondents' own expressions of their understanding of the phenomenon under study (Urdu, T, 2004).

3.4.2 Qualitative Research Methods

Qualitative method also known as interpretive method among researchers has not been commonly used in studying language learning strategies and motivation in learning foreign languages even though it has been widely implanted since a decade ago (Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M, 1995). The main difference between quantitative and qualitative methods in language learning strategies is the focus. The first research method focuses more on the participants, whereby the latter method focuses more on the researcher's interpretations and precedence. For qualitative studies, the researches mostly will be analyzed based on the findings from notes taken during classroom observations, interviews, journal entries or authentic documents such as recorded speech samples, texts written by participants or video recording of lessons (Lu, Y. C, 2007). Therefore, the researcher can determine students' language learning motivations from descriptions constructed after observing students' involvement in classroom activities. This will also help the researcher to determine the possible motivations obtained from observation. For small sampling studies, qualitative method can be applicable, but if the sampling studies are large, then the researcher should implement the quantitative method.

Therefore, for the purpose of this study, the researcher hereby implemented the quantitative method, where survey was administered with close-ended questions deriving specific information from.

3.5 Respondents of the Study

The target respondents in this study were the English language learners in Centre of Language and Pre-University Academic Development (CELPAD). For the purpose of this study, the English language learners were grouped into two levels of proficiency: High level and low level, using their EPT scores. At the time the survey was actualized, the learners have been studying the English language in CELPAD from an average of 3 months to 5 while the others for more than 12 months. One eventual reason on why CELPAD was selected by the researcher is because of its nature for being heterogeneous or multicultural. This makes this study unique from other studies on learning strategy use. Most of the learners in CELPAD particularly the sampling subjects for this study are from different parts of Asia like China, Thailand, Indonesia, India, Cambodia and Malaysia and Africans and Middle Eastern students as well. As mentioned earlier, these learners are diverse with regards to nationality and cultural orientations. By being heterogeneous in its composition, helps the researcher to carry out a significant study since very few researchers have done a study on learning strategies with respondents of mixed nationality and ethnic groups. In this multicultural facet, there might surface differences in strategy use and as well as motivation among the learners. This was proven by the study on Motivation and Second Language Acquisition (Schmidt, R. & Watanabe, Y, 2001).

3.5.1 Nationality

Many foreign students as well as Malaysian students participated in the survey. Table 3.1 shows the distribution of different nationalities of the learners of this finding below. It is notable that the majority of the CELPAD learners were Malaysians who make up 30.1 % of the total sample population. It should also be noted that the next highest proportion of CELPAD learners were the Arab students who represented 24 % of the sample. Indonesian students made up the third highest proportion of the institute's students population and contributes to 13.7% of the whole respondents. The other nationalities were very small in number compared to the other major groups as mentioned above. They were relatively small in numbers since a few of the nationalities composed of one or two students from each country. For example, Kyrgyzstan, Japanese, Somali, and Uzbekistan. See table 3.1 below for details.

Table 3.1: Distribution of Nationality

Nationality	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Malaysian	55	30.1	30.1	30.1
2. Arabs	44	24.0	24.0	54.1
3. Indonesian	25	13.7	13.7	67.8
4. African	18	9.8	9.8	77.6
5. Thai	10	5.5	5.5	83.1
6. Indian	6	3.3	3.3	86.4
7. Iranian	5	2.7	2.7	89.1
8. Cambodian	4	2.2	2.2	91.3
9. Chinese	4	2.2	2.2	93.5
10. Bangladesh	3	1.6	1.6	94.6
11. Pakistani	2	1.1	1.1	96
12. Uzbekistan	2	1.1	1.1	97
13. Vietnamese	2	1.1	1.1	98.1
14. Japanese	1	.5	.5	99
15. Kyrgyzstan	1	.5	.5	99.5
16. Somali	1	.5	.5	100
Total	183	100.0	100.0	100

3.5.2 Distribution of EPT Score

The researcher randomly chose learners who studied in CELPAD academic year 2011- 2012 from different levels , since the Head of the English department only gave the researcher the list of names of the level instructors and the conduct of surveys were administered through either the availability or approval of the level instructors.

The respondents were divided into groups using their English Proficiency Test (EPT) scores. The EPT scores were then divided into two groups, high and low proficiency level and cut point 5 value was used in the test. Thus good, fairly good, satisfactory and quite satisfactory were grouped into high level proficiency and poor, very poor and extremely poor were categorized into low level group.

Table 3.2: Distribution of EPT Score

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	Grouped as
Valid Good	1	.5	.5	.5	High level prof.
Fairly Good	17	9.3	9.3	9.8	
Satisfactory	33	18.0	18.0	27.9	
Quite Satisfactory	59	32.2	32.2	60.1	
Poor	8	4.4	4.4	64.5	Low level prof.
Very Poor	30	16.4	16.4	80.9	
Extremely Poor	35	19.1	19.1	100.0	
Total	183	100.0	100.0		

Their English proficiency was measured by IIUM English Proficiency Test. The learners' English Proficiency Test (EPT) score (as of semester 1, 2011- 2012) was

collected and summarized into groups based on their scores. This summary is useful to identify the general command of the English language among the English language learners. Table 3.2 above depicts the percentage value representing the subjects' responses to the question. Table 3.2 also shows the numerical representation of the EPT score of this finding. Those who scored in the range between 6.5 to 6.9 are considered good students. In the sense that, these students have generally effective command of the language despite some inaccuracies, inappropriacies and misunderstandings which means they still face problems in writing their academic essays. Only one respondent had scored good point in the EPT score, that was between 6.5 to 6.9. Those in the second range are considered fairly good which means that these scorers have generally effective command of the language despite some inaccuracies, inappropriacies, and misunderstandings. Even though there are minor concerns on their average capability, they still face problems in completing academic essays. Based on table 3.2, 17 respondents were categorized in this group which contributes to 9.3%. The learners who scored between 5.5 to 5.9 are considered satisfactory. This shows that they are satisfactory in the command of the language, coping with over-all meaning in most situations, though are likely to make mistakes. They are expected to handle basic communication in their own field. The fourth category is below satisfactory learners (whose scores were 5.0 to 5.4), which contributes to the higher percentage out of the total sum of the respondents. They contributed to 32.2% (or 59) out of 183 English language learners. These learners have partial command of the language, coping with over-all meaning in most situations, though is likely to make many mistakes. The rest of the category in the EPT score group are the poor, very poor and extremely poor type students (scores from 3.0 to 4.9). These students most likely have basic competence and is limited to familiar situation. They have frequent problems in understanding and

expressing situations, not capable of using complex language, very weak in reading or writing basic sentences.

The descriptions of their scores as mentioned above were based upon CELPAD booklet and IELTS score band interpretation.

3.5.3 Gender

The respondents for this study were randomly chosen 183 pre-university English language learners, inclusive of females and males who were arbitrarily chosen. Originally there were supposedly 197 participants, but only 183 learners managed to give full support by participating in the survey and accomplished the three questionnaires (demographic, SILL & AMBT) and the rest of the respondents failed to complete the survey. Based on the total questionnaires distributed, 14 language learners were considered invalid because they were either incomplete or unfinished. Thus including them in the survey would lead to data errors, so the researcher excluded them in this research. The survey lasted for over 2-weeks as it was contingent on the availability of the instructors.

As shown in Table 3.3, most of the respondents are males which contributes to around 57.9% out of 183 respondents and the rest, 42.1% are females.

Table 3.3: Gender

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	106	57.9%	57.9%	57.9
Female	77	42.1%	42.1%	100.00
Total	183	100	100	

It is found in this study that male learners of English were majority than the female learners in CELPAD for two reasons: firstly, this study is focused on heterogenous composition of respondents and secondly, Arab nationals were the second highest rank of learners from the sample, by random. Considering that, most of the Arab

countries do not allow their women to study abroad without a “Mahram”, a shariah legal terminology which means any man with whom a woman has blood relationship or tied by marriage (a husband). Thus, majority of the sample population in this study were men than women.

Although all the respondents studied English in their home countries before coming to Malaysia, this does not automatically enable them to enroll in degree programs in IIUM. In order to register for degree programs, they need to fulfill the language requirements at IIUM. Consequently, this was their main reason in learning English in CELPAD. Respondents for this study were randomly selected from the CELPAD classes. The non probability sampling technique utilized for this study was purposeful. Also, the researcher would not aspire responses to be similar among them. It would be easier to get approximate data if you have no account on the respondents’ opinions yet.

The principal method of inquiry for this study is a questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed to the respondents randomly. The set of questionnaire are divided into 3 parts inclusive of demographic information, SILL survey forms and AMBT survey form.

3.6 Instruments

The most frequent and effective method in identifying students’ learning strategies is through questionnaires (Chamot, 2004). The only limitations are the learners may not recollect the actual strategies that they may have employed while learning the language or may claim to use certain strategies where in fact they do not use or may not comprehend the listed strategies in the questionnaire items. For these reasons, some studies have developed questionnaires based on tasks that students have just completed, reasoning that students will be more likely to remember and to report

accurately if little time has elapsed (see Chamot & El-Dinary, 1999; Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Ellis & Sinclair, 1989; Fan, 2003; Kojic-Sabo & Lightbrown, 1999; National Capital Language Resource Centre [NCLRC], 2000a, 2000b; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford et. al, 2004; Ozeki, 2000; Rubin & Thompson 1994; Weaven & Cohen, 1997).

For this study, the two main research instruments as follow were employed.

3.6.1 Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

The first one is SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning), a 7.0 version designed by Oxford (1990) which is used to determine the strategy utilization by the learners that they perceived themselves using. This questionnaire consists of 50 close-ended questions with the 5- point Likert scale ranged from 1 -5 answering type. The researcher defined SILL as a decisive tool which has been used and tested over the years to determine the use of language learning strategies by learners. SILL is also accompanied with the background questionnaire which delves on demographic information of the respondents, their stance in learning the English language, reasons of learning the language, etc. The background questionnaire is an optional article to be used to collate demographic information. It has been used in SILL research studies to provide additional information on students characteristics (Oxford, 1990). Originally the (SILL) background questionnaire has 15 question items, but for the purpose of this study, the researcher only adopted 12 questions because these items will help the researcher generate a better understanding of the target learners and the SILL results in context.

SILL questionnaire was developed to assess learning strategy among English speaking foreign language learners in a language institute in California (Oxford Burry-Stock, 1995). An amended version was published in 1990 with 50 components utilized

for ESL / EFL learners. The SILL instrument adheres 50 strategy statements each describing the use of one strategy. These strategies are divided into two major classes: direct and indirect. These are then subdivided into six strategy categories according to Oxford's (1990) learning strategy classification system. The six groups are as follow:

1. Part A: Memory strategies / Items #1-9 (9 items) – for entering information into memory storage and for retrieving it when needed such as creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds, employing actions and reviewing well.
2. Part B: Cognitive strategies / Items # 10-23 (14 items) – are skills or steps that involve direct analysis, transformation. These involve formal practice of sounds or structures, reasoning, conscious ways of tackling learning, such as note-taking, resourcing and elaboration.
3. Part C: Compensation strategies / Items # 24-29 (6 items) - for reducing or overcoming one's own deficiencies by using other possible alternatives such as guessing or using gestures.
4. Part D: Metacognitive strategies / Items # 30-38 (9 items) - involve planning and thinking about learning such as planning one's learning, monitoring one's own speech or writing, and evaluating how well one has done.
5. Part E: Affective strategies / Items # 39-44 (6 items) – help learners gain control of their emotions, attitudes, and motivations relative to language learning. These refer to handling emotions or attitudes, encouraging oneself, talking with someone about your feelings...
6. Part F: Social strategies / # 45-50 (6 items) – refer to cooperation with others in the learning process, such as asking questions, becoming aware of other's thoughts and feelings, learning others' culture.

According to Oxford, the first three refer to direct strategy whereas the latter are indirect strategies. Meaning, the first three components in SILL contribute directly to

learning strategies whereas the following three components contribute indirectly. The main feature in the direct strategies is that all these require mental processing and process in its own way. The other components were called indirect strategies because they support and manage language learning in many occurrences directly involving the target language.

The SILL is a self-report survey or questionnaire used to assess the frequency language learning strategies used (Oxford, 1990). The researcher's ultimate reason for choosing this inventory from other inventories was its distinction and accomplishments associated with language learning. It has been a well-known tool to investigate LLS in language acquisition. Macaro (2006) stated that this inventory has received recognition from extensive studies in different contexts, which further testified its reliability and validity. Based on Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, & Robbins (1999), educating the learners with language learning strategies can assist students to attain goals of improving their mastery of the target language and it is often helped with the indirect strategies involved. Aside from that, it was also reported by Oxford & Ehrman (1995) that SILL's reliability is ordinarily in the range of 0.90s. It has been carefully and extensively developed, in order to assure its validity and reliability. It is noteworthy to mention that Strategy Inventory for language Learning (SILL) (Oxford, 1990) was first designed as an instrument for assessing the frequency of use of language learning strategies for the Army Research Institute and students at the Defence language Institute in Monterey, California. The SILL uses a five-point Likert scale that students had to respond for each strategy item ranging from 1 - 5 ('never or almost not true of me' to 'Always or almost true of me'). Examples of strategy statement that a learner might perceive using are, "I use new words in a sentence so I can remember them"; "I try to talk like native English speakers" etc.

3.6.2 Attitude Motivation Battery Test

The second instrument is Attitude Motivation Battery Test. AMBT was originally developed for the use of secondary school students studying English as a foreign language. The items comprising each scale are presented in the item-key document. So far AMBT has been translated and used widely in language researches in Brazil, Croatia, Japan, Poland, Romania and Spain. This instrument is AMBT (Attitude Motivation Battery Test) which was administered in order to collect data on the learning motivation construct of these students. AMBT was developed on the basis of Gardner's motivation construct (1985).

This test was modified according to the needs of this study. The original total number of questions in the AMBT is 116, but in this study, it was minimized and customized to only 10 items by the researcher. This was done due to time constraints that learners may face during the data gathering process since SILL itself would take half an- hour test plus its demographic questionnaire. The researcher would want to avoid that students feeling bored and hastily complete the test , and thus questions on motivation was made concise in this study.

Ultimately, this study used SILL mainly to investigate the use of learning strategies employed by the target respondents in learning the English language and AMBT survey is a component which can help the research to understand the learners' motivation constructs and how would it affect in the selection of learning strategies.

3.6.3 Validity and Reliability of Instruments

The instruments were designed to relate the problem statement, research questions and the hypotheses as well. Questionnaires of SILL and AMBT were administered to assess learners use of learning strategies and how gender, nationality...etc, have correlation with the utilization of these learning strategies and to

identify learners' motivation constructs and how selected variables have relationship with learners' motivation, respectively.

The main instruments to collect data were the SILL consisting of 50 item questions accompanied by demographic tool and AMBT. AMBT survey instrument's questions are considerably large. Thus, to demonstrate the accuracy of the measurement, the researcher modified the AMBT survey into concise form inclusively of 10 items only which are designed to determine whether learners' motivation orientation are instrumental or integrative. Thus this will minimize possible data error due to respondents' carelessness, fatigue and lost of interests in answering both questionnaires which would affect the result of the study.

Furthermore, the researcher also had an informal conversation with a few respondents prior or after the survey just to get an overview of how they perceive learning the target language- which is English. It is important that observations should be done to check the content validity, clarity of statements, competence of directions and for suitability (Schumann, J. H., & Wood, L. A. 2004). In this study, the researcher had already witnessed the students' behavior during the first meeting prior or after the delivery of the survey.

Furthermore, relevant statistical analyses were used to analyze the collected data based on the distribution of responses on the frequency of the language learning strategies use and the correlation of learning strategies used and proficiency, gender and nationality. Normally the reliability of a questionnaire will be determined by the test-retest approach. Although pilot data collection for test-retest was not implemented in this study aside from the informal observation through chats, the researcher has chosen SILL instrument with certainty because there are many evidences that SILL is reliable. Considerable evidences show that SILL is valid and reliable (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). As pointed earlier, SILL is a decisive tool which has been used and tested over

the years to determine the use of language learning strategies by language learners. The mean score of the findings determine the reliability of co-efficient (Mondada, L., & Doehler, S. P, 2004).

The computed reliability co-efficient (r) can conclude whether the objective of the study can be reliable or vice versa. For the SILL survey, the researcher estimates the Cronbach alpha value between .73 ~.88. This is inclusive of all the six sections in the SILL. Cronbach's α (alpha) is a coefficient of reliability. It is commonly used as a measure of the internal consistency or reliability of a psychometric test score for a sample of examinees.

To cite a few of its consistency: the internal consistency reliability Cronbach's alpha of SILL is .96 for a 1200-person university sample and .95 for a 483-person military sample (Ya-Ling, 2008). On the other hand, based on the study conducted by Basaran & Hayta (2013), it was confirmed on the study the reliability scale Cronbach's alpha of AMBT is being 0.918 which means it has a significant reliability.

For this study, the result as shown in table 3.4 below indicates that the Cronbach's alpha value for this instrument is 0.833, which is a high level of internal consistency for the researcher's scale of SILL and the reliability level of this instrument was within the adequate range. In this study, results are compared and correlated with previous studies and the estimate internal consistency reliability of Cronbach Alpha of SILL is .83 or 83% reliable across 183 English learners of CELPAD.

Table 3.4 Reliability Statistics for SILL

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.833	.862	50

On the other hand, the use of standardized Attitude/ Motivation Battery Test is recommended or a variation thereof (Dörnyei, 2001b). Several revisions of the AMBT have been proven reliable in the field, including that of Clement (1994), Dörnyei (1994, 1998, 2001b, 2003); and Gardner (1994, 2001, 2003). Dörnyei also adds that AMBT has good psychometric properties, predictive and construct validity (2001b).

For AMBT survey, the researcher run a reliability test and revealed that the Cronbach's α (alpha) value for this test is .784, as shown in table 3.5. Therefore, it has been confirmed that the internal consistency of the scale with the Cronbach Alpha of .78. Since all the Cronbach Alpha reliability values are above 0.7, this indicates that the grouping of all 10 items in the AMBT survey test is reliable.

Table 3.5 Reliability Test for AMBT

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.784	.789	10

3.7 Data Collection Procedures

Respondents from English language learners of Centre of Language and Pre-University Academic Development (CELPAD) were selected for this case study. The researcher compiles the answers of the sample in order to determine how the group as a whole thinks or behaves. For this study the researcher had used the questionnaire to elicit information on students' English language learning strategies use. Henceforth, the researcher can investigate respondents' opinion regarding the language learning strategies use and their motivation constructs.

Prior to the administration of the research instruments, ethical considerations were attended to. The researcher sought the approval of the relevant authorities, such as

the centre administrative (e.g. the Dean & English head) and teachers were contacted, and permissions were sought and accomplished. Once the approval was granted, the data collection tools were prepared and adjusted accordingly. Before the conduct of the survey, the learners were informed about the objectives and significance of the research and informed that their participation was on voluntary basis and the information obtain will be handled with utmost anonymity and confidentiality. The completion of the survey should be 30 – 40 minutes run to administer both survey instruments (SILL & AMBT). That is why the researcher chose the availability of the assigned teacher at a particular time and most of them preferred to run the survey 30 minutes before class dismissal time. Then, data gathered from the survey was analyzed. The case study was organized into single phase:

(1) Data collection using standardized survey questions. The questionnaire was divided into 3 parts.

Part 1/ Demographic describes the respondent's background such as their name, gender, last EPT score, nationality, self-grade on English proficiency, the purpose that encourages them to learn the language and favourite experiences in learning the language.

Part 2 measures the students' language learning strategies preferences. For this purpose, SILL (Strategy Inventory of Language Learning) has been used. The questionnaire consists of 50 questionnaires in six parts. Overall, the mean scores for SILL instrument will depict how often the respondents use strategies for learning English. High use ranges from 3.5- 5.0, Medium use from 2.5- 3.4 and 1.0- 2.4 for Low use of LLS, as definition of SILL averages set by Oxford (1990).

The final & third part of survey is the modified Attitude/ Motivation Battery Test by Gardner, R.C. The researcher hopes to identify and analyze what the main motivations of these students are, which could influence a student in learning the target

language. The AMBT for this research, as mentioned earlier, contained 10 questions and 5 Likert scale will be used. They need to answer in 5 likert-scale whereby answers are in the choice of disagree to agree. Overall for the 3rd section of survey, the researcher is more interested in collecting data regarding motivation issues among the respondents using the AMBT instrument.

The feedback received from the respondents was remarkable. They gave full cooperation with the researcher. The entire questionnaires and results were used by the researcher to study the language learning strategies and motivations involved and perceived by the learners and how it would affect the learners' interests towards learning the target language despite the differences in their mother tongue. It is through this research, the researcher hopes to identify any significant relationships between the learning strategies used and their gender, proficiency, nationality and particularly, motivation.

3.8 Data Analysis

In this study, the researcher used Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). SPSS is a suitable tool to run t-test, descriptive analysis and frequencies. Thus it is selected to do the analysis for the instrumentation used for this study. Data analysis has multiple facets and approaches, encompassing diverse techniques under a variety of names, in different business, science, and social science domains (Stevens, J, 1996).

To determine respondents' background information, language learning strategy use and perceived motivation constructs, it is significant to compute descriptive statistics along with frequency, its percentages, means, standard deviations (SD). From a raw data, it was transferred to and created a spreadsheet in excel format for analysis of data after they were collected through questionnaires. Then it was imported to SPSS using ODBC (Open Database Connectivity) driver so that the study can be done in

SPSS by the researcher. Based on the research questions, SILL instrument (version 7.0), originated from Oxford's (1990), was used in this study, while Gardner's original AMBT was modified accordingly to test motivation constructs, respectively. For SILL the 5 point Likert scale was used as of the following:

- The score 1=Never or almost never true of me,
- 2= Usually not true of me,
- 3= Somewhat true of me,
- 4= Usually true of me and
- 5= Always or almost always true of me was used.

On the other hand, the modified AMBT was also used with 5 Likert-type- response questionnaire, but the definition varies as interpreted below.

- 1= strongly disagree,
- 2= disagree,
- 3=Neutral,
- 4= agree and
- 5= strongly agree.

The mean scores were also ranked from the best (closer to 5= strongly agree) to worst (closer to 1= strongly disagree) to segregate the perceived accomplishment of language learning motivations and objective into top and bottom quartiles.

The sample questionnaires can be viewed in the appendices.

The type of analysis done on these questionnaires will be explained in this section. For the survey section part 1, analysis will be done on the distribution of frequencies, its percentages will be generated. For SILL survey, the researcher has decided to do an analysis on the mean and standard deviation score for each component using the SPSS and percentages. It is important because mean was used in analyzing the data as the researcher can measure the central tendency and spread and as to check

possibilities of the hypotheses for this study, standard deviation (SD) is more appropriate. The mean and standard deviation scores would be analyzed among gender in each component of Language Learning Strategies with alpha value of, $*p < .05$. Likewise, the researcher would do analysis on mean and standard deviation for proficiency level, nationality, as well and for the overall study. T-test was conducted to analyze any significant difference between male and female learners on the use of LS and differences on the use of LS among CELPAD learners of different nationalities as well as their perception and motivations. The most widely used type of correlation coefficient is Pearson r . Finally, correlation analysis between SILL and AMBT was computed as well. While, Pearson correlation was utilized to find out if there were any significant relationship between students' language learning strategy use and their perceived motivations.

For this study, the researcher would be implementing the quantitative research method. Quantitative data analysis was conducted utilizing SPSS 15.0 for windows and focused on descriptive survey analysis, as well as t –testing to ascertain the statistical significance of mean differences at $p < \alpha$ levels which is $p = 0.05$.

Overall, analysis would be done on the frequency, percentage, standard deviation, significant difference and correlation coefficient on the collated data.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the key findings resulting from the group as obtained through the 3 questionnaires (demographic profile, SILL & AMBT). Results were analyzed following the methodological framework as mentioned in chapter 3. Instruments such as SILL and AMBT have been customized and used in data collection procedures for CELPAD English language learners.

Research questions were stipulated along with their hypotheses. Thus, it is necessary to mention that these hypotheses will be answered in the findings along with the questionnaires in this chapter subsequently.

The questionnaire was design into three parts. Briefly, the first part was questions asked regarding the learners' demographic profile, English proficiency and their basic idea on English language. The descriptions taken from the demographic profile presented background knowledge about not only the learners' profile but also their history in learning English. The second part was questions asked about the learners perceived LS through the SILL instrument. The third part in the instrument was the AMBT questionnaire to identify the motivation orientation perceived by the respondents.

The section questions are:

Section 1: Demographic or background information (see chapter 3 also).

Section 2: Learners' understanding on SILL

Section 3: Learners' understanding on AMBT

In each of the category in this chapter, the findings are first reported, then followed by in-depth analysis and discussions. Descriptions of the data are given, followed by data reported in table format for SILL results and AMBT results, to visually illustrate the average percentage sequentially. Actual quotes and key words are provided throughout the report.

4.2 Purpose of the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate the influence of motivation on learning strategies used by ESL learners and to examine how language learning strategy can best assist students to become more effective English language learners. Furthermore this research will also identify the significant differences between the achievement of different nationalities group or gender of CELPAD students with respect to their perceived utilization of learning strategies and their motivation construct as one influencing variable. The backwash or outcome analysed in this study inclusively contributed to learners' retention of strategies preferences and their manners towards English as a Second/ Foreign Language acquisition during the learning curves. The researcher also hopes from the findings of this study that the significant learning strategies and approaches among the English language learners of various background in CELPAD can provide insights on how the learners view the overall learning process and hopefully will generate a good impact on teaching and learning in a FL/L2 setting. The significant findings on the different learning strategies used by high proficiency and low proficiency English language learners will also be analysed. The third purpose will be on finding the motivation constructs of the learners who come from diverse background or nationalities. The key respondents are the English language learners of CELPAD.

4.3 Findings and Discussions

4.3.1 Findings of Section 1: Demographic Profile

This section provides the analysis on finding the learners' background knowledge about the English language from their own perspectives, or learners' history in learning English, the duration they studied in CELPAD, self-rating their proficiency of the English language compared to the rest of the students in the class and also compared to overall native speakers of the language. Some demographic information of the learners' gender, nationality, and last English Proficiency Test score are already presented in chapter 3.

Other information revealed in the first section of the questionnaire was the importance of gaining proficiency in English and why they want to learn the language. The respondents were also queried regarding additional information such as how they feel about learning the English language, and their favourite experience in learning the English language. The sample represents the population of CELPAD students. Thus the findings are explained from the true scenario of English learning of CELPAD's English language learners or learners from CELPAD environment since the sample is the representation of the total population of English learners in International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM). These may not be direct reflective to the RQs but the answers here sustain and validate the learning strategies used and the perceived motivation constructs by the learners. This could be explained more in the succeeding discussions section later.

The demographic information of the respondents are explained briefly in succeeding sections along with explanation of the average in percentages. All Tables for SILL results and AMBT results are provided in order to illustrate the graphical representation of the distribution of the average. All tables are arranged sequentially in this chapter.

4.3.1.1 Duration of time Studying English at CELPAD

In section 1 of the questionnaire, the English language learners were also questioned regarding the length of time they had studying English in CELPAD. The learners' answers were categorized into four main groups which are 1-4 months in CELPAD, 5-8 months, 9-12 months and more than 12 months duration of study in CELPAD. Some of them had enrolled for less than three months, where as some have been in CELPAD for more than a year. The average length of time studying in CELPAD would be between 5 months to two years. It should be noted that the highest population was in 5 to 8 months duration. These learners contributed 49.2% from the total of 183 students. The study was conducted in the academic year 2011-2012 in the second semester and 30.05% respondents have been in CELPAD between a month to 4 months, and 12.6% respondents for more than a year. The lowest population was in the group of 9 to 12 months or most likely less than a year. This contributed to around 8.2%. See table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Duration of time Studying English at CELPAD

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 5 months to 8 mo.	90	49.18	49.18	49.18
1 month to 4 mo.	55	30.05	30.05	79.23
More than 12 mo.	23	12.57	12.57	91.8
9 mo. to 12 mo.	15	8.20	8.20	100.0
Total	183	100.0	100.0	

The length of time studying may have had little or no effect on the data of the present study in measuring learning strategies use and motivation, however, it is one aspect by which carving knowledge of learning strategies can retain and progress overtime. Among other things, language learners do not improve learning by just one flick of a hand or overnight. It is noteworthy to mention that the average amount of time studying is important to base on observation and theories by Cummins, Collier, Krashen, et.al., which have shown that the average length of time for learning academic language ranges between 5 to 10 years (Lightbrown & Spada, 2006.)

During the researcher's informal interview or chat with some learners, they attested they did not want to prolong studying in CELPAD, though it may be fun, because everybody just wanted to pass the EPT and others just got tired and bored repeating levels and just wanted to move on to undergraduate programme. However, according to those who have stayed in CELPAD for more than 5 months, what made them repeat some levels is because they could not pass their EPT (English Placement Test) and previous scores were not valid to enter the undergraduate programme. They thought they could be accelerated to the next level, but it was difficult to pass the EPT.

4.3.1.2 Self-rate Proficiency in English as compared to Classmates

For the question on rating their own proficiency, the students were asked to rate themselves on their overall proficiency in the English language compared to their classmates. The students rated themselves in the scale of (1) excellent , (2) good, (3) fair or (4) poor. The summary is presented in table 4.2 below, as follows.

Table 4.2: Self- Rate Proficiency in English as compared to Classmates

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1- 3	90	49.2	49.2	49.2
2- 2	87	47.5	47.5	96.7
3- 4	6	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	183	100.0	100.0	

In terms of self-rated English proficiency as compared to classmates, 49.2% of the respondents rated themselves as being fair in English proficiency. This is the highest rating contributed by these language learners. Others rated themselves as being good in the language, which makes up 47.5% and only 3.3% of the total learners stated that they rated themselves as poor. The findings show that the learners of CELPAD rated themselves as being fair in the competency of English proficiency compared to the rest of their classmates.

4.3.1.3 Self-Rate Proficiency in English compared to Native Speakers

The same rating was required from these English language learners, however, this time they were asked to rate themselves against the native speakers of the English language. The numerical representation of the findings is presented in table 4.3 below. Again the majority rated themselves as fair. But very few learners rated themselves as good in the language. This is because 55.7% of the sample rated themselves 3 (fair) and 21.9% rated 2, as being good in the English language. However, this could be inaccurate since it is self-report and the learners may not report truthfully. Secondly, there was no proper tool or actual observation on the part of the researcher to measure their proficiency rate as compared to the native speakers. This rate was based only on what

the respondents perceived about themselves. These learners could be biased in answering questions about themselves and this was not supported by any evidence.

The summary shows that the CELPAD learners find themselves to be fair in the proficiency of the English language in comparison to native speakers of English. See table 4.3 below for details.

Table 4.3: Self- Rate Proficiency in English language compared to the Native Speakers

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1- 3	102	55.74	55.74	55.74
2- 4	41	22.4	22.4	78.14
3- 2	40	21.86	21.86	100.0
Total	183	100.0	100.0	

Fundamentally, what the learners in this study revealed is that most of them are quite confident and moderate as far as proficiency of the English language is concerned. Having explored the self-rating proficiency of these students compared to their classmates and native speakers in this study, it is relatively important to mention that several studies have confirmed a significant relationship between language learning strategies use and language proficiency. To name a few, a study of 147 foreign students in different universities in United States found that self-rating proficiency was significantly correlated to the use of language learning strategies (Osanai, 2000), while a study of Wharton on university students' learning strategies also reported the students who rated themselves on their proficiency as "good" or "fair" used more strategies more often than those who self-reported themselves "poor" in proficiency (Wharton, 2000).

4.3.1.4 Importance of Becoming Proficient in English

The learners were asked to rate themselves with regards to the importance of gaining proficiency in the English language. For this question, the scales are (1) very important, (2) important and (3) not so important. The summary of the findings is provided in table 4.4. Refer below.

Table 4.4: Importance of becoming Proficient in English

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	139	76.0	76.0	76.0
2	42	23.0	23.0	98.9
3	2	1.1	1.1	100.0
Total	183	100.0	100.0	

It is noted that the majority of the CELPAD learners find it very important to be proficient in the language. And very few students responded as not so important in gaining proficiency. This is because 76% of the learners stated very important. While 23% of them thought studying the language is quite important and only 1.1% responded not so important. The succeeding item will explain their reason or reasons on wanting to learn English.

4.3.1.5 Reasons Why Students Want To Learn English

Next, these English language learners were inquired about why they want to learn English and become more proficient. There were diverse responses for this question as this was not a close-ended question. The different responses are summarized in table 4.5 as a numerical representation of the findings. As a result, it is obvious that most of the CELPAD students prioritize it for a future career. This is

revealed by 83.6% learners out of 183 valid responses. This is probably because English has become a requisite in order to be hired or promoted in most employment in their countries. About 71% of the sample stated that they want to learn English because of the interests toward the language other than for the requirements to enter undergraduate programme. A close proximity of 69.9% or 70% from the group claimed as just simply interested in the language. So, it could be inferred that most of them find learning English as trendsetting (an “in-thing”) or simply put in an expression: “Hey, It’s an international language!” The rest answered the need to learn English for travelling purposes, to meet and have friends who can speak English, to educate other people about Islam...etc. Learners were allowed to stipulate more than one answer, so table 4.5 shows the cumulative percentage is more than 100%. See table 4.5 below for illustration.

Table 4.5: Reasons on why Students want to learn English

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Interested in the Language	128	69.9	69.9	69.9
Interested in the culture	22	12.0	12.0	81.9
Have friends who can speak the language	86	49.9	49.9	131.8
Requirements to enter the undergraduate program	130	71.0	71.0	202.8
Need for future Career	153	83.6	83.6	286.4
Need for Travel	94	51.4	51.4	337.8
To educate people about Islam / to invite people toward Islam	5	2.7	2.7	286.4
It's an international language	3	1.6	1.6	337.8
To translate Thai books to English	1	.5	.5	286.4
To marry a non- Arab girl	1	.5	.5	337.8
To help me understand when I watch English programs and movies	1	.5	.5	286.4

These learners stipulated one to two (1 to 2) or more reasons on why they learn English. And these reasons may be their motivation that drive them to learn the target

language and thus, the researcher hereby inferred that most learners in this study are instrumentally motivated in the context of learning English

4.3.1.6 Favourite Experiences while Learning English

The last question of section 1 was about the learners' favourite experiences while learning the English language. The researcher attempts to find out the learning experiences of the entire CELPAD learners by using the responses from the sample. The numerical representation of the responses are summarized in table 4.6. There were various experiences expressed by the learners, to enumerate: communicating with other people, learning the components of English to minor reasons such as using the language for travelling, enjoying learning English because of their teachers and so on. Overall, the main trend for the favorite experiences collated are improving essay writing, communicating with friends, acquiring self-confidence, like speaking English, better learning through reading, listening English and watching English programs, and movies. The learners claimed that they are able to communicate with foreign friends and understand them better and speaking with other people as their favourite experiences in learning English, with 26.8% of the respondents out of 183 sample population. Watching English movies, news, TV programs were the second highest favourite experience for these respondents in learning English. It comprises 14.2% respondents, 11.5% of the respondents contributed that reading English media as well as speaking English were their favorite experiences.

On the contrary, 5.5% out of 183 answered that they had no favourite experiences while learning English. Nonetheless, it is possible to make an assumption from these findings that the respondents are really seeking to gain confidence and communicative competence. See table 4.6 below.

Table 4.6: Favourite Experience Learning English

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Communicating with foreign friends and understand them/ Speaking with other people	49	26.8	26.8	71.5
To be able to understand English news, movies and TV programmes/ I like watching any English media	26	14.2	14.2	41
Reading English articles, books, magazines, novels, Islamic books... etc.	21	11.5	11.5	52.5
I like speaking English.	21	11.5	11.5	64
listening to English music or movies.	16	8.7	8.7	72.7
improving my writing skills...eg. Essay, journals	12	6.5	6.5	79.2
Doing class activities such as group work, presentations, group discussions, playing word/ structure games, making a storyboard	11	6.0	6.0	85.2
Nothing/ No response	10	5.5	5.5	90.7
I enjoy learning English with my classmates/ I enjoy learning English	9	4.9	4.9	95.6
I like learning grammar and new vocabularies.	5	2.7	2.7	98.3
Speaking with Native speakers	4	2.2	2.2	100.5
improving speaking skills	3	1.6	1.6	102.1
Ability to do error analysis on sentence grammar structures	2	1.1	1.1	79.7
Able to join debate competition	2	1.1	1.1	72.6
Using English while I'm travelling	2	1.1	1.1	102.4
Getting high marks on class exercises	1	.5	.5	103.2
Attending seminars and able to understand them.	1	.5	.5	103.7
Helping some people with my English	1	.5	.5	104.2
I like my teachers.	1	.5	.5	104.7
To get recognition from my teacher/s	1	.5	.5	105.2

4.4 Implications of Findings to Research Questions and Hypotheses

Ultimately, this study is conducted for the purpose of investigating the learners' motivation constructs in general and the language learning strategy preferences they have and how motivation has influenced their LLS use. In addition, the potential existence of a relationship between learners' LLS use and their proficiency level, gender and nationality were also investigated. The proceeding section contains the summary of the findings. These summaries are used to formulate answers to the research questions developed earlier in the study and to validate the hypotheses designed by the researcher as mentioned in the precedent chapters earlier in this thesis. The following herewith presents the results of the analysis using t-test through means, standard deviations and the significant differences.

(1) What are the strategies used by high proficiency and low proficiency of English language learners?

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in the mean of language strategy use of high proficiency and low proficiency English language learners of various backgrounds.

H₀₂: High proficiency learners may not use different or more strategies than low proficiency learners.

(2) Is there a significant difference between male and female learners on the use of language learning strategies?

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in the mean of language learning strategy use of female and male English language learners of various backgrounds.

H₀₄: Female learners use more language learning strategies than male learners.

(3) What learning strategies are used by the Pre-university IIUM English language learners belonging to different nationalities?

H₀₅: There is no significant relationship between the uses of the six classifications of learning strategies of CELPAD English language learners in connection with their nationalities or background.

(4). What are the motivation construct of these English language learners of CELPAD of different nationalities?

H₀₆: There is no significant relationship between the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their nationality.

(5) What are the motivation construct of these English language learners of CELPAD of different gender ?

H₀₇: There is no significant relationship between the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their gender.

H_{07a}: There is significant relationship between the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their gender.

(6) Is there a significant relationship between learners' language learning strategies and their motivation constructs?

4.4.1 Overall Language Learning Strategy Use

The results herewith are presented in tables followed by discussions of the findings. The results of descriptive statistics, as shown in Table 4.75, showed that the mean value of students' overall language learning strategy use lies in a medium level (M=3.48, SD=1.09). This present study illustrates that these English language learners were medium users of learning strategies. Overall, learners reported to use Metacognitive strategies most often (M=3.86, SD=.92), memory strategies and affective strategies the least often (M=3.24, SD=1.11; M=3.25, SD= 1.36, respectively).

Descriptive statistics were analyzed to investigate the language learning strategies used by the learners of CELPAD. If we have to examine the descriptive statistics of the SILL in each item by category, it is reported that metacognitive strategies were the most predominantly used strategy category with mean value of $M=3.86$.

In the SILL classifications (Oxford, 1990): Part D which is metacognitive strategies, showed the item which bears high mean value of 4.24 was item no. 32 “I pay attention when someone is speaking English”, while item no.34 “I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English” was the least used in this category/classification ($M=3.31$). See table 4.7 for numerical representation of these findings below.

Table 4.7: Summary Differences between the Six Strategy Categories Use

Category	N	Mean	SD	Rank	Interpretation of Mean (Oxford's)
Metacognitive Strategies	183	3.86	.92	1	High
Social Strategies	183	3.60	1.05	2	High
Cognitive Strategies	183	3.52	1.02	3	High
Compensation Strategies	183	3.43	1.05	4	Medium
Memory Strategies	183	3.25	1.36	5	Medium
Affective Strategies	183	3.24	1.11	6	Medium
Overall LLS	183	3.48	1.09		Medium

As it is evident in table 4.7, ranking second in the mostly used strategy category is social strategies (Part F) with a mean value of 3.24. For this category (Part F), the strategy item no.45 “If I do not understand something in English I ask the other person to slow down...” ($M=4.03$) was mostly used and item no.50 “I try to learn the culture of English speakers” was the least preferred strategy ($M= 2.84$) for this category. The third

preferred used SILL category was cognitive strategies (mean=3.52), indicating item no.15 “I watch English language TV shows spoken in English...” was the highest in this category and no.23 “I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English” was the lowest, with mean values (M= 4.14 and M=3.05, respectively).

These findings coincided with the previous findings in table 4.6 under demographic profile section above where watching, listening to any English media are the learners favourite experiences. Ranking fourth is compensation strategies (M=3.43). For this category (Part C), the strategy which was highly preferred in this category was item no.29 “If I can’t think of an English word I use a word or phrase...” (M=3.91) and statement no.27 “I read English without looking up every new word” was the least favoured strategy in this particular category (M=2.95). Then, memory strategy category with a mean of 3.25 ranking fifth, and item no.2 was mostly used with “I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them” (M=3.81) and item no.6 “I use flashcards to remember new English words” the least used one (M= 2.49).

Lastly, the least frequently used strategy category was affective strategies (Part E) with a mean difference of 3.24 just a very minimal difference from the fifth (5th) category ranking sixth (6th). For this category, “I encourage myself to speak English...” and “I write down my feelings in a language diary”, where the former was frequently used and the latter the least used with mean differences of M= 3.98 and M=2.16, consecutively. The last 2 least preferred SILL categories have very minimal differences based on means (M=3.25 and M=3.24, respectively.) The mean score and standard deviation (SD) of each SILL strategy category is presented in Summary differences between the six strategy categories use in table 4.7 above. See Appendix D for the mean scores of each SILL category item for your reference.

Evidently, this current study observed that the overall use of the learners’ learning strategies were M= 3.48 which fell in medium range of use in accordance with

Oxford's definition of SILL average (1989; 1990). Despite the differences in the mean scores, the averages for all the SILL strategy categories are from 3.2 to 3.80, indicating medium use to high use. As indicated above, among all the learning strategies, metacognitive was reported the highest and memory and affective strategies were the least favoured used from the 6 strategies, where mean scores placed very slight difference (M= 3.25; M= 3.24, consecutively.)

Metacognitive strategies refer to a structure which involves focusing, organizing, planning and evaluating learning process. This learning strategy embodies overviewing and linking with materials at hand, paying attention, organizing, setting goals and objectives, identifying the purpose of a language task, planning for language task, self-monitoring and self-evaluation (Oxford, 1990, p.20). This present study then reveals that these English language learners were already accustomed to organizing their learning process and evaluating their learning behaviour. The results even identified they were good in paying attention and evaluating themselves to be better learners in English. The reason behind this could be their ethnocentric assumptions as students are from different cultural background and perhaps the teaching methods and learning approaches they had in their countries helped in the current intensive programme of the language centre. Furthermore, these learners also have solid instrumental motivation constructs (e.g. getting a good job, entering into a university). These could be the prime contributors to students who are meta-cognitively- oriented.

The findings of the study indicating metacognitive strategies category being the dominant preferred use category were congruent with the findings of that of Hong-Nam & Leavell (2006) who investigated 55 students learning English (L2) who come from different cultural and linguistic cultivation, Green's (1991) preliminary study of 213 students at a Puerto Rican university, Oh's (1992) study on 59 EFL students studying in Korean university, Shamis (2003) study on the LS use of Arab EFL English major in

Palestine and including the recent study of Farsani, et al. (2011) investigation on LLS use by Iranian learners. All these studies mentioned above have reported that metacognitive strategies were found to be the most frequently used among the participants and showed that they were medium users of the learning strategies. Moreover, coincidental findings were also discerned or uncovered in research conducted among Asian countries like Korean, Japan, and China on Asian students' use of learning strategies (e.g. Wharton, 2000; Myung-Cook, 2001; Goh & Kwah, 1997).

The next highly preferred use learning strategies after metacognitive is social strategies. This category indicates learning with others, asking questions for clarifications and cooperating with other learners. As reported, this is followed by cognitive and compensation strategies. These findings synchronized with that of Philips (1991) study of Asian EFL students who enrolled in college Individualized English Program (IEPs) using social strategies more than affective and memory strategies. On the other hand, Myung- Cook (2001) observed that Korean learners of Chinese used social and cognitive strategies the most and the affective and memory strategies the least. He adds that he also found non-Korean learners reported high utilization of compensation and metacognitive strategies while affective and memory strategies the least. Quadir (2010) reported a study on Japanese and Bangladeshi students' use of LLS and found affective was the least favoured strategies.

It can be shown in table 4.7 above; there were two least frequently used strategy categories in this study: Memory and affective strategies. This study also reported that memory and affective strategies were the least preferred used by the English language learners for the overall used of LS, with only one point difference. Memory strategies indicate creating mental linkages, reviewing and storing information. These findings are synonymous to the observance of Hong-Nam & Leavell (2006); Goh & Kwah (1997); Wharton (2000), to name a few. It is interesting to note that in this present study most of

the respondents were Asians making up 62% of the sample population. And, based on the previous studies observed by Politzer & McGroarty (1985); Tyacke & Mendelsohn (1986); and O'Malley & Chamot (1990), with similar findings, it is noted that Asian learners prefer rote- memorization, rote learning strategies based on linguistics rules and didactic way of teaching. On the contrary, this study reports otherwise, that memory strategies were minimally used by the learners. They could probably be habitually using rote memorization (such as memorizing grammar rules) but that is not the case here. Based on the findings of this study, these learners were the least users of strategies such as using of flashcards in remembering words, using rhymes to remember new English words, making a mental picture and physically acting out new English words. Therefore, it is safe to assume that these English language learners are not aware of other techniques on memory strategies. Thus memory strategy was reported as the least favoured strategy category.

Another least preferred or occasional use of strategy category was affective strategies. This category pertains to expressing oneself to others during the learning process and controlling one's emotions. Although this category was reported the least used, the overall mean score ($M=3.24$) still lies in medium range. The learners self-reported that they are constantly encouraging themselves to speak the language even when they are afraid to or stressed when using English, however, they still lack in other areas of affective strategies. The researcher believes that the reason of infrequent usage of other affective strategies like expressing oneself to others or writing down their feelings in a learning diary could be related to culture, social backgrounds or individual characteristics. For example, Arabic and African students are not usually fond of expressing their feelings to other people, even friends, let alone other learners of the language. And, in this study, Arab students were the 2nd highest representation of the sample population. This current finding can be supported from the previous findings

conducted by Shamis (2003) and Riazi (2007), who reported affective strategies/compensation were the least preferred strategy for the Arab EFL learners.

In conclusion, the results reported above were based on the learners' perception of themselves using the language learning strategies (LLS). Overall, this study also determined that these learners were medium users of language learning strategy.

4.4.2 Proficiency Level and Learning Strategies Use

Results of the Data Analyses Concerning Research Question 1

What are the strategies use by high proficiency and low proficiency English language learners?

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in the mean of language learning strategy use of high proficiency and low proficiency English language learners of various backgrounds.

H₀₂: High proficiency learners may not use different or more strategies than low proficiency learners.

As shown in table 4.8, EPT scores by the English language learners were examined against the language learning strategy use by the learners to observe the significant value. Independent sample t-test were used to run this analysis as the EPT scores were in seven variables. These seven variables were good, fairly good, satisfactory, quite satisfactory, poor, very poor and extremely poor. The EPT scores were then divided into two groups to assess high and low proficiency level and a 5 point cut value was used in the test. Thus, good, fairly good, satisfactory and quite satisfactory were grouped into high level; and poor, very poor and extremely poor were categorized into low level.

As reflected in table 4.8 below, for the English language learners of CELPAD, there was no statistically significant difference in the overall use of learning strategy

categories in connection to level of proficiency ($\text{sig} = .465$). The alpha value which is marked indicates the strategies values to be more than .05 which is not statistically significant. Therefore, this study failed to reject the Null hypothesis (H_{01} : there is no significant difference in the mean of language strategy use of high proficiency and low proficiency English learners of various backgrounds). This simply shows that the probability is high that there may not be a relationship existing in the use of learning strategy chosen by the respondents in relation to their proficiency levels in learning English. This current study indicates that low or high level proficiency does not have correlation with the language learning strategies used by the sample group in learning English.

Furthermore, on analysing table 4.8 for hypothesis H_{02} (high proficiency learners may not use different or more strategies than low proficiency learners), it indicates that for all the six classification of LS applied in learning English high level proficiency learners use the strategies more frequently than the low level proficiency learners. Based upon the mean difference on the SILL average score between high and low level proficiency English language learners, it is indicated in table 4.78, that Mean = 3.50 for high level & 3.46 for low level. Therefore, the Null hypothesis H_{02} (high proficiency learners may not use different or more strategies than low proficiency learners) is rejected. According to the summary results for the use of six categories of LS by English proficiency as shown in the table below, the most frequently used strategy was metacognitive strategies (mean= 3.81(Low) and 3.90 High), followed by social strategies (mean=3.60 (L) and 3.61 (H)), cognitive strategies (mean=3.49 (L) and 3.53 (H)), compensation strategies (mean= 3.42 and 3.43), memory strategies (mean=3.24 and 3.26) and affective strategies as less frequently used (mean = 3.21 and 3.25). Thus, high level proficiency students tend to use metacognitive strategies more frequently as the mean value shows first ranking which was 3.90. The least frequent

strategy used by the high level scorers shows affective strategies (3.25). Thus, it is probable to assume that high proficiency learners use different or more strategies than low proficiency learners in learning English. The current findings can be supported by previous studies on LLS use in connection with proficiency, and such studies were observed in Oxford & Burry-Stock (1995); Green & Oxford (1995); Wharton (2000).

In this study, the sample group was divided into two groups and these groups were named High and Low level proficiency students, whereby other studies used terminologies like successful and less successful students/ unsuccessful learners or course levels in determining the relation between the LLS use and proficiency. Griffiths (2003) also ascertained a positive association between course levels and reported LS used by 348 students in a private language school in New Zealand. It was reported that learning strategies were frequently used by advanced students than by elementary students.

Table 4.8: Summary of Differences in the Use of Language Learning Strategies by Proficiency Level

	Proficiency Level	N	Mean	SD	Pearson
Memory Strategies	Low	73	3.24	1.25	.381 *
	High	110	3.26	1.34	
Cognitive Strategies	Low	73	3.49	1.06	.955 *
	High	110	3.53	.99	
Compensation Strategies	Low	73	3.42	1.08	.400 *
	High	110	3.43	1.02	
Metacognitive Strategies	Low	73	3.81	1.03	.211 *
	High	110	3.90	.84	
Affective Strategies	Low	73	3.21	1.15	.517 *
	High	110	3.25	1.08	
Social Strategies	Low	73	3.60	1.08	.331 *
	High	110	3.61	1.02	
Overall Language learning strategies	Low	73	3.46	1.11	.465 *
	High	110	3.50	1.05	

* $p > .05$

Overall, based on the summary result of this study, the rank of strategy categories used by the entire sample for English proficiency revealed that English language learners have a High use of metacognitive, social and cognitive strategies when measured using the SILL average. However, compensation, memory and affective strategies are in medium use or less preferred use by both two groups, if measured using the SILL average definition. However, it is still arguable that the mean differences between two levels (High & Low) across six LS categories were very minimal. Therefore, as indicated above, it should be pointed out that in this study English language learners at all levels do use learning strategies.

4.4.3 Gender and Language Learning Strategies Use

Results of the Data Analyses Concerning Research Question 2

Is there a significant difference between male and female English language learners on the use of language learning strategies?

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in the mean of language learning strategy use of female and male English language learners of various backgrounds.

H₀₄: Female learners use more language learning strategies than male learners.

To test the hypothesis H₀₃ (There is no significant difference in the mean of language strategy use of female and male English language learners of various backgrounds) and H₀₄ (female learners use more language learning strategies than male learners) the researcher conducted t-test with independent variables.

Table 4.9 illustrates that there was no statistically difference in the overall use of learning strategies between male and female learners. The result of significant difference p- value was .431, which indicates more than the p-value ($p < 0.05$), referred as a significance level. The present study observed that it did not have any significant

differences in the use of memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, social strategies and/or the overall language learning strategies in connection to gender. Therefore, H_{03} : There is no significant difference in the mean of language learning strategy use of female and male English language learners of various backgrounds was not fully rejected. It is proven in this study that there is a probability that no relationship exists on the language learning preferences between respondents in relation to gender. Similarly, Kim (1995) discovered that there is no significant difference on language learning strategies use between males and females. In other words, based on the findings of the present study, the researcher claimed that no relationship exist between language learning strategy use and gender. Nevertheless, the frequency of using the learning strategies can be made regardless of gender.

On the other hand, to test hypotheses H_{04} (female English language learners use more language learning strategies than male learners), referring to table 4.9, shows that female learners tend to use more strategies in learning English compared to the male counterparts except for social strategies. In this study, the overall mean value showed by female learners is 3.55 compared to male learners' overall mean value which is $M=3.44$. As reported in this study female learners are frequent users of LS from different classifications than the male learners except for social strategies. There might be a slight difference in mean value between the 2 groups, but female achieved $M= 3.59$ and male has $M=3.62$ for social strategies. The rest of the five strategies indicated that female learners use more language learning strategies than male learners. This shows that the null hypothesis H_{04} (female learners use more language learning strategies than male learners) is statistically true. Based on the overall summary result of the gender differences on LLS use, metacognitive strategies ($M=3.84$, $F=3.89$) were reported to be highly used by both genders, following by cognitive for female (3.55) in high use as

well, which indicates practicing, receiving and sending messages, analyzing and reasoning..., while the male counterpart preferred social strategies as their 2nd most frequent LS use at M=3.62 (also in high use). The reported category strategy pertains to asking for clarification or verification with peers and empathizing with others. The least favorite or least use category strategies are memory strategies for females indicating M=3.35, which is in medium range. Male respondents reported affective strategies to be their least preferred strategy at M=3.11, at medium range of use as well, based on SILL average definition (Oxford, 1990) as shown in the following table.

Table 4.9: Summary of Gender differences on Language Learning Strategy Use

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	P
Memory Strategies	Male	106	3.17	1.07	.391 *
	Female	77	3.35	1.56	
Cognitive Strategies	Male	106	3.50	1.03	.453 *
	Female	77	3.55	.98	
Compensation Strategies	Male	106	3.38	1.08	.416 *
	Female	77	3.48	.99	
Metacognitive Strategies	Male	106	3.84	.98	.253 *
	Female	77	3.89	.84	
Affective Strategies	Male	106	3.11	1.14	.488 *
	Female	77	3.42	1.03	
Social Strategies	Male	106	3.62	1.08	.583 *
	Female	77	3.59	1.00	
Overall Language learning strategies	Male	106	3.44	1.06	.431 *
	Female	77	3.55	1.07	

*p>.05

Statistical analysis of the findings was furnished as to whether there is a significant difference on the learning strategy use between both genders. It was confirmed in this study that there was no statistical difference on the LS use in connection with the learners' gender. Based on Mean differences value, this study affirmed that female English language learners use different or more strategies

frequently than their male counterparts. These findings have substantiated the formulated hypothesis on the basis of past several researches (Green & Oxford, 1995; Dryer & Oxford, 1996; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Lee & Oh, 2001; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; Lee & Oxford, 2008).

With regards to the use of particular strategy type, both gender favored using metacognitive strategies, which was the most highly used strategy in learning English and the least favored strategies were affective strategies for male respondents and memory strategy for females. These findings were quite different with the findings of other researchers in their studies. In Quadir's (2010) study, he disclosed that gender difference in strategy use was not found to be significant but only in cognitive strategies used by female Japanese learners where it was reported that it was used significantly higher than the male learners.

In reference to all these studies on comparing learning strategies used between genders including the present study, it is discovered that female learners tend to employ multiplicity of strategies in learning compared to male learners.

4.4.4 Nationality and Language Learning Strategies Use

Results of the Data Analyses Concerning Research Question 3

What learning strategies are used by the Pre-university IIUM English language learners of different nationalities?

H₀₅: There is no significant relationship in the uses of the six classifications of learning strategies of CELPAD English language learners in connection with their nationalities or backgrounds.

In research question 3, the researcher was keen to find the most frequently used strategies by the sample from different nationalities. The researcher chose the mean test to run the analysis to find central tendency of the learning strategies use. In hypothesis

H₀₅ (There is no significant relationship in the uses of the six classifications of learning strategies of CELPAD English language learners in connection with their nationalities or backgrounds), the researcher assumes that there is no significant relationship between the use of the six classifications of learning strategies of CELPAD learners from different countries. Basically, this is a study involving a heterogenous composition of respondents of different nationalities. As shown in table 3.1 earlier, majority of the sample are Malaysians who ranked 1st, followed by Arab nations (2nd), Indonesians (3rd) and Africans as the fourth largest number of participants where as other nationalities had minimal or very low representation. In this section, these learners' LS use were analysed in connection with their nationality. The summary of differences in the use of the six strategy categories by nationalities and the strategy ranking are also shown in each of the following tables.

Table 4.10 shows the different nationalities on the first strategy category, which is memory strategies used. Based on the ranking, Indian students were the highest users (M= 4.07) of this strategy in learning English. This was followed by Chinese students (3.61) and Cambodians (3.53) in the third place. This strategy category (Memory strategies) entails strategies on rote learning aspects, creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds and reviewing well. English language learners from Japan, Uzbekistan and Pakistan are reported to be the least users of this particular strategy (M= 2.67, M= 2.61; M=2.39, respectively). It is quite suprising to note from the survey result that the latter learners of the mentioned countries and other FL respondents emerged to be low users of memory strategies particularly the Japanese since their mode of education is mainly based on rote memorization. The total mean difference for memory strategies is 3.25, which indicates medium range of use by the English language learners of CELPAD.

Table 4.10 : Summary of Differences in the use of Memory Strategies by Nationality

Nationality		Memory Strategies	Rank
Indian	Mean	4.07	1
	N	6	
	Std. Deviation	2.60	
Chinese	Mean	3.61	2
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	2.16	
Cambodian	Mean	3.53	3
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	1.17	
African	Mean	3.44	4
	N	18	
	Std. Deviation	1.06	
Indonesian	Mean	3.37	5
	N	25	
	Std. Deviation	0.93	
Bangladesh	Mean	3.30	6
	N	3	
	Std. Deviation	0.86	
Malaysian	Mean	3.26	7
	N	55	
	Std. Deviation	0.98	
Kyrgyzstan	Mean	3.22	8
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Iranian	Mean	3.18	9
	N	5	
	Std. Deviation	1.08	
Thai	Mean	3.18	9
	N	10	
	Std. Deviation	1.09	
Arabs	Mean	3.02	10
	N	44	
	Std. Deviation	1.09	
Somali	Mean	3.00	11
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Japanese	Mean	2.67	12
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Vietnamese	Mean	3.44	13
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.63	

Table 4.10, continued.

Uzbekistan	Mean	2.61	13
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.55	
Pakistani	Mean	2.39	14
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.86	
Total	Mean	3.25	
	N	183	
	Std. Deviation	1.36	

Table 4.11 shows the result of the English language learners' perceived use of strategies in this category by nationality. On this second strategy, which is cognitive strategies, these learners reported that they practised using the language, receiving and sending messages and analyzing and reasoning. Accordingly, Japanese English language learners were the highest users ($M= 3.92$) of this strategy in learning English. This was followed by Cambodian students who ranked second at 3.83. and Kyrgyzstan and Thai respondents in the third place, with mean scores of 3.77. Whereas, Pakistani English language learners showed the least use of this strategy as the mean value for this group is $M=3.04$ as illustrated in the following table.

Table 4.11 : Summary of Differences in the use of Cognitive Strategies by Nationality

Nationality		Cognitive Strategies	Rank
Japanese	Mean	3.92	1
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Cambodian	Mean	3.83	2
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	0.88	
Kyrgyzstan	Mean	3.77	3
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Thai	Mean	3.77	3
	N	10	
	Std. Deviation	0.89	
Indian	Mean	3.71	4
	N	6	
	Std. Deviation	1.00	

Table 4.11, continued.

Iranian	Mean	3.69	5
	N	5	
	Std. Deviation	0.86	
Indonesian	Mean	3.66	6
	N	25	
	Std. Deviation	0.89	
African	Mean	3.64	7
	N	18	
	Std. Deviation	1.07	
Bangladesh	Mean	3.62	8
	N	3	
	Std. Deviation	0.88	
Chinese	Mean	3.56	9
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	1.28	
Somali	Mean	3.54	10
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Uzbekistan	Mean	3.54	10
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.54	
Arabs	Mean	3.48	11
	N	44	
	Std. Deviation	1.05	
Malaysian	Mean	3.47	12
	N	55	
	Std. Deviation	0.96	
Vietnamese	Mean	3.08	13
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.87	
Pakistani	Mean	3.04	14
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	1.03	
Total	Mean	3.55	
	N	183	
	Std. Deviation	1.02	

Next table 4.12 shows the different nationalities on the preferences of the third strategy, which is compensation strategy. When compared across nationality, Bangladeshi English language learners were the highest users ($M= 3.93$) of this strategy in learning English. This was followed by Japanese students ($M=3.50$) as the 2nd highest

users of compensation strategies. Chinese, Indonesian and Vietnamese English language learners also reported significantly higher use of such category than other nationality groups, ranking third at a mean value of $M= 3.50$. And again, Pakistani English language learners were found to have used this strategy least as the mean value for this group is 2.70. The lack of compensation strategies may also be attributed to the mentioned participants' inadequacy to apply these learning strategies which includes guessing intelligently and knowledge in conveying their thoughts in speaking and writing. The overall mean value of the LS use of compensation strategies category across nationality is at $M= 3.33$, $SD=1.07$, which indicates these English language learners have medium use of this particular strategy as illustrated in the following table.

Table 4.12: Summary of Differences in the use of Compensation Strategies by Nationality

Nationality		Compensation Strategies	Rank
Bangladesh	Mean	3.93	1
	N	3	
	Std. Deviation	0.46	
Japanese	Mean	3.60	2
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Chinese	Mean	3.50	3
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	0.73	
Indonesian	Mean	3.50	3
	N	25	
	Std. Deviation	0.88	
Vietnamese	Mean	3.50	3
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.71	
Thai	Mean	3.48	4
	N	10	
	Std. Deviation	1.06	
African	Mean	3.47	5
	N	18	
	Std. Deviation	1.14	

Table 4.12, continued.

Cambodian	Mean	3.45	6
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	1.36	
Iranian	Mean	3.36	7
	N	5	
	Std. Deviation	0.76	
Arabs	Mean	3.24	8
	N	44	
	Std. Deviation	1.09	
Indian	Mean	3.23	9
	N	6	
	Std. Deviation	0.85	
Malaysian	Mean	3.23	9
	N	55	
	Std. Deviation	1.13	
Somali	Mean	3.20	10
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Uzbekistan	Mean	2.90	11
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.42	
Kyrgyzstan	Mean	2.80	12
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Pakistani	Mean	2.70	13
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.99	
Total	Mean	3.33	
	N	183	
	Std. Deviation	1.07	

Subsequently, as shown in table 4.13 below, it is observed that the fourth strategy on learning strategies has the highest level of usage by nationality. These English language learners reported to have used the Metacognitive strategies as most often ($M= 3.86$, $SD 0.92$). As a matter of fact, in this study metacognitive strategies category was reported to be the overall highest strategy used in language learning by 183 respondents of this study. Metacognitive strategies refer to arranging and planning the learning and evaluating learning. So, it is possible to assume that English language learners of CELPAD were mentally conscious of their language learning process,

capable to regulate their cognition and evaluate their progress. The highest ranking users of this strategy were Iranian students (4.17) followed by the African students with a mean difference of $M=4.07$. Thai students were also reported as being frequent users of this strategy, ranking third across all nationalities ($M= 4.02$). In this study, Kyrgyzstan English language learners were the least users of this strategy as the mean value for this group is $M=2.22$. Unfortunately, not much studies have been done or published early on Kyrgyzstan's learning strategies in order to find resonance or contradiction to these findings. See table 4.13 below for numerical representation.

Table 4.13 : Summary of Differences in the use of Metacognitive Strategies by Nationality

Nationality		Metacognitive Strategies	Rank
Iranian	Mean	4.17	1
	N	5	
	Std. Deviation	0.83	
African	Mean	4.07	2
	N	18	
	Std. Deviation	0.98	
Thai	Mean	4.02	3
	N	10	
	Std. Deviation	0.99	
Cambodian	Mean	3.97	4
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	0.81	
Bangladesh	Mean	3.89	5
	N	3	
	Std. Deviation	0.87	
Japanese	Mean	3.89	5
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Vietnamese	Mean	3.89	5
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.78	
Indonesian	Mean	3.88	6
	N	25	
	Std. Deviation	0.87	
Malaysian	Mean	3.87	7
	N	55	
	Std. Deviation	0.85	

Table 4.13, continued.

Arabs	Mean	3.79	8
	N	44	
	Std. Deviation	0.94	
Indian	Mean	3.79	8
	N	6	
	Std. Deviation	0.67	
Chinese	Mean	3.55	9
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	0.97	
Somali	Mean	3.55	9
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Pakistani	Mean	3.39	10
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.55	
Uzbekistan	Mean	3.33	11
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	1.09	
Kyrgyzstan	Mean	2.22	12
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Total	Mean	3.86	
	N	183	
	Std. Deviation	0.92	

As illustrated in table 4.14 , English language learners reported using the fifth category: affective strategies as the least frequently used strategy. However, if we consider the mean difference in terms of the use of affective strategies, it occupied the medium level of LS use of the learners across nationality ($M= 3.18$, $SD= 1.09$). The results may show that it is the least preferred strategy category but the mean average proves that these English language learners are still medium users of this particular category. It is interesting to note that Somalis students were the highest users of the affective strategy ($M= 4.00$) in learning English. The researcher is not aware if there are published studies on the learning strategies use in English learning for this particular sample group. This current findings could probably be one of the first to account for the Somalis English learners on language learning strategies use. This category entails

managing “negative” emotions such as anxiety, nervousness and fear and encouraging oneself. According to Nakata (2006), in EFL contexts where learners have infrequent native speaker contact, anxiety can be high in output activities such as speaking. However, based on the findings, this study proves otherwise considering the demographic location of this sample group, where almost all of them may not and could not have greater exposure to spoken English outside the classroom and /or may have insufficient contact with native speakers. Despite lack of support outside the classroom, it is noteworthy to emphasize that these sample group of English language learners particularly the Somali students were relatively high in using this category of lowering anxiety, encouraging oneself such as to take the risk wisely and express feelings with others. It seems that what is seen as their weakness is actually their strengths to move forward during the learning curves. In the case of Somali students, what can be viewed as anxiety, in their case is “facilitative anxiety” – this was also uncovered in the study of Scarcella & Oxford (1992). This was followed by Chinese students (M=3.80) and Japanese students (M=3.60) in the third place. Uzbekistan students were the least users of this strategy as the mean value for this group is M=2.60. See the numerical representation of the findings below.

Table 4.14 : Summary of Differences in the use of Affective Strategies by Nationality

Nationality	Affective Strategies	Rank	Nationality
Somali	Mean	4.00	1
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Chinese	Mean	3.80	2
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	0.68	
Japanese	Mean	3.60	3
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Thai	Mean	3.48	4
	N	10	
	Std. Deviation	1.09	
Bangladesh	Mean	3.33	5
	N	3	
	Std. Deviation	0.69	

Table 4.14, continued.

Cambodian	Mean	3.20	6
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	1.16	
Malaysian	Mean	3.20	6
	N	55	
	Std. Deviation	1.10	
Kyrgyzstan	Mean	3.20	6
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Indonesian	Mean	3.16	7
	N	25	
	Std. Deviation	0.85	
Arabs	Mean	3.13	8
	N	44	
	Std. Deviation	1.11	
Indian	Mean	3.13	8
	N	6	
	Std. Deviation	0.89	
African	Mean	3.07	9
	N	18	
	Std. Deviation	1.33	
Iranian	Mean	3.00	10
	N	5	
	Std. Deviation	0.90	
Vietnamese	Mean	2.80	11
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.56	
Pakistani	Mean	2.70	12
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.71	
Uzbekistan	Mean	2.60	13
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.28	
Total	Mean	3.18	
	N	183	
	Std. Deviation	1.09	

The last strategy in Oxford's (1990) classification, the social strategy was reportedly used frequently by the sample group across nationality. The social strategies were by far among the most regularly used strategies, as reported by these English language learners. As mentioned above, social strategies category was reported to be the 2nd highest favoured learning strategies by these English language learners. Based on table 4.15, the overall mean difference value in the use of this particular category of learning strategies across nationality was $M= 3.60$, $SD= 1.05$, which designates high range of use, based on Oxford's (1990) definition of LS average. Based on ranking,

Japanese students were the highest users of this strategy with mean value of $M= 4.67$. According to one study conducted by Mori (2007), regardless of proficiency level the Japanese students used learning strategies moderately and social strategies was the most highly used strategy category. Similarly, these findings can be backed up with the study of Yamato (2002) on Japanese EFL learners which indicates social/ affective strategies were associated to Japanese EFL learners. On the contrary, a study observed by Noguchi (1991) yielded responses from Japanese university students that among all the strategies which were relatively low to medium use, social strategies were the least frequently used among Japanese university students.

This was followed by Cambodian English language learners as the 2nd highest user of this particular strategy (at $M=4.29$) and African students ($M=3.86$) in the third place. However, Pakistani students self-reported as the least users of this strategy as the mean value for this group is $M=2.58$. See table 4.15 below for numerical representation.

Table 4.15: Summary of Differences in the Use of Social Strategies by Nationality

Nationality		Social Strategies	Rank
Japanese	Mean	4.67	1
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Cambodian	Mean	4.29	2
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	0.85	
African	Mean	3.86	3
	N	18	
	Std. Deviation	1.07	
Arabs	Mean	3.71	4
	N	44	
	Std. Deviation	1.06	
Bangladesh	Mean	3.67	5
	N	3	
	Std. Deviation	0.74	
Iranian	Mean	3.67	5
	N	5	
	Std. Deviation	0.93	

Table 4.15, continued.

Indian	Mean	3.61	6
	N	6	
	Std. Deviation	1.03	
Indonesian	Mean	3.58	7
	N	25	
	Std. Deviation	0.83	
Chinese	Mean	3.54	8
	N	4	
	Std. Deviation	1.25	
Thai	Mean	3.53	9
	N	10	
	Std. Deviation	1.17	
Somali	Mean	3.50	10
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Malaysian	Mean	3.46	11
	N	55	
	Std. Deviation	1.03	
Vietnamese	Mean	3.33	12
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	0.71	
Uzbekistan	Mean	3.25	13
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	1.29	
Kyrgyzstan	Mean	3.17	14
	N	1	
	Std. Deviation	.00	
Pakistani	Mean	2.58	15
	N	2	
	Std. Deviation	1.29	
Total	Mean	3.60	
	N	183	
	Std. Deviation	1.05	

As a result, therefore, hypothesis H_{05} (There is no significant relationship in the uses of the six classifications of learning strategies of CELPAD English language learners in connection with their nationalities or backgrounds) cannot be rejected as the findings are true and the p-value is more than 0.05 (statistical sig. level), as shown in table 4.16. It shows that all the six strategies in language learning is not statistically significant related to the nationalities of these learners. Based on the present study, it

implies that there is no possible relationship between LLS use and nationality. However, based on mean differences, this study supports the observance that learners of different cultural background employ varied learning strategies, as Bedell (1993 cited in Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995) summarized in the findings of a number of studies and showed that different cultural groups use particular types of strategies at different frequency levels. Besides, culture is an integrated system of patterns of society, compound and amazingly complicated. So, Oxford points out “it would be impossible (and undesirable) to try to attribute one particular language learning approach to a specific cultural group.” Hence, this present study conform to that analysis. This proves the Null hypothesis: H_{05} (There is no significant relationship in the uses of the six classifications of learning strategies of CELPAD English language learners in connection with their nationalities or backgrounds) is true as the p value does not show statistically significant correlation to the language learning strategies.

Nonetheless, based on the summary of mean differences by nationality on the use of learning strategies the present study determined that nationality groups utilize certain types of learning strategies. To illustrate, the Japanese respondents were reported to be using the strategies in SILL the most as the overall mean value for all strategy categories shows $M=3.72$, which is on the High range of use as defined in Oxford (1990). Thus, the study indicates that the Japanese group is the highest user of learning strategies. Japanese has a very high range use on social strategies with mean value (4.67), followed by cognitive, metacognitive, compensation & affective which shared high range of usage and the least used for this sample was memory strategies ($M= 3.92, 3.89, 3.60 \& 2.67$, respectively.) The present study revealed that social strategy category was predominant and highly used than other learning strategies for the Japanese English learners. However, this study opposes the findings of that Noguchi (1991) whereby

social strategies were found to be generally unpopular among Chinese and Japanese students.

Ranking second across all nationalities was Cambodians with an average score of 3.71; $p=0.322$ (not sig.), which also indicates high use of LS. Bangladeshis, ranking third, was also the highest users of learning strategies ($M=3.62$; $p=0.283$ not sig.). It is also necessary to mention, out of 16 nationalities, three nationalities, Japanese, Kyrgyzstan and Somalian's t value cannot be generated because the sum of caseweights is less than or equal 1. So, their level of significant difference cannot be produced.

It is reported in the present study that Cambodian students ranked second (2nd) as the highest user of learning strategies. This sample group self-reported that they used social strategies more frequently than other LS categories. Then, metacognitive ($M=3.97$), cognitive ($M=3.83$), memory ($M=3.53$) and compensation ($M=3.45$), while affective strategies were seen to be the least used by the sample group ($M=3.20$). The researcher is unsure if there is any published studies on LLS preference on the part of Cambodian students or any information that could reveal their outlook at language learning strategies. There might be quite a number of studies regarding learning strategies context for this group, but no further reference can be made due to scarcity of resources. Therefore, the present study claims that Cambodian English language learners have remarkably used learning strategies.

Moreover, it is also interesting to note that the results of this study showed Bangladeshi English language learners ranked 3rd as the highest frequent users of learning strategies. Compensation strategies category was the highest used learning strategies category for this group with mean value of $M=3.93$. This is followed by metacognitive, social, cognitive and memory strategies which were highly used as well ($M=3.89, 3.67, 3.62, 3.53$, respectively) except for affective strategies as the least used category by the group ($M=3.33$). Although it was the least used category by the group,

it was still within the range of medium use as defined by Oxford (1990). Contrary to this study, Quadir (2005) observed in his study of 165 EFL- major university students from Japan and Bangladesh that Bangladeshi students reported more frequent cognitive strategy use than the Japanese students and affective strategy was found to be prevalent in both groups as the least preferred strategy category. Thus, the latter observance is in consonance with the present study.

It is also significant to mention as in this study the respondents are mixed-nationality, multicultural in composition, there were few overlapping as to the ranking on LLS preference across nationality. Chinese, Indians and African English language learners were ranked fourth (4th) high users of LLS across all nationalities. It is presented in this study that among the three (3) nationalities ranking fourth (4th), it was found that Indian respondents were the highest users of memory strategies, cognitive and metacognitive as the mean scores were $M=4.07$, $M=3.71$ & $M=3.79$, respectively. This study also shows that aside from Bangladesh English language learners, Chinese English language learners were also the highest users of Compensation strategies among the 4th placer group and the 2nd highest users of this category across all nationalities. These findings were consistent with other studies like Goh & Kwah (1997) on 175 Chinese students, Yang (1994) who looked at students' use of LLS in Taiwan and People's Republic of China and reported that compensation strategies were the most preferred (also cited in Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). Chang (1991) conducted a study on LLS use on 50 Chinese students in University of Georgia and found compensation strategy category was also frequently used and affective strategy category was the least frequent. The latter category, however, was observed to be frequently used by Chinese English language learners in this present study. Lastly, among the three nationalities being the 4th highest users of LLS, it is interesting to mention that African students were found to be the highest users of social strategies among the three nationalities. As a

matter of fact, this group of English language learners from Africa was observed to be the third (3rd) highest users of social strategy category across all nationalities. Metacognitive strategies were also reported to be frequently used by these learners. There might be minimal published research on this phenomena for African English language learners, but the findings of this study supports the study on South African EFL learners by Dreyer & Oxford (1996) who found that metacognitive and affective strategies were the predominantly used learning strategies and observed to have significant relationship with L2 proficiency. However, since there are less resources available on LS use by Africans, this present study uncovers that social strategies were the highest preferred and used learning strategies by African English language learners. On the other hand, Pakistani group of learners are the least user of LLS in learning English. The rest of the description of mean differences in connection with learning strategies use across nationalities are numerically presented in the table. See table 4.16 for numerical representation of the findings.

Table 4.16: Summary of Nationality Differences on Language Learning Strategies (SILL) Use

Nationality		SILL	Rank	P value
Japanese	Mean	3.72	1	t cannot be computed because the sum of caseweights is less than or equal 1.
	N	1		
	Std. Deviation	.00		
Cambodian	Mean	3.71	2	0.322 *
	N	4		
	Std. Deviation	1.04		
Bangladesh	Mean	3.62	3	0.283 *
	N	3		
	Std. Deviation	0.75		
Chinese	Mean	3.59	4	0.456 *
	N	4		
	Std. Deviation	1.18		
Indian	Mean	3.59	4	0.257 *
	N	6		
	Std. Deviation	1.17		

Table 4.16, continued.

African	Mean	3.59	4	0.136 *
	N	18		
	Std. Deviation	1.10		
Thai	Mean	3.58	5	0.198 *
	N	10		
	Std. Deviation	1.05		
Iranian	Mean	3.51	6	0.291 *
	N	5		
	Std. Deviation	0.89		
Indonesian	Mean	3.52	7	0.097 *
	N	25		
	Std. Deviation	0.87		
Somalian	Mean	3.46	8	t cannot be computed because the sum of caseweights is less than or equal 1.
	N	1		
	Std. Deviation	.00		
Malaysian	Mean	3.41	9	0.105 *
	N	55		
	Std. Deviation	1.00		
Arabs	Mean	3.39	10	0.153 *
	N	44		
	Std. Deviation	1.05		
Vietnamese	Mean	3.34	11	0.427 *
	N	2		
	Std. Deviation	0.71		
Kyrgyzstan	Mean	3.06	12	t cannot be computed because the sum of caseweights is less than or equal 1.
	N	1		
	Std. Deviation	.00		
Uzbekistan	Mean	3.04	13	0.616 *
	N	2		
	Std. Deviation	0.69		
Pakistani	Mean	2.80	14	0.589 *
	N	2		
	Std. Deviation	0.90		
Total	Mean	3.46		0.302 *
	N	183		
	Std. Deviation	1.08		

*p>.05

* 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

When considered collectively as one group, these English language learners are reported to be using metacognitive and social strategies more than any other strategies during their language learning curve. Based on the results of mean differences across nationalities on the use of LLS, it can be assumed that majority of the learners may have employed learning strategies which were the same as, or similar to the ones they had learnt or used habitually (e.g. rote-memorization) over time in schools in their home countries. Since the representations of the sample population were heterogenous, as planned, it was an attempt by the researcher to shed light on the variation of LLS use across nationalities.

Based on the reviews of past studies stipulated above this section, certain strategies were commonly attributed to certain nationality. So this current study not only concurs with but also contradict with few studies on LS too. This is because there is substantial evidence as stipulated in earlier studies that nationality is one factor that has an impact on the learning strategy choice. However, this study would like to emphasize that it is not safeguarded to assign a certain strategy category to a certain nationality immediately since LS can change over time due to teaching environment, students' self-efficacy in using LLS and other elemental variables that affect different learners.

4.5 The Relationship between Motivation and their Nationality.

Results of the Data Analyses Concerning Research Question 4

(4). What are the motivation construct of these English language learners of CELPAD of different nationalities?

H_{06} : There is no significant relationship between the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their nationality.

4.5.1 Summary of Significant Relationship between Motivation constructs and Nationalities

Ten survey questions were asked on the motivation orientation aspects that construct the sample group to learn English. All the questions were measured with 5-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. First the questions were analysed through cross checking against the nationality variables and by gender. Based on the findings, table 4.17, there is no statistically significant relationship between nationality and motivation constructs of these learners. The overall mean value across 16 nationalities shows $M=4.31$ which means the respondents highly agreed with most of the statements from the AMBT questionnaire. Overall, the p / significance value for motivation across nationality shows .132 which is higher than .05 significance level. This proves that all these learners of different nationalities are not statistically significantly related to motivation constructs. This signifies hypothesis H_{06} (There is no significant relationship between the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their nationality) is true. In other words, there is no existing relationship between learners' motivation constructs and their cultural background. Yet when analysed separately, some nationalities showed significant relationship with their motivation constructs such as the Cambodians (0.048), Indians (0.028), Indonesians (0.00647), Malaysians (0.00) and Thai students (0.021). Where as for the Japanese, Somalians and Kyrgyzstan nationalities, t value was not generated due to the sum of

caseweights, which is less than or equal to 1. The learners for these three groups were very minimal (1 or 2) and it generated zero value for standard deviation.

The concept of integrative motivations resembles that successful learners tend to adopt new identity to enhance their own capabilities. Tollefson's study (1991, p. 23), reveals that learners who are keen in understanding their own culture tend to be more successful than learners who are concerned about preserving their culture. See Table 4.17 at Appendix A section for details.

4.6 The Relationship between Motivation and Gender

Results of the Data Analyses Concerning Research Question 5

(5). What are the motivation construct of these English language learners of CELPAD of different gender?

H₀₇: There is no significant relationship between the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their gender.

H_{07a}: There is significant relationship between the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their gender.

4.6.1 Summary of Significant Relationship between Motivation constructs and Gender

Based on table 4.18 (See Appendix B), in all ten questions, female learners tend to agree with all the statements on motivation as the average mean value shows more than the mean value shown by male learners. For the first statement, the female learners' mean value shows 4.66, followed by 4.65, 4.04, 4.73, 4.49, 4.36, 3.97, 3.81, 3.69 and 4.71 respectively. This resulted in an average value of M=4.31 for female. Whereas, the distribution of mean for the males in all statements presents these values 4.32, 4.20, 3.81, 4.48, 4.12, 3.99, 3.59, 3.43, 3.26 & 4.32, respectively. The mean

average value for male learners shows $M=3.95$. Obviously, females exhibited higher mean difference in all 10 questions in AMBT. Thus, this study identified that female learners were more motivated than male learners.

The p value for each statement by gender has been illustrated under the sig (2-tailed column). In the first statement, “Studying English is important because it will allow me to be at ease with people who speak English” has given significant relationship between gender and motivation constructs as the significant value shows $p=0.004$ for males and $p=0.002$ for female counterparts. This was the same with the statements, “Studying English is important as it will make (one) more educated” ($p=.000$ for both gender) and “Studying English is important because it will be useful in getting a good job” ($p=0.003$ for males & $p=.001$ for females). These findings concurred with the earlier mentioned finding stipulated in table 4.5 as one of their reasons they study English.

Moreover, these findings have proven the researcher’s hypothesis H_{07} : There is no significant relationship between the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their gender, is invalid or not true. Thus, the findings shall lead to the alternative hypothesis (H_{07a}): “There is significant relationship between the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their gender” being acceptable. The findings identified that hypothesis (H_{07a}) is valid because the table shows that there is a positive correlation between gender and the motivation constructs, and in addition, this study emphasised that female learners are highly motivated.

The results in table 4.18 reveals a significant difference on gender and the male and female learners’ perceived motivations. Based on the findings, female learners tend to show significantly higher motivation level than male learners. Similar findings were analysed by Mills, Pajares and Herron’s studies (2007). In their study, they want to find the significant relationship between motivational influence in learning English. Their

study shows that female students have higher sense of self motivations in learning English than male learners. (See table 4.18 at Appendix B for details).

It was also an attempt of this present study to discover which motivational construct a certain gender is inclined to. Based on findings through the mean difference values, this study indicates that both genders were instrumentally and integratively motivated learners. It is also interesting to note that both genders had answered disagreement to the statement/ item no. 3 “Most native speakers are so friendly and easy to get along with.” The answer of both genders for that statement shows no correlation as the significant level was higher than significant level at 0.05 (2 tailed) – Male = .104 & Female = .094, respectively.

Furthermore, based on mean differences female learners reported the statement/ item no.10 “they are studying English because it is helpful in getting a good job” as the most favoured motivation for them, with mean value of $M= 4.71$. This result coincides with the finding in table 4.5 that getting a good job is the top reason for learning the target language of these respondents. Thus, this demonstrates that female learners are highly- motivated in instrumental motivation constructs.

The male learners, on the other hand, identified item no. 4 indicating the need to learn English to boost career path with mean value $M= 4.48$. This demonstrates that the male students are also rated highly in instrumental motivation constructs. Thus, male learners were relatively motivated as well and like the female learners, their motivation constructs also have positive influence on learning. See table 4.18 at Appendix B section for details.

Several studies have also focused on the association of self- efficacy, motivation and learning performance (e.g. Bandura, 1977a & b; Schunk, 1989 to name a few; cited in Schunk, 1995.) Self-efficacy refers to a learner’s confidence that drives one to accomplish tasks. Collins (1982) pointed out that self-efficacy predicts motivation and

achievement across ability levels. The researcher believes that self-efficacy and motivation go hand in hand, that if a learner is highly motivated, he/ she will have great confidence or self-efficacy to perform and accomplish a task, thereby generating successful learning and, as a result will reinforce motivation. It is like a constant cycle to successful learning. Therefore, self-efficacy has close correlation with learners' motivation. That being said, this study reviewed past literature for references to this concept. Consequently, it was discovered that the findings of this study show female learners were more highly motivated than male counterparts. Similar observations were also ascertained that female students showed significant higher perceived self-efficacy than male students (Mills, Pajares, Herrons (2007). However, Çubukçu's (2008) findings revealed that there are no significant differences between male and female in respect to how they see self-efficacy. Comparatively, Gong (2002), Çubukçu (2008) and Liao (2009) made a conclusion in their studies that no significant gender difference was found in students' academic self-efficacy.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that in conjunction with the recent study, Mochizuki (1999) and Wharton (2000) depicted in their studies that motivation is a stronger factor to influence students' learning experiences; making the right choices in learning strategies than any other factors. And in this present study, the underlying motivation of these learners in learning to study the language is mainly instrumental construct.

4.7 Correlation between Language Learning Strategy and Motivation

This section here answers the formulated sixth (6) research question: Is there a significant relationship between learners' language learning strategy use and their motivation constructs? To analyse the relationship between the two instruments: language learning strategies and attitude/motivation battery test, the researcher used the

Pearson correlation analysis. It is appropriate as the Pearson's correlation analysis is a technique for investigating the relationship between two quantitative variables such as SILL and AMBT. Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) is a measure of the strength of the association between the two variables.

This study reveals, as shown in table 4.19, significantly positive and mostly moderate correlations were found between the respondents' motivation constructs and language learning strategies used in all the six categories. The overall language learning strategies (LLS) statistically correlated significantly with the AMBT which shows the value 0.193(**). This means the correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed). As the researcher mentioned in the previous section that self-efficacy is closely related to motivation when handled effectively promote positive outcome in learning. In part, according to a study conducted by the American National Capital Language Resource Center (2000), similar findings were discovered. Student's language learning strategy is found to be positively correlated with their motivation constructs in language learning. Students who tend to use more language learning strategies are highly motivated or confident in their language learning abilities. This was also reflected in Hsieh (2008) study on 249 undergraduate students' differences among L2 learners' learning attitude, motivation and achievement. The study observed that students with higher self-efficacy and/or motivation are reported to have higher interest in learning language and show positive attitude towards learning a L2/Foreign language. On the other hand, Çubukçu's (2008) study which was conducted on low self-efficacy, mentioned that those students who have low self-efficacy would not attempt or are not willing to try when facing problems or difficulties in learning and are likely to give up easily without even looking for solutions. He then concluded that there should be significant and positive correlation between language learning strategy use and

perceived self-efficacy, which describes that highly motivated learners would definitely apply more strategies compared to those with lower self-efficacy or confidence.

Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1986) probed a similar study and proposed the same concept as Çubukçu's study. They signified that those learners' who often use varied language learning strategies could enjoy high level of self-efficacy. Oxford, R. L. & Shearin, J. (1994), came out with a framework for self-efficacy and motivational construct engagement and learning, by explaining the inter-relationship between motivations and learner's behavioral engagement, cognitive engagement and motivational engagement. Overall, a predominant number of studies concluded that highly motivated learners tend to use more strategies in learning language and build better performance.

In sum, this study, as shown in table 4.19, reported that English language learners' learning strategies have significant influence on their motivational orientation. It is with the implementation of the LLS that motivation can be seen in force or operating. Over the years, a popular citation on any motivation research always show findings of some studies like Nyikos & Oxford which delineates that the "degree of motivation is the most powerful influence on how and when students use language learning strategies" (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992; Ellis, 1994). However, in this study a significant correlation exists between motivation and the use of LLS, which means learners with high motivation constructs employ learning strategies effectively. That being said effective use of LS will lead to successful learning, thereby reinforcing the elements of motivation back again. The researcher believes that with these concept learners in a L2/FL setting will result in better performance and achievement of their goals.

In an interesting study by Schmidt & Watanabe (2001), a group of 2,089 learners of different foreign languages at the University of Hawaii were investigated on

motivation and strategy use and reported that not all motivation orientations affect strategy use equally nor all strategies are equally affected by motivations. They also further examined that motivational constructs emerged as a strong predictor of the LLS use. In their study, it was also reported that cognitive and metacognitive were mostly affected by motivation. See table 4.19 for numerical representation of the findings on correlation in the Appendix C section.

4.8 Further Findings on the Different LLS use between Malaysian and International students.

This findings are not part of the formulated research questions in this study, however, as the researcher would like to show in-depth observance in this study, the researcher also wanted to investigate the significant difference between international English language learners and Malaysian counterparts in respect to the learning strategy use. So, in order to determine the difference of LLS use between international and Malaysian English language learners and to investigate whether international learners use different learning strategies than Malaysian learners, the researcher ran an independent t-test to seek mean and alpha value . For this analysis, the researcher classified the sample into two groups, which were International group and Malaysian English language learners group. The Africans, Arabs, Bangladesh, Cambodians, Chinese, Indians, Indonesians, Iranians, Japanese, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistani, Somalians, Thai, Uzbekistan and Vietnamese were grouped as international group of learners and the second group was Malaysian English language learners in order to check the mean difference value of these two groups. Table 4.20 below shows that out of the six strategies, three (3) strategies were highly used by international English language learners namely, cognitive (mean = 3.55), compensation (mean= 3.46) and social strategies (mean= 3.67) as mean values for these strategies. This study also

demonstrated that International students were reported to be relatively higher user of cognitive, compensation and social strategies than Malaysian students as the mean value of the group were $M=3.44$, $M=3.33$ and $M=3.46$, respectively. Other strategy categories for the two groups have very minimal mean difference values. Thus the overall language learning strategies average mean value for International students shows $M=3.50$ and mean value for Malaysians students show $M=3.44$. These findings determined that international students were likely be frequent users of learning strategies than their Malaysian counterparts. See table 4.20 for details and numerical representation of the findings.

Table 4.20: Summary of Differences on Language Learning Strategy Use by International students vs. Malaysian students

	Gender	N	Mean	P
Memory Strategies	International Students	128	3.25	.365
	Malaysians	55	3.26	*
Cognitive Strategies	International Students	128	3.55	.515
	Malaysians	55	3.44	*
Compensation Strategies	International Students	128	3.46	.396
	Malaysians	55	3.33	*
Metacognitive Strategies	International Students	128	3.86	.316
	Malaysians	55	3.87	*
Affective Strategies	International Students	128	3.21	.342
	Malaysians	55	3.29	*
Social Strategies	International Students	128	3.67	.522
	Malaysians	55	3.46	*
Overall Language learning strategies	International Students	128	3.50	.409
	Malaysians	55	3.44	*

* $p > .05$

4.9 Summary of the Findings of the Analyses

As proven in several studies and this present study, there is a significant correlation between learners' language learning strategy used and motivation constructs. Research has shown that language learning strategies have direct impact or influence on learners' motivational constructs. By implication, educators should encourage learner's with low motivation constructs to adapt language learning strategies. Out of eight hypotheses, the researcher has proven that most of the hypotheses showed positive results and this summarize the study that language learning strategies with proper motivation constructs may enable a student to perform better in learning languages and recognizing their own abilities. High motivation results in high efficacy and sustain motivation right back again, when students believe with continued effort, they can achieve their goals. Teachers could also use multiple evaluation methods to assess students' learning achievement, so that teachers could identify students' strengths and weaknesses and provide sincere and positive verbal persuasion and suggestion for students (Zimmerman, 1990). By doing so, learners' motivation could be raised and more frequent use of language learning strategies could be expected, and in the end, better learning achievement could be attained.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This study empirically investigated the utilization of learning strategies of the students of CELPAD and their motivation constructs based on two commonly used frameworks: SILL of Oxford and AMBT based on Gardner's. Both frameworks were found to be appropriate and useful to answer the research questions and the set hypotheses. As mentioned, this study was done to seek answers to five research questions and to answer eight hypotheses created at the beginning of the chapter. This section stipulates the summary of findings based on the set research questions and hypotheses and indicates implication of the study as well.

5.2 Overall

The result of this study showed that English learners from 16 different nationalities were medium users of language learning strategies. The mean difference values of the six LS categories were from medium to high use, as defined by Oxford (1990b), but overall the sample group: English language learners were medium users of these strategies. Within strategy categories, significant differences did emerge across selected factors in this study based on mean differences, however, in terms of individual categories across nationality, major differences emerged. Among the 6 learning strategy categories, metacognitive was reported to be the highest strategy category used by the English language learners studying in Malaysia (particularly in CELPAD, IIUM) and social strategies. Memory and affective strategies, on the other hand, were the least preferred learning strategies for these learners. In terms of metacognitive strategies, these English language learners have strength in paying attention, planning and self-evaluating their learning performance. The reason behind this could be their anxiety to

pass the English requirement test because the sooner they pass this test, the sooner they begin their undergraduate studies. This leads to hastiness on the part of the learners to complete the course. Therefore, it is important for educators and the learners themselves to realize that metacognitive strategies are extremely important. It may be in agreement with the findings in this study, “in previous studies of L2 and foreign language, students used metacognitive strategies less often than cognitive strategies and were limited in range of the latter strategy category, with planning strategies frequently employed and with little self- monitoring” as postulated by Oxford (1990, p. 138). That being said, efficient planning and self- evaluation of learning progress by the students are elemental factors in achieving learning goals. Thus, conscious and regular use of metacognitive strategies can lead to successful language learning (Oxford, 1990, p. 136) and as suggested learners need to learn much more about the essential metacognitive strategies like accurately evaluating their progress or seeking practice opportunities (Oxford, 1990, p. 138), since these learning strategies contribute significant measures for learners to be autonomous in their learning progress.

These English language learners showed strong preference to question items in SILL such as asking the other person if they do not understand, asking their peers and practising the language with other students. These are social strategy behaviour, which ranked 2nd highest used of learning strategies. These strategies from this particular category may be a habitual behaviour by the students unknowingly as part of learning strategies. However, asking questions is one of the essential factors for social interaction and it is important for students to note that it is one way to gain immense benefits. With conscious use of this strategy that is “Asking questions” helps learners to restore communication with other learners and it provides a larger amount of learning input in the target language and this indicates interests and involvement (Oxford, 1990, p. 145).

The least preferred strategies by the English language learners were memory and affective strategies. Even though they were ranked the least favoured among the 6 categories of learning strategies, they were still in medium range of usage.

5.3 Proficiency and Language Learning Strategy Use

RQ1: What are the learning strategies used by high and low proficiency English language learners?" Two hypotheses were derived from this first research question.

They are:

1. "There is no significant difference in the mean of language strategy use of high proficiency and low proficiency English language learners of various backgrounds".

The independent t-test was performed to seek significant or insignificant relationship between language proficiency learners and language learning strategy. The results showed the hypothesis was true, that significant differences in strategy use accounted for by level of proficiency is not statistically significant because there was no significant relationship between high or low proficiency levels using language learning strategies. For the sample of 183 students, the alpha value as indicated is more than .05, which is insignificant. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis is accepted and proved that there is no correlation between the proficiency of the learners and the learning strategy use.

Nevertheless, this study also proves that learners' proficiency levels determine the varied use of LLS based on mean differences. Many studies of L2 learning (like Green & Oxford, 1995; Griffiths & Parr, 2001; Wharton, 2000, to name a few) have largely recorded how successful learners seem to use wider variety of language learning strategies than unsuccessful learners.

2. The second hypothesis “High proficiency learners may not use different or more strategies than low proficiency learners” is rejected.

The result delivered through the distribution of the scores and mean difference value, indicates that high proficiency learners are more interested in implementing more strategies than low level proficiency learners, as the mean difference value in the utilization of LS is higher than low level counterparts. It was reported that high proficiency learners were frequent users of LS than the low proficiency learners. This study affirmed that metacognitive strategies were used more frequently followed by social strategies, while affective strategies were the least frequent used learning strategies. A few researchers have observed this conclusion, among them, Vann & Abraham (1987; 1990) who conducted a research on successful and unsuccessful language learners and found that unsuccessful learners used similar strategies as of those successful learners, however, the only difference is that successful ones employed more learning strategies and more appropriate strategies in varied situations.

Researches examining on language learning strategy use and English proficiency of learners have constantly shown that successful learners have degrees of flexibility when choosing strategies (Abraham & Vann, 1987; 1990). Watanabe's (1990) postulated that students who had higher self-rated proficiency used more SILL strategies more frequently than those with lower self-rated proficiency. However, Chamot and El-Dinary (1999) reported in their study that there are no differences in total strategy use between effective and less effective students, but some differences emerged in the type of strategy students used when dealing with reading in the target language.

Indeed, this study indicates LL strategies were significantly favoured frequently by high proficient English language learners than low proficient learners. This study predicted that low proficiency learners may possess little knowledge of English learning

or perform rote strategies, and less awareness on the effective way of LS application. As Chamot and O'malley (1990) claimed, learners are unique and naturally possess different learning styles, and that the the lack of awareness may lead to inappropriate use of learning strategies available (Oxford, 2003).

On the other hand, the findings also resulted that between two levels (High & Low) across six LS categories, the mean differences were very minimal. Therefore, it should be pointed out that in this study these English language learners irrespective of levels certainly use learning strategies.

So, it is the attempt of this study to encourage both teachers and language learners that to be proficient in language learning one should not depend simply in using the LLS but employ a wider range of learning strategies in more situations and apply learning strategies suitable for different tasks.

5.4 Gender and Language Learning Strategy Use

RQ2: Is there a significant difference between male and female learners on the use of language learning strategies? There are two hypotheses set for this research question as well.

1. The third hypothesis is there is no significant difference in the use of learning strategies between male and female English language learners is accepted.

To check hypothesis three and four, independent t-test was run. The findings of this study reported that there was no statistical difference in the overall use of learning strategies between male and female respondents. Thus, the third hypothesis is proven true. This is due to the findings that the p value was more than .05. However, the mean difference showed an average strategy use of the entire target respondents with $M=3.48$, which defined that these English language learners were medium users of LLS. According to Griffiths (2003), to be able to claim that the learning strategies are utilized

at a high frequency level, the mean value should be 3.50 or more than 3.50. But this study showed the mean value of 3.48 which is closer to 3.50. So, the overall observation in this research indicated above moderate frequency level of language learning strategy used by the learners. Similar to the findings of the study, Kim (1995) and Hong- Nam & Leavell (2006) also found no statistical significant difference on language learning strategy use between genders.

2. The fourth hypothesis that female learners tend to use more strategies than male learners is accepted or proven true.

The findings showed that female learners tend to use more strategies than male learners because the mean value for female attributable to LS use is higher than the mean value for males. The findings in this study reveals that female English language learners employed an average of $M=3.55$ learning strategies used while males used $M=3.44$, which means female learners were highly frequent users of LLS than the male counterparts. Female learners were reported to have high mean scores in all strategy categories except for social strategies, where interestingly male learners were relatively higher. Many recent researches support this findings as proven in these lined up of studies by Green & Oxford, 1995; Dryer & Oxford, 1996; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; Lee & Oxford, 2008. Furthermore, to account the use of particular strategy type across gender, both male and female learners were frequent users of metacognitive strategies. The least favored learning strategies for females were memory, while affective strategy category was the least used by males, but both categories were still in medium range used as defined in Oxford (1990).

5.5 Nationality and Language Learning Strategy Use

RQ3: What learning strategies are used by the Pre-university IIUM English language learners belonging to different nationalities?

1. This leads to hypothesis 5 that is there is no significant relationship in the uses of the six classifications of learning strategies of these learners in reference to the influence of nationality/ background is accepted.

In this study, the learners were grouped into 16 nationalities. The fifth hypothesis as mentioned above cannot be rejected because the findings proved to be true and the p-value is at 0.302, which is more than 0.05 significance level. Thus, the findings depicted that there was no statistical significance between nationalities and language learning strategies, indicating no possible relationship exists between LLS and nationality. It is noteworthy to consider that this study being multifarious in representation (16 nationalities), the overall summary of the distribution showed that Japanese students were the highest frequent user of learning strategies compared to the other 15 nationalities with the mean value of $M= 3.72$, followed by Cambodian nationality with mean value of $M=3.71$. and Bangladeshi learners were ranked third highest users of LLS. Interestingly, Chinese, African and Indian learners of English were ranked fourth (4th) as frequent users of learning strategies.

Despite numerous studies of LLS use in English as a second/ foreign language, (Oxford & Green (1995); Griffiths & Parr (2001; Hong- Nam & Leavell, 2006 etc.), the researcher claimed that not many studies on LLS have been done with English language learners of multi-cultural background. In reference to the SILL results, eventhough there was no statistically significant differences with respect to nationality, the findings indicate medium to high use of learning strategies based on mean difference value across nationality. To reiterate the distribution of mean averages across nationalities: Japanese, African, Bangladesh, Cambodian, Chinese, Indian, Indonesian, Iranian and

Thai English language learners are reported to be high users of LLS with mean value from highest to lowest (M= 3.72 to 3.51). Six nationality groups used LS in medium range. These are the Arabs, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysian, Somali, Uzbekistan and Vietnamese learners of English (M= 3.46 – 3.04). Pakistanis students were the least users of LS among the group.

Several studies observed that nationality or cultural background is related to language learning strategies (Bedell & Oxford, 1996; Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995, Grainger, 1997 and Wharton, 2000, also cited in Hong- Nam & Leavell, 2006). It cannot be denied based on this study and past studies (reviews mentioned earlier) that learners are defined by their nationality in relation to the preferences of learning strategies and this may be based on ethnocentric assumption about effective language learning (Politzer & McGroarty, 1985). Based on mean differences, the present study determines that nationality groups utilized specific kinds of learning strategies. To cite a few examples, Asian learners are frequent users of memory strategy in particular rote memorization (Politzer & Groarty, 1985), though this study rejects that finding; Asian ESL students preferred social strategies (Phillips, 1991); South African EFL learners favoured metacognitive strategies from all LS categories (Dreyer & Oxford, 1996); Noguchi, on the contrary, found social strategies to be unpopular among Chinese and Japanese students and metacognitive strategies are frequently preferred by Arab English learners (Abu Shmis, 2003). Indeed, varied nationalities use different learning strategies during the learning curve. Furthermore, Oxford also points out “it would be impossible (and undesirable) to try to attribute one particular language learning approach to specific cultural group” That is why, the researcher attempted to investigate the use of LLS among English language learners of different nationalities to shed light on the variation of LLS preferences across nationalities.

Some of the findings herewith indicate that these English language learners from different nationalities have varied patterns of strategies used in choosing the LLS in comparison with previous studies. The present findings indicate, for example, the Chinese students may not be associated with rote- memorization, but are now user of compensation strategies. Since the respondents here are heterogenous in composition, coming from various nationalities, the findings based on mean differences indicate indeed cultural differences influence strategy choice and use. However, definite generalization should not be drawn immediately since the sample representations from 16 nationalities were not even and unbalanced. Thus the need to further investigate by replicating this study in similar paradigm is necessary for future research in order to generate in-depth study, verification and ensure validity of research findings. As Littlewood (2000, p. 31) adverted “the need to question our preconception, and to explore in greater depth the nature and extent of cultural influences on learning”. A larger representation of different nationalities should also be considered.

5.6 Motivation Constructs and English Language Learners’ Nationality

RQ4: What are the motivation construct of these English language learners of CELPAD of different nationalities?

In answering this question the researcher analyzed the AMBT data to see the motivation constructs of the English language learners by nationalities. Hypothesis 6 was formulated which was “there is no significant relationship in the motivation constructs of English language learners of CELPAD and their nationality”.

To answer hypothesis 6, the independent and dependent variables were correlated to investigate any significant relationships between the learners’ motivation constructs and their nationality. This hypothesis was proven true as the overall value shows no significant correlation between the motivation constructs of these learners

across nationality which showed $p=0.132$, which is higher than .05 significance level. This proves that there is no connection between the motivation constructs of the learners and their nationality. These English language learners of different nationalities are not statistically significant related to motivation constructs. In other words, there is no existing relationship between learners' motivation constructs and their cultural background. Additionally, if we had to evaluate individually, out of 16 countries, 5 Asian nationalities show significant relationship towards their motivation constructs which were Cambodians (0.048), Indians (0.028), Indonesians (.000647), Malaysians (0.00) and Thai students (0.021).

5.7 Motivation Constructs and English Language Learners' Gender

RQ5: What are the Motivation construct of these English language learners of different gender?

For this part, two (2) hypotheses were formulated to examine on whether motivation constructs have significant relationship in reference to the learners' gender.

First, hypothesis 7: There is no significant relationship between the motivation constructs of these English language learners of CELPAD and their gender was rejected because results shows significant difference (2-tailed) which was less than .05 except for the statement "Most native speakers are so friendly and easy to get along with." For this statement both male and female learners gave .104 and .094, respectively. Thus the overall significant difference determines there is significant relationship between the English learners' motivation constructs and their genders. The present study identified that female learners were more highly motivated than male learners. The p value for each statement by the gender has been illustrated under the sig (2-tailed column). For the first statement, "Studying English is important because it will allow me to be at ease with people who speak English" has depicted significant relationship between gender

and motivation constructs as the significance value shows $p=0.004$ for males and $p=0.002$ for female counterparts, “Studying English is important as it will make (one) more educated” ($p=.000$ for both gender) and “Studying English is important because it will be useful in getting a good job” ($p=.003$ for males & $p=.001$ for females).

Secondly, based on the result presented by hypothesis 7, this had proven that hypothesis H_{07a} is true as there is a correlation between the motivations constructs of these English language learners and their genders. This study claimed that both variables present significant relationship arising from correlation method. The findings identified that hypothesis 07a is valid because table 4.18 showed that there is an existing relationship between motivation constructs in relation to gender. Based on this findings, female learners were reported to be highly motivated.

5.8 Correlation between LLS Use and Motivation

RQ5: Is there a significant relationship between learners’ language learning strategies and their motivation construct?

For the last analysis in chapter four, the researcher did a correlation test between SILL and AMBT. As a result, the overall language learning strategies (LLS) correlated significantly with the AMBT with a value at $0.193(**)$ level, which means the two variables are significantly related at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Therefore, this study validates that utilization of language learning strategy has significant correlation with motivation, and indeed affirms Motivation as one essential variable that affects strategy use (Oxford, 1990). It shows that English language learners of CELPAD are highly motivated to learn English and have been using the six different strategies which are memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies.

The findings generally support other researchers’ findings that highly motivated students have more positive attitudes in learning English and are more intrinsically

motivated too (Ainol Madziah & Isarji, 2009; Thang, 2004). The analysis actually shows that higher proficiency level students who apply positive attitudes and motivations towards learning English tend to use more language learning strategies compared to low level proficiency students.

This shows that both motivation and language learning strategy are important and are interrelated to create interests among English language learners. Thus no matter what the underlying motivation to study a second/foreign language, it cannot be denied that motivation is one imperative variable when examining successful second/ foreign language acquisition.

5.9 Further Findings

Given the overall result, the researcher would like to magnify or strengthen the result of this research. So, the researcher has decided to investigate trends in the use of LS by Malaysian students. Since the setting is in Malaysia, the researcher thought it would be equally important to investigate the use of language learning strategies by the Malaysian English language learners compared to the international students learning English.

All the 16 nationalities were grouped into International students and were tested against Malaysian students. The mean value for International group was 3.50 which is higher than Malaysian group of 3.44. The findings of this present study indicates that international English language learners obviously use more learning strategies than Malaysian counterparts.

5.10 Implications and Recommendations

The findings of this study yield several pedagogical implications. Further research on a wide range of variables affecting language learning strategies such as cultural, motivation, learning style, gender, etc, should be done and continued in this context or another considering that only a better understanding of effective learning and teaching strategies can alleviate problems in learning and can boost development in attaining level of success in learning among language learners and which will surely give a positive impact on teaching as well.

This study is mainly attributed to the “Good Learner tradition” as pioneered by Rubin & Stern (1975). Following that rationale along with several studies about learning, the present study accords that learning strategies can help guarantee learning success. The conscious use of LLS has been found to be one of the characteristics of good language learners (Rubin, 1975, Bialystok, 1981; Wenden, 1985; Cohen, 1987; O’Malley and Chamot, 1990). However, it is extremely important to understand that being conscious of learning strategies does not indicate students become successful learners of the target language. Successful language learners do not necessarily use more strategies, but instead different combinations of the strategies (Kaylani, 1996). Therefore, this study recommends language learners who aspire to be proficient should use LS in a wider range in different situations and suitable for different tasks.

The sample being multifarious in composition by nationality, this study shows the employment of LLS across nationality. Researchers, educators and curriculum designers should understand that assigning a specific strategy type to a certain nationality should not be the case because learning strategy can change overtime through different factors, such as teaching environment, students’ self-efficacy in using LLS and other fundamental variables that affect learners’ learning. Furthermore, for learners to be successful at learning a second/ foreign language does not solely depend

on monotony of teaching methods or predictability of learning environment, but also the exposure of learners to different learning environment (like studying the target language abroad) and that they are challenged by other learners “wanting to get ahead” , thereby encouraging oneself to progress in learning.

Opinions about the role of motivation in academic achievement and what can be done about it to help learners vary greatly among researchers, educators, administrators and perhaps curriculum innovators as well. Learners’ motivation and strategy use should be practical interests to language teachers and program designers who want their courses to be congruent to learners’s needs and interests (Schmidt et al., 1996). The identification of learners’ motivation constructs early on in language settings and the utilization of LS could be the answers to reduce problems and pressure in learning by both educators and learners. Thus, this study confirms how teaching and learning strategies are connected to learners’ learning progress as well as to positively impact English learners’ motivation to succeed in learning the target language. It is important to consider, having the knowledge of LLS on how and when to appropriately use them can help learners to be more involved in learning by elevating learner’s self- efficacy to accomplish a task and one’s confidence in possessing the skills needed to perform the tasks (Garcia et al., 1991), thereby sustaining motivation back again to create positive outcome and attainment of goals.

There should also be a need for future research to focus on integrating LLS training into language instruction in order for teachers to assess students’ learning strategies and therefore help them improve and adapt effective selection of strategies in learning not only among high level proficiency students, but most importantly to encourage the low level proficiency students to enhance success in learning.

When LLS training is introduced during the learning process, students may boost their self- efficacy and thus provides a good effect on the use of learning

strategies. Chamot and colleagues (1987) discovered that effective learners are reported to have greater frequency and range of strategy use. Therefore, when learners are more aware of the LLS, they will frequently use more learning strategies.

Nyikos (1989), on the other hand, revealed that learners who used only a few strategies were generally unaware of the strategies they utilized. Therefore, it is necessary for language teachers to help students identify the right strategies (through LLS training) to be used in performing their learning tasks during the learning curves and for teachers, too, to match their teaching strategies to the learning tasks. Learners will then be able to apply appropriate strategies for themselves. It is also very important to continuously encourage English language learners and other language learners to be aware of language learning strategies in order to be fluent and proficient in the language and generate good causatum in learning context as a whole. Griffiths (2007) and Nyikos & Oxford (1993) claimed that with better understanding of the relationship between LLS and learners, conscious selection of strategies suitable for learners with different learning style preferences is made possible, and this may lead to optimal learning effectiveness.

Every educator or teacher should encourage every learner to employ not just selection or preferences but the appropriateness in selecting LS to certain tasks. As Oxford (2003) pointed out “Learners adopting appropriate LLS may be encouraged to extend themselves beyond their style preferences, leading to more robust language-related experimentation and positive learning effects.”

Furthermore, motivation is indeed an essential variable in language learning strategy. If in any case, learners both lack academic skills and motivation, the greater problem is Motivation (Kelly, 1988). As discussed earlier, it is necessary for teachers or educators to strengthen students’ motivation especially the ones who are coping hard in the learning process and on the verge of being demotivated. Most researchers agree that

it is only through sharpening those “tool” that they can be successful in both academic and professional lives (Csizer & Dornyei, 2005a,b; Dornyei, 1990, 1994, 2001a,b, 2006; Dornyei & Skehan, 2003 and also cited in Bahous, 2011).

Nonetheless, since the sample of this study is heterogeneous in component as learners are from different origins and backgrounds, the researcher hereby recommend to have a better understanding first of the cultural background of the learners to understand what influence their motivation and their selection of strategies in order to fully investigate the need to enhance successful language learning performance. That being said, this study hereby recommends further research replicating similar pattern, collection of data from different areas over time on vast representations (subjects) to achieve a profound frame of reference about successful language learning.

Finally, the researcher hope that this research and other similar studies on language learning strategy would be able to enhance “good learning and good learner” factor with respect to foreign/ second language acquisition context. The researcher would also like to encourage curriculum designers and higher education facilitators from various institutions to implement LLS be functional throughout the learning period of the English and other language learners so that it will be beneficial for them in their learning practise as well as in their working world.

REFERENCES

- Al- Tamimi, A. & Shuib, M. (2009). Motivation and attitudes towards learning English: A study of petroleum engineering undergraduates at Hadhramout. Retrived December 16, 2011 from http://www.ukm.my/ppbl/Gema/abstract%20for%20pp%2029_55.pdf
- Bahous, R., Bacha, N., & Nabhani, M. (2011) Motivating Students in the EFL classroom: A case study Perspectives. *English Language Teaching*. Vol.4, No.3 (2011).
- Bedell, D., Oxford, R. L. (1996). Cross-cultural comparison of Language learning strategies in the People's Republic of China and other countries. In Oxford, R. (ed.), *Language Learning strategies around the World: Cross Cultural Perspectives*. (pp. 47-60). University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI.
- Bialystok, E. (1981). The Role of concious strategies in second language proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, 65, 24 & 35.
- Bidin, S., Jusoff, K., Abdul aziz, N., Mohammad, S. M., Tajudin, T. (2009). Motivation and attitude in Learning English among UITM students in the Northern region of Malaysia. *English Language Teaching*. 2(2), 16-20.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Teaching by Principles*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall.
- Brown, H. D. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. (2nd Edition) Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. Prentice Hall.
- Brown, H. (2007). *Principles of Language learning and teaching*. (5th Ed.) New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Chamot, A. U., Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in Foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annuals*, 22, 13-24.
- Chamot, A.U. & El-Dinary, P.B. (1999). Children's learning strategies in immersion classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83 (3), 319- 341.
- Chamot, A.U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1 (1). 12-25.

- Chamot, A.U. & Keatley, C.W. (2004). Learning styles of students of less commonly target languages. Paper presented at the *2004 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. San Deigo, CA.
- Chen, C., Lee, S., & Stevenson, H. (1996). Academic achievement and motivation of Chinese students: A cross-cultural perspective. In S. Lau (Ed.), *Growing up the Chinese way* (pp. 69–92). Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Cheng, H., & Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: *The case of EFL of EFL teaching in Taiwan*. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, Vol 1 (1), 153- 174.
- Chou, C.T. (2007). *A study on the relationships among English self-efficacy, English Learning anxiety, English learning strategies, and English learning achievement of senior high school students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei Taiwan.
- Cohen, A.D. (1987). Studying Learner Strategies. How do we get the information. In a Wenden & J. Rubim (Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, pp. 33-40. Englewood Cliffs; NJ: Prentice- Hall.
- Cohen, A.D. (1997). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*, London: Longman.
- Collins, J. (1982). *Self-efficacy and ability in achievement behaviour*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Crystal, D. (2003) *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Çubukçu, F (2008). A study on the correlation between self-efficacy and foreign language learning anxiety. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 4(1), 148-158
- Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Classic definition and new direction. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self- instruction in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Djigunovic, J. M. (2000). Are language learning strategies motivation- specific? *Language Learning Strategies and Motivation. Orbis Linguarum, 18*, 125-138.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivation in foreign-language learning classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 273-284
- Dörnyei, Z. (1996a). Moving language learning motivation to a larger platform for theory and practices. In R.L. Oxford (ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century*, 89- 101.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching, 31*, 117-135.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Otto, I. (1998). Motivation in Action: A process model of L2 motivation. Working paper in Applied Linguistics, 4, 43- 69.
- Dörnyei, Z. & Kormos, J. (2000). The role of individual – social variables in oral task performance. *Language Teaching Research, 4*, 275- 300.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. Harlow: Longman
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. N.Y. Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning Supplement, 53*, 3-29
- Dreyer, C. & Oxford, R. (1996). Learning strategies and other predictors of ESL proficiency among Afrikaans speakers in South Africa. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross Cultural Perspective* (pp.61- 74). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second language teaching and Curriculum Centre.
- Ehrman, M., Oxford, R. L. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on Adult Language learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal, 73*, 1-3.
- Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern language Journal*.

- El-Dib, M.A. (2004). Language learning strategies in Kuwait: Links to Gender, Language level and culture in a hybrid context. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37.1, 85-95.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of 2nd Language acquisition*. China: Oxford University Press.
- Finnegan, E. (1999). *Language: Its structure and use*. (3rd Ed.). Harcourt Brace.
- Gardner, D., & Miller, L. (1999). *Establishing self-access*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social Psychology and second language teaching: the role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W.E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in second language learning*. Newbury House: Rowley, M.A.
- Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (2nd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.
- Grainger, P.R. (1997). Language learning strategies for learners of Japan: Investigating ethnicity. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30 (3), 378- 385.
- Green, J. M. and Oxford, R. L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 261-297.
- Green, J. M. (1991). Language learning strategies of Puerto rican university students. Paper presented at the *Annual meeting of Puerto Rico Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Language*, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
- Griffiths, C., Parr, J. M. (2001). Language Learning strategies: Theory and Perception. *ELT Journal* 53 (3), 247-254.
- Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language strategy use. *System*, 31, 367–383.
- Goh, C.C.M., & Kwah, P.F. (1997). Chinese ESL students' learning strategies: A look at Frequency, proficiency and gender. *Hongkong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2 (1), 39-53.
- Gu, M.Y. (n.d). *The Discursive construction of English learners' motivation in China: A multi-level Perspective*. Peter Lang

- Gu, Y. (2002). Gender, academic major, and vocabulary learning strategies of Chinese EFL learners. *RELC Journal*, 33 (1), 35-54.
- Held, D. McGrew, A. Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J. (1999). *Global Transformations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hismanoglu, M. (2000). Language learning strategies in foreign language learning & teaching. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. VI, No.8., Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Hismanoglu-Strategies.html>.
- Hong-Nam, K. & Leavell, A.G. (2006). Language Learning strategies use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System*, 34, 399-415.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Pergamon. (First published 1979, Strasbourg: Council of Europe).
- Hsieh, P.H. (2008). "Why are college foreign language students self-efficacy, attitude and motivation so different?" *International Education*, 38 (1), 6-94.
- Kaylani, C. (1996). The Influence of gender and motivation on EFL learning strategy use in Jordan. In Rebecca Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives*.
- Kim, Y. M. (1995). The effect of gender and language context on the use of LLS. *English Teaching*, 50, 331-345.
- Lai, Y. C. (2005). *Language learning strategy use and language proficiency for EFL learners in Taiwan*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California
- Lavelle, E. (2009). *Writing through college: Self-efficacy and instruction*. In R. Beard, D. Myhill, J. Riley & M. Nystrand (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Writing Development* (pp. 415-423). London: SAGE
- Lee, K. (2003). The relationship of school year, sex, and proficiency on the use of language learning strategies in learning English. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5 (4), 1- 36.
- Lee, P. Y. (2008). *A study of EFL learning strategies used by Cadets in Taiwan*. Unpublished master's thesis, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taiwan, R.O.C.

- Li, Y., & Wang, C. (2010). An empirical study of reading self-efficacy and the use of reading strategies in the Chinese EFL context. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12(2), 144-162.
- Lightbrown, P.M., & Spada N. (1993). Focus on form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: *Effects on second language learning studies in second language acquisition*. 12: 429- 48
- Lightbrown, P.M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How Language are learned*. China: Oxford University Press, 7-17, 49, 54.
- Littlewood, W. (1983). *Communicative language teaching: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lu, Y. C. (2007). *ESL students' learning motivations and learning strategies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota
- MacIntyre, P.D., & Noels, K.A. (1996). Using social- psychological variables to predict the use of language learning strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 373- 386.
- MacIntyre, P.D., MacMaster, K., & Baker S.C. (2001). The convergence of multiple models of motivation for second language learning: Gardner, Pintrichs, Khul & McCrosky. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivating and second language acquisition* (pp. 461 -492). Honolulu, H.I. : University of Hawaii Press.
- Manolopoulou-Sergi, E. (2004). Motivation within the information processing model of foreign language learning. *System* 32(3), 427–441.
- Mochizuki, A. (1999). Language learning strategies used by Japanese University students. *RELC Journal*, 30(2), 101-113.
- Moiinvaziri, M. (2007). *Motivational Orientation in English language learning*. Retrived December 8, 2011 <http://www.usingenglish.com/articles/motivational-orientation-in-english-language-learning.html>
- Mondada, L., & Doehler, S. P. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 501–518.
- Myung- Cook, K. (2001). *Language Learning strategies and Proficiency of Korean learners of Chinese*. M.A. thesis, University.

- Nakata, Y. (2006). *Motivation and experiences in foreign language learning*. Oxford: Peter Lang AG.
- Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H.H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner: Research in education* series no. 7. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Noguchi, T. (1991). Review of language learning strategy: Research and its implications. Unpublished thesis, Tottori University, Tottori, Japan.
- Norris-Holt, J. (2001). Motivation as a contributing factor in second language acquisition. *The Internet TESL Journal* 7 (6). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Norris-Motivation.html>.
- Nunan, D. (1997). Designing and adapting materials to encourage learner autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 192-203). London: Longman.
- Oh, J. (1992). Learning strategies used by university students in Korea. *Language Teaching*, 1, 3-53.
- O'Malley, J., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J., Chamot, A. U., Stewner- Manzares, G., Russo, R.P., & Kupper L., (1985). "Learning Strategy Applications with Students of English as a Second Language" *TESOL Quarterly* 19: 557-584.
- Ong, S. Y. (2004). *English language learning strategies used by the sophomore students of a technology university students*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Southern Taiwan University, Taiwan, R.O.C.
- Osanai, D. (2000). *Differences in language learning strategies between male and female, and also between Asian and Latino ESL students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Oxford, R (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*. NY: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R.L., Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 291-300.

- Oxford, R.L. & Ehrman, M. (1995). Adult language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System*, 23 (3), 359- 386.
- Oxford, R., Burry-Stock, J. (1995). Assessing the use language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL). *System* 23, 1, 1-23
- Oxford, R.L. & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning Motivation: expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12-28
- Oxford, R.L. (1996). *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century*. Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press.
- Oxford, R.L. (2003). Language learning styles and strategies: An Overview: Learning styles and strategies/ Oxford, *GALA*, 1- 25.
- Oxford, R.L. (2003b). Relationships between second language learning strategies and proficiency in the context of Learner autonomy and self-regulation. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses. Canarian Journal of English Studies*, 38, 109-126.
- Oxford, R., Cho, Y., Leung, S., & Kim, H.J. (2004). Effect of the presence and difficulty of task on strategy use: An exploratory study. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 42, 1- 47.
- Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (1997). The predictive and meditational role of the writing Self-efficacy beliefs of upper elementary students. *Journal of Educational Research*, 90, 353–360.
- Park, G. (1997). Language learning strategies and English proficiency in Korea university students. *Foreign Language Annuals*, 30. 211- 221.
- Phillips, V. (1991). A look at learner strategy use and ESL proficiency. *CATESOL Journal (Nov)*, 57- 67.
- Politzer, R.L., & McGroarty, M. (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviors and their relationship to gain in linguistic and communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 103–124.
- Quadir, M. (2005). Speaking strategy use by the EFL students in Japan and Bangladesh. *Journal of International Development & Cooperation*, 12, 47-62.

- Richard, J.C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classroom*. NY : Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, J.C., Platt, J. & Platt, H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied*. Essex: Longman.
- Root, E. (1999). *Motivation and Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Setting: A look at a Learner of Korean*. (CARLA Working Paper # 14). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Centre for Advanced Language Acquisition.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What 'good language learners' can tell us? *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41-51.
- Sawhney, C. (1998). The role of attitudes and motivation in foreign language learning: The case of German in India. IN R.K. Agnihotri et al. (Eds.), *Social Psychological Perspective on Second language learning*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Scarcella, R. & Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The Individual in the communicative classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Scharle, Á., & Szabó, A. (2000). *Learner autonomy: A guide to developing learner responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R. & Watanabe, Y. (2001). *Motivation, strategy use, and pedagogical preferences in foreign language learning*. In Dornyei, Z & Schmidt, R (Eds.), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*, (pp. 313-360). Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.
- Schunk, D.H. (1995). *Self-efficacy, motivation, and performance*. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 7 (2), 112-137. Retrived from http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncg?f/D_schunk_self_1995.pdf.
- Shamais, W. A. (2003). Language Learning strategy use in Palestine. *TESL – EJ*. 7 (2), 20-33.
- Sinclair, B. (2000). Learner autonomy: The next phase. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath & T. Lamb (Eds.), *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions* (pp. 15-23). London: Longman.

- Skehan, P. (1991). Individual differences in second language learning. *Studies in second language Acquisition*, 13, 275- 98.
- Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M. (1995). *COLT Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching observation scheme: Coding conventions and applications*. Sydney, Australia.
- Stern, H.H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learners? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31, 304-328.
- Stern, H.H. (1992). *Issue and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stevens, J. (1996). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Takeuchi, O. (2003). What can we learn from good learners: A qualitative study in the Japanese foreign language context. *System*, 31, 385-392.
- Thang, S.M. (2004). Learning English in multicultural Malaysia: Are Learners motivated? *Journal of Language and Learning*. 2 (2).
- Teng, L.Y. (2000). *The relationship among language learning strategies, teaching strategies, and English achievement*. Master's Thesis, Southern Taiwan University, Taiwan R.O.C.
- Thomson, C. K. (1996). Self-assessment in self-directed learning: Issues of learner diversity. In R. Pemberton, E. S. L. Li, W. W. F. Or & H. D. Pierson (Eds.), *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning* (pp. 77-91). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Turner, J. C. (2001). Using context to challenge our understanding of motivational theory. In S. Volet & S. Järvelä (Eds.), *Motivation in learning contexts: Theoretical advances and methodological implications* (pp. 85–104). London: Pergamon
- Urduan, T. (2004). Predictors of academic self-handicapping and achievement: Examining achievement goals, classroom goal structures, and culture. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(2), 251–264.
- Vann, K.J. & Abraham, R.G. (1990). Strategies of unsuccessful language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*. 24, 177- 188.

- Vaezi, z. (2008). Language learning motivation among Iranian undergraduate students. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 5 (1), 54- 61.
- Wang, B. (2009). Motivation and language learning. *Asian Social Sciences*, 5 (1), 98-100.
- Watanabe, Y. (1990). *External variables affecting language learning strategies of Japanese EFL learners: Effects of entrance examination, years spent at college/ university, and studying overseas*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK.
- Wenden, A.L. (1985). Learner Strategies. *TESOL Newsletter* 19 (5): 1-7.
- Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wharton, G. (2008). Language learning strategies use of bilingual foreign language learner in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50 (2), 203-243.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ya- Ling, W. (2008). Language learning strategy used by students at different proficiency level. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 10 (4): 75- 95.
- Yamato, R. (2002). A study on Motivation and strategy in an EFL setting. *JACET Bulletin*, 35, 1-13.
- Yang, D. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System*, 27, 515- 535.
- Zimmerman, B. J. & Martinez-Pons M. (1986). Development of a structured interview for Assessing student use of self-regulated learning strategies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23, 614-628.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self- regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational Psychologist*, 25 (1), 3-17.
- Zubairi, A.M. & Hj Sarudin, I. (2009). Motivation to learn a foreign language in Malaysia. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*. 9 (2), 73-87.