EFFECTS OF MOTIVATION ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNERS' USE OF LEARNING STRATEGIES AND LANGUAGGE PERFORMANCE IN VIETNAMESE HIGH SCHOOLS

By

Huynh Huu Hien

Nguyen Thi Uyen Phuong

INTRODUCTION

- Oxford and Nyikos (1989) found that motivation was the best predictor of strategy use in a large scale study of university students (see MacIntyre & Noels, 1996)
- Several authors have concluded that motivation for language learning plays a key role in strategy use (MacIntyre & Noels, 1996)
- Motivation was the most significant factor influencing language learning strategy use … and was strongly related to learning strategy use (Oxford & Ehrman, 1995)

INTRODUCTION (2)

- Much of the interest in language learning strategies stems from the findings that such strategies facilitate language learning (MacIntyre & Noels, 1996)
- The most enduring conclusion from these various sources is that a variety of language learning strategies have the potential to facilitate language learning (MacIntyre & Noels, 1996)
- Many studies indicate that the frequency of use of language learning strategies directly relates to language performance. (Oxford & Ehrman, 1995)

INTRODUCTION (3)

- Various other studies which have attempted to investigate the relationship between language learning strategies and success in language learning by speakers of other languages have produced mixed results (Tennant & Gardner, 2004)
- These mixed findings suggest that factors such as situation, context, sample and individual styles may be important moderating variables.
- Cultural background is a key factor in language learning strategy use (Oxford & Ehrman, 1995)

INTRODUCTION (4)

- The study is aimed to study the following questions:

- How does motivation affect the use of language learning strategies and language performance in the context of Vietnamese high schools?
- How does learning strategy use affect language performance in the context of Vietnamese high schools?

METHOD

Participants

- Totally, 75 high school students agreed to do the survey.
- Their age bracket: 15-18 (except one student of over 18 years of age)
- All the respondents are from high schools in Danang City
- 53 respondents provide valid responses; 22 invalid responses
- 19 males and 34 females

METHOD (2)

Materials

- For Learning Strategies, the 50-item SILL designed for ESL students was adapted from Oxford (1990).
- All items refer to the English language students are studying in their course at school.
- Ratings were made on 5-point Likert scale (1. never …. 5. always).
- For Motivation, the mini-AMTB (consisting of 11 items) was adapted (Tennant & Gardner, 2004).
- Performance was rated by students based on their results of English course in the previous term (on the scale of 1 to 10 marks).

METHOD (3)

Procedure

- An English teacher was given the information of the study and administered the survey
- The study was conducted during an outdoor get-together of students
- The teacher clarified those items making students confused

METHOD (4)

Data analyses

- Multiple regression was used as statistical procedure
- It is used to identify how subsets of predictors correlates with a dependent variable.
- Two type of subsets of predictors: motivation subsets & learning strategy subsets
- Dependent variables in use are language performance (predictors: subsets of motivation or learning strategies) and subsets of learning strategies (predictors: subsets of motivation)

METHOD (5)

- Originally, 5 subsets of motivation were used (for the Mini-AMTB):

(1) Integrativeness (INTEG = Interaction with English-speaking people + Attitude toward English-speaking people + Interest in English)

(2) Attitude toward the learning situation (ATT = Attitude toward English teacher + Attitude toward English classes)

(3) Motivation (MOTIV = Learning hard + Desire to learn English + Attitude toward learning English)

(4) Language anxiety (ANX = Anxiety outside class + Anxiety in class)

(5) Instrumental orientation (INST)

METHOD (6)

- To improve the model, only 3 subsets of motivation remains in our study

(1) INTE-MOTIV (= INTEG + MOTIV + INST)

(2) ATT

(3) ANX

- In 1989, six subsets of learning strategies (out of the 50 items of SILL) were developed based on factor analyses, including:

(1) Memory strategies, 9 items; (2) Cognitive strategies, 14 items; (3) Compensation strategies, 6 items; (4) Metacognitive strategies, 9 items; (5) Affective strategies, 6 items; (6) Social strategies, 6 items

RESULTS

Mean ratings of each variable

(Performance &

Motivation variables)

Table 1

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
performance	47	6.9691	1.21152
Interaction with English-speaking people	53	3.94	1.854
Attitude toward English-speaking people	53	4.49	2.072
Interest in English	53	4.25	1.880
Desire to learn English	53	4.38	1.853
Attitude toward learning English	53	4.36	1.809
Attitude toward English teacher	53	3.68	1.978
Practical purposes of learning English	53	5.77	1.637
Anxiety outside class	53	4.13	2.519
Attitude toward English classes	53	4.17	2.335
Anxiety in class	53	3.85	2.248
Learning hard	53	3.66	1.568

RESULTS (2)

Mean ratings of each learning strategy use

Vstra16: using rhymes to remember new words

Vstra17: using flashcards to remember new words

Vstra20: using location to remember new words

Vstra31: trying to find patterns in English

Vstra34: making summaries

Table 2

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Vstra12	51	3.4314	1.22074
Vstra13	51	2.4902	1.36195
Vstra14	53	3.1509	1.62192
Vstra15	52	2.8462	1.43328
Vstra16	53	2.1321	1.40107
Vstra17	53	1.8302	1.29698
Vstra18	52	2.5769	1.07277
Vstra19	53	2.6604	1.30005
Vstra20	53	2.1887	1.25662
Vstra21	52	2.7885	1.19372
Vstra22	52	2.8846	1.62883
Vstra23	53	2.8679	1.30144
Vstra24	53	2.4906	1.24996
Vstra25	53	2.7547	1.38544
Vstra26	53	4.1132	.99345
Vstra27	53	2.6604	1.56824
Vstra28	53	2.8679	1.35927
Vstra29	53	3.5660	1.32301
Vstra30	53	3.1509	1.52412
Vstra31	53	2.4340	1.47426
Vstra32	53	2.9434	1.36459
Vstra33	53	3.0943	1.44467
Vstra34	53	2.0189	1.20081
Vstra35	53	3.2830	1.49843
Vstra36	53	3.2830	1.34989
Vstra37	53	3.3019	1.36699

RESULTS (3)

Mean ratings of each learning strategy use (cont'd)

Vstra45: planning my schedule to have time to study

Vstra47: looking for opportunities to read in English

Vstra54: writing my feelings in a diary

Table 3

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Vstra39	53	2.5849	1.46016
Vstra40	53	3.0377	1.31504
Vstra41	53	2.9434	1.30701
Vstra42	53	3.2075	1.43257
Vstra43	53	3.4906	1.38151
Vstra44	53	3.8113	1.27183
Vstra45	53	2.4717	1.35311
Vstra46	53	2.6415	1.42902
Vstra47	53	2.4528	1.42189
Vstra48	53	3.3962	1.34935
Vstra49	53	3.1698	1.31172
Vstra50	53	3.1509	1.29193
Vstra51	53	3.1509	1.32137
Vstra52	53	2.7358	1.37493
Vstra53	52	3.3846	1.44377
Vstra54	53	1.3019	.88979
Vstra55	53	2.9623	1.46710
Vstra56	53	3.4340	1.35177
Vstra57	53	2.8113	1.56962
Vstra58	53	3.2264	1.33937
Vstra59	53	3.2264	1.36778
Vstra60	53	3.0000	1.35873
Vstra61	53	2.6981	1.55149

RESULTS (4)

Mean ratings of each

Motivation factor & Strategy Type

Table 4

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
INTE_MOTIV	53	4.4070	1.44072
ATT	53	3.9245	1.72481
ANX	53	3.9906	1.98671
Memory Strategies	48	2.5972	.68556
Cognitive Strategies	51	2.5980	.70392
Compensation Strategies	53	3.0314	.84987
Metacognitive Strategies	53	3.0650	1.00105
Affective Strategies	52	2.7660	.66769
Social Strategies	53	3.0660	.86376
Valid N (listwise)	41		

RESULTS (5)

- Results of regression *analyses* predicting **Language Performance** based on the factors of **Motivation**

Table 5

	INTE_MOTIV N=47	ATT N=47	ANX N=47	% of variance accounted for
PERFORMANCE (N=47)	.326 **	.386 ***	- .091	40.4

** P< .05 *** P< .01

ANX: NOT statistically significant

RESULTS (6)

Results of regression *analyses* predicting **Language Performance** based on the **Learning Strategy Use**

Table 6

	Memory Strategies N=41	Cognitive Strategies N=41	Compensation Strategies N=41	Metacognitive Strategies N=41	Affective Strategies N=41	Social Strategies N=41	% of variance accounted for
PERFORMANCE N=41	.531 **	.067	.077	.019	.064	- .288	31.4

** P< .05

Statistical significance only for Memory Strategy

Implications:

RESULTS (7)

Results of regression *analyses* predicting **Learning Strategy Use** based on the factors of **Motivation**

Table 7

	INTE_MOTIV	ATT	ANX	% of variance accounted for	N
Memory Strategies	.599 ***	.106	.033	43.8	48
Cognitive Strategies	.616 ***	.060	- .062	42.5	51
Compensation Strategies	.576 ***	- .054	.053	30.6	53
Metacognitive Strategies	.659 ***	.067	- .093	49.2	53
Affective Strategies	.279 *	.132	.010	13.5	52
Social Strategies	.297 *	- .206	- .198	9.8	53

- Significance of full model (ANOVA analysis) at P< .10 with dependent variable of **Affective Strategies** (weak)
- No statistical significance found for full model (ANOVA analysis) with dependent variable of **Social Strategies**

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

- The highest mean rating of motivation factor is INTE-MOTIV (Integratedness + Motivation + Instrumental Orientation) is 4.4070, which is much higher than average (Table 4)

→ Students have very high motivation to study English

- Also, students anxiety about learning is also high (ANX=3.9906), so they hardly feel at ease with language learning (Table 4)
- Of the six subsets of learning strategies, the ranking of use from high to low (Table 4) is Social Strategies (3.0660), Metacognitive Strategies (3.0650), Compensation Strategies (3.0314), Affective Strategies (2.7660), Cognitive Strategies (2.5980), Memory Strategies (2.5972)

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION (2)

→It seems that students are well aware of improving their learning by interaction with others whereas they are not likely to pay much attention to memory skills

- However, students' attitude toward the learning situation (toward the teacher and the course) has the greatest effect on their language performance (beta = .386; $p < .01$), followed by aggregate motivation (beta = .326; $p < .05$).
- Conversely, students' anxiety (beta = -.091; not significant) has no effect on performance.

→One reason could be that though their anxiety is high, they rarely practice speaking inside and outside the classroom, so effect was not found

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION (3)

- Of the learning strategies, only the memory strategy category has good effect on language performance (beta = .531; $p < .05$). Other learning strategy subsets have no correlation with performance.

→This is interesting because memory strategies group is ranked the lowest by students but is the only one factor influencing their performance. Is that the consequence of the tradition of rote learning in Vietnam, so they do it without being aware of doing it ??

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION (3)

- Concerning the impact of motivation on learning strategies, only the aggregate motivation (INTE-MOTIV) has an effect on 4 of the strategy group in the following order: metacognitive, cognitive, memory, compensation strategies (beta = .659; .616; .599; .576 respectively; $p < .01$). Almost no effect was found on affective and social strategies.

→Possibly, the accustomed grammar-translation method of learning (much related to metacognitive and cognitive strategies) has brought about this result by regression.

- This pilot survey seems to confirm many researchers' results that the context of language learning and students culture have various impact on the use of learning strategies and then on language performance.

REFERENCES

- MacIntyre, P. D. & Noels, K. A. (1996). Using Social-Psychological Variables to Predict the Use of Language Learning Strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 373-386.
- Oxford, R. L. (**1990).** *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know.* New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. L. & Ehrman, M. E. (1995). Adults' Language Learning Strategies in an Intensive Foreign Language Program in the United States. *System*, 23(3), 359-386.
- Tennant, J. & Gardner, R. C. (2004). The Computerized Mini-AMTB. *Calico Journal*, 21(2), 245-263.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR LISTENING

Q & A