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The purpose of the present study was to investigate the role of motivation (instrumental motivation, integrative motivation, effort, valence, expectancy, and ability), gender, and language learning strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) proficiency. Descriptive statistics (range, means, and standard deviations), a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation analysis, an Independent Sample T-Test, and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) tests were conducted to answer the questions raised in the study.

The participants were 147 female and male undergraduate students enrolled in intensive English classes at the American University of Beirut (AUB). The study employed a survey design which involved administering two different questionnaires, the Motivation Scale (MS), developed by Wen (1997) and modified by Shaaban and Ghaith (2000), to measure motivation, and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), developed by Oxford (1990), to measure Language Learning Strategies (LLSs). In order to determine language proficiency, the verbal SAT scores were used.

The results of this study revealed, at the P < .05 alpha level, that, although motivation in general does not correlate with EFL proficiency, effort does, in favor of the high proficient. The findings also revealed no significant gender differences in overall motivation; however, females make more effort and have a higher perception of the valence of learning EFL than males. In addition, the results did not show a significant role for gender in EFL proficiency.

Furthermore, the results showed that overall strategy use does not play a significant role in EFL proficiency; however, the results revealed a low, negative correlation between the use of metacognitive strategies and proficiency. The findings also revealed that the most frequently used strategies were the cognitive and metacognitive strategies (with a significant correlation between them), and the least frequently used strategies were the affective strategies. Finally, the results showed no significant role for gender in the overall use of language learning strategies, but they showed significant differences between males and females in their use of memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies, in favor of females.

The results are discussed and recommendations for further research are suggested.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Previous research has identified a number of factors as determinants of proficiency in a second or foreign language. Among those factors are learners’ motivation, gender, and language learning strategies. According to Gardner (1985), for an individual to truly learn a language, s/he must find the learning situation to be rewarding, and must be motivated. Gardner even identifies motivation as the single most influential factor in learning a new language. Similarly, Oxford, Park-Oh, Ito, and Sumrall (1993) reported that motivation is the single best predictor of language learning achievement, all things being equal. Moreover, Yamashiro and McLaughlin (1999) maintained that students’ motivation and their language proficiency are positively internally related. In addition, a number of studies reported that there is a significant relationship between gender and language learning. Specifically, the findings of these studies suggested that females tend to “be more willing to exert effort in learning English” (Shaaban & Ghaith, 2000, p. 641). Furthermore, Liu (2004) reported significant “strategy use differences by gender in favor of females” (p. 11). On another note, it has been established that successful language learners use a variety of strategies to improve their performance in the target language (Cohen, 1990; Nyikos, 1987; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1993). According to Oxford (1990a), the most successful learners tend to use learning strategies that are appropriate to the task, material, self-objective, needs, and stage of learning. In 1994, Oxford further relates the use of learning strategies and techniques to language achievement and proficiency.
Rationale

High School students in Lebanon are not proficient enough in English as a Foreign Language (EFL). According to Al-Amine and Faour (1998) and Shaaban and Ghaith (2000), students go to university after having studied English for so many years, and still lack the basic skills in the language. As such, it is important to determine the factors that impact Lebanese EFL students’ language proficiency. There is no research in Lebanon about the factors that are correlated to EFL learners’ proficiency development; hence, there is a need to conduct further research in order to determine the most important factors that are correlated to FL proficiency in the Lebanese context.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the role of motivation, gender, and learning strategies in student proficiency. More specifically, this study will address the following questions:

1. What types of language learning strategies are most frequently used by EFL learners in Lebanon?
2. What associations, if any, exist between strategy use and language proficiency among EFL learners in Lebanon?
3. Are there any statistically significant intercorrelations among the six language learning strategies?
4. Do males differ from females in their motivation to learn English as a Foreign Language?
5. Do males differ from females in their use of language learning strategies?
6. Do males differ from females in their proficiency level?
7. Do low proficient learners differ from high proficient learners in their motivation to learn English as a Foreign Language?

8. Do low proficient learners differ from high proficient learners in their use of language learning strategies?

**Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses are formulated:

**HO1:** There will be no statistically significant relationship between strategy use and proficiency among EFL learners in Lebanon.

a. There will be no statistically significant relationship between memory-related strategy use and proficiency among EFL learners in Lebanon.

b. There will be no statistically significant relationship between cognitive strategy use and proficiency among EFL learners in Lebanon.

c. There will be no statistically significant relationship between compensation strategy use and proficiency among EFL learners in Lebanon.

d. There will be no statistically significant relationship between metacognitive strategy use and proficiency among EFL learners in Lebanon.

e. There will be no statistically significant relationship between affective strategy use and proficiency among EFL learners in Lebanon.

f. There will be no statistically significant relationship between social strategy use and proficiency among EFL learners in Lebanon.

**HO2:** There will be no statistically significant intercorrelations among the six language learning strategies.

2.1- Memory-Related Strategies:
a. There will be no statistically significant correlation between memory-related strategies and cognitive strategies.
b. There will be no statistically significant correlation between memory-related strategies and compensation strategies.
c. There will be no statistically significant correlation between memory-related strategies and metacognitive strategies.
d. There will be no statistically significant correlation between memory-related strategies and affective strategies.
e. There will be no statistically significant correlation between memory-related strategies and social strategies.

2.2- Cognitive Strategies:

a. There will be no statistically significant correlation between cognitive strategies and compensation strategies.
b. There will be no statistically significant correlation between cognitive strategies and metacognitive strategies.
c. There will be no statistically significant correlation between cognitive strategies and affective strategies.
d. There will be no statistically significant correlation between cognitive strategies and social strategies.

2.3- Compensation Strategies:

a. There will be no statistically significant correlation between compensation strategies and metacognitive strategies.
b. There will be no statistically significant correlation between compensation strategies and affective strategies.
c. There will be no statistically significant correlation between compensation strategies and social strategies.

2.4- Metacognitive Strategies:

a. There will be no statistically significant correlation between metacognitive strategies and affective strategies.

b. There will be no statistically significant correlation between metacognitive strategies and social strategies.

2.5- Affective Strategies:

a. There will be no statistically significant correlation between affective strategies and social strategies

HO3: There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their motivation to learn English as a Foreign Language.

a. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their integrative motivation.

b. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their instrumental motivation.

c. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their effort.

d. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their valence.

e. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their expectancy.

f. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their sense of ability.
HO4: There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their use of language learning strategies.
   a. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their use of memory-related strategies.
   b. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their use of cognitive strategies.
   c. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their use of compensation strategies.
   d. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their use of metacognitive strategies.
   e. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their use of affective strategies.
   f. There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their use of social strategies.

HO5: There will be no statistically significant differences between males and females in their proficiency level.

HO6: There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their motivation.
   a. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their integrative motivation.
   b. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their instrumental motivation.
   c. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their effort.
d. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their valence.

e. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their expectancy.

f. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their sense of ability.

HO7: There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their use of language learning strategies.

a. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their use of memory-related strategies.

b. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their use of cognitive strategies.

c. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their use of compensation strategies.

d. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their use of metacognitive strategies.

e. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their use of affective strategies.

f. There will be no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their use of social strategies.

Rationale for the Hypotheses

The first hypothesis formulated in the present study regarding the relationship between strategy use and proficiency among EFL learners in Lebanon is based on

The second hypothesis regarding the intercorrelations among the six language learning strategies is based on Hsiao and Oxford’s (2002) study conducted to examine the consistency of the SILL with learners’ strategy use, in which they reported that problems do exist in the method of classifying strategies, and that “the strategy categories mutually support each other” (p. 379). This hypothesis is also based on another study conducted by Oxford and Ehrman (1995) which reported that there are moderate intercorrelations among the different strategies in the SILL.

The third hypothesis regarding the differences between males and females in their motivation to learn English as a Foreign Language is based on a first study conducted by Shaaban and Ghaith (2000) which reported that there are significant differences between males and females in their motivation to acquire English as a foreign language, mainly in their effort and perception of the valence of learning English, in favor of females, and on another study conducted by Kang (2000) which reported that males differ from females in their motivation to learn English as a Foreign Language, namely in integrative motivation, in favor of females.

The fourth hypothesis regarding the differences between males and females in their use of language learning strategies is based on a first study conducted by Goh and
Kwah (1997) which reported that female students were found to use compensation and affective strategies significantly more often than male students, on another study conducted by Shmais (2003) which reported that males do not differ from females in their use of language learning strategies; and, finally, on a third study conducted by Liu (2004) which reported that males differ from females in their overall use of language learning strategies, namely in their use of memory and affective strategies, in favor of females.

The fifth hypothesis regarding the differences between males and females in their proficiency level is based on a first study conducted by Al-Nujaidi (2003) which reported that significant gender differences favoring females were found in the EFL Saudi learners' performance on tests, and on a second study conducted by Burton, Henninger, and Hafetz (2005) which reported that men performed better than women for mental rotation on the SAT, and the women performed better than the men for verbal fluency.

The sixth hypothesis regarding the differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their motivation is based on a study conducted by Shaaban and Ghaith (2000) which reported that there is a difference among students of different levels (level II and level III) of proficiency in their integrative motivation, in their effort, and in their valence, and all of them in favor of level II learners, which means that the learners in level III (the ones with higher proficiency) had lower levels of integrative motivation, effort, and valence.

Last but not least, the seventh hypothesis regarding the differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their use of language learning strategies is based on the following studies: a first study conducted by Bremner (1999) which
reported that low proficient learners differ from high proficient learners in their use of language learning strategies, namely the cognitive and compensation strategies, in favor of the high proficient; a second study conducted by Shmais (2000) which reported that low proficient learners do not differ from high proficient learners in their use of the language learning strategies, except in the cognitive strategies, in favor of the high proficient, and in the affective strategies, in favor of the less proficient who use them in order to lower their anxiety and encourage themselves to store and retrieve information; and, finally, a third study conducted by Liu (2004) which reported that low proficient learners differ from high proficient learners in their use of language learning strategies, in favor of the high proficient. Due to those varied results, it seemed useful to investigate the differences between low and high proficient learners in Lebanon in their use of language learning strategies.

It would be useful here to mention the first research question regarding the types of language learning strategies most frequently used by EFL learners in Lebanon, a question which was not formulated in a hypothesis; it is based on a first study conducted by Goh and Kwah (1997) which reported that metacognitive strategies are most frequently used, while memory strategies are least frequently used; on a second study conducted by Chang and Huang (1999) which reported that compensation strategies are the ones most commonly used; on a third study conducted by Bremner (1999) which reported that compensation and metacognitive strategies are respectively the most used, while affective and memory strategies are the least used; on a fourth study conducted by Shmais (2003) which reported that the most frequently used strategies are the metacognitive strategies (79.6%) and the least used strategies are the compensation strategies (63%); and, finally, on a fifth study conducted by Liu (2004)
which reported that the most frequently used strategies were metacognitive strategies and the least frequently used were memory strategies (between them respectively are compensation, affective, cognitive and social strategies).

**Definitions of Variables**

**Motivation**

*Integrative Motivation*

It lies more in the affective domain (Dornyei, 1990). It deals with “the way expertise in a foreign language can enable the user to participate in the culture of another region or country and interact with other people” (Kyriacou & Kobori, 1998, p.345). This will be measured by items 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, and 9 of the Motivation Scale survey.

*Instrumental Motivation*

It is the connection of success and reward; learning the language for a material, pragmatic benefit such as improved career prospects and access to higher education. (Vroom, 1964; Gardner & Lambert 1972; Dornyei, 1990; Kyriacou & Kobori, 1998). This will be measured by items 5, 6, 7, and 10 of the Motivation Scale survey.

*Effort*

It is the amount of effort that learners are willing to exert in order to become proficient in the target language. According to Vroom’s expectancy value theories (1969), the learner’s motivation to acquire a second language is determined by effort, among other factors. This will be measured by items 11 to 16 of the Motivation Scale survey.
Valence

Value of obtaining a goal (Vroom, 1964). This will be measured by items 1 to 6, part 2, section 1.

Expectancy

Perceived probability of success (Vroom, 1964). This will be measured by items 1 to 6, part 2, section 2.

Sense of Ability

Appraisal of one’s ability to achieve the goals (Vroom, 1964). It is closely related to Bandura’s self-efficacy (1986, 1997) which highlights the belief that a particular action is possible and that the individual can accomplish it, judging one's own ability and competence. This will be measured by items 1 to 6, part 2, section 3.

Language Learning Strategies

Language learning strategies are the often conscious steps or behaviors used by language learners to enhance their own learning (Oxford, 1990, 1993). Six categories of strategies were identified by Oxford (1990) in her Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL):

Memory-Related Strategies

They help learners link what they are learning in the target language with already existing information; they are measured in this study by items 1-9 in the SILL;

Cognitive Strategies

They involve reasoning, analysis, summarizing, and reorganizing information; they are measured by items 10-23 in the SILL;
**Compensation Strategies**

They help learners make up for missing knowledge; they are measured by items 24-29 in the SILL;

**Metacognitive Strategies**

They help learners to think about their own thinking, about how they are learning the new material; they are measured by items 30-38 in the SILL;

**Affective Strategies**

They consist in boosting one’s self-confidence and willingness to learn; they are measured by items 39-44 in the SILL;

**Social Strategies**

They consist in asking for clarifications and relying on the society to get more information about the material learned; they are measured by items 45-50 in the SILL.

**Language Proficiency**

In the present study, language proficiency is based on the self-reported verbal SAT scores of 129 students (87.7%). The test scores ranged between 300 and 490.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter will begin with a brief review of Krashen’s affective filter hypothesis and the role of affect in language learning. Then, motivation will be defined and its sources will be described. Following this part, the different theories of motivation as well as a few relevant models will be explored. Finally, language learning strategies will be discussed and a review of related studies will conclude the chapter.

Krashen’s Affective Filter Hypothesis and Affect in Language Learning

In his theory of second language acquisition, Krashen (1985) proposed the affective filter hypothesis. This hypothesis stipulates that motivation is one of the affective variables that play a facilitative, but non-causal role in second language acquisition. Krashen (1985b) claims that students with high motivation and low anxiety are better disposed to acquire a second language. However, low motivation and high anxiety can all together raise the affective filter and lead into a “mental block” that prevents “comprehensible input” from being used for acquisition. In other words, when the filter is “up,” it hinders language acquisition.

Hence, what one concludes is that affect does play a very important role in second language acquisition. It needs to be taken into consideration by L2 teachers and they have to make sure that the learner’s affective filter is low at all times in order for proper learning to take place.
Definition of Motivation

Although the word “motivation” might appear simple and easy, it is in fact very difficult to define. It seems to have been impossible for theorists to reach consensus on a single definition. According to Gardner (1985), motivation is concerned with the question, “Why does an organism behave as it does?” Moreover, motivation involves four aspects: a goal, an effort, a desire to attain the goal, and a favorable attitude toward the activity in question. Motivation is also defined as the impetus to create and sustain intentions and goal seeking acts (Ames & Ames, 1989). It is important because it “determines the extent of the learner’s active involvement and attitude toward learning” (Ngeow, 1998, p. 1). Interestingly, many researchers consider motivation as one of the main elements that determine success in developing a second or foreign language. According to Oxford and Shearin (1994), motivation determines the extent of active, personal involvement in L2 learning. Finally, based on the preceding definitions, we can come up with the following: motivation involves a goal, an effort, a desire, energy, active involvement, and persistence.

Sources of Motivation

In fact, “Without knowing where the roots of motivation lie, how can teachers water those roots?” (Oxford & Shearin, 1994, p.15). According to Fisher (1990), educational psychologists point to three major sources of motivation in learning: the learners’ natural interest – intrinsic satisfaction; the teacher / institution / employment – extrinsic reward; and success in the task combining satisfaction and reward. Furthermore, according to Littlejohn (2001):
While teachers and school systems have drawn on both of the first two sources of motivation, the third source is perhaps under-exploited in language teaching. This is the simple fact of success, and the effect that this has on our view of what we do. As human beings, we generally like what we do well, and are therefore more likely to do it again, and put in more effort ... In the classroom, this can mean that students who develop an image of themselves as ‘no good at English’ will simply avoid situations which tell them what they already know – that they aren’t any good at English. Feelings of failure, particularly early on in a student’s school career, can therefore lead to a downward spiral of a self-perception of low ability – low motivation – low effort – low achievement – low motivation – low achievement, and so on. (p. 3)

Theories of Motivation

Motivation has been explained in terms of eight different theories: the behavioral, cognitive, cognitive developmental, achievement motivation, psychoanalytic, humanistic, social cognition and transpersonal/spiritual theories.

*Behavioral Theories*

According to the behaviorists, motivation is explained in terms of external stimuli and reinforcement. The physical environment and actions of the teacher are of prime importance. Three theories fall under the umbrella of the behavioral, these are the:
**Classical Conditioning (Pavlov)**

This theory states that biological responses to associated stimuli energize and direct behavior.

**Instrumental/Operant Learning (Skinner)**

This theory states that the primary factor is consequences: reinforcers are incentives to increase behavior and punishers are disincentives that result in a decrease in behavior. (Stimulus => response => reward)

**Observational/Social Learning (Bandura)**

This theory suggests that modeling (imitating others) and vicarious learning (watching others have consequences applied to their behavior) are important motivators of behavior.

Weiner (1990) points out that behavioral theories tend to focus on extrinsic motivation (rewards) whereas cognitive theories deal with intrinsic motivation.

**Cognitive Theories**

As for the cognitive theories, cognitivists explain motivation in terms of a person’s active search for meaning and satisfaction in life. Thus, motivation is intrinsic.

The cognitive theories are:

**Expectancy-Value/VIE Theory**

Vroom (1964) proposes the following equation:

Motivation = Perceived Probability of Success (Expectancy) Connection of Success and Reward-- material benefit (Instrumentality) Value of Obtaining Goal (Valence, Value)

(VIE = Valence, Instrumentality, Expectancy)
Since this formula states that the three factors of Expectancy, Instrumentality, and Valence or Value are to be multiplied by each other, a low value in one will result in a low value of motivation. Therefore, all three must be present in order for motivation to occur. That is, if an individual doesn't believe he or she can be successful at a task, or the individual does not see a connection between his or her activity and success, or the individual does not value the results of success, then the probability is lowered that the individual will engage in the required learning activity. From the perspective of this theory, all three variables must be high in order for motivation and the resulting behavior to be high.

Hence, an individual will act in a certain way based on the expectation that the act will be followed by a given outcome and on the attractiveness of that outcome to the individual.

*Attribution Theory (Heider, 1958; Weiner, 1974)*

This theory proposes that every individual tries to explain success or failure of self and others by offering certain "attributions." These attributions are either internal or external and are either under control or not under control. The following chart shows the four attributions that result from a combination of internal or external locus of control and whether or not control is possible. In a teaching/learning environment, it is important to assist the learner to develop a self-attribute explanation of effort (internal, control). If the person has an attribution of ability (internal, no control) as soon as the individual experiences some difficulties in the learning process, he or she will decrease appropriate learning behavior. If the person has an external attribution, then nothing the person can do will help that individual in a learning situation (i.e., responsibility for
demonstrating what has been learned is completely outside the person). In this case, there is nothing to be done by the individual when learning problems occur.

Cognitive Dissonance Theory

This theory was developed by Leon Festinger (1957) and states that, when there is a discrepancy between two beliefs, two actions, or between a belief and an action, we will act to resolve conflict and discrepancies. The implication is that if we can create the appropriate amount of disequilibrium, this will in turn lead to the individual changing his or her behavior which in turn will lead to a change in thought patterns which in turn leads to more change in behavior.

Cognitive Developmental Theories

Regarding the cognitive developmental theorists, students’ needs, goals, and interests must be the starting point if motivation is to occur. Thus, for motivation and progress to exist, instructional input to students must be challenging and relevant (Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Two important theories fall under the cognitive developmental: stages of cognitive development theory and zone of proximal development.

Stages of Cognitive Development Theory (Piaget, 1972, 1990)

According to Piaget, children are motivated to develop their cognitive or mental abilities in a predictable set of stages:

Sensorimotor stage (infancy, 0 to 2 years). In this period (which has 6 stages), intelligence is demonstrated through motor activity without the use of symbols. Knowledge of the world is limited (but developing) because it is based on physical interactions / experiences. Children acquire object permanence at
about 7 months of age (memory). Physical development (mobility) allows the child to begin developing new intellectual abilities. Some symbolic (language) abilities are developed at the end of this stage.

*Pre-operational stage (toddler and early childhood, 2-7 years).* In this period (which has two substages), intelligence is demonstrated through the use of symbols, language use matures, and memory and imagination are developed, but thinking is done in a nonlogical, nonreversible manner. Egocentric thinking predominates.

*Concrete operational stage (elementary and early adolescence, 7-12 years).* In this stage (characterized by 7 types of conservation: number, length, liquid, mass, weight, area, volume), intelligence is demonstrated through logical and systematic manipulation of symbols related to concrete objects. Operational thinking (mental actions that are reversible) develops. Egocentric thought diminishes.

*Formal operational stage (adolescence and adulthood, 12 years –adult).* In this stage, intelligence is demonstrated through the logical use of symbols related to abstract concepts. Early in the period there is a return to egocentric thought.

Only 35% of high school graduates in industrialized countries obtain formal operations; many people do not think formally during adulthood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Development Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sensorimotor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Preoperational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Concrete operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Formal operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to this model, fulfillment of the previous stage is necessary for advancement to the next stage. In order for the child to be motivated, parents and teachers need to challenge his/her abilities, but NOT present material or information that is too far beyond the child's level. It is also recommended that teachers use a wide variety of concrete experiences to motivate the child (e.g., use of manipulatives, working in groups to get experience seeing from another's perspective, field trips, etc).

Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978)

The Zone of Proximal Development is the distance between the learner's actual developmental level and the level of potential development; it is the gap between what we are trying to teach and the current state of development in that area. If the gap is too large, instruction won’t be effective; too small and the learner won’t be extended, therefore teachers must have background knowledge of those they teach.

Achievement Motivation Theories

Atkinson and Raynor (1974) talk about three theories:

Need for Achievement

Individuals with a high need for achievement are interested in excellence for its own sake (rather for extrinsic rewards), tend to initiate achievement activities, work with heightened intensity on these tasks, and persist in the face of failure.

Fear of Failure

This theory states that the main drive to do well comes from avoiding a negative outcome rather than approaching a positive one.
Fear of Success ("Nerd" vs. "cool")

This theory states that some individuals might prefer to fail for fear of losing social support (affiliation).

However, Locke and Latham (1994) have discussed a fourth theory, the Goal theory, which covers three separate types of goals.

Goal Theory

Mastery goals (also called learning goals). They focus on gaining competence or mastering a new set of knowledge or skills;

Performance/normative goals (also called ego-involvement goals). They focus on achieving normative-based standards, doing better than others, or doing well without a lot of effort;

Social goals. They focus on relationships among people (see Ames, 1992; Dweck, 1986; Urdan & Maher, 1995). Students pursuing social goals try hard to achieve in academic situations for social reasons.

In the context of school learning, which involves operating in a relatively structured environment, students with mastery goals outperform students with either performance or social goals. However, in life success, it seems critical that individuals have all three types of goals in order to be very successful. One aspect of this theory is that individuals are motivated to either avoid failure (more often associated with performance goals) or achieve success (more often associated with mastery goals). In the former situation, the individual is more likely to select easy or difficult tasks, thereby either achieving success or having a good excuse for why failure occurred. In the latter situation, the individual is more likely to select moderately difficult tasks
which will provide an interesting challenge, but still keep the high expectations for success.

_Psychoanalytic Theories of Motivation_

Following the achievement motivation theories come the psychoanalytic theories of motivation which propose a variety of fundamental influences. Freud (1990) suggested that all creation or behavior is a result of internal, biological instincts that are classified into two categories: life (sexual) and death (aggression). However, Erikson (1993) and Sullivan (1968) propose that interpersonal and social relationships are fundamental. Adler (1989) also proposes power and money as motivators, whereas Jung (1953, 1997) talks about temperament and search for soul or personal meaningfulness.

_Humanistic Theories of Motivation_

Humanists stress the need for personal growth. They place a great deal of emphasis on the total learner. They also maintain that learners need to be empowered and have control over the learning process. The teacher becomes a facilitator. Three theories fall under the umbrella of the “humanistic” theories of learning. These are:

_Hierarchy of human needs (Maslow, 1954)_

It is based on two groupings: deficiency needs and growth needs. Within the deficiency needs, each lower need must be met before moving to the next higher level. The first four levels (Deficiency Needs) are:

*Physiological.* Hunger, thirst, bodily comforts, etc.;

*Safety/Security.* Out of danger;

*Belonging and Love.* Affiliate with others, be accepted; and
Esteem. To achieve, be competent, gain approval and recognition.

Therefore, according to Maslow, an individual is ready to act upon the growth needs if and only if the deficiency needs are met.

The remaining four levels (Growth Needs) are:

Cognitive. To know, to understand, and explore;

Aesthetic. Symmetry, order, and beauty;

Self-Actualization. To find self-fulfillment and realize one's potential; self-actualized people are characterized by:

• Being problem-focused;
• Appreciating life;
• Showing concern about personal growth;
• Showing ability to have peak experiences.

Transcendence. To help others find self-fulfillment and realize their potential.

The essence of the hierarchy is the notion of “pre-potency”, which means that you are not going to be motivated by any higher-level needs until your lower-level ones have been satisfied.

Hierarchy of Motivational Needs (Alderfer, 1972)

Maslow recognized that not all personalities followed his proposed hierarchy.

While a variety of personality dimensions might be considered as related to motivational needs, one of the most often cited is that of introversion and extroversion.

Reorganizing Maslow's hierarchy based on the work of Alderfer and considering the introversion/extroversion dimension of personality results in three levels, each with an introverted and extroverted component. This organization suggests that there may be two aspects of each level that differentiate how people relate to each set of needs.
Different personalities might relate more to one dimension than the other. For example, an introvert at the level of Other/Relatedness might be more concerned with his or her own perceptions of being included in a group, whereas an extrovert at that same level would pay more attention to how others value that membership.

*Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985)*

This theory is based on the relationship between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation and the basic human need for autonomy. It proposes that a person must be able to initiate and regulate, through personal choice, the effort expanded to complete a task in order for the task to be intrinsically rewarding.

*Intrinsic motivation.* It involves the performance of a task for its own sake. It values rewards gained through the process of task completion, regardless of any external rewards.

*Extrinsic motivation.* It involves the pursuit of some reward external to the completion of the task, such as good grades. It is believed to undermine intrinsic motivation; individuals will often lose their intrinsic interest in a task if the task is seen as a means to an end.

*Social Cognition Theory*

Bandura (1986, 1997) discusses two themes: self-efficacy, which highlights the belief that a particular action is possible and that the individual can accomplish it, and self-regulation, which highlights the establishment of goals, the development of a plan to attain those goals, the commitment to implement that plan, the actual implementation of the plan, and subsequent actions of reflection and modification or reduction.
Transpersonal / Spiritual Theories

Finally, there are the transpersonal/spiritual theories which deal with the meaningfulness of our lives or ultimate meanings. According to Huitt (2000), the way we view our spirituality has a big influence on our values and self-concept; “One's perspective on humankind's spiritual nature also impacts the dreams and goals one develops and how one pursues them” (p.1).

Models of Motivation

A few relevant models of motivation are to be presented. These models are: Gardner and Lambert’s Socio-Educational Model, Vroom’s Expectancy Model, Dornyei’s Motivational Construct, and Wen’s Four Motivational Factors.

In their Socio-Educational Model, and after conducting a study that lasted more than ten years, Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972) concluded that the learner's attitude toward the target language and the culture of the target-language-speaking community play a crucial role in language learning motivation. They introduced the notions of instrumental and integrative motivation.

In the context of language learning, instrumental motivation refers to the learner's desire to learn a language for utilitarian purposes (such as school/university requirement, employment or travel), whereas integrative motivation refers to the desire to learn a language to integrate successfully into the target language community. However, researchers have challenged the social psychological approach claiming that it does not include the cognitive aspects of learning motivation (Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Dornyei, 1994), it is not practical, and does not benefit L2 learning since it is too broad to help L2 educators generate practical guidelines (Dornyei, 1990).
Gardner (1985) explored **four other motivational orientations**: the reason for learning, the desire to attain the learning goal, the positive attitude toward the learning situation, and the effortful behavior. Gardner also described core second language learning motivation as a construct composed of three characteristics: the attitudes towards learning a language (affect), the desire to learn the language (want), and motivational intensity (effort). Therefore, according to Gardner, a highly motivated individual will enjoy learning the language, will want to learn the language, and will finally strive to learn the language. "An integratively oriented learner would likely have a stronger desire to learn the language, have more positive attitudes towards the learning situation, and be more likely to exert more effort in learning the language (Gardner, 1985).

According to Vroom’s (1969) **expectancy model**, the learner’s motivation to acquire a second language is determined by effort, valence, expectancy, ability to achieve the goals, and instrumentality.

In 1990, Dornyei considers instrumental motivation more important than integrative motivation for learners of foreign languages. He, thus, postulates a **motivational construct** consisting of an instrumental motivational subsystem, an integrative motivational subsystem, a need for achievement, and attribution about past failures.

In 1997, Wen incorporates expectancy–value theories and identifies **four motivational factors**:

- Motivation of instrumentality,
- Intrinsic motivation,
- Expected learning strategies and efforts, and
• Passivity towards requirements.

After having identified those four motivational factors, Wen develops a tool for measuring motivation: the “Motivation Scale” which measures instrumental and integrative motivation, effort, valency, expectancy, and ability. In 2000, Shaaban and Ghaith slightly modify this tool and use it with AUB students.

Language Learning Strategies

Research has proved that language learning strategies are extremely effective in second or foreign language learning; they have the potential to be “an extremely powerful learning tool” (O’Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Kupper, and Russo, 1985, p.43). Dansereau (1985) defined learning strategies as a "set of processes or steps (used by a learner) that can facilitate the acquisition, storage, and /or utilization of information" (p. 210). Also in 1985, O’Malley et al defined learning strategies as being “operations or steps used by a learner that will facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval or use of information” (p.23).

In 1986, Weinstein and Mayer stated that learning strategies have learning facilitation as a goal and are intentional on the part of the learner. In fact, more proficient students tend to consciously use more strategies to learn the language (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1999). In 1990(b), Oxford stated that “Learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations” (p. 8). In brief, according to Oxford (1990b, p. 9), language learning strategies

• allow learners to become more self-directed
• expand the role of language teachers
are problem-oriented
• involve many aspects, not just the cognitive
• can be taught
• are flexible
• are influenced by a variety of factors.

Oxford classifies learning strategies into six groups: memory-related, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. The classification framework of learning strategies came into being from some researchers’ efforts for determining the characteristics of the "good language learner" (Naiman et al. 1978; Rubin 1975; Stern, 1975). Oxford’s taxonomy is “perhaps the most comprehensive classification of learning strategies to date” (Ellis, 1994, p.539). Here are, below, the definitions Oxford provided in 1998, 2001 (pp. 363-365), and 2003 for each set of strategies:

Memory-Related Strategies

They help the learner link one L2 item or concept with another but do not necessarily involve deep understanding. Various memory-related strategies enable the learner to store and retrieve information in an orderly string (e.g., acronyms), while other techniques create learning and retrieval via sounds (e.g., rhyming), images (e.g., a mental picture of the word itself or the meaning of the word), a combination of sounds and images (e.g., the keyword method), body movement (e.g., total physical response), mechanical means (e.g., flashcards), or location (e.g., on a page or blackboard).

One would be using memory-related strategies by creating mental linkages, such as grouping and placing words in context; applying images and sounds to represent
things in memory; structured reviewing; using mechanical techniques such as physical response, etc.

Cognitive Strategies

According to Oxford (1998), cognitive strategies enable the learner to manipulate the language material in direct ways, e.g., through reasoning, analysis, note-taking, summarizing, synthesizing, outlining, reorganizing information to develop stronger schemas (knowledge structures), practicing in naturalistic settings, and practicing structures and sounds formally.

One would be using cognitive strategies by practicing and repeating new words, deductive reasoning, translating, analyzing; taking notes, highlighting, summarizing, imitating native speakers, starting conversations in the target language (TL), practicing sounds, using words in different ways, watching TV shows or going to movies spoken in the TL, reading for pleasure in the TL, skimming passages first then going back and reading them carefully, looking for words in native language that are similar to new words being studied, trying to find patterns, finding the meaning of a word by chunking, and trying to avoid literal translation.

Compensation Strategies

They help the learner make up for missing knowledge. Those strategies involve guessing from the context in listening and reading, using synonyms and “talking around” the missing word to aid speaking and writing, selecting a topic for discussion based on one’s knowledge of the language and shaping the discussion to avoid unknown vocabulary, guessing at words based on context, using gestures, and coining words to communicate.
One would be using compensation strategies by making wise guesses in listening and reading, making up new words, reading without looking up every word, trying to guess what people will say next, replacing words one cannot find with synonyms or descriptions, and, strictly for speaking, using gestures or pause words.

**Metacognitive Strategies**

They are employed for managing the learning process overall. Several studies of EFL learners reached the conclusion that metacognitive strategies are often strong predictors of L2 proficiency (Oxford, 1998). These strategies are used to oversee, regulate or self-direct language learning. They involve various processes such as planning, prioritizing, and self-management.

One would be using metacognitive strategies by identifying one’s own learning style preferences and needs, planning for an L2 task, gathering and organizing materials, arranging a study space and a schedule, looking for people to talk to in the TL, monitoring mistakes, evaluating task success, evaluating the success of any type of learning strategy, paying attention, setting goals and objectives, looking for opportunities to read, and evaluating one’s own performance and progress.

**Affective Strategies**

These are strategies such as identifying one’s mood and anxiety level and trying to control them, talking about feelings, rewarding oneself for good performance, and using deep breathing or positive self-talk.

One would be using affective strategies by using music or laughter as part of the learning process, making positive statements about one’s own progress, discussing feelings, trying to relax whenever one feels afraid of using the TL, encouraging oneself to speak the TL even when one is afraid of making mistakes, writing down feelings in a
language learning diary, and talking to someone else about how one feels when learning the TL.

**Social Strategies**

They help the learner work with others and understand the target culture as well as the language. Social strategies are those activities learners engage in which afford them opportunities to be exposed to and practice their knowledge. Although these strategies provide exposure to the target language, they contribute indirectly to learning since they do not lead directly to the obtaining, storing, retrieving, and using of language (Wenden & Rubin, 1987, pp. 23-27).

One would be using affective strategies by seeking correction, asking for clarification, working/practicing with peers, talking with a native-speaking conversation partner, exploring cultural and social norms, and developing cultural understanding.

Furthermore, Oxford (1990b, p. 17) devised a taxonomy of language learning strategies in which she divided the strategies into two classes: direct strategies and indirect strategies. Direct strategies are the ones used directly in a language learning situation, and they are divided into three subclasses: memory strategies (strategies to store and retrieve aspects of the target language by creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds, reviewing, and acting), cognitive strategies (strategies for using the language and for understanding how it works, like practicing, receiving and sending messages, analyzing and reasoning, and creating structure for input and output), and compensation strategies (strategies for using the language despite gaps in knowledge such as guessing intelligently and overcoming limitations). Indirect strategies are the ones used to manage learning in general, not specifically the target language. Those strategies include metacognitive strategies (strategies for centering, arranging, planning,
organizing, and evaluating learning), affective strategies (strategies for approaching the task positively like lowering anxiety, encouraging oneself, and taking one’s emotional temperature), and social strategies (strategies for working with others to get input and practice, like asking questions, cooperating, and empathizing with others).

It is worthy to note here that the present study deals with, either the strategies as a whole, or each strategy separately; it does not take the direct and indirect strategies as two whole entities that need to be studied. We encourage researchers, however, to conduct future studies about the effect of each set of strategies (direct or indirect) taken as a whole.

Review of Relevant Studies

Studies on Motivation

In a study of the motivation of 180 Arabic native speakers enrolled in the University Orientation Program (UOP) at the American University of Beirut (of those students, 41 were in level II [intermediate] and 139 in level III [high intermediate]; 108 were males and 72 were females), Shaaban and Ghaith (2000) studied six motivational constructs: instrumental motivation, integrative motivation, effort, valence, expectancy, and perception of ability. They used, as a measurement tool, a modification of Wen’s (1997) Motivation Scale. The results --related to the present study-- that they reached are that there were significant differences between males and females in their motivation to acquire English as a foreign language, mainly in their effort and perception of the valence of learning English, in favor of females. In addition, their results revealed a difference among students of different levels (level II and level III) of
proficiency in their integrative motivation, in their effort, and in their valence, and all of them in favor of level II learners, which means that the learners in level III (the ones with higher proficiency) had lower levels of integrative motivation, effort, and valence.

In 2000, Kang administered a motivation questionnaire adapted from AMTB (Attitude/Motivation Test Battery devised by Gardner in 1985) to 234 Korean 9th graders (113 males, 121 females) learning English as a foreign language in order to investigate their EFL motivation for learning English and the relationship between gender and motivation. Methodologies employed included factor analysis, Pearson product-moment correlations, and discriminate function analysis. The results relevant to this study showed that males differed from females in their motivation to learn English as a Foreign Language, namely in integrative motivation, in favor of females.

*Studies on Learning Strategies*

Goh and Kwah (1997) conducted a study of language learning strategies used by 175 ESL students from the People’s Republic of China aimed at surveying the frequency of strategy use and determining how this strategy use is influenced by the learners’ proficiency level and gender. They used the SILL questionnaire (Strategy Inventory of Language Learning) by Oxford (1990) and concluded that metacognitive strategies were most frequently used, while memory strategies were least frequently used; in addition, female students were found to use compensation and affective strategies significantly more often than male students.

In another study conducted in 1999 by Chang and Huang who administered motivation (Motivational Element Questionnaire) and learning strategies (SILL)
questionnaires to 46 Taiwanese undergraduate and graduate students of advanced EFL at a public university in the USA in order to investigate the relationship between motivation and learning strategies, results relevant to our study revealed that compensation strategies were the ones most commonly used by the participants.

Bremner (1999) administered the SILL questionnaire (the Strategy Inventory of Language Learning by Oxford, 1990, pp. 293-300) to 149 Hong Kong learners (113 females and 36 males) studying a language and communication skills course at the City University of Hong Kong. The study aimed at investigating the levels of strategy use among the group and the relationship between the students’ strategy use and their language proficiency. In order to determine the students' proficiency in relation to each other, the following tasks were administered in the first and second half of the twenty-week course: two spoken tasks, two written tasks, and two discrete-item language tests. Scores from these were totaled and converted into a percentage. The participants were divided into three groups (low, medium, and high) of roughly equal numbers on the basis of proficiency scores. Differences in mean strategy use in the six SILL categories in relation to proficiency by group were determined using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The Scheffe post-hoc test was used to see where there were any significant differences. To determine significance throughout the study, a standard of \( p < .05 \) was used.

The results of the study showed that compensation and metacognitive strategies were respectively the most used, while affective and memory strategies were the least used. Moreover, the results showed that low proficient learners differed from high proficient learners in their use of language learning strategies, namely the cognitive and
compensation strategies, in favor of the high proficient. In addition, the researcher concluded that compensation strategies might be more readily available to learners who have reached higher levels of proficiency.

Shmais (2003) administered the Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990) to 99 English majors (19 males and 80 females) studying at An-Najah National University in Palestine. The purpose of this study was to investigate the LLSs that are most frequently used, and to determine if the use of language learning strategies differed by gender and proficiency. Proficiency was determined by students' learning level (i.e., sophomore, junior, senior), self-reported proficiency in English (i.e., the students' university average in English courses) and language self-efficacy (i.e., how good the students perceived themselves as English learners). The questionnaires were translated into Arabic and then distributed by the researcher. They were given out during students' regular English classes. The subjects were informed that their participation was entirely voluntary. The subjects did not give their names; only their gender, average and level of learning were required. The ANOVA test was used to determine significant variation in mean strategy use by gender and proficiency. Wilks Lambda and Sidak tests were used to determine differences across all the strategies by gender and proficiency. The results of this study showed that the most frequently used strategies were the metacognitive strategies (79.6%) and the least used strategies were the compensation strategies (63%). In general, the results showed that males did not differ from females in their use of language learning strategies, and low proficient learners did not differ from high proficient learners in their use of the language learning strategies, except in the cognitive strategies, in favor of the high proficient, and in the
affective strategies, in favor of the less proficient who use them in order to lower their anxiety and encourage themselves to store and retrieve information.

Liu (2004) administered Oxford’s SILL (1990 Version 7.0) to 428 technological institute English majors in China in order to investigate their strategy use. All the English majors at Nanyang Institute of Technology (China) were invited to participate in the study and a total of 379 valid questionnaires (87 by males and 292 by females) were analyzed using the SPSS. Descriptive statistics for overall strategy use, Independent Sample T-Tests on learners’ strategy use by proficiency and by gender, correlations between EFL proficiency and strategy use, and a bivariate correlation between learners’ gender and strategy use were conducted in order to answer the research questions.

The results showed that the most frequently used strategies were metacognitive strategies and the least frequently used were memory strategies (between them respectively are compensation, affective, cognitive and social strategies) and that low proficient learners differed from high proficient learners in their use of language learning strategies, in favor of the high proficient. The study also revealed that males differed from females in their overall use of language learning strategies, namely in their use of memory and affective strategies, in favor of females.

In conclusion, this chapter has reviewed the literature related to this study. Specifically, the chapter covered the following: Krashen’s affective filter hypothesis and the role of affect in language learning, in addition to motivation, its sources, theories, and a few relevant models. Then, language learning strategies were discussed, and their components (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and
Finally, a few relevant studies related to motivation and conducted by Shaaban and Ghaith (2000) and Kang (2000) were covered, then a few other studies related to language learning strategies and conducted by Goh and Kwah (1997), Chang and Huang (1999), Bremner (1999), Shmais (2003), and Liu (2004) were reviewed.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology of data collection and analysis used in the present study. Specifically, the chapter includes sections that describe the study design, the participants, the instruments, and the procedures of data collection and analysis.

Study Design

The study was conducted at the American University of Beirut during the first semester of the 2005-2006 academic year. It employed a survey design which involved administering two different questionnaires (the Motivation Scale, MS, and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning, SILL) to a group of participants. The two instruments were first piloted with a small group of students (n = 9) who were later excluded from the study. Those participants were carefully chosen by their teacher, at the researcher’s request: 3 students were of low proficiency, 3 of medium proficiency, and 3 of high proficiency. They took less than forty minutes to complete the survey. They were requested to ask any questions that would help them better understand the sentences in the survey. A copy of the survey before the pilot is included in Appendix 1, and another copy of the survey after the pilot is included in Appendix 2.

Some of the questions the participants asked are related to the meanings of:

- Appreciate (MS, Q 1)
- Cultural heritage (MS, Q 4)
- Sheer luck (MS, Q 11)
• “I will spend about the following amount of time to practice the language after classes” (MS*, Q 13)
• Called upon (MS, Q 14)
• Significant (MS, II)
• Fairly fluently (MS, II, Q 1)
• “I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English” (SILL, Q 1)
• Rhymes (SILL, Q 5)
• Flashcards (SILL, Q 6)
• “I physically act out new English words” (SILL, Q 7)
• Skim (SILL, Q 18)
• Patterns (SILL, Q 20)
• Gestures (SILL, Q 25)
• “I do notice that” (SILL, Q 42)
• “Language learning diary” (SILL, Q 43)

Note: MS = Motivation Scale; Q = Question

Following those questions, the problematic words and phrases were either defined or translated. For example, the word “appreciate” was given the definition “find value in;” the “Western cultural heritage” was translated into الإرث الثقافي الغربي; the word “fluently” was both defined and translated: fluently = well - بطلاقة; the sentence “I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English” was explained with “I relate what I am studying to what I already know.” The word “rhymes” was both shown in an example and translated: example = achieve and
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The word “flashcards” was defined: flashcards are cards on which I write the words I am studying on one side and their definitions on the other side, to help myself learn those words; the sentence “I physically act out new English words” was explained in an example: for the word jump, I physically jump up and down; the word “skim” was explained with “read over the passage quickly”; the word “pattern” was translated into ﻟﻤﻂ; “gestures” was translated into إﺷﺎرات and, finally, “language learning diary” was translated into دفتر لتدوين اليوميّات.

The participants also asked about the difference between the three main questions of part II in the motivation scale:

- How significant are these outcomes of your English class to you?
- How probable is it that you will achieve the above outcomes from the English class that you are taking now?
- What do you think of your own ability to achieve the above outcomes?

In the modified version of the survey, the word “significant was defined as “important; the sentence “How probable is it that you will achieve the above outcomes from the English class that you are taking now?” was explained with “What are your chances of success in the following?” And the sentence “What do you think of your own ability to achieve the above outcomes?” was explained with “How capable are you to achieve the above outcomes?”

Moreover, the participants in the pilot survey asked about the meanings of “cognitive,” “compensation,” and “metacognitive” which are the titles of parts B, C,
and D of the SILL; therefore, it was decided to remove the titles of the different parts of the SILL, lest the participants should be confused.

The modified version of the survey (see Appendix 2) was later administered to the six sections of Intensive English 100 at AUB: sections A1, A2, and B1, B2, B3, B4.

Participants

The participants are 147 undergraduate students (n=147, 82 males and 65 females) enrolled in intensive EFL classes at the American University of Beirut (AUB), Lebanon. These intensive EFL classes are intended to help improve students’ English language proficiency so that they may pursue their studies at the American University of Beirut, where the medium of instruction is English.

The American University of Beirut enrolls students from Lebanon and the Arab world. The acceptance of students into various majors at the university is usually determined on the basis of their scholastic record and their SAT scores. However, students who do not get the required score on English language admission tests (TOEFL, SAT Verbal, or AUB-EN) are asked to join the intensive English classes.

“English 100 is an integrated course that develops students’ linguistic and communicative competence (...). The course is designed along two tracks: A and B. In 100A, students meet 15 hours a week, whereas in 100B, students meet for 10 hours a week and while the two tracks differ in pace, the overall course objectives and promotion criteria remain the same for both tracks” (AUB English 100).

Most of the participants (134) reported being native speakers of Arabic; seven participants reported being native speakers of French, five of other languages, and one
did not specify. Of these, 42 students (28.6%) are enrolled in English 100 section A and the remaining 105 (71.4%) are enrolled in English 100 section B. Sixty-eight students (46.2%) have studied English as a first foreign language; sixty-three students (42.8%) have studied French as a first foreign language and English as a second foreign language; fourteen students (9.5%) have studied Arabic as a first foreign language; finally, two students (1.3%) have studied another unspecified language as a first foreign language. These two students’ native language is Arabic, which means that they must have studied English as a second foreign language.

Forty students have been accepted into a major in arts and sciences, 33 in agricultural and food sciences, 30 in business, 17 in engineering, 13 in health sciences, 7 in medicine, and 7 students are majorless. The age of the participants ranges from 17 to 40 years, with a mean average of 18.50 and a standard deviation of 2.30.

Instruments

As mentioned before, this study employed a survey design which involved administering two different questionnaires, the Motivation Scale and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), to a total of 147 university-bound students enrolled in intensive EFL classes at AUB, Lebanon. The first page of the survey included demographic questions (11 items) regarding the participants’ age, gender, intended field of study, intensive English level and section, native language, first foreign language, school they came from, entrance exam (TOEFL or EEE) score, and SAT verbal score.
In order to measure the participants’ level of motivation to study English as a foreign language, the motivation scale developed by Wen (1997) and modified by Shaaban and Ghaith (2000) (see Appendix 2) was used. This version consists of 34 items divided into two major parts and has a general internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha reliability) of .83 based on estimations from the present study.

Part 1, titled “Motivation Information,” consists of three subscales (16 items) measuring the factors of integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, and effort. Part 2, titled “Information on Learning Outcomes,” consists of three subscales (18 items) measuring the factors of valence, expectancy, and ability.

The integrative motivation subscale consists of six Likert-type, 6-point items (1, 2, 3, 4, 8, and 9) that focus on the appreciation of the culture, art, and literature of English in addition to communication with English speakers; it has an internal consistency of .71.

Similarly, the instrumental motivation subscale consists of four Likert-type, 6-point items (5, 6, 7, and 10) that focus on the importance of English for economic development, for understanding people’s problems, for obtaining employment or pursuing further education; it has an internal consistency of .51.

As for the effort subscale, it consists of six multiple-choice items that focus on the degree of effort exerted in learning English and has an internal consistency of .62. Responses range from “a” for no effort to “d” for very high effort.

In addition, the valence subscale consists of six Likert-type, 6-point items that focus on the participants’ importance attached to the following outcomes: fluency,
communication, comprehension, good grades, and understanding English culture and
customs. This subscale has an internal consistency of .76.

The expectancy subscale consists of six Likert-type, 11-point items (ranging
from 0 to 100) that focus on the participants’ views of the probability of their achieving
the same outcomes mentioned in the valence subscale. This subscale has an internal
consistency of .75.

Finally, the ability subscale consists of six Likert-type, 11-point items (ranging
from 0 to 100) that focus on the participants’ perceptions of their ability to achieve the
same outcomes mentioned in the valence and expectancy subscales. This subscale has
an internal consistency of .80.

The internal consistencies of those six subscales are all based on estimations
from the present study.

*Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)*

In order to measure the participants’ use of language learning strategies, we used
the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) devised by Oxford (1990) and
used, among others, in: Dreyer and Oxford, 1996; Bremner, 1999; Chang and Huang,
1999; and Liu, 2004 (see Appendix 2).

The SILL was devised by Rebecca Oxford (1990) as an instrument for assessing
the frequency of use of language learning strategies by students. There are two versions
of the SILL: one for native speakers of English (80 items) and another for learners of
English as a second or foreign language (50 items). The SILL is the only language
learning strategy instrument that has been extensively field-tested for reliability and
The version of the SILL used in this study is a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 [never true] to 5 [always true]. It consists of 50 items divided into six subscales: Memory, Cognitive, Compensation, Metacognitive, Affective, and Social strategies, and has a general internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha reliability) of .88 based on estimations from the present study.

The memory subscale consists of nine items that focus on relating what we study to what we already know, using new words in a sentence to remember them, connecting the sound of a new word to a picture of it, making mental pictures, using rhymes, flashcards, acting out words, reviewing, and remembering locations of new words. The memory subscale has an internal consistency of .68.

The cognitive subscale consists of 14 items that focus on saying, trying, practicing, using words in different ways, starting conversations, watching TV, reading for pleasure, writing notes, skimming, looking up words, finding patterns, making summaries… when studying English. The cognitive subscale has an internal consistency of .72.

The compensation subscale consists of 6 items that focus on making guesses, using gestures, making up new words, not looking up all words while reading, and finding alternative words. The compensation subscale has an internal consistency of .43.

The metacognitive subscale consists of 9 items that focus on finding ways to use English, learning from English mistakes, paying attention, trying hard to improve, organizing time in order to study better, looking for people to talk to in English, looking for opportunities to read, having clear goals for improving, and thinking about self-progress. The metacognitive subscale has an internal consistency of .80.
The affective subscale consists of 6 items that focus on relaxing, encouraging oneself, rewarding oneself, noticing one’s nervousness when studying the language, writing down feelings in a language learning diary, and sharing feelings. The affective subscale has an internal consistency of .52.

The social subscale consists of 6 items that focus on asking for repetition or clarification when not understanding, asking to be corrected, practicing, asking for help, asking questions in English, and trying to learn about the target language culture. The social subscale has an internal consistency of .68.

The internal consistencies of those six subscales are all based on estimations from the present study.

**Measuring FL Proficiency**

Data on learners’ EFL proficiency were obtained by asking learners to self-report their verbal SAT scores. The participants were divided into two categories: high proficient and low proficient, based on the median score (420) of their verbal SAT. It would be useful to mention here that, although the participants were also asked in the survey to report their scores on the TOEFL or EEE (AUB English Entrance Exam) which measure proficiency, their scores on the verbal SAT (which is an English aptitude test) were used because, whereas 34 students (23.1%) reported their TOEFL scores and 102 students (69.3%) reported their EEE scores, 129 students (87.7%) reported their verbal SAT scores.
Data Collection

Permission was obtained from the course coordinator to ask the different instructors of the six sections of English 100 (A1- A2- B1- B2- B3- and B4) at AUB to use 40 minutes of their class time for the administration of the survey. Both the course coordinator and the individual instructors were very collaborative and understanding. The instructors did not interfere at all during the forty minutes allotted to the survey. The researcher introduced the survey, its purpose, its structure and content, and how it was to be filled out. She also suggested that the participants take a few minutes of rest between the two questionnaires so that they would make sure they were alert enough in order to answer the second questionnaire properly as well.

The participants were informed that their participation was entirely voluntary and were asked to be honest in their answers. The participants were also informed that the findings would be used for research purposes only and that their individual responses would remain anonymous.

The participants were requested to ask the researcher any questions they would have in order to make sure that they would understand each item and answer appropriately.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 13.0 for Windows. Six composite scores of motivation (integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, effort, expectancy, valence, and perception of ability) and six composite scores of language learning strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation,
metacognitive, affective, and social strategies) were computed for each respondent by adding the scores on the subscale items that measure these variables.

In order to address question 1 regarding the types of language learning strategies most frequently used by EFL learners in Lebanon, composite scores on the subscales of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) were computed for each participant, then descriptive statistics (range, means, and standard deviations) were computed. Finally, a mean rank order of scores was generated.

In order to address questions 2 and 3, a Pearson Product-Moment correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between the use of language learning strategies and the participants’ proficiency as measured by the verbal SAT scores, and the intercorrelations among the six language learning strategies.

In order to address questions 4, 5, and 6 regarding the differences between males and females in their motivation, use of learning strategies, and EFL proficiency, composite scores for each participant and descriptive statistics (means, and standard deviations) on the subscales of motivation and SILL were computed. A two-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) test was conducted. Gender (male vs. female) was used as an independent variable and the determinants of motivation (instrumental, integrative, effort, valence, expectancy, and ability) and the types of strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social) as dependent variables. In addition, an Independent Sample T-Test was conducted to compare the proficiency level of the male and female participants in the study.

In order to address questions 7 and 8 regarding the differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their motivation to learn English as a Foreign Language and their use of language learning strategies, composite scores for low and high
proficient learners on the subscales of motivation and learning strategies, and descriptive statistics (range, means, and standard deviations) were computed. A two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test with the determinants of motivation and learning strategies was conducted. The level of proficiency (high vs. low) was used as an independent variable and the determinants of motivation (instrumental, integrative, effort, valence, expectancy, and ability) and the types of strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social) as dependent variables.
The present study aimed at investigating the role of motivation, gender, and language learning strategies in EFL proficiency. In other words, its objective was to study the differences in motivation and language learning strategy use according to gender and proficiency level. As mentioned before, motivation and language learning strategies were used as dependent variables, and gender and proficiency were used as independent variables. This chapter reports the results of the study. All statistical tests conducted to address the questions in the study used .05 as the minimum alpha level of significance. The chapter is organized according to the order of the research questions. It presents descriptive statistics (range, means, and standard deviations), the results of intercorrelations (Pearson Product-Moment correlation analyses), an Independent Sample T-Test, and two-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) tests.

In order to address question 1 regarding the types of language learning strategies most frequently used by EFL learners in Lebanon, composite scores on the subscales of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) were computed for each participant, then descriptive statistics (range, means, and standard deviations) were computed. Finally, a mean rank order of scores was generated. Results are presented in Table 1 below:
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Mean Rank Order of Learning Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means and standard deviations reported in Table 1 reveal that cognitive strategies are used most frequently by the respondents ($M = 45.70$, $SD = 7.25$), followed respectively by metacognitive ($M = 30.43$, $SD = 6.02$), memory ($M = 25.86$, $SD = 5.58$), compensation ($M = 19.18$, $SD = 3.41$), social ($M = 18.20$, $SD = 4.54$), and affective ($M = 16.96$, $SD = 4.17$) strategies. Thus, the three most frequently used are the cognitive, metacognitive, and memory strategies; and the three least frequently used are the compensation, social, and affective strategies.

The results of the Pearson Product-Moment correlation analysis computed to examine the relationship between the use of language learning strategies and the participants’ proficiency as measured by the verbal SAT scores are shown in Table 2 below:
Table 2

*Intercorrelations among Language Learners’ Strategies and Proficiency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Memory</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitive</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compensation</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Metacognitive</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Affective</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>415.23</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>43.35</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at $p < .05$

** Significant at $p < .01$

The results of the correlational analysis summarized in Table 2 reveal the following aspects of interest:

There is a low, negative correlation between the use of metacognitive strategies and proficiency ($r = -.20, p < .01$), and there is no correlation between the use of the other five strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, affective, and social) and proficiency, as measured by the verbal SAT. Hence, the first hypothesis is accepted: there is no statistically significant relationship between strategy use and foreign language learners’ proficiency, except between metacognitive strategies and proficiency, which leads us to reject hypothesis 1d and to accept hypotheses 1a, b, c, e, and f.
If we look at the intercorrelations among the six strategies (question 3), we notice that hypothesis 2 should be rejected: there are statistically significant intercorrelations among the six language learning strategies.

First, the results reveal that there is a moderate, positive correlation between the use of memory strategies and cognitive strategies \((r = .53, p < .01)\), a low, positive correlation between the use of memory strategies and metacognitive strategies \((r = .39, p < .01)\), and also a low, positive correlation between the use of memory strategies and affective and social \((r = .34, p < .01)\) strategies.

Second, the results show that there is a strong, positive correlation between the use of cognitive strategies and metacognitive strategies \((r = .64, p < .01)\), a moderate, positive correlation between the use of cognitive strategies and social strategies \((r = .53, p < .01)\), and a low, positive correlation between the use of cognitive strategies and compensation \((r = .29, p < .01)\) and affective \((r = .37, p < .01)\) strategies.

Third, the results show that there is a low, positive correlation between the use of compensation strategies and social strategies \((r = .24, p < .01)\).

Fourth, the results show that there is a moderate, positive correlation between the use of metacognitive strategies and affective \((r = .40, p < .01)\) and social strategies \((r = .44, p < .01)\).

Finally, the results reveal that there is a low, positive correlation between the use of affective strategies and social strategies \((r = .31, p < .01)\).

Based on the aforementioned, hypotheses 2.1a, c, d, and e, 2.2a, b, c, and d, 2.3c; 2.4a and b, and 2.5a are rejected and hypotheses 2.1b and 2.3a and b are accepted.
In order to answer question 4, composite scores on the subscales of motivation and descriptive statistics (range, means, and standard deviations) were computed for each participant, and a MANOVA analysis was conducted using gender (males vs. females) as an independent variable and the determinants of motivation (integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, effort, valence, expectancy, and ability) and overall motivation as dependent variables. Results are presented in Tables 3 and 4 below:

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Motivation Determinants by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(n = 65)</em></td>
<td><em>(n = 60)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>25.37</td>
<td>25.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td>22.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>17.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>27.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>370.92</td>
<td>391.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>406.00</td>
<td>426.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>866.19</td>
<td>909.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(n = 65)</em></td>
<td><em>(n = 60)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>25.37</td>
<td>25.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td>22.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>17.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>27.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>370.92</td>
<td>391.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>406.00</td>
<td>426.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>866.19</td>
<td>909.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

**Multivariate Analysis of Variance Summary of Determinants of Motivation by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Multivariate ANOVAa</th>
<th>Univariate ANOVAb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>Integrative Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>$F$ .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* $dfs = (6,118)$  
*b* $dfs = (1,123)$  
* $p < .05$

The results of the MANOVA analysis for male and female participants show that the third hypothesis is also accepted. The MANOVA analysis reveals that there are no overall statistically significant differences between males and females in their motivation to acquire English as a foreign language, $F(6,118) = 1.19, p = .31$. Moreover, the univariate analysis of variance shows no significant differences between males and females in their integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, expectancy, and estimation of ability. However, there are significant differences in their effort, $F(1, 123) = 4.19, p = .04$, and perception of the valence of learning English, $F(1, 123) = 3.64, p = .05$ in favor of females. The mean effort score for females is 17.15 ($SD = 2.83$), whereas the mean effort score for males is 16.08 ($SD = 3.00$). Similarly, the mean valence score for females is 27.77 ($SD = 5.25$), and the mean valence score for males is 26.00 ($SD = 5.08$). Based on the above, hypotheses 3c and d are rejected whereas hypotheses 3a, b, e, and f are accepted.
In order to answer question 5, composite scores on the subscales of the SILL and descriptive statistics (range, means, and standard deviations) were computed for each participant, and a MANOVA analysis was conducted using gender (males vs. females) as an independent variable and the types of strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, social) and overall strategies as dependent variables. Results are presented in Tables 5 and 6 below:

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Strategies by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>43.91</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150.51</td>
<td>30.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the MANOVA analysis for male and female participants show that the fourth hypothesis is rejected. The MANOVA analysis reveals that there are statistically significant differences between males and females in their strategy use, $F(6,117) = 3.81, p = .00$. Moreover, the univariate analysis of variance shows no significant differences between males and females in their use of metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. However, there are significant differences in their use of memory, $F(1, 122) = 11.17, p = .00$, cognitive, $F(1, 122) = 8.66, p = .00$, and compensation $F(1, 122) = 13.67, p = .00$ strategies, in favor of females.

The mean memory score for females is 27.73 ($SD = 5.00$), whereas the mean memory score for males is 24.48 ($SD = 5.75$). In addition, the mean cognitive score for females is 47.66 ($SD = 7.07$), and the mean cognitive score for males is 43.91 ($SD = 7.11$). Finally, the mean compensation score for females is 20.37 ($SD = 3.21$), and the mean compensation score for males is 18.25 ($SD = 3.18$).
Based on the above, hypotheses 4a, b, and c are rejected whereas hypotheses 4d, e, and f are accepted.

In order to answer question 6 regarding whether there are statistically significant differences between males and females in their proficiency level, an Independent Sample T-Test was conducted. Results are presented in Table 7 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 70)</td>
<td>(n = 59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal SAT</td>
<td>413.86</td>
<td>416.86</td>
<td>46.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the Independent Sample T-Test show that the fifth hypothesis is accepted: there are no statistically significant differences between males and females in their proficiency, based on their verbal SAT scores, $t(127) = -.39$, $p = .69$ (two-tailed). The mean score for males is 413.86 ($SD = 46.37$), and the mean score for females is 416.86 ($SD = 39.79$).

In order to address research questions 7 and 8, the participants were divided into high and low categories based on the median score (Md = 420) of their self-reported verbal SAT scores. Sixty-eight students scored 420 or below ($n = 68$), these would be the
low proficient learners), and 61 students scored above 420 ($n = 61$, these would be the high proficient learners). It is worthy to note here that out of 147 students, 18 participants (12.2%) did not report their verbal SAT scores and 129 (87.8% of the participants) did report their verbal SAT scores which ranged between 300 and 490.

In order to find out whether there are statistically significant differences in the motivation of low and high proficient EFL learners (question 7), composite scores on the subscales of motivation were computed for low and high proficient students, then descriptive statistics (range, means, and standard deviations) were computed. Finally, a MANOVA analysis was conducted. Results are presented in Tables 8 and 9 below:

### Table 8
*Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Motivation Determinants by Proficiency Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High Proficiency</th>
<th>Low Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>387.50</td>
<td>72.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>421.67</td>
<td>81.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>900.85</td>
<td>168.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

**Multivariate Analysis of Variance Summary of Determinants of Motivation by Proficiency Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Multivariate ANOVAa</th>
<th>Univariate ANOVA b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* $dfs = (6,106)$  
*b* $dfs = (1,111)$  
*p* < .05

The results of the MANOVA analysis for low and high proficient participants show that the sixth hypothesis is accepted.

The MANOVA analysis reveals that there are no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient participants in their motivation to acquire English as a foreign language, $F(6,106) = 1.13, p = .34$. Moreover, the univariate analysis of variance shows no significant differences between low and high proficient participants in their integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, valence, expectancy, and estimation of ability. However, there are significant differences in their effort, $F(1, 111) = 5.28, p = .02$, in favor of the high proficient. The mean effort score for high proficient participants is 17.00 ($SD = 2.78$), whereas the mean effort score for low proficient participants is 15.77 ($SD = 2.88$). Based on the above, hypothesis 6c is rejected whereas hypotheses 6a, b, d, e, and f are accepted.
In order to find out whether there are statistically significant differences in the use of language learning strategies of low and high proficient EFL learners (question 8), composite scores on the subscales of learning strategies were computed for low and high proficient students, then descriptive statistics (range, means, and standard deviations) were computed. Finally, a MANOVA analysis was conducted. Results are presented in Tables 10 and 11 below:

Table 10

*Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Strategies by Proficiency Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High Proficiency</th>
<th>Low Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>((n = 56))</td>
<td>((n = 54))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>25.86 5.48</td>
<td>25.98 6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>46.29 6.11</td>
<td>44.96 7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>19.57 3.28</td>
<td>19.02 3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>31.12 5.72</td>
<td>28.83 5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>16.93 4.56</td>
<td>17.09 3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>18.07 4.94</td>
<td>18.20 4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157.84 30.09</td>
<td>154.08 31.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Multivariate Analysis of Variance Summary of Learning Strategies by Proficiency Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Multivariate ANOVA</th>
<th>Univariate ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>Memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>1.22 $^a$</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$dfs = (6,103)

$^b$dfs = (1,108)

$^*p < .05$

The results of the MANOVA analysis for low and high proficient participants show that the seventh hypothesis is accepted.

The MANOVA analysis reveals that there are no statistically significant differences in the use of language learning strategies of low and high proficient EFL learners, $F(6,103) = 1.22, p = .29$. Moreover, the univariate analysis of variance shows no significant differences between low and high proficient participants in their use of memory, cognitive, compensation, affective, and social strategies. However, there are significant differences in their use of metacognitive strategies, $F(1, 108) = 4.21, p = .04$, in favor of the high proficient. The mean metacognitive score for high proficient participants is 31.12 ($SD = 5.72$), whereas the mean metacognitive score for low proficient participants is 28.83 ($SD = 5.97$). Based on the above, hypothesis 7d is rejected whereas hypotheses 6a, b, c, e, and f are accepted.
Summary of Results

The statistical analyses computed to answer the eight research questions in this study showed the following: the cognitive strategies were the most frequently used strategies, followed by metacognitive and memory strategies; and the least used strategies were the affective strategies; In addition, there were significant intercorrelations among the six LLSs, namely between the cognitive and metacognitive strategies; there were significant differences between males and females in their use of memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies, and in their effort and perception of the valence of learning English, all of them in favor of females; there were no significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their use of strategies, but there were differences between low and high proficient participants in their effort, in favor of the high proficient; and, finally, there were no significant differences between males and females in their proficiency level.

In other words, the rejected main hypotheses are only two out of seven: the second and the fourth:

- The second: there are statistically significant intercorrelations among the six language learning strategies. More specifically, hypotheses 2.1. a, c, d, and e; 2.2. a, b, c, and d; 2.3. c; 2.4. a and b; 2.5. are rejected and hypotheses 2.1. b and 2.3. a and b are accepted.
- The fourth: there are statistically significant differences between males and females in their strategy use: the differences lie in their use of memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies, in favor of females. Hence, hypotheses 4 a, b, and c are rejected whereas hypotheses 4. d, e, and f are accepted.
As for the hypotheses we accepted, they are: the first, third, fifth, sixth, and seventh.

- The first: There is no statistically significant relationship between strategy use and foreign language learners’ proficiency, except with metacognitive strategies. More specifically, hypotheses 1 a, b, c, e, and f are accepted but hypothesis 1, d is rejected.

- The third: there are no statistically significant differences between males and females in their motivation to acquire English as a foreign language, except in their effort and perception of the valence of learning English, in favor of females. More specifically, hypotheses 3. a, b, e, and f are accepted; only hypotheses 3. c and d are rejected.

- The fifth: there are no statistically significant differences between males and females in their proficiency level.

- The sixth: there are no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient participants in their motivation to acquire English as a foreign language. However, there are significant differences in their effort, in favor of the high proficient. Hence, hypothesis 6.c is rejected whereas hypotheses 6. a, b, d, e, and f are accepted.

- The seventh: there are no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their use of language learning strategies. However, there are significant differences in their use of metacognitive strategies, in favor of the high proficient. Hence, hypothesis 7.d is rejected whereas hypotheses 6. a, b, c, e, and f are accepted.
Finally, the general results of the present study concerning the role of motivation, gender, and language learning strategies in EFL proficiency are the following: first, overall motivation does not correlate with EFL proficiency, only effort does: the high proficient make more effort than the low proficient. Second, gender does not play a significant role in overall motivation; however, females make more effort and have a higher perception of the valence of learning EFL than males. Third, gender does not play a significant role in EFL proficiency. Fourth, overall strategy use does not play a significant role in EFL proficiency; however, there is a low, negative correlation between the use of metacognitive strategies and proficiency, and the high proficient use metacognitive strategies more than the less proficient.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study attempted to examine the role of motivation, gender, and language learning strategies in student proficiency.

The first research question dealt with the types of language learning strategies most frequently used by EFL learners in Lebanon. The results showed that cognitive strategies ($M = 45.70$, $SD = 7.25$) were used most frequently by the respondents, followed respectively by metacognitive ($M = 30.43$, $SD = 6.02$), memory ($M = 25.86$, $SD = 5.58$), compensation ($M = 19.18$, $SD = 3.41$), social ($M = 18.20$, $SD = 4.54$) and, lastly, affective ($M = 16.96$, $SD = 4.17$) strategies. However, it should be noted that, although cognitive strategies were ranked as the most frequently used strategies, there appears to be a wide variation in the use of those strategies among learners, given the relatively large standard deviation ($SD = 7.25$) in their responses.

The aforementioned results indicate that the participants in this study do a lot of the following: practicing, using words in different ways, starting conversations, watching TV, reading for pleasure, writing notes, skimming, looking up words, finding patterns, making summaries (components of cognitive strategies), and of the following: finding ways to use English, learning from English mistakes, paying attention, trying hard to improve, organizing time in order to study better, looking for people to talk to in English, looking for opportunities to read, having clear goals for improving, and thinking about self-progress (components of metacognitive strategies).

These findings are somewhat consistent with previous research. Studies conducted by Goh and Kwah (1997), Shmais (2003), and Liu (2004) revealed that
metacognitive strategies are the ones most frequently used, and another study conducted by Bremner (1999), revealed that compensation and metacognitive strategies are respectively the most used. Although none of those studies mentioned anything about cognitive strategies, what they reported as the most frequently used strategy is the one that ranked second in the present study, with a significant difference between its mean and the mean of the least used strategies, the affective ones. On the other hand, Chang and Huang (1999) reported that compensation strategies are the ones most commonly used, whereas the present study revealed that Lebanese students do not use compensation strategies a lot, which means they need to be trained to make guesses, use gestures, make up new words, refrain from looking up all words while reading (which they might think is the appropriate way), and finding alternative words.

As for the least frequently used strategies, according to this study, they are the social and affective strategies, with the affective ones ranking last. This means that Lebanese students need to be trained to ask for repetition or clarification when not understanding (without any feeling of shame!), to ask to be corrected, to practice, to ask for help, to ask questions in English, and to try to learn about the target language culture (components of the social strategies). In addition, they need to be trained to focus on relaxing, encouraging oneself, rewarding oneself, noticing one’s nervousness when studying the language, writing down feelings in a language learning diary, and sharing feelings (components of the affective strategies). The results of the present study are somewhat consistent with the findings of Bremner (1999) who reported that affective and memory strategies are the least used. Whereas affective strategies rank last, in the Lebanese case, memory strategies rank third, which is inconsistent with the findings of the studies conducted by Goh and Kwah (1997), Liu (2004), and Bremner (1999) which
reported that memory strategies are the least frequently used. On another note, according to Shmais (2003), the least used strategies are compensation strategies which, in this study, do rank low.

With regard to research question 2 that dealt with associations between strategy use and language proficiency among EFL learners in Lebanon, the results showed that there is no correlation between the use of the overall strategies and proficiency, as measured by learners’ self-reported scores on the verbal SAT; however, a low, negative correlation was noted between the use of metacognitive strategies and proficiency.

It is important to note here that these results are inconsistent with the research findings, especially that they imply that the higher the proficiency, the lower the use of metacognitive strategies, which is contrary to what some researchers like Oxford (1993) and Okada, Oxford, and Abo (1996) reported, namely concerning the fact of distinguishing successful learners from less successful ones based on their use of metacognitive strategies. Moreover, these findings are also inconsistent with the results that Watanabe (1990), Phillips (1991), Oxford, Park-Oh, Ito and Sumrall (1993), Green and Oxford (1995), Sheorey (1999), Osanai (2000), and Su (2005) reported, based on empirical studies, which reveal strong positive correlations between strategy use as a whole and English language proficiency, be it self-perceived or not, in favor of the higher proficient. Only one study conducted by Mullines (1992 cited Bedell & Oxford 1996, p.50) on 110 English majors in Thailand did not reveal a significant correlation between proficiency and overall strategy use. Hence, this area needs further research, especially in Lebanon.
As for the intercorrelations among the six strategies (research question 3), the results, as shown in Table 12 below, revealed that there is no statistically significant correlation between compensation strategies on the one hand and memory, metacognitive and affective strategies on the other. However, there is a:

- Strong, positive correlation between the use of
  - cognitive strategies and metacognitive strategies

- Moderate, positive correlation between the use of
  - memory strategies and cognitive strategies;
  - cognitive strategies and social strategies;
  - metacognitive strategies and affective and social strategies.

- Low, positive correlation between the use of
  - memory strategies and metacognitive, affective and social strategies;
  - cognitive strategies and compensation and affective strategies;
  - compensation strategies and social strategies;
  - affective strategies and social strategies.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These findings are consistent with a study conducted by Oxford and Ehrman (1995) which reported that there are moderate intercorrelations among the different strategies in the SILL; with another study conducted by Su (2005) whose results revealed significant relationships in all six categories of language learning strategies; and with a study conducted by Hsiao and Oxford (2002) whose results revealed the existence of problems in the method of classifying strategies in the SILL since “the strategy categories mutually support each other” (p. 379). Hence, it might be appropriate to look more closely into the different categories of the SILL and give them definitions that would not overlap.

The results regarding research question 4 that dealt with the differences between males and females in their motivation to learn English as a Foreign Language showed that there are no statistically significant differences between males and females in their motivation to acquire EFL. However, there are significant differences in their effort and perception of the valence of learning English, which is consistent with previous research conducted by Shaaban and Ghaith in 2000 at the same university, AUB. Females do make more effort than males and give more value to learning the language.

As for research question 5 regarding the differences between males and females in their use of language learning strategies, its results showed statistically significant differences between males and females in their strategy use: the differences lay in their use of memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies, in favor of females. These findings are somehow consistent with those of Goh and Kwah (1997) who reported that female students were found to use compensation strategies significantly more often than
male students, and those of Liu (2004) who reported that males differ from females in their overall use of language learning strategies, namely in their use of memory strategies, in favor of females. However, Goh and Kwah as well as Liu reported a difference between males and females in their use of affective strategies, which is not the case in the present study. Moreover, the findings of the present study are not consistent at all with those of Shmais (2003) who reported that Arab males do not differ from Arab females in their use of language learning strategies.

Moreover, the results of question 6 that dealt with the differences between males and females in their proficiency level showed that there are no statistically significant differences between males and females in their proficiency level, unlike the results of a study conducted by Al-Nu'aidi (2003) which reported that significant gender differences favoring females were found in the EFL Saudi learners' performance on tests, and of a second study conducted by Burton, Henninger, and Hafetz (2005) of Fordham University which reported that women performed better than men for verbal fluency.

Question 7 dealt with the differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their motivation. The results showed that there are no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient participants in their motivation to acquire English as a foreign language. However, there are significant differences in their effort, in favor of the high proficient. These findings are not consistent with the results of the study conducted by Shaaban and Ghaith (2000) which reported that there is a difference among students of different levels of proficiency in their effort and also in their
integrative motivation and valence, and all of them in favor of level II learners (the lower proficient), which means that the learners in level III (the higher proficient) had lower levels of integrative motivation, effort, and valence. Hence, further research needs to be conducted in this area.

Finally, the results of question 8 regarding the differences between low and high proficient learners in their use of language learning strategies revealed that there are no statistically significant differences between low and high proficient EFL learners in their use of language learning strategies. However, there are significant differences in their use of metacognitive strategies, in favor of the high proficient. The findings of this study appear to be inconsistent with those of other studies. In 1999, Bremner reported that low proficient learners differed from high proficient learners in their use of language learning strategies, namely in their use of cognitive and compensation strategies, in favor of the high proficient. In 2000, Shmais reported that low proficient learners did not differ from high proficient learners in their use of the language learning strategies, except in the cognitive strategies, in favor of the high proficient, and in the affective strategies, in favor of the less proficient who use those strategies in order to lower their anxiety and encourage themselves to store and retrieve information. Finally, in 2004, Liu reported that low proficient learners differed from high proficient learners in their overall use of language learning strategies, in favor of the high proficient. Due to those varied results, it seems extremely useful to conduct further studies that investigate the differences between low and high proficient learners in Lebanon in their use of language learning strategies.
Last but not least, it would be useful to mention the seemingly inconsistent results of research questions 2 and 8. The results of question 2 showed that there is a low, negative correlation between the use of metacognitive strategies and proficiency; which means that, the higher the proficiency, the less the use of metacognitive strategies. As for the results of question 8, they showed that the high proficient use metacognitive strategies more than the low proficient. At first, one might think that the results of those two questions contradict each other. However, after further thought, one can explain those results the following way: the high proficient in general use metacognitive strategies more than the less proficient; however, the more those high proficient get, the more self-confident they become, the less they feel the need to use metacognitive strategies and think about the way they are learning the language. Therefore, one can conclude that the results of those two questions complement each other. Further research, though, in this field, is recommended.

Before concluding this research study, it would be appropriate to list some of its limitations:

- The participants in this study represent only college students studying at an American university with a high tuition. Their socio-economic status and their educational background would not be good representatives of the Lebanese population as a whole. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be generalized to the whole Lebanese population.
- The questions in the Motivation Scale and in the SILL are not specific to the Lebanese population and culture. For example, most of the participants did not
understand the meaning of “flashcards” and are not used to writing in a diary, so those concepts seem to be irrelevant to EFL learners in Lebanon.

- The use of self-reported Verbal SAT scores in this study is a limitation and is based only on the individual respondents’ answers.
- The verbal SAT is an aptitude test rather than a proficiency test. This might explain some of the inconsistencies between the results of the present study and other results.
- The fact that multiple statistical tests have been conducted might have caused the “Problem of Multiple Statistical Tests:” as the number of tests increases, so does the chance of a false positive result (refer to Tables 4- 6- 9- and 11).

In conclusion, although the findings of the present study regarding the role of motivation, gender, and language learning strategies were inconsistent with most of the other studies reviewed, those findings did highlight the need to conduct further research in Lebanon related to motivation and, mainly, to language learning strategies, in order to shed light on the reasons behind the inconsistency of most of the findings of the present study with other studies. Furthermore, one should always bear in mind that the two variables-- motivation and language learning strategies-- play a big role in language learning, and researchers need to devise appropriate strategies that would help teachers to motivate students and to train them to use strategies that would facilitate their language learning.
APPENDIX I

PILOT SURVEY

The Role of Motivation, Gender, and Language Learning Strategies in EFL Proficiency

Nada Salem AbiSamra

Master’s Degree Thesis

TEFL

Education Department

The American University of Beirut

Fall 2005

Dear Student,

Thank you for volunteering to take part in the pilot study of the measuring instruments: “Motivation Scale” [developed by Wen (1997) and modified by Shaaban & Ghaith (2000)] and “Strategy Inventory for Language Learning” (SILL) [developed by Oxford, 1989] that will be used in the thesis titled “The Role of Motivation, Gender, and Language Learning Strategies in EFL Proficiency.”

I hope that you will answer all questions. However, you may skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. Please answer all questions honestly. Fill in ONE circle to answer each question. Mark the answers that feel right when you first read them. If there are any words/phrases that you cannot understand, please underline them and put a question mark next to them.

Confidentiality procedures: All of your answers will be kept confidential. I will not discuss the information you provide with anyone. As soon as I receive your questionnaire, I will assign it an ID number. I will then remove the top page with your name on it from your questionnaire so that your answers are not linked with your name.

Thank you for all your help!

Sincerely,

Nada Salem AbiSamra

Email: nadabs@hotmail.com

URL: http://nadabs.tripod.com
General Information

Student Name: __________________________________________

1. Give your age in years: ________________________________

2. Indicate your Gender. Please circle what applies: M    F

3. What is your major? __________________________________

4. Intensive English Level: Level I    Level II    Level III    Level IV    Level V

5. Native Language: _____________________________________

6. First foreign language: ________________________________

7. School you came from: ________________________________

8. Did you take the TOEFL or the EEE? Please circle what applies: TOEFL or EEE

9. When did you take the TOEFL or EEE (date)? ______________

10. TOEFL or EEE score:__________________________________

Motivation Scale [developed by Wen (1997) and modified by Shaaban and Ghaith (2000)]

The following are statements with which some people will agree and others will disagree. There are not right or wrong answers, since many people have different opinions. Please give your immediate reactions to each of the items. On the other hand, please do not be careless, as it is important that we obtain your true feelings. Circle the number of the alternative below the statement that best indicates your feelings about that statement.

I- Motivation Information

A- Studying English will help me …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>(Strongly disagree)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>(Strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Better understand and appreciate English art and literature</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meet and converse with more and different people</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learn about other cultures and understand the world better</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Understand the Western cultural heritage</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Because I feel English is an important language in the economic development of the world</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Better understand the problems that English speakers face</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In getting a job</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Converse and communicate with English-speaking friends
   (Strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Strongly agree)

9. Communicate in English when I travel to English-speaking countries
   (Strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Strongly agree)

10. Because I need it for my university
    (Strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Strongly agree)

B- When I learn a foreign language, I expect that:

11. I will …
    a. pass on the basis of sheer luck and intelligence
    b. do just enough work to get along
    c. try hard to learn the language
    d. enjoy doing all the work

12. I will think about the words and ideas that I have learned in my classes
    a. hardly ever
    b. once or twice per week
    c. several times during the week
    d. daily

13. I will spend about the following amount of time to practice the language after classes
    a. zero hours
    b. one hour per week
    c. four hours per week
    d. more that six hour per week

14. I will …
    a. not necessarily be active in speaking the language in class
    b. answer the questions when I am called upon
    c. volunteer to answer the questions that are easy
    d. always rewrite them, correcting my mistakes

15. After I get my English assignments back, I will …
    a. just throw them in my desk and forget them
    b. look them over but not bother correcting mistakes
    c. correct mistakes when I have time
    d. always rewrite them, correcting my mistakes

16. I will try to speak English after class:
    a. never
    b. when I have to
    c. when I am offered the opportunity to do so
    d. in a wide variety of situations and as much as possible
II. Information on learning outcomes: Valence, Expectancy, and Ability

How significant are these outcomes of your English class to you? Circle the number that best indicates your feelings about each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Valence Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To speak English fairly fluently</td>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to communicate with English speakers in basic English</td>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop comprehension of reading assignments</td>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive the grade of &quot;A&quot; in course</td>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To better understand English people and their way of thinking</td>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn about English culture and customs</td>
<td>Very Insignificant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How probable is that you will achieve the above outcomes from the English class that you are taking now? Circle the expected probability for each outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Probability Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To speak English fairly fluently</td>
<td>No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To communicate with English speakers in basic English</td>
<td>No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop reading comprehension in English</td>
<td>No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive the grade of &quot;A&quot; from the class</td>
<td>No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To better understand English people and their way of thinking</td>
<td>No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn more about English culture and customs</td>
<td>No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you think of your own ability to achieve the above outcomes? Circle your estimated ability for each outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Ability Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To speak English fairly fluently</td>
<td>Very Low Ability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 Very High Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to communicate with English speakers in basic English</td>
<td>Very Low Ability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 Very High Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop reading comprehension in English</td>
<td>Very Low Ability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 Very High Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive the grade of &quot;A&quot; in course</td>
<td>Very Low Ability 0 10 20 30 40 50 Very High Ability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. To better understand English people and their way of thinking

| Very Low Ability | 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 | Very High Ability |

6. To learn more about English customs and culture

| Very Low Ability | 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 | Very High Ability |

**Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)**

(Oxford, 1989)

This form of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) is for students of English as a second or foreign language. You will find statements about learning English. Please read each one and write the response (1, 2, 3, 4 or 5) that tells HOW TRUE OF YOU THE STATEMENT IS in the space next to the statement.

1. Never or almost never true of me.
2. Usually not true of me.
3. Somewhat true of me.
4. Usually true of me.
5. Always or almost always true of me.

NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME means that the statement is very rarely true of you.
USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true less than half the time.
SOMewhat TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you about half the time.
USUALLY TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true more than half the time.
ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you almost always.

Answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Work as quickly as you can without being careless. This usually takes about 20-30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, let the teacher know immediately.

**Part A: Memory**

| 1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English. | (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True) |
| 2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them. | (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True) |
| 3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word. | (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True) |
| 4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used. | (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True) |
| 5. I use rhymes to remember new English words. | (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True) |
| 6. I use flashcards to remember new English words. | (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True) |
| 7. I physically act out new English words. | (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True) |
| 8. I review English lessons often. | (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True) |
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part B: Cognitive**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. I say or write new English words several times.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I try to talk like native English speakers.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I practise the sounds of English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I use the English words I know in different ways.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I start conversations in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I read for pleasure in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I try to find patterns in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I try not to translate word-for-word.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part C: Compensation**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I read English without looking up every new word.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part D: Metacognitive**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I look for people I can talk to in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I think about my progress in learning English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part E: Affective**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part F: Social**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I practise English with other students.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I ask for help from English speakers.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I ask questions in English.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.</td>
<td>(Never True)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your time.
APPENDIX II

MODIFIED SURVEY

The Role of Motivation, Gender, and Language Learning Strategies in EFL Proficiency.

Nada Salem AbiSamra
Master’s Degree Thesis
TEFL
Education Department
The American University of Beirut
Fall 2005

Dear Student,

Thank you for volunteering to take part in the study of the measuring instruments: “Motivation Scale” [developed by Wen (1997) and modified by Shaaban & Ghaith (2000)] and “Strategy Inventory for Language Learning” (SILL) [developed by Oxford, 1989] that will be used in the thesis titled “The Role of Motivation, Gender, and Language Learning Strategies in EFL Proficiency.”

I hope that you will answer all questions. However, you may skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. Please answer all questions honestly. Fill in ONE circle to answer each question. Mark the answers that feel right when you first read them. If there are any words/phrases that you cannot understand, please underline them and put a question mark next to them.

Confidentiality procedures: All of your answers will be kept confidential. I will not discuss the information you provide with anyone. As soon as I receive your questionnaire, I will assign it an ID number. I will then remove the top page with your name on it from your questionnaire so that your answers are not linked with your name.

Thank you for all your help!

Sincerely,

Nada Salem AbiSamra
Email: nadabs@hotmail.com
URL: http://nadabs.tripod.com
General Information

Student Name: ____________________________

1. Give your age in years: ____________________________ (Example: 18 years old)

2. Indicate your Gender. Please circle what applies: M     F

3. What are you majoring in? ____________________________

4. Intensive English Level (100): Section ______

5. Native Language: ____________________________

6. First foreign language: ____________________________

7. Name and location of the school you came from: ____________________________

8. Did you take the TOEFL or the EEE? Please circle what applies: TOEFL or EEE

9. When did you take the TOEFL or EEE (date)? ____________

10. TOEFL or EEE score: ____________________________

11. SAT Verbal Score: ____________________________

Motivation Scale (MS) [developed by Wen (1997) and modified by Shaaban and Ghaith (2000)]

The following are statements with which some people will agree and others will disagree. There are not right or wrong answers, since many people have different opinions. Please give your immediate reactions to each of the items. On the other hand, please do not be careless, as it is important that we obtain your true feelings. Circle the number of the alternative below the statement that best indicates your feelings about that statement.

I- Motivation Information

A- Studying English will help me …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>(Strongly disagree)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>(Strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Better understand and appreciate (find value in) English art and literature</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meet and converse with more and different people</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learn about other cultures and understand the world better</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Understand the Western cultural heritage (التراث الثقافي الغربي)</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Because I feel English is an important language in the economic development of the world</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Better understand the problems that English speakers face</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In getting a job</td>
<td>(Strongly disagree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Converse and communicate with English-speaking friends
   *(Strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Strongly agree)*

9. Communicate in English when I travel to English-speaking countries
   *(Strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Strongly agree)*

10. Because I need it for my university
    *(Strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Strongly agree)*

B- When I learn a foreign language, I expect that:

11. I will …
    a. pass on the basis of sheer (complete) luck and intelligence
    b. do just enough work to get along
    c. try hard to learn the language
    d. enjoy doing all the work

12. I will think about the words and ideas that I have learned in my classes
    a. hardly ever
    b. once or twice per week
    c. several times during the week
    d. daily

13. I will spend about the following amount of time to practice the language after classes (How much time will you spend, after classes, to practice the language?)
    a. zero hours
    b. one hour per week
    c. four hours per week
    d. more than six hour per week

14. I will …
    a. not necessarily be active in speaking the language in class
    b. answer the questions when I am called upon (asked)
    c. volunteer to answer the questions that are easy
    d. always rewrite the answers, correcting my mistakes

15. After I get my English assignments back, I will …
    a. just throw them in my desk and forget them
    b. look them over but not bother correcting mistakes
    c. correct mistakes when I have time
    d. always rewrite them, correcting my mistakes

16. I will try to speak English after class:
    a. never
    b. when I have to
    c. when I am offered the opportunity to do so
    d. in a wide variety of situations and as much as possible
II. Information on learning outcomes:

How significant (important) are these outcomes of your English class to you? Circle the number that best indicates your feelings about each statement.

| 1. To speak English fairly fluently (well- بطلاقة) | (Very Insignificant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Very Significant) |
| 2. To be able to communicate with English speakers in basic English | (Very Insignificant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Very Significant) |
| 3. To develop comprehension of reading assignments | (Very Insignificant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Very Significant) |
| 4. To receive the grade of "A" in course | (Very Insignificant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Very Significant) |
| 5. To better understand English people and their way of thinking | (Very Insignificant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Very Significant) |
| 6. To learn about English culture and customs | (Very Insignificant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (Very Significant) |

How probable is it that you will achieve the above outcomes from the English class that you are taking now? (What are your chances of success in the following?) Circle the expected probability for each outcome.

| 1. To speak English fairly fluently | No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability |
| 2. To communicate with English speakers in basic English | No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability |
| 3. To develop reading comprehension in English | No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability |
| 4. To receive the grade of "A" from the class | No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability |
| 5. To better understand English people and their way of thinking | No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability |
| 6. To learn more about English culture and customs | No Probability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% Probability |

What do you think of your own ability to achieve the above outcomes? (How capable are you to achieve the above outcomes?) Circle your estimated ability for each outcome.

| 1. To speak English fairly fluently | Very Low Ability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 Very High Ability |
| 2. To be able to communicate with English speakers in basic English | Very Low Ability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 Very High Ability |
| 3. To develop comprehension of reading assignments | Very Low Ability 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 Very High Ability |
4. To receive the grade of "A" in course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Low Ability</th>
<th>0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</th>
<th>Very High Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. To better understand English people and their way of thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Low Ability</th>
<th>0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</th>
<th>Very High Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. To learn more about English customs and culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Low Ability</th>
<th>0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</th>
<th>Very High Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Good work! You have now finished the first part of the survey. You can rest for a few minutes before you start the second part. You need to rest so that you can focus well on the second part. Please do not disturb the other students who are still working, though.

When you are ready, start the strategy inventory, part II; it should take no longer than 25 minutes. Take your time and answer honestly. We are counting on your honesty! Thank you in advance.

**Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)**

(Oxford, 1989)

This form of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) is for students of English as a second or foreign language. You will find statements about learning English. Please read each one and write the response (1, 2, 3, 4 or 5) that tells HOW TRUE OF YOU THE STATEMENT IS in the space next to the statement.

1. Never or almost never true of me.
2. Usually not true of me.
3. Somewhat true of me.
4. Usually true of me.
5. Always or almost always true of me.

NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME means that the statement is very rarely true of you. USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true less than half the time. SOMewhat TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you about half the time. USUALLY TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true more than half the time. ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you almost always.

Answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Work as quickly as you can without being careless. This usually takes about 20-30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, let the teacher know immediately.

**Part A:**

1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never True</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
(I relate what I am studying to what I already know).

2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.  
   (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.  
   (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.  
   (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

5. I use rhymes (example: achieve and believe- ﻗﺎﻓﻴﺔ، ﺳﺠﻊ to remember new English words.  
   (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

6. I use flashcards to remember new English words. (Flashcards are cards on which I write the words I am studying on one side and their definitions on the other side, to help myself learn those words)  
   (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

7. I physically act out new English words (example: for the word jump, I physically jump up and down).  
   (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

8. I review English lessons often.  
   (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.  
   (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

**Part B:**

10. I say or write new English words several times.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

11. I try to talk like native English speakers.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

12. I practise the sounds of English.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

13. I use the English words I know in different ways.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

16. I read for pleasure in English.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

20. I try to find patterns in English. (A pattern = ﻟﻤﺸﻄ)  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

22. I try not to translate word-for-word.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)

23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.  
    (Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)
**Part C:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I read English without looking up every new word.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part D:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I look for people I can talk to in English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I think about my progress in learning English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part E:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. If I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English, I do notice that (الأخطئ تلك)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary (دفتر لتدوين اليوميات)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part F:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I practise English with other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I ask for help from English speakers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I ask questions in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Never True) 1 2 3 4 5 (Always True)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your time.
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