

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no1.18>

Language Learning Strategies, Motivation, and Writing Achievement of Indonesian EFL Students

Mutiatus Nasihah

Graduate Program in English Language Teaching
Universitas Negeri Malang, East Java, Indonesia
East java, Indonesia

Bambang Yudi Cahyono

Universitas Negeri Malang, East Java, Indonesia
East java, Indonesia

Abstract:

This study aims at investigating the correlation between language learning strategies (LLSs) and writing achievement, the correlation between motivation and writing achievement, and the correlation between LLSs combined with motivation and writing achievement. It involved one-hundred English as a foreign language (EFL) students of a senior high school which is located in a big city in Indonesia. The students were selected randomly to be the participants of this study. The data were collected by using the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire, motivation questionnaire, and writing tests. The results of research revealed that the null hypotheses for the three correlational analyses were rejected. In other words, there is a significant correlation between LLSs and writing achievement; there is a significant correlation between motivation and writing achievement; and there is a significant correlation between LLSs combined with motivation and writing achievement. Theoretically, this study supports the important roles of LLSs and motivation, either separately or combined, in predicting writing achievement. Pedagogically, when teaching writing, EFL teachers are recommended to introduce the potential of LLSs to EFL students, arouse the students' motivation to write, or to apply both of them simultaneously to boost EFL students' writing achievement.

Keywords: Language learning strategies, motivation, writing achievement

Cite as: Nasihah, M. Cahyono, B. Y. (2017). Language Learning Strategies, Motivation, and Writing Achievement of Indonesian EFL Students. *Arab World English Journal*, 8 (1). DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no1.18>

Introduction

Over the last twenty-five years there has been a growing amount of research on the use of language learning strategies (LLSs) to enhance students' learning of second language (Rubin, 1987; Oxford, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). The idea behind the research on LLSs is to find out the LLSs performed by good language learners, so that other language learners could use the LLSs which have been proven effective to boost language learning. Researchers have also tried to elaborate factors that determine the choice of LLSs (e.g., Oxford & Nyikos, 1989). Similarly, there has been a lot of research on the role of motivation in second/foreign language learning (e.g., Gardner, 1985; Crooked & Schmidt, 1989; Ramage, 1990; Shia, 1998). It has been understood from the research on motivation that language learners who have high motivation are likely to be more successful in learning a second language than those who have low motivation.

In the context of English as a foreign language (EFL), some research examining the relation between the use of LLSs or motivation and the learning of EFL has involved Chinese students (e.g., Chun-huan, 2010; Xu, 2011) and Taiwanese students (e.g., Chang & Liu, 2013; Chang, 2011). In Indonesia, research investigating LLSs or motivation in EFL writing in particular are difficult to find out. A research study was conducted by Setiyadi, Sukirlan, and Mahpul (2016). However, Setiyadi et al.'s research focused on identifying the LLSs employed by successful learners, following previous research on LLSs. They found that the students were able to decide the strategies which were appropriate with the specific language skills. In light of the scarcity of research on LLSs, motivation, and EFL writing in the Indonesian context, we aimed to investigate how LLSs, motivation, and combination of LLSs and motivation are correlated with writing achievement of Indonesian EFL students.

Literature Review

Several key definitions of learning strategies have been given by leading figures in the second and foreign language field, among others, Rubin (1987), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), and Oxford (1990). These researchers had the same voice that LLSs are important in enhancing students' language learning. By employing the LLSs, the students are able to overcome their problems related to language learning tasks and to go through the difficulties in their learning. In other words, LLSs are what learners do to learn language and relate to their characteristics, learning skills, problem-solving skills, and learning achievement.

According to Oxford (1990), there are two kinds of strategies: direct and indirect strategies. LLSs that directly involve the target language are called *direct strategies*. These strategies include memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies. Meanwhile, the *indirect strategies* support and manage language learning without directly involving the target language. These strategies include metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. Although there are various kinds of strategies, as a whole, LLSs support and connect each other in developing students' language skills.

The choice of LLSs is influenced by many factors (e.g., Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Cohen, 1998). The factors affecting the choice of LLSs are among others, level of language proficiency, gender, and motivation. Motivation, in particular, is regarded as the most important factor in determining success in language learning (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Gardner, 1985). Accordingly, an increasing number of second language or foreign

language researchers indicated that both LLSs and motivation play important roles in successful language learning, which suggest a need to investigate the links between the two significant characteristics of learning (Ellis, 1994).

There are two kinds of motivation: intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Intrinsic motivation is generally characterized by people having personal interest in doing something. Therefore, they do activities for their own sake and not because of an extrinsic reward. Intrinsically-motivated behaviors bring about internally rewarding consequences such as satisfactory feelings, improved competence and self-determination. On the other hand, extrinsic motivation derives from an anticipation of external rewards such as praise, awards, prizes, and evaluation. Extrinsically-motivated students do activities because of some rewards or avoidance of punishment.

Language learners attempt to gain certain goals; one of the most important goals is learning to write. Academic writing ability is particularly recognized as one of the most crucial aspects of language ability for successful academic achievement. However, it is also considered as the most difficult skill for EFL students to master. Since it is an active, productive skill, students learning to write in a foreign language face multiple challenges (Hyland, 2003; Erkan & Saban, 2011). Therefore, in the process of writing the students may make use of the LLSs so that they can get better result in completing their writing tasks. For example, Chand (2013) conducted a study on the relation between the use of LLSs and academic writing of Fiji tertiary students. He found that there is a weak positive correlation between strategy use and academic writing.

There are some studies which investigated the relationship between motivation and writing ability, A study conducted by Yuan-bing (2011) revealed that motivation, especially intrinsic motivation plays an important role in second language writing process. Besides, Afzal, Khan and Hamid (2010) who conducted a study on 324 Pakistan university students delineated that students' extrinsic and intrinsic motivation has positive impact on their academic performance.

In addition, research studies proved that there is a close relationship between motivation and LLSs. Schmidt and Watanabe (2001) conducted research on motivation and strategy use among 2,089 learners of five different foreign languages at the University of Hawaii. The result showed that among the different types of LLSs, the use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies was affected by motivation. Similarly, Xu (2011) found that Chinese graduates' motivation was found significantly correlated with their learning strategy use. The more motivated students were the more strategies they tended to use. Chang and Liu (2013) found that the frequency of strategy use had a highly significant and positive correlation with motivation. The relationship of LLSs and motivation was also emphasized in the work of Bonney, Cortina, Smith-Darden et al. (2008).

It is apparent that there have been research studies on the relationship between LLSs and writing achievement, the relationship between motivation and academic writing, as well as the relation of motivation and the use LLSs. However, there has been no research study which examined the relationship of the three variables (LLSs, motivation, and writing achievement) involving Indonesian EFL students. Therefore, the study is directed to examine how LLSs,

motivation, or LLSs combined with motivation are related to writing achievement of Indonesian EFL students.

Research Questions

In light of the introduction and the literature review, this study aims at investigating the correlation between LLSs, motivation, as well as LLSs in combination with motivation, and writing achievement. The research questions study can be put forward as follows:

1. Is there any correlation between the use of LLSs and writing achievement of Indonesian EFL students?
2. Is there any correlation between motivation and writing achievement of Indonesian EFL students?
3. Is there any correlation between the use of LLSs combined with motivation and writing achievement of Indonesian EFL students?

Method

This study aims at finding out the correlation among LLSs, motivation, and writing achievement. It involved 100 eleven-grade students of a senior high school in Malang city, which is located in the province of East Java, Indonesia. The students were taken by using non-proportional stratified random sampling from the total number of 290 students. The participants represented the students from various programs: Natural Science, Social Science, Language, and Islamic Studies.

The data were obtained by using questionnaires and a writing test. There were two kinds of questionnaire distributed to the students. The first was the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire which was used to identify the students' LLSs. The SILL questionnaire was developed by Oxford (1990: 293-297) and it was used in this study without modification. It contains 50 items and covers 6 categories of LLSs: Memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. The second was motivation questionnaire which deals with students' motivation in learning English, covering both intrinsic and extrinsic types of motivation. Twenty items of motivational statements were adapted from Brown (2007) and Shia (1998) and used in this study (See Appendix A). In addition, a writing test was administered to measure students' writing ability. In reference to the English syllabus for the eleven-grade students, the students were asked to write an analytical exposition essay of about 200 words on a currently popular topic: "Is social media good for us?" The students' essays were scored by using scoring rubrics proposed by Jacobs, Zinkraf, Wormuth et al. (1981) consisting of five components: content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics (See Appendix B).

The completion of the questionnaires and the administration of the writing test occurred one after another in one session (90 minutes). Having been obtained, the data were transferred to a softfile for statistical analysis. A Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0 was used to analyze the data. The scores of the students can be seen in Appendix C.

Generally, the present study used .05 level of significance. Therefore, the computation of correlation with significant point less than .05 showed the rejection of null hypothesis. In other words, the alternative hypothesis was accepted and that the variables showed a statistically

significant correlation. On the other hand, if the significant point of computation showed greater than .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was accepted which means that there was no significant correlation between the variables.

A normality test was conducted to check the normal distribution of the variables. For the correlation analysis, since one of variables was not normally distributed, which is the writing achievement, the analysis of Spearman correlation was used in this study. The Spearman correlation assesses how well the relationship between two variables can be described using a monotonic function. Thus, the correlations between LLSs and writing achievement as well as between motivation and writing achievement were conducted in this study.

In addition, to see the correlation between multiple variables and a single variable, a regression analysis was used. When more than one variable are combined to correlate with a dependent variable, a multiple regression can be employed to analyze the data. A multiple regression (or a multiple correlation) is a statistical procedure for examining the combined relationship of multiple independent variables with a single dependent variable (Creswell, 2012: 349). In the present study the two combined variables (i.e., LLSs and motivation) were correlated with writing achievement by using multiple linier regression analysis.

Results

The results of the study were used to answer the research questions: the correlation between LLSs and writing achievement, the correlation between motivation and writing achievement, and the correlation between LLSs combined with motivation and writing achievement of Indonesian EFL students

Before the data were analyzed, it was necessary to test the normality of the variables. A normality test is used to determine whether sample data have been drawn from a normally distributed population. The result of normality test of the three variables is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		LLSs	Motivation	Writing
N		100	100	100
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	154.7500	73.1700	16.8100
	Std. Deviation	24.97003	7.63439	2.58861
	Absolute	.074	.075	.227
Most Extreme Differences	Positive	.042	.045	.159
	Negative	-.074	-.075	-.227
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.740	.746	2.271
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.644	.634	.000

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Table 1 presents the result of normality test which was conducted by using One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. If the score of Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) of Kolmogorov-Smirnov is higher than the level of significance 0.05 (> 0.05), the variable is normally-distributed and vice versa. From the result of normality test above, it was clear that both LLSs and Motivation variables are normally distributed, since the score of Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) of them were 0.644

and 0.634 respectively which were higher than 0.05. Meanwhile, the result of normality test of writing score is 0.000 which showed that it was lower than 0.05 (< 0.05). Thus, it could be concluded that the variable of writing score is not normally-distributed.

To examine the correlation between LLSs and writing achievement, Spearman correlation analysis was used in this study. This is because one of the correlated variables was not normally distributed. The result of correlation between LLSs and motivation is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Correlation between LLSs and writing achievement

			LLSs	Writing
Spearman's rho	LLS	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.374**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	100	100
	Writing	Correlation Coefficient	.374**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	100	100

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

Table 2 shows the correlation coefficient of 0.374 which was higher than the r table ($r_{table} = 0.197$). It was also clear that the score of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.000 which was lower than the significant level $\alpha = 0.05$ ($0.000 < 0.05$). It leads to the rejection of null hypothesis which means that there is a significant correlation between LLSs and writing achievement. Meanwhile, as the result of the analysis on the correlation between motivation and writing achievement, the result of the statistical computation is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Correlation between motivation and writing achievement

			Motivation	Writing
Spearman's rho	Motivation	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	.356**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	100	100
	Writing	Correlation Coefficient	.356**	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	100	100

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

The Spearman's rho analysis in Table 3 shows that the correlation coefficient of motivation and writing achievement was 0.356 which was higher than r table ($r_{table} = 0.197$). The score of Sig. (2-tailed) could be seen that it was also lower than the significant level $\alpha = 0.05$ ($0.000 < 0.05$). It is apparent that the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted in which it indicated that there is a significant correlation between motivation and writing achievement.

For further analysis of the variables including LLSs, motivation, and writing achievement, a multiple regression analysis was employed. In this study, LLSs (x1) and

motivation (x2) as the independent variables are correlated with writing achievement (y) as the dependent variable. The result of ANOVA test can be shown in Table 4.

Table 4. ANOVA test

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	164.792	2	82.396	16.030	.000 ^b
	Residual	498.598	97	5,140		
	Total	663.390	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Writing

b. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, LLSs

The ANOVA test revealed that the F score is 16.03. Meanwhile, the F distribution table with the significant level $\alpha = 0.05$ is $F_{0.05;2,97}=3.09$. Since the F score=16.03 is greater than F table = 3.09 ($16.03 > 3.09$), H_0 is rejected. The table also showed the Sig. = 0.000 which was lower than the significant level $\alpha = 0.05$ ($0.000 < 0.05$). It leads to the rejection of null hypothesis. This means that there was a significant correlation between LLSs combined with motivation and writing achievement. In other words, the use of LLSs as well as students' motivation can be used to predict the students' writing achievement.

To see the coefficient of each of the combined variables, a coefficient analysis was conducted and the result is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Coefficient of each of the combined variables

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-column	Sig.
		B-column	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.542	2.263		2.449	.016
	LLSs	.038	.010	.367	3.791	.000
	Motivation	.073	.033	.217	2.236	.028

a. Dependent Variable: Writing

Table 5 shows that the significance of coefficient for LLSs is .000 and for motivation is .028. Both of the coefficients of LLSs and motivation are smaller than .05, indicating the rejection of the null hypothesis. This means that when the score of LLSs increases, the writing achievement will also increase by .038. Similarly, when the score of motivation increases, the students' writing achievement will increase by .073. In sum, it was proved that the combined variables of LLSs and motivation are significantly correlated with writing achievement.

Discussion

The results of the present study suggest that, first, there is a significant correlation between LLSs and writing achievement. This means that the more frequently the students use LLSs, the higher their writing scores, and vice versa. This finding supports the result of a previous study conducted by Olivares (2002) who investigated the effect of learning strategies on the writing ability of the students taking an intermediate-advanced level Spanish writing course.

More particularly, he found that the use of memory strategies was correlated with students' writing achievement. However, unlike Olivares' study, this study employed a simultaneous analysis of LLSs rather than the parts of LLSs. The result of this study also conforms to the study conducted by Chand (2013). He found that there was a positive correlation between the use of LLSs and academic writing proficiency of Fiji tertiary students. However, the correlation was a weak one. This means that strategy use has a low predictive effect on academic writing proficiency.

In line with the present study, Setiyadi et al. (2016) found that metacognitive strategies were significantly correlated with writing skill. The students were able to decide the strategies appropriate for the specific skills. In preparing writing task, the students need metacognitive strategy to get brainstorming while finding their ideas in their mind. For example, they may try to recall their background knowledge about the topic of the writing task. As stated by Oxford (1990), in metacognitive strategy, the students are able to identify the purpose of a language task. In the present study, the students were asked to write an analytical exposition essay; thus, they have to consider the purpose for writing the essay so that the readers can understand the essay well. The use appropriate LLSs often leads to improved overall proficiency or proficiency in a more specific skill (Oxford & Burry, 1995).

Second, there was a statistically significant correlation between students' motivation and their writing achievement. The finding also revealed the positive point on the significant value of its correlation which indicated that the more motivated the students, the higher their writing achievement. The result is in line with the study conducted by Yuan-bing (2011) which shows that motivation plays an increasingly important role in second language writing process. It is also supported by the idea from Hyland (2003) that writing is two-way communication between the writer and the reader; thus, thinking about the intended readers before writing will promote writers' motivation. In this study, in accomplishing the writing task, the students try to engage the activities for their own sake. In other words, they are able to accomplish the task because of their motivation in writing.

Finally, the present study showed that there was a positive correlation between LLSs combined with motivation and writing achievement. In fact, a number of research studies proved that there is a close relationship between LLSs and motivation (e.g., Xu, 2011; Chang & Liu, 2013). Accordingly, both LLSs and motivation play important roles in successful language learning. In learning to write, in particular, the students may use some of LLSs, such as compensation strategies for expressing the language despite their limitation in knowledge, metacognitive strategy for evaluating their learning, and cognitive strategy for practicing their skills. Thus, the students need to be trained to use appropriate LLSs as well as to maintain their motivation in writing in order to achieve good writing.

As writing competence is considered as the most difficult task for EFL learners to accomplish, there are more learning strategies that should be employed by the students. The close relationship between LLSs and writing achievement give the important point to the teachers on the importance of LLSs in enhancing students' learning. Besides, the significant correlation between motivation and writing achievement indicated that motivation also plays important role in students' learning to write. Moreover, the combination of LLSs and motivation

can contribute to the increase of students' writing achievement, as proven in the result of the present study. In other words, the teachers are able to elicit students' LLSs as well as engage their motivation in order to achieve better result in writing achievement. Therefore, it can be concluded that LLSs and motivation, either separately or simultaneously, can be used to enhance writing achievement among EFL learners.

Conclusion

The results of the present study revealed that there is a significant correlation between LLSs and writing achievement, a significant correlation between motivation and writing achievement, and a significant correlation between LLSs combined with motivation and writing achievement. This means that more successful achievement in writing may be predicted by the use of LLSs, the increase in motivation, or by simultaneous use of LLSs combined with motivation. In light of these findings, EFL teachers are recommended to consider encouraging or training the students to use LLSs and raising their motivation when teaching writing. This is because teachers' lack of control in the students' use of LLSs may make the students unaware of the importance of LLSs to enhance their writing achievement. In addition, teachers' negligence on the importance role of motivation may lead to students' lack of enthusiasm in writing which in turn affect their writing achievement. By assisting the students in employing LLSs as well as raising their motivation, the teachers can engage students in learning the target language, especially in writing, and make the learning process more enjoyable and effective. For further researchers who are interested in conducting research in the same field, the use of LLSs can be correlated with other factors such as learning attitude, anxiety, and learners' belief about learning English. Besides, other skills of language learning namely listening, speaking, and reading, can be considered to be correlated with the use of LLSs.

About the Authors:

Mutiatur Nasihah is a student in Graduate Program in English Language Teaching at Universitas Negeri Malang, East Java, Indonesia. She obtained her Bachelor degree in English Language and Letters from Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim at Malang, East Java, Indonesia.

Bambang Yudi Cahyono is a professor in Applied Linguistics at Universitas Negeri Malang, East Java, Indonesia. He earned his MA degree from Concordia University, Montreal, Canada and PhD from the University of Melbourne, Australia.

References

- Afzal, H., Ali, I., Khan, M.A., & Hamid, K. (2010). A Study of University Students' Motivation and its Relationship with their Academic Performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 80-88. Retrieved from <http://www.cssnet.org/ijbm>
- Bonney, C.R., Cortina, K.S., Smith-Darden, J.P., & Fiori, K.L. (2008). Understanding Strategies in Foreign Language Learning: Are Integrative and Intrinsic Motive Distinct Predictors? *Learning and Individual Differences*, 18(1), 1-10. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2007.11.005>
- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.

- Chand, Z.A.(2013). Language Learning Strategy Use and Its Impact on Proficiency in Academic Writing of Tertiary Students. *Social and Behavioral Science*, 118, 511-521. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.070>
- Chang, C., & Liu, H. (2013). Language Learning Strategy Use and Language Learning Motivation of Taiwanese EFL University Students. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 10(2), 196-209. Retrieved from <http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/>
- Cohen, A.D. (1998). *Strategies in Learning and using a second language*. Essex, UK: Longman.
- Cohen, A.D. (2012). Strategies: The Interface of Styles, Strategies, and Motivation on Tasks. In S. Mercer, S. Ryan, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology for Language Learning: Insights from Research, Theory and Practice* (pp. 136-150). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating, Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Crooked, G., & Schmidt, R. (1989). Motivation: Reopening the Research Agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erkan, D.Y., & Saban, A.I. (2011). Writing Performance Relative to Writing Apprehension, Self-Efficacy in Writing, and Attitudes towards Writing: A Correlational Study in Turkish Tertiary-Level EFL. *Asian EFL journal*, 5(4), 164-192. Retrieved from www.asian-efl-journal.com
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, H.L., Zinkraf, S.A., Wormuth, D.R., Hartfiel, V.F., & Hughey, J.B. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- O'Malley, J., & Chamot, A. (1990). *Language Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olivares, G. (2002). Learning Strategies and Achievement in the Spanish Writing Classroom: Case Study. *Foreign language Annals*, 35(5), 561-570. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2002.tb02724.x>
- Oxford, R., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables Affecting the Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(3), 291-300. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb06367.x>
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher should Know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, R.L, & Burry-Stock, J. (1995). Assessing the Use of Language Learning Strategies Worldwide with the ESL/EFL Version of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System*, 23(1), 1-23.
- Ramage, K. (1990). Motivational Factors and Persistence in Foreign Language Study. *Language Learning*, 40, 189-219.
- Rubin, J. (1987). Learner Strategies: Theoretical Assumptions, Research History and Typology. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning* (pp. 15-30). Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.

- Schmidt, R., & Watanabe, Y. (2001). Motivation, Strategy Use, and Pedagogical Preferences in Foreign Language Learning. In Z. Dornyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 313-360). Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.
- Setiyadi, B., Sukirlan, M., & Mahpul. (2016). How Successful Learners Employ Learning Strategies in an EFL Setting in the Indonesian Context. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 9(8), 28-38. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n8p28>
- Shia, R.M. (1998). *Academic Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation and Metacognition. Assessing Academic Intrinsic Motivation: A Look at Student Goals and Personal Strategy*. Unpublished Senior Thesis. Wheeling, WV: Wheeling Jesuit University.
- Xu, X. (2011). The Relationship between Language Learning Motivation and the Choice of Language Learning Strategies among Chinese Graduates. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 1(2), 203-212. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v1n2p203>
- Yuan-bing, D. (2011). How to Motivate Students in Second Language Writing. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 8(4), 235-240. Retrieved from www.davidpublishing.com

Appendix A. Questionnaire of Motivation in Learning English

Name : _____

Class : _____

Direction:

This is a questionnaire of motivation in learning English. There is no right or wrong answer in this sheet. Finish it for 15 minutes. Read the statements carefully and give a circle to one of the options (1,2,3,4, or 5) based on your own motivation in learning English. The descriptions of the options are stated as follows:

- 1= Strongly disagree**
2= Disagree
3= Rarely agree
4= Agree
5= Strongly agree

NO	STATEMENTS	OPTIONS				
1	I want to learn everything I need to learn	1	2	3	4	5
2	I have high expectations of myself.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I feel good about myself when I finish a difficult project.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I like to spend time learning English that interests me.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I work best in group environment.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I try to do my best on every assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I see myself as well-informed in many academic areas.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Sometimes I do more than I have to for an assignment to help me understand the material better.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I learn English for my future.	1	2	3	4	5
10	No matter how much I like or dislike a class, I still try to learn from it.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Being in school gives me the opportunity to prove my family	1	2	3	4	5

	that I can achieve something.					
12	I feel that I should be recognized when I demonstrate my abilities in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I feel more accepted by others when I receive a good grade on a test.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I finished my task because of a reward from my teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I find my ability to be higher than most of my peers.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I feel ashamed when I receive a low grade.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I get frightened that I will not remember anything when I take a test.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I get nervous when my teacher begins to hand back tests.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I try to make my teacher proud of me in the class.	1	2	3	4	5
20	Even when I have studied for hours, I do not feel that I have studied enough for a test.	1	2	3	4	5

Adopted from Brown (2007) and Shia (1998)

Appendix B. Scoring Rubrics for Writing Test

Writing Aspect	Score	Category	Description
Content	4	Very good	All ideas in the sentences are relevant to the topic; all sentences contain a lot of supporting details related to the main ideas.
	3	Good	Most of the ideas in the sentences are relevant to the topic; the sentences contain some supporting details related to the main ideas.
	2	Fair	Some ideas are relevant to the topic; the sentences contain few supporting details related to the main idea.
	1	Poor	Limited number of ideas are relevant to the topic; the sentences contain very limited supporting details related to the main ideas.
Organization	4	Very good	Well organized and perfectly coherent; the composition contains complete generic structure of analytical exposition text, namely thesis statement, arguments, and reiteration/conclusion.
	3	Good	Fairly well organized and generally coherent; the composition contains two generic structures of analytical exposition text (one of the generic structure component is missing)
	2	Fair	Loosely organized; the composition only contains one generic structure of analytical exposition text (two of the generic structure components are missing).
	1	Poor	Ideas disorganized; lack logical sequencing. The composition does not contain any generic structure of analytical exposition text (all of the generic structure

			components are missing).
Vocabulary	4	Very good	Very effective choice of words; no misuse of vocabulary and words forms
	3	Good	Effective choice of words; few misuse of vocabulary and word forms
	2	Fair	Less effective choice of words; some misuse of vocabulary and word forms
	1	Poor	Not effective choice of words; a lot of misuse of vocabulary and word forms
Grammar	4	Very good	No errors; full control of complex structure
	3	Good	Few errors; good control of structure
	2	Fair	Many errors; fair control of structure
	1	Poor	Dominated by errors; no control of structure
Mechanics	4	Very good	No errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing
	3	Good	Few errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing
	2	Fair	Frequent errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing
	1	Poor	Dominated by errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing

Adapted from: Jacobs et al. (1981)

Appendix C. Students' Score of the Language Learning Strategies (LLSs), Motivation (M), and Writing (W)

No	LLSs	M	W	No	LLSs	M	W
1	191	76	19	51	174	78	16
2	137	72	18	52	139	65	17
3	181	77	19	53	166	83	18
4	126	64	17	54	120	78	19
5	174	77	19	55	151	70	17
6	156	72	19	56	161	64	19
7	170	72	15	57	156	77	19
8	160	78	19	58	171	84	19
9	107	69	18	59	188	86	15
10	161	71	19	60	143	52	16
11	161	61	19	61	147	69	13
12	178	72	15	62	98	65	12
13	178	78	19	63	158	67	18
14	163	77	19	64	171	75	19
15	151	70	18	65	197	80	17
16	113	70	19	66	164	68	18

17	171	79	19	67	151	75	18
18	159	72	18	68	141	76	13
19	175	74	18	69	162	84	17
20	168	66	18	70	159	68	13
21	168	69	20	71	161	71	12
22	131	84	19	72	151	82	18
23	155	72	20	73	101	73	14
24	159	68	19	74	151	67	16
25	150	76	16	75	142	71	18
26	171	71	19	76	158	73	17
27	155	79	19	77	118	76	13
28	207	87	18	78	157	84	16
29	177	90	18	79	136	76	15
30	191	76	18	80	144	75	13
31	166	79	19	81	103	62	14
32	156	80	19	82	126	69	13
33	173	79	17	83	107	67	13
34	138	68	18	84	131	60	15
35	194	86	19	85	131	64	10
36	180	84	18	86	134	69	17
37	170	81	17	87	162	66	11
38	196	78	19	88	183	80	17
39	149	76	19	89	135	69	15
40	128	62	19	90	89	78	9
41	143	76	18	91	139	64	14
42	148	73	18	92	137	66	13
43	125	69	18	93	184	48	14
44	177	73	18	94	99	56	10
45	191	82	20	95	158	68	10
46	202	86	19	96	130	80	19
47	165	58	16	97	170	77	17
48	150	79	18	98	171	73	17
49	138	74	16	99	194	75	20
50	142	74	15	100	181	78	18
Total					15475	7317	1681
Mean					154.75	73.17	16.81