

respondents' socio-economic background, their English use and exposure to the language, attitude towards the English Language and their perception of their English Language instructors. Chapter 4 will discuss the findings of this study, that is, the relationship between the variables and the respondents' achievement in the English Language examination.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the findings of the study on the relationship between the respondents' socio-economic background, their English use and exposure to the language, their attitude towards the English Language and their perception of their English Language instructors, and the English Language achievement or grades obtained for their Level 2 English for Reading and Writing course. The chapter discusses the data as they apply to the four research questions of this study, namely:

- i. Does a student's socio-economic background influence his or her academic achievement in the English Language examination?
- ii. Does a student's use of English and exposure to the language influence his or her academic achievement in the English Language examination?

- iii. Does a student's attitude towards English influence his or her academic achievement in the English Language examination?
- iv. Does a student's perception of the English instructors influence his or her academic achievement in the English Language examination?

Data collected from items 1-7 and items 12 and 13 of the questionnaire were analyzed according to the frequency count of each item which was then converted into a percentage for each respondent. Data collected from items 8-11 and items 14-49 were also firstly analyzed according to the frequency count of each item and then the accumulated scores for items 8-11 and items 14-49 were tabulated to determine the respondents' socio-economic background, their English use and exposure to the language, their attitude towards the English Language and their perception of their English Language instructors.

4.1 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis and presentation of the data are based on the following:

- i. Demographic background of the respondents;
- ii. Respondents' socio-economic background;
- iii. Respondents' English use and exposure to the language;
- iv. Respondents' attitude towards English; and
- v. Respondents' perception of their English Language instructors.

Tables were used to facilitate the interpretation of the findings.

4.1.1 The Demographic Background of the Respondents

100 first year undergraduates who had already completed Level 2 of their English course were studied. Items 1 – 3 in the questionnaire provided the demographic background of the respondents. Item 1 of the questionnaire showed the respondents' ethnicity. Table 4.1 shows the breakdown of the ethnicity.

Table 4.1: Respondents' Ethnicity

Ethnicity	No. of Respondents
Malay	49
Chinese	36
Kadazandusun	7
Bajau	4
Others	4
Indian	0
Murut	0
Total	100

Table 4.1 shows that 49 respondents are Malays, 36 Chinese, 7 Kadazandusun and 4 Bajau. Four other respondents are from other ethnicities (Others), namely Brunei, Bugis and Bidayuh. This shows that the majority of the respondents are Malays and Chinese.

Items 2 and 3 of the questionnaire showed the respondents' English Language grade for MUET and Level 2 English for Reading and Writing respectively.

Table 4.2 (a): English Language Grades for MUET

Item	Variants	No. of Respondents
Q2	Band 1	7
	Band 2	35
	Band 3	58
Total		100

Table 4.2 (b): Grades for Level 2 English for Reading and Writing

Item	Variants (Grades)	No. of Respondents
Q3	A	0
	A-	6
	B+	20
	B-	14
	B	19
	C+	13
	C	15
	C-	7
	D+	2
	D	3
	E	1
Total		100

The respondents' grades for MUET and Level 2 of English for Reading and Writing are shown in Table 4.2 (a) and Table 4.2 (b) respectively. Based on Table 4.2 (a), most of the respondents achieved Band 3 for their MUET examination. Table 4.2 (b) shows that grades achieved by the respondents range from A- to E. These findings show that the achievement for Level 2 of English for Reading and Writing of the respondents of this study is good because the majority of the respondents achieved B+, a result which is categorized as a credit in the UMS grading scheme (see Table 3.9). Perhaps this is due to their MUET result, in which the majority of them achieved Band 3, and also the course they major in namely engineering. The researcher feels that the respondents have a rather strong foundation in the English Language. In addition, the lectures for the engineering course are all conducted in the English Language, and this provides the needed environment for students to improve their performance in the English Language. This is shown in their achievement for Level 2 English for Reading and Writing, where the best grades achieved ranged from B+ to C (the number of respondents achieving these grades exceeded ten).

4.1.2 Respondents' socio-economic background

To determine the respondents' socio-economic background, items 4 – 7 of the questionnaire were analyzed by frequency count. The scores for each variant chosen by each respondent for items 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the questionnaire were accumulated to determine the respondents' socio-economic background.

Item 4 of the questionnaire showed that 53 of the respondents had their primary and secondary schooling in rural areas and the other 47 respondents had their primary and secondary schooling in urban areas. Table 4.3 shows the categories.

Table 4.3: Location of the Previous School Attended

Item	Variants	No. of Respondents
Q4	Rural	53
	Urban	47
Total		100

Item 5 of the questionnaire showed that 63 of the respondents lived in the rural areas and the other 37 lived in the urban areas. This shows that many of the respondents resided in rural areas which is supported by the finding of item 4, i.e. many respondents had their primary and secondary schooling in rural areas. The proximity between their home and school could be one of the factors affecting their choice of schooling. The location of the respondents' homes is shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Location of the Home

Item	Variants	No. of Respondents
Q5	Rural	63

	Urban	37
Total		100

Item 6 of the questionnaire showed the breakdown of the ethnicity in the respondents' housing area. Based on this breakdown, it was found that most of the respondents (80) live among their ethnic group while the remaining 20 live in multiethnic group (there is more than one ethnicity living in the respondents' housing area). Table 4.5 (a) shows the breakdown of the ethnicity in the respondents' housing area and Table 4.5 (b) shows the breakdown of the predominant ethnicity in the respondents' housing area.

Table 4.5 (a): Ethnicity in the Respondents' Housing Area

Item	Variants (Ethnicity)	No. (%)
Q6	Malay	50
	Chinese	30
	Kadazandusun	6
	Bajau	5
	Indian	0
	Murut	0
	Others	0
	Malay and Chinese	3
	Malay, Chinese and Indian	2
	Others and Chinese	1
	Others and Kadazandusun	2
Total		100

Table 4.5 (b): Predominant Ethnicity in the Respondents' Housing Area

Item	Variants	No. of Respondents
Q6	Same Ethnic Group	80
	Multiethnic Group	20
Total		100

Item 7 of the questionnaire showed that 82 of the respondents' immediate neighbours are of the same ethnicity, eight have multiethnic neighbours (there is more

than one ethnic group living as the respondents' immediate neighbours and one of the groups is of the same ethnic group with the respondents), and ten of the respondents' immediate neighbours are of different ethnicities (none of the respondents' immediate neighbours is of the same ethnic group). This shows that most of the respondents' immediate neighbours are of the same ethnic group and this could influence their language choice (see Table 4.14). The breakdown of the respondents' immediate neighbours' ethnicity is illustrated in Table 4.6 (a) and Table 4.6 (b) shows the classification of the respondents' immediate neighbour's ethnicity.

Table 4.6 (a): Respondents' Immediate Neighbour's Ethnicity

Item	Variants (Ethnicity)	No. (%)
Q7	Malay	40
	Chinese	23
	Kadazandusun	6
	Bajau	4
	Indian	0
	Murut	0

	Others	3
	Chinese and Indian	2
	Chinese and Others	2
	Chinese and Kadazandusun	1
	Chinese and Malay	11
	Malay, Bajau and Others	1
	Malay and Kadazandusun	1
	Malay and Indian	2
	Malay, Chinese and Indian	3
	Malay, Chinese and Kadazandusun	1
Total		100

Table 4.6 (b): Classification of the Respondents' Immediate Neighbour's Ethnicity

Item	Variants	No. of Respondents
Q7	Same Ethnic Group	82
	Multiethnic Group	8
	Different Ethnic Group	10
Total		100

The findings of items 6 and 7 show that the respondents' language use and preference are influenced by their immediate environment which in this case is principally defined by the people who live in their community. The majority of the respondents lives among their ethnic group and have neighbours of the same ethnicity, which do not require them to speak in other languages with their neighbours as they all speak the same language. Therefore, it may indicate that their willingness towards learning another language, which in this case is the English Language, is low.

Item 8 of the questionnaire elicited the respondents' parents' occupations. Table 4.7 shows the findings.

Table 4.7: Parents' Occupations

Item	Occupation	Father (%)	Mother (%)
Q8	Legislators/Senior Officer/Managers/Professionals	19	4
	Technician/Clerical Workers	12	6
	Skilled Agricultural & Fishery Workers	16	2
	Craft & Related Trades Workers, Plant & Machine Operators & Assemblers	16	2
	Elementary Occupation	32	15
	Others (Retirees/Jobless/Housewives)	5	71
Total		100	100

The table shows that many of the respondents' fathers were involved in elementary jobs or labour jobs (32%), and most of the mothers were housewives (71%). This could be due to the fact that the majority of the respondents live in rural areas. With the type of jobs the respondents' parents are involved in and the location of their homes, it can be concluded that the respondents have a minimal exposure to the English Language.

Item 9 of the questionnaire elicited the respondents' parents' highest level of education. Table 4.8 shows the data collected.

Table 4.8: Parents' Highest Level of Education

Item	Highest Level of Education	Father (%)	Mother (%)
Q9	Degree	5	1
	Diploma/Certificate	5	4
	Secondary School	52	46

	Primary School	31	30
	No formal education	7	19
Total		100	100

Table 4.8 illustrates that most of the parents completed their education at the secondary level. The second highest level of education completed by the respondents' parents is primary school. This could explain why many of the fathers have blue collar jobs while the mothers are housewives (see Table 4.7). This finding is further supported by data from Item 10 of the questionnaire.

Item 10 of the questionnaire elicited the respondents' parents' income per month. This is shown in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Parents' Income per Month

Item	Income Per month	Father (%)	Mother (%)
Q10	RM4500 and above	2	0
	RM2500-4499	11	1
	RM1500-2499	18	3
	RM889-1499	32	10
	RM888 and below/None	37	86
Total		100	100

The table shows that most of the parents have a monthly income ranging from RM888 and below/None to RM1499. This is due to the fact that most of the parents have blue collar jobs.

Item 11 of the questionnaire shows the type of housing the respondents live in. Table 4.10 illustrates this.

Table 4.10: Types of Housing

Item	Type of Housing	No. of Respondents
Q11	Detached house/Bungalow	9
	Semi-detached house/Condominium	1
	Double-storey terrace house/Apartment/ Double-storey kampung house	25
	Single-storey terrace house/Single-storey kampung house	57
	Flat/Squatter house	8
Total		100

As shown in Table 4.10, most of the respondents live in either a single-storey kampung house/single-storey terrace house (57) or a double-storey kampung house/double-storey terrace house/apartment (25).

To determine the respondents' socio-economic background, the researcher accumulated the scores for each variant chosen by each respondent for items 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the questionnaire. The complete cumulative scores for each respondent is listed in Appendix C. Respondents classified as the upper social class were those who obtained scores ranging from 14.8 to 20.0, while respondents classified as the middle social class were those who obtained scores ranging from 9.4 to 14.7; respondents classified as the lower social class were those who obtained scores ranging from 4.0 to 9.3 (see Table 3.5). The findings show that none of the respondents qualified as the upper social class; 30 respondents were categorised as middle social class, and most of them (70) made up the lower social class. Table 4.11 shows the summary of the data on the respondents' socio-economic background.

Table 4.11: Respondents' Socio-economic Background

Variants	No. of Respondents
----------	--------------------

Upper social class	0
Middle social class	30
Lower social class	70
Total	100

One of the purposes of this study is to see the relationship between the respondents' socio-economic background and their achievement in the Level 2 English for Reading and Writing examination. Table 4.12 shows the relationship.

Table 4.12: Respondents' Socio-economic Background and Achievement in the Level 2 English for Reading and Writing Examination

Variants	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	E	Total (%)
Upper Social Class	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Middle Social Class	-	3 (10%)	7 (23.3%)	8 (26.6%)	2 (6.6%)	4 (13.3%)	3 (10.0%)	2 (6.6%)	1 (3.3%)	-	-	30
Lower Social Class	-	3 (4.2%)	13 (18.5%)	11 (15.7%)	12 (17.1%)	9 (12.8%)	12 (17.1%)	5 (7.1%)	1 (1.4%)	3 (4.2%)	1 (1.4%)	70
Total												100

Based on Table 4.12, no one from any of the social classes achieved an A. Grades D and E were only scored by the respondents of the lower social class. The best grade achieved by the middle social class was A- and the poorest grade achieved was D+. The average grade obtained by this group was B. For the lower social class, the best grade was also A- and the poorest grade was E. The average grade obtained by this group was B+. Of the two social classes, it was interesting to note that the data shows that those from the lower social class achieved the better average grade, B+. According to Connant (1961), Chandrasegaran (1979), Kailsan (1983), Mariam (1983), Mohana (1984), Chong (1993)

and Eilers (2002), the higher the social class, the better the performance in using the target language. The findings of this study, however, show that there is minimal relationship between the respondents' socio-economic background and their grades in the Level 2 English for Reading and Writing examination.

As mentioned above, it was found in the study that respondents from both the middle and lower social classes scored A- as the best grade. When the poorest grade of these two social classes was compared, it was found that the respondents of the lower social class achieved grade E, the lowest grade in the UMS grading system (see Appendix B). The respondents of the middle social class, on the other hand, achieved D+ as the lowest grade. This finding ties in with the finding from other studies that the lower the social class, the poorer the performance in the English Language (Connant, 1961; Chandrasegaran, 1979; Kailsan, 1983; Mariam, 1983; Mohana, 1984; Chong, 1993; Eilers, 2002; Tan, 1986; Lim, 2003; Seetha, 2006).

However, in this study, the best average grade, B+, was achieved by the respondents from the lower social class. This contradicts the finding that the lower the social class, the poorer the performance in the English Language. However, the lowest grade achieved by this group, i.e. E, should not be disregarded. Therefore, it can be concluded that socio-economic background does have some influence on the respondents' grades in the Level 2 English for Reading and Writing examination.

4.1.3 Respondents' Use of the English Language and Exposure to it

To elicit the respondents' use of the English Language and exposure to the language, items 12 and 13 of the questionnaire were first analyzed in order to determine the respondents' parents' first language and the language(s) they use or speak at home. The data from items 12 and 13 are shown in Table 4.13 and Table 4.14 respectively. The scores for each variant selected by each respondent for items 14 – 25 of the questionnaire were accumulated and analyzed.

Item 12 of the questionnaire showed that 46 of the respondents' parents' used Malay as their first language; 36 of the respondents' parents used Chinese as their first language; five of the respondents' parents' first language is Kadazandusun; one of the respondents' parents' first language is Bajau; one of the respondents' parents' first language is Bidayuh; two of the respondents' parents' first language is Bugis. Nine of the respondents' parents have first languages that are not shared by their spouse. This is because they are from different ethnicities. The respondents' parents' first languages are shown in Table 4.13. The finding shows that the majority of the respondents' first languages is either Malay or Chinese.

Table 4.13: Respondents' Parents' First Language

Item	Variants	No. of Respondents
Q12	Malay	46
	Chinese	36
	Kadazandusun	5
	Bajau	1
	Bidayuh	1
	Bugis	2
	Malay and Bugis	4
	Chinese and Bajau	2
	Bugis and Kadazandusun	1
	Chinese and Indian	1
	Chinese and Bugis	1
Total		100

Item 13 of the questionnaire showed that 97 of the respondents speak their mother tongues at home, whereas three of the respondents speak their mother tongues as well as English. This shows that almost all of the respondents use or speak their first language at home. They are not exposed to English as they do not use English at home. Only three of them are exposed to English because they not only speak their mother tongue at home but they also use English. Table 4.14 illustrates the respondents' use of language(s) at home.

Table 4.14: Respondents' Use of Language(s) at Home

Item	Variants	No. of Respondents
Q13	Mother Tongue	97
	Multi-languages	3
Total		100

The frequencies of occurrence for the responses on items 14 -25 are illustrated in Table 4.15 (a).

Table 4.15 (a): Frequencies of Occurrence for Items 14-25

Items	Never (%)	Seldom (%)	Variants			Total (%)
			Sometimes (%)	Often (%)	All the time (%)	
Q14	55	30	15	0	0	100
Q15	61	33	5	1	0	100
Q16	16	43	37	4	0	100
Q17	75	17	4	2	2	100
Q18	0	11	28	55	6	100
Q19	11	38	34	16	1	100
Q20	7	46	38	9	0	100
Q21	18	51	24	5	2	100
Q22	7	45	37	10	1	100
Q23	8	37	45	9	1	100
Q24	6	29	37	26	2	100

Q25	2	17	39	32	10	100
-----	---	----	----	----	----	-----

Items 14, 15 and 16 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.15 (a)) elicited the respondents' use of English at home with their parents and siblings. The study shows that 55% of the respondents never use the English Language with their father at home (Item 14).

Therefore, they are not exposed to the language through their father. 30 respondents (30%) seldom use the English Language with their father at home and they seldom get exposed to the language as they always use their native first language to interact with their father. 15 respondents (15%) sometimes use the English Language and this results in minimal exposure to the English Language at home. The use of the native first language at home has contributed to the minimal usage of the English Language with the father at home. The respondents feel that the use of the English Language with their father is ineffective because their father does not understand them. None of the respondents use English often and they are rarely exposed to the language. The same also applies to the use of the English Language with the respondents' mother at home (Item 15). The study also reveals that (see Table 4.15 (a)) most of the respondents (61%) never use English with their mother at home. Therefore, they never get exposed to the language through their mother. 33% of the respondents seldom use English with their mother and they seldom get exposed to the language. Only one respondent (1%) often uses the English Language with his mother at home. He is often exposed to the language because his mother always encourages him to speak the language. Item 16 of the questionnaire examined the use of the English Language and exposure to the language with siblings at home (see Table 4.15 (a)). 43 respondents (43%) seldom use English with their siblings. 14 respondents (14%) never use the English Language with their siblings and have never

been exposed to the language at home. Although many of these respondents use their native first language with their parents at home, they also use the English Language with their siblings at home though they use the language rarely. 37% of the respondents sometimes use English with their siblings and they sometimes get exposed to the language at home as they only use the language with their siblings and not with their parents. Only four respondents (4%) often use the English Language with their siblings at home. The frequent use of English with their siblings has resulted in frequent exposure to the language. This helps them to improve their proficiency in the English Language. All of these findings show that zero usage of the English Language with parents at home does not always result in zero exposure to the language. The majority of the respondents have a minimal exposure to English as they use English only with their siblings and this limits the learning of the English Language at home.

Item 17 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.15 (a)) elicited the frequency of use of the English Language and exposure to the language with the respondents' neighbours. Most of the respondents (75%) never use English to communicate with their neighbours. This is because most of them live amongst their own ethnic group (see Table 4.5). Therefore, the use of the English Language is not necessary as they can communicate in their native first language. 17 respondents (17%) seldom use the English Language to communicate with their neighbours. Only four respondents (4%) use the English Language often or all the time to communicate with their neighbours because their neighbours are of different ethnicities. Thus, they are more exposed to the language. The findings of item 17 show that living in the neighbourhood of the same ethnicity has discouraged the respondents' use of the English Language. This results in minimal use of

English and exposure to it.

Items 18 and 19 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.15 (a)) elicited the frequencies of occurrence of watching English programs on television as well as listening to English channels on the radio. All the respondents watch English programs on television.

Therefore, they are exposed to the language via television. However, the frequency of watching English programs on television differs. Many of the respondents (55%) often watch English programs on television. Six respondents (6%) watch English programs on television all the time. Among the reasons given for the high frequency of watching English programs on television are that the programs are more interesting than other language programs. They also contain more action as well as impart more knowledge.

Item 19 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.15 (a)) elicited the regularity of listening to English channels on the radio. 89 of the respondents (89%) listen to English channels on the radio. Out of the 89, 38 respondents seldom listen to the channels on the radio and 34 sometimes listen to the channels on the radio. One main reason why they seldom or only sometimes listen to English channels on the radio is that they lack of understanding of the language. Only one respondent (1%) listens to English channels on the radio all the time, while 16 respondents (16%) often listen to English channels on the radio. Despite the respondents' lack of understanding of the English Language, they still listen to English channels on the radio. They listen to this channel because of their determination to improve their proficiency in the English Language. On the contrary, 11 respondents (11%) never listen to English channels on the radio. Among the reasons why these respondents never listen to the channels are their preference for Radio ERA (a Malay channel) and lack of understanding of the English Language. Therefore, this group of

respondents never gets exposed to the English Language through the radio.

Items 20, 21 and 22 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.15 (a)) showed the frequencies of occurrence of reading English materials such as magazines, novels or books and newspapers. 46 respondents (46%) seldom read the magazines and 38% of the respondents sometimes read the magazines. Only nine respondents (9%) often read English magazines because they wanted to improve their proficiency in the language. Despite the different frequency of reading English magazines, these respondents are exposed to the English Language to some degree. On the other hand, seven respondents (7%) never read English magazines. This group of respondents is not exposed to English via English reading materials. The difficulties in getting magazines since they live in rural areas, the expensive price of English Language reading materials and their general lack of understanding of the English Language are among the reasons why they never read magazines. The study also shows that 18 respondents (18%) never read English novels or books. It is because they find the language and style used in English novels or books difficult to understand as the plot of the story is too complicated and long. Therefore, these respondents are not exposed to the English Language through English reading materials. Many respondents (82%) read English novels or books. 51% of them seldom read English novels or books, 24% of them sometimes read English novels or books, five of the respondents (5%) often read English novels or books and only two of them (2%) read English novels or books all the time. Despite the lack of understanding of the English Language, they read novels or books in order to improve their proficiency in the language. Therefore, these groups of respondents are exposed to English. In addition, 93 respondents (93%) read English newspapers. 45% of them seldom read the English

newspapers, 37% of them sometimes read the English newspapers, ten of the respondents (10%) often read the English newspapers and only one of them (1%) read the English newspapers all the time. These respondents are exposed to the English Language. Nevertheless, there are seven respondents (7%) who never read the English newspapers because of lack of understanding of the language and lack of interest in reading newspapers. As a result, they are not exposed to the language via English reading materials. The findings of items 20, 21 and 22 of the questionnaire show that the respondents do read English reading materials but their lack of understanding of the language as well as the difficulties in getting the English reading materials and the high cost of these reading materials have discouraged them from reading, and this results in their minimal English usage and exposure to English through the written form.

Items 23, 24 and 25 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.15 (a)) elicited the regularity of using English to communicate with friends of the same or other races and lecturers. The study shows that 37 respondents (37%) seldom use the language, while 45 respondents (45%) sometimes use the language to communicate with friends of the same race. Nine respondents (9%) often use English with their friends of the same race. Only one respondent (1%) uses English to communicate with friends of the same race all the time. Thus, it can be concluded that these groups of respondents do get exposed to the English Language. However, there are eight respondents (8%) who never use English to communicate with their friends of the same race. They claim that they do not want to be laughed at by their friends. Therefore, this group of respondents is not exposed to English through communicating with friends of the same race. The study also shows that most of the respondents (94%) use English when interacting with friends of other races. 29

respondents (29%) seldom use the language when communicating with friends of other races, while 37 respondents (37%) sometimes use English to communicate with friends of other races. 26 respondents (26%) often use English to communicate with friends of other races. Only two respondents (2%) use English when interacting with their friends of other races all the time. These findings show that these groups of respondents are exposed to the English Language. On the contrary, six respondents (6%) never use English to interact with their friends of other races. Among the reasons why the respondents never use the language to communicate are the lack of proficiency in the English Language and shyness. They are afraid that their friends will laugh at their lack of proficiency in the language. Therefore, they never use English to communicate with friends of other races. As a result, they are not exposed to the English Language through communicating with friends of other races. Also, two respondents (2%) never use English to communicate with their lecturers so they are not exposed to the language through communicating with lecturers. This is due to their lack of proficiency in the language. Ten respondents (10%) use English with their lecturers all the time because their lecturers are expatriates and English is the only language used in their lectures. The other 32 respondents (32%) often use English to communicate with their lecturers as the lectures are taught in the English Language. Therefore, they need to use English when interacting with their lecturers. 17 respondents (17%) seldom use English to communicate with their lecturers, while 39 respondents (39%) sometimes use the language when interacting with their lecturers. The use of English to communicate with their lecturers shows that the respondents are exposed to the language. The respondents' lack of proficiency in the English Language, however, is the main reason why these respondents seldom or only sometimes use English with their lecturers.

To determine the respondents' use of English and exposure to the language, the researcher appointed a score to each of the variants of items 14 - 25 of the questionnaire (see 3.4.2). These scores were then accumulated to determine the respondents' use of English and exposure to it (see Table 3.6). The accumulated scores are illustrated in Appendix E. The findings are summarized in Table 4.15 (b).

Table 4.15 (b): Respondents' Use of English and Exposure to it

Variants	No. of Respondents
High	0
Medium	52
Low	48
Total	100

Table 4.15 (b) shows that none of the respondents have high English use and exposure to the language. Most of the respondents have medium use of the English Language and exposure to the language (52) with the scores ranging from 28.1 to 44.1. The remaining 48 respondents have low use of the English Language with scores ranging from 12.0 to 28.0 (see Table 3.6).

The relationship between the respondents' use of and exposure to English and their achievement in the Level 2 English for Reading and Writing examination is shown in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16: Respondents' Use of English and Exposure to the Language and Achievement in the Level 2 English for Reading and Writing Examination

Variants	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	E	Total (%)
High	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Medium	-	3 (5.7%)	11 (21.1%)	9 (17.3%)	11 (21.1%)	5 (9.6%)	8 (15.3%)	3 (5.7%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	-	52
Low	-	3 (6.2%)	9 (18.7%)	10 (20.8%)	3 (6.2%)	8 (16.6%)	7 (14.5%)	4 (8.3%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (4.1%)	1 (2.0%)	48
Total												100

Table 4.16 shows that none of the respondents have high level English use and exposure to the language. The respondents have either medium or low use of English and exposure to the language. The best grade achieved by those with medium English use and exposure to the language was A-, while the poorest grade obtained by this group was D. The best average grade achieved by them was B+. For respondents with low English use and exposure to the language, the best grade achieved was also A- and the poorest grade achieved was E. The average grade achieved by this group was B. Between the two groups, it was the respondents of medium English use and exposure to the language who achieved the better average grade.

Studies by Subramaniam (1976), Ong (1986), Wilhelm (1995) and Hamida (1996) found that the higher the use of the English Language and exposure to the language, the higher the academic performance. In this study, it was also found that the respondents' use of the English Language and exposure to the language did influence their achievement in the English Language.

Even though the respondents with medium and low use of the English Language and exposure to the language scored the same best grade, i.e. A-, the respondents with low English use and exposure to the language obtained the poorer lowest grade, i.e. E. It

is expected (Ee, 2001) that those with low English use and exposure to the language will get lower grades than those with medium English use and exposure to the language.

Therefore, the findings in this study verify Ee's (2001) finding that low English use and exposure to the language contributes to low achievement in the English Language. The findings also verify other studies which state that lack of use and exposure to the target language will contribute to poor performance in the target language (Hale & Budar, 1970; Fathman, 1976; Seliger, 1977; Fillmore, 1991; Hamida, 1996).

In addition, respondents with medium English use and exposure to the language scored a better average grade, that is B+, than the respondents with low English use and exposure to the language who achieved a grade of B. There are a number of factors contributing to this low English use and exposure to the language based on the responses given by respondents for items 14 – 25 of the questionnaire. Factors such as lack of exposure to the English Language at home and the neighborhood they live in where parents and siblings as well as neighbors do not use English to communicate contribute to their poor achievement in the English Language examination. Also, lack of reading in English, failure to watch and listen to English Language channels and programs on television or radio, the fact that English Language reading materials are expensive (e.g. English Language magazines) and shyness are reported to be other main contributors to the failure to score better grades in the English Language examination.

The factors provided by the respondents with medium English use and exposure to the language, on the other hand, showed that they are motivated to use the language despite the lack of motivation from parents, siblings and the neighbourhood they live in.

Based on the responses for items 14 -25 of the questionnaire, it was found that these respondents are motivated and inspired to use and to expose themselves to the language even though they are laughed at by friends. This is because they realize the need to use and to become familiar with the English Language in order to improve their competency in the language. These factors clearly explain why, on average, they scored better grades than those with low English use and exposure to the language. All of these findings further confirm that there is a relationship between the respondents' use of the English Language and exposure to the language and their achievement in the English Language examination.

4.1.4 Respondents' Attitude towards the English Language

Items 26 - 37 elicited the respondents' attitude towards the English Language. The frequencies of occurrence for the responses to items 26 - 37 are shown in Table 4.17 (a).

Table 4.17 (a): Frequencies of Occurrence for Items 26-37

Items	Variants					Total (%)
	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Not Bothered/ Do Not Know (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	
Q26	3	6	3	47	41	100
Q27	0	3	5	44	48	100
Q28	1	1	1	26	71	100
Q29	6	21	35	31	7	100

Q30	3	22	20	42	13	100
Q31	4	28	32	31	5	100
Q32	7	15	13	39	26	100
Q33	11	38	26	21	4	100
Q34	6	11	15	40	28	100
Q35	0	3	6	49	42	100
Q36	0	2	10	38	50	100
Q37	2	4	15	51	28	100

Items 26 and 27 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.17 (a)) elicited respondents' perception of their fluency in English vis-à-vis their acceptance of Western culture and their patriotism. The findings show that nine respondents (9%) disagree with Item 26. Three of them (3%) strongly disagree, while six of them (6%) disagree. For these nine respondents, fluency in English meant an acceptance of Western culture. On the contrary, 47 of the respondents (47%) agree with the statement and 41 of them (41%) strongly agree with the statement. According to these 88 (47+41), being fluent in English has nothing to do with accepting Western culture. Three respondents could not be bothered or could not effectively respond to the statement. For item 27, the data shows that most of the respondents agree that being proficient in English does not mean they are less patriotic towards their country, i.e. 48 strongly agree (48%) and 44 agree (44%) with the statement. Only three respondents (3%) disagree with the statement, while five (5%) did not know or are not bothered with the statement. It can be concluded that the findings of items 26 and 27 show that the respondents are aware that the learning of English is a separable issue from the acceptance of Western culture.

Item 28 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.17 (a)) elicited responses on the importance of having a good command of the English Language for the respondents' future career. Only two respondents (2%) disagree. One (1%) strongly disagrees and one

(1%) disagrees with the statement because for them being fluent in English does not guarantee them a job. They feel that they can still survive with only the Malay Language as the Malay Language is the official language of the country. According to these respondents, they should uphold the Malay Language and employers should also do so. On the other hand, 71 of the respondents (71%) agree and 26 of the respondents (26%) of them strongly agree that having a good command of the English Language is essential for their future career. According to these 97 respondents, English is an international language. Thus, being fluent in the language enables them to be employed not just locally but also internationally. Only one respondent (1%) was not bothered or did not know the importance of having a good command of the English Language for her future career. These findings demonstrate the respondents' alertness to the importance of having a good command of English for their future career and which in turn may increase their motivation to learn the language.

Item 29 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.17 (a)) showed that 31 respondents (31%) agree and seven (7%) strongly agree that it is prestigious to speak English with their friends, while 21 of the respondents (21%) disagree and six of them (6%) strongly disagree with the statement. None of the respondents gave any reason for their choice. Interestingly, the data shows that many respondents (35%) did not know or are not bothered to comment on whether or not it is prestigious to speak English with their friends. This group of respondents also did not state any reasons for their choice.

Item 30 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.17(a)) showed that 42 respondents (42%) agree and 13 of them (13%) strongly agree that it is important to speak in English

when interacting with local lecturers. All the respondents are from the engineering school. Most of the lectures in that school are conducted in the English Language even though some of the lecturers are locals. According to the 55 respondents, it is very important to speak in English when interacting with their local lecturers. Nevertheless, 22 of them (22%) disagree and three of them (3%) strongly disagree with the statement. According to these 25 (22+3) respondents, even though the lectures are in English, some of the lecturers are locals. Therefore, they can speak in the Malay Language when interacting with the local lecturers. In contrast, 20 respondents (20%) do not know or are not bothered to decide whether or not it is important to speak in English when interacting with local lecturers. This is because the lecturers, according to them, do not bother whether or not they speak in English or Malay when interacting with them. The answers or responses they get from the lecturers are usually in both languages.

Item 31 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.17(a)) showed that 31 respondents (31%) agree and five of them (5%) strongly agree that they are interested in learning English because it is easy. They do not state any reasons for their choice. On the contrary, 28 of them (28%) disagree and four of them (4%) strongly disagree with the statement. They are interested in learning the language but the language is difficult to understand and learn, especially its grammatical rules. 32 respondents (32%) do not know or are not bothered to decide whether or not they are interested in learning English because it is easy.

Item 32 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.17(a)) showed that most of the respondents, i.e. 39 of them (39%) agree and 26 of them (26%) strongly agree that

learning English is not about fulfilling the university's requirement to graduate.

According to these 65 (39+26) respondents, English is important for their future career. Therefore, they feel that everybody should learn the English Language. Only 15 of the respondents (15%) disagree and seven of them (7%) strongly disagree with the statement. For these 22 (15+7) respondents, learning English is compulsory if they want to graduate. 13 of them (13%) do not know or are not bothered to decide whether or not learning English is one of the university's requirements to graduate. Again, the finding of item 32 shows that most of the respondents are aware of the importance of English for their future career and it is important for them to learn the language in order to be easily employed locally or internationally.

Item 33 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.17 (a)) showed that 38 respondents (38%) disagree and 11 of them (11%) strongly disagree that they need to speak in English with the people who know how to speak in their mother tongue. According to these 49 (38+11) respondents, they will be labeled as 'showing-off' if they speak to this group of people in the English Language. Therefore, they do not want to speak in English with the people who know how to speak in their mother tongue. In contrast, only 21 of the respondents (21%) agree and four of them (4%) strongly agree with the statement that they will speak in English with the people they meet who know how to speak in their mother tongue. According to these 25 (21+4) respondents, this is one of the opportunities for them to practise the English Language. They are aware that regular use of the English Language will help them to improve their proficiency in the language. 26 of the respondents (26%) do not know or are undecided whether or not they will speak in English when they meet people who know their mother tongue. According to them, the

choice of language use depends on the language used by the people they meet. If the people they meet start the conversation in their mother tongue, they will speak or interact in their mother tongue.

Item 34 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.17 (a)) showed that 68 (28+40) respondents (68%) agree and strongly agree that they feel great if they can communicate in English because English for them is an international language and used widely in business transactions as well as education. Therefore, the ability to communicate in the language makes them a part of the international community and also makes people treat them better. Only six respondents (6%) disagree and 11 of them (11%) strongly disagree with the statement. According to these 17 (6+11) respondents, the ability to communicate in English does not make them feel great. 15 of the respondents (15%) do not know or are not bothered to decide whether or not they feel great if they can communicate in English.

Item 35 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.17 (a)) showed that the majority of the respondents (91%), i.e. 49 of them (49%) agree and 42 of them (42%) strongly agree that it is important to have the ability to speak and read in English even though some of their courses are in Malay. They know the importance of being proficient in English for their future career. Thus, they use the language whenever they can regardless of the situation. However, three of the respondents (3%) disagree about the importance of the ability to speak and read in English. According to them, there are courses in Malay which do not require them to speak and read in English. In addition, six of the respondents (6%) do not know or are not bothered whether or not it is important to have the ability to speak and

read in English even though some of the courses are in Malay.

Item 36 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.17 (a)) showed that the majority of the respondents (88%), i.e. 38 of them (38%) agree and 50 of them (50%) strongly agree that knowing English helps them to access information easily. Surprisingly, two of the respondents (2%) disagree with the statement and ten of them (10%) do not know or are not bothered to consider whether or not knowing English helps them to access information easily. Unfortunately, they did not give any reasons for their choice.

Item 37 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.17 (a)) elicited the finding that most of the respondents (79%), i.e. 51 of them (51%) agreed and 28 of them (28%) strongly agreed that their friends are not showing-off if they speak in English to them. Only six of the respondents (6%) disagreed with the statement because they felt that their friends are showing-off if they speak in English to them. 15 of them (15%) do not know or are not bothered whether or not their friends are showing-off when they speak in English to them. None of the respondents state their reasons for their choice.

To determine the respondents' attitude towards the English Language, the scores for each variable selected by each respondent for items 26 - 37 of the questionnaire were accumulated (see Appendix E). Based on the accumulated scores, the respondents were grouped into three different categories of attitudes, namely *positive*, *neutral* and *negative* (see 3.4.3). The summary of the findings are shown in Table 4.17 (b).

Table 4.18 shows that the best grade achieved by those who have a positive attitude was A-, and the poorest grade achieved by these respondents was E. The average grade obtained by this group was B. Respondents with a neutral attitude towards the English Language also achieved A- as the best grade, D as the poorest grade and B+ as the average grade. Between the two groups, it was surprisingly the respondents who have a neutral attitude towards the English Language who obtained the better average grade, i.e. B+.

Studies have shown that attitude influences students' proficiency in the English Language (Rajagopal, 1976). The more positive the students' attitude towards the English Language, the more competent they are in the language (Subramaniam, 1976; Lau, 1999). In this study, the respondents with a positive attitude and neutral attitude towards English achieved the same best grade, i.e. A-. The poorest grade, E, was scored by the respondents with a positive attitude, while the respondents with neutral attitude achieved the better average grade, i.e. B+. The poorest grade for the group with neutral attitude was D which was also better than the grade achieved by the respondents with a positive attitude towards the English Language. This shows that regardless of the respondents' attitude towards the English Language, they can still achieve good results. Therefore, the data from this study shows that the respondents' attitude towards the English Language does not strongly influence their achievement in the English Language examination.

4.1.5 Respondents' Perception of their English Language Instructors

To see whether or not the respondents' perception of their English Language instructors has an influence on their performance in the English Language examination, the relationship between the respondents' grades in the Level 2 English for Reading and Writing examination and their perception of the English Language instructors was analyzed. Table 4.19 (a) shows the frequency counts for the responses for items 38 - 49 of the questionnaire.

Table 4.19 (a): Frequencies of Occurrence for Items 38-49

Items	Variants					Total (%)
	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Not Bothered/Do Not Know (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	
Q38	2	5	13	51	29	100
Q39	6	17	41	23	13	100
Q40	0	4	11	42	43	100
Q41	0	4	10	59	27	100
Q42	2	5	20	51	22	100
Q43	1	10	19	51	19	100
Q44	2	17	34	38	9	100
Q45	1	11	14	48	26	100
Q46	1	24	36	27	12	100
Q47	1	7	15	47	30	100
Q48	1	19	23	41	16	100
Q49	0	4	28	37	31	100

Item 38 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19 (a)) showed that most of the respondents (80%), i.e. 51 of them (51%) agree and 29 of them (29%) strongly agree that their English Language instructors do not only ask students who are talkative in the

classroom to answer questions. However, two of the respondents (2%) disagree and five of the respondents (5%) strongly disagree with the statement, while 13 of the respondents (13%) do not bother nor know whether or not their English Language instructors do not only ask students who are talkative in the classroom to answer questions. According to those who disagree with the statement, their English Language instructors always ask talkative students to answer questions because this ‘popular’ group of students always participates in classroom activities, while the ‘unpopular’ group of students dislikes to participate in the classroom activities because they do not want to be laughed at if they make mistakes.

Item 39 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19 (a)) showed that 23 of the respondents (23%) agree and 13 of them (13%) strongly agree that their English Language instructors do not have favorite students, while 23 of the respondents (23%) disagree with the statement. These 23% of respondents believe that their English Language instructors do favour certain students. According to them, the same group of students always gets the opportunity to participate and respond in the classroom activities. These students are praised and their names are always called out during lessons. This intimidates students who seldom get the opportunity to participate in the classroom activities. They feel neglected and this results in their reluctance to participate in classroom activities. 41 of the respondents (41%) do not know or are not bothered whether or not their English Language instructors have favorite students. Among the reasons given were shyness to participate in classroom activities and fear of being labeled as show-offs by their classmates. Therefore, whether or not their English Language instructors have favorite students, it does not affect them.

Item 40 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19 (a)) showed that the majority of the respondents (85%), i.e. 42 of them (42%) agree and 43 of them (43%) strongly agree that their English Language instructors do not scold them if they give wrong answers, while only four of the respondents (4%) disagree with the statement. The other 11 of them (11%) do not know or are not bothered whether or not their English Language instructors will scold them for giving wrong answers.

Item 41 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19 (a)) showed that most of the respondents (86%), i.e. 59 of them (59%) agree and 27 of them (27%) strongly agree that their English Language instructors always encourage them to ask many questions in class. On the contrary, only four of the respondents (4%) disagree with that statement. Among the reasons given for this disagreement were that the instructors would prefer them to accept the answers given and they should not ask questions as it takes time to explain. Ten of the respondents (10%) do not know or are not bothered whether or not their English Language instructors like to encourage them to ask many questions in class.

Item 42 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19(a)) elicited the data that 51 of the respondents (51%) agree and 22 of the respondents (22%) strongly agree that their English Language instructors always give them the opportunity to participate in class, while five of the respondents (5%) disagree and two of the respondents (2%) strongly disagree with the statement. They disagree because they think their English Language instructors have favorite students, and these students always get the opportunity to participate in class. Furthermore, they are not competent in the English Language and

this inhibits them from participating in classroom activities. The other 20 of the respondents (20%) do not know or are not bothered whether or not their English Language instructors give them the opportunity to participate in class.

Item 43 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19 (a)) showed that the majority of the respondents (70%), i.e. 51 of the respondents (51%) agree and 19 of the respondents (19%) strongly agree that they like the way their English Language instructors teach them in class. Only 11 (10+1) of the respondents (11%) do not like the way their English Language instructors teach them in class. The remaining 19 respondents (19%) do not know or are not bothered whether or not they like the way their English Language instructors teach them in class.

Item 44 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19 (a)) showed that 38 of the respondents (38%) agree and nine of the respondents (9%) strongly agree that they feel important in the classroom because their English Language instructors always ask about their health or studies and respond to them. 17 of the respondents (17%) disagree and two of the respondents (2%) strongly disagree with the statement because whether or not the English Language instructors always ask about their health or studies and respond to them, their feeling is neutral. It does not make them more important than the other students who are seldom being questioned or responded to by their English Language instructors. The same reasons were given by 34 respondents (34%) who do not know or are not bothered about feeling important in the classroom. For these respondents, it does not make any difference.

Item 45 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19 (a)) revealed that most of the respondents (74%), i.e. 48 of the respondents (48%) agree and 26 of the respondents (26%) strongly agree that they are not afraid of their English Language instructors, while one of the respondents (1%) disagrees and 11 of the respondents (11%) strongly disagree with the statement. The other 14 of the respondents (14%) do not bother nor know whether or not they are afraid of their English Language instructors.

Item 46 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19 (a)) showed that 27 of the respondents (27%) agree and 12 of the respondents (12%) strongly agree that their English Language instructors do remember their name, while 24 of the respondents (24%) disagree and one of the respondents (1%) strongly disagrees with the statement. They disagree because there are many students in the English Language class and it is difficult for their English Language instructors to remember everybody's name. However, some feel that their English Language instructors should know their name to show that the instructors have no favorite students in the class. The other 36 of the respondents (36%) do not know or are not bothered whether or not their English Language instructors remember their name.

Item 47 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19 (a)) demonstrated that most of the respondents (77%), i.e. 47 of the respondents (47%) agree and 30 of the respondents (30%) strongly agree that friendly English Language instructors make them feel comfortable in class. In contrast, only seven of the respondents (7%) disagree and one of the respondents (1%) strongly disagrees that friendly English Language instructors make them feel comfortable in class. According to these eight respondents, they do not feel comfortable in the English Language class because they are not competent in the

language. They are afraid that their classmates will laugh at their mistakes and this makes them feel uncomfortable in class. 34 of the respondents (34%) do not know or are not bothered whether or not friendly English Language instructors make them feel comfortable in class.

Item 48 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19 (a)) showed that 41 of the respondents (41%) agree and 16 of the respondents (16%) strongly agree that their English Language instructors always ask their opinion on how to make the lessons more interesting. However, 20 (19+1) do not agree. According to them, their English Language instructors always follow the work scheme prepared by the coordinator of the English Language course. Since there are only 14 weeks in a semester, the instructor prefers to follow the work scheme so that the lessons can be finished on time. In addition, 23 of the respondents (23%) do not know or are not bothered whether or not their English Language instructors always ask their opinion on how to make the lessons more interesting. They stated that even if they do give their opinion on how to make the lessons more interesting, their instructors will seldom carry out their suggestions. Therefore, they feel that it is pointless to give opinions on how to make the lessons more interesting.

Item 49 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.19 (a)) showed that most of the respondents (68%), i.e. 37 of them (37%) agree and 31 of them (31%) strongly agree that they like the way their English Language instructors dress for class, while four of the respondents (4%) do not agree with the statement. According to them, how the instructors dress for class does not affect their performance in the English Language.

They still have problems in attaining proficiency and competency in the language. The other 28 of the respondents (28%) do not know or are not bothered about the way their English Language instructors dress for class.

To determine the respondents' perception of their English Language instructors, the accumulated scores for each variant selected by each respondent for items 38 - 49 of the questionnaire (see Appendix F) were used. These accumulated scores were then grouped into three categories of perception, i.e. *positive*, *neutral* and *negative* (refer to 3.4.4). Table 4.19 (b) illustrates the summary of these findings.

Table 4.19 (b): Respondents' Perception of their English Language Instructors

Categories of Perception	No. of Respondents
Positive	52
Neutral	48
Negative	0
Total	100

Table 4.19 (b) shows that none of the respondents have a negative perception of their English Language instructors. 52 of the respondents have neutral perceptions of their English Language instructors as their accumulated scores range from 28.1 to 44.1, and 48 respondents have positive perceptions of their English Language instructors as their accumulated scores range from 44.2 to 60.0 (see Table 3.8).

Studies have shown that language anxiety has a strong influence on students' confidence in the learning of the target language (Young, 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner,

1991). Students' negative perceptions of the English Language teachers can also contribute to high language anxiety in the English Language classroom (Phillips, 1998). To see whether or not the respondents' perception of their English Language instructors affects their grades in the English Language examination, the researcher analyzed the relationship between these two factors. The finding is shown in Table 4.20.

Table 4.20: Respondents' Perception of their English Language Instructors and Achievement in the Level 2 English for Reading and Writing Examination

Variants	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	E	Total (%)
Positive	-	2 (3.8%)	12 (23.0%)	12 (23.0%)	8 (15.3%)	6 (11.5%)	5 (9.6%)	3 (5.7%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.8%)	1 (1.9%)	52
Neutral	-	4 (8.3%)	8 (16.6%)	7 (14.5%)	6 (12.5%)	7 (14.5%)	10 (20.8%)	4 (8.3%)	1 (2.0%)	1 (2.0%)	-	48
Negative	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total												100

Table 4.20 shows that the respondents with a positive perception of the English Language instructors achieved the best grade, A-; the poorest grade obtained by this category of respondents was E. The average grades for respondents with a positive perception of their English Language instructors were B+ and B. The respondents who have a neutral perception of the English Language instructors also obtained the same best grade, A-. Their poorest grade was D, and the average grade achieved by them was C. Between these two groups, it was the respondents with a positive perception of their English Language instructors who achieved the best average grade, B+ and B.

Even though there are studies showing the encouraging effect of positive

perception of the English Language teachers on the learners' performance in the English Language, a study by Vijchulata and Gan (1985) showed that learners' perception of their English Language teachers or lecturers has no effect on their achievement in the English Language. Therefore, it can be concluded that learners' perception of the English Language teachers or lecturers could leave both a significant or insignificant effect on learners' achievement in the English Language. The findings in this study show this to be true as the poorest and the lowest grade, that is E, was achieved by those who had a positive perception of their English Language instructors. However, this group of respondents was also the one who obtained the best average grade, B+. In addition, they also achieved the best grade, A-. It is expected that they should be getting better grades than the respondents with a neutral perception of their instructors since they have a positive perception of their English Language instructors. According to Gardner (1985), learners' positive attitudes or perceptions of their English Language lecturers relate to their positive achievements in the English Language. This is confirmed by the better grades achieved by the respondents with a positive perception of their English Language instructors. Although the respondents with a neutral perception of their English Language instructors obtained A-, they only managed to achieve C as the best average grade. This finding should not be ignored. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a relationship between the respondents' perception of their English Language instructors and their achievement in the English Language examination, even though it is not the strongest of relationships (Oller, Baca and Vigil, 1977; Annie, 1982; Subrayan, 1986).

4.2 CONCLUSION

The variables studied, namely the respondents' socio-economic background, their English Language use and exposure and their perception of their English Language lecturers as well as their attitude towards the English Language show a relationship with the respondents' achievement in the English Language examination. Therefore, it can be concluded that all the three levels of Dornyei's framework on second language motivation, namely the language level, the learning situation level and the learner level, influence the respondents' grades in the English Language examination. Chapter 5 will summarize the findings and suggest necessary recommendations relevant to this study.