

BUKTI KORESPONDENSI
ARTIKEL JURNAL NASIONAL TERAKREDITASI SINTA 2


Judul artikel : A Study On University Students' Self-Regulated Motivation To Improve Efl Speaking Across Academic Levels

Jurnal : *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 2024, Volume 12(2), 661-676.


Penulis : Silih Warni, Tri Wintolo Apoko, Martriwati, Angsu-orn Na Nongkhai

No.	Perihal	Tanggal
1.	Bukti konfirmasi submit artikel dan artikel yang disubmit	16 Februari 2024
2.	Bukti review dan hasil review	27 Februari 2024
3.	Bukti konfirmasi submit revisi dan artikel yang diresubmit	4 Maret 2024
4.	Bukti konfirmasi artikel accepted	17 April 2024
5.	Bukti konfirmasi artikel published online	22 April 2024











**1. Bukti Konfirmasi Submit Artikel
dan Artikel yang Disubmit
(16 Februari 2024)**



JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching
2338-0810 (Print), 2621-1378 (Online) Website: ojs e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/jollt/index
Accredited Sinta by Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia
Decree No. 79/E/KPT/2023, July 2023



[HOME](#) | [ABOUT](#) | [USER HOME](#) | [SEARCH](#) | [CURRENT](#) | [ARCHIVES](#) | [ANNOUNCEMENTS](#)

INDEXED/LISTED BY
         

Home > User > Author > Submissions > #10870 > Summary

#10870 Summary

SUMMARY REVIEW EDITING

Submission

Authors	Silih Warni, Tri Wintolo Apoko, Martriwati Martriwati, Angsu-orn Na Nongkhai
Title	A Study on University Students' Self-Regulated Motivation to Improve EFL Speaking Skills Across Academic Levels
Original file	10870-39098-5-SM.DOCX 2024-02-16
Supp. files	None
Submitter	Dr Silih Warni
Date submitted	February 16, 2024 - 04:07 PM
Section	Articles
Editor	Cut Meutia
Abstract Views	572

ADDITIONAL MENU
[FOCUS AND SCOPE](#)
[PUBLICATION ETHICS](#)
[EDITORIAL TEAM](#)
[REVIEWER](#)
[OPEN ACCESS POLICY](#)
[SCREENING PLAGIARISM](#)
[AUTHOR GUIDELINES](#)
[ONLINE SUBMISSION](#)
[AUTHOR FEES](#)



JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching
2338-0810 (Print), 2621-1378 (Online) Website: ojs e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/jollt/index
Accredited Sinta by Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia
Decree No. 79/E/KPT/2023, July 2023



[HOME](#) | [ABOUT](#) | [USER HOME](#) | [SEARCH](#) | [CURRENT](#) | [ARCHIVES](#) | [ANNOUNCEMENTS](#)

INDEXED/LISTED BY
         

Home > User > Author > Archive

Archive

ACTIVE ARCHIVE

ID	MM-DD SUBMIT	SEC	AUTHORS	TITLE	STATUS
10870	02-16	ART	Warni, Apoko, Martriwati, Nongkhai	A STUDY ON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' SELF-REGULATED MOTIVATION...	Vol 12, No 2 (2024)

1 - 1 of 1 Items

Start a New Submission

[CLICK HERE](#) to go to step one of the five-step submission process.

Refbacks

ALL NEW PUBLISHED IGNORED

	DATE ADDED	HITS	URL	ARTICLE	TITLE	STATUS	ACTION
<input type="checkbox"/>	2024-04-23	5	https://elkite-ildikti3.kemdikbud.go.id/	A Study on University	—	New	EDIT DELETE

ADDITIONAL MENU
[FOCUS AND SCOPE](#)
[PUBLICATION ETHICS](#)
[EDITORIAL TEAM](#)
[REVIEWER](#)
[OPEN ACCESS POLICY](#)
[SCREENING PLAGIARISM](#)
[AUTHOR GUIDELINES](#)
[ONLINE SUBMISSION](#)
[AUTHOR FEES](#)
[CONTACT](#)
[ABSTRACTING/INDEXING](#)
[JOURNAL HISTORY](#)

A STUDY ON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' SELF-REGULATED MOTIVATION ACROSS ACADEMIC LEVELS

¹Silih Warni, ²Tri Wintolo Apoko, ³Martriwati

¹English Lecturer, Department of English, Faculty of Teachers Training and Pedagogy,
University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr.Hamka, Indonesia

silihwarni@uhamka.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract (10pt, Bold)
Article History	
Received:	<i>Students in most universities in non-English Speaking countries have limited opportunities to speak English in class. Self-regulated learning enables some self-motivated students to find opportunities outside the classroom to have face to face and virtual interaction to enhance their English speaking. This study is intended to examine the level of self-regulated motivation of university students to improve their Speaking of English as a foreign language (SRMIS-EFL). Moreover, this study investigates if students' SRMIS-EFL differ among academic levels. 156 EFL students from an English Department in a private university in Jakarta took part in this study. Self-reported SRMIS-EFL questionnaire was used as the data collecting method. Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis were then conducted. The findings showed that the overall SRMIS-ELF level of students was high. Moreover, students used various self-regulatory motivation strategies to enhance their EFL speaking skills. As for the aspect of academic level, the results of this study shows that SRMIS-EFL of senior students are lower than SRMIS-EFL of junior students , and there is a statistically significant difference of students' SRMIS-EFL across academic levels. The results of this study indicate that motivational regulation instruction should be included in EFL curricula to increase students' awareness of motivational self-regulation strategies to enhance their self-regulated motivation.</i>
Revised:	
Published:	
Keywords	
<i>self-regulated learning, self-regulated motivation, academic level</i>	
How to cite:	

INTRODUCTION

One essential skill that helps lay the groundwork for lifelong learning is self-regulated learning, or SRL (Dent & Koenka, 2016). According to Zimmerman, B. J., and Schunk (Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, 2011). SRL is defined as a dynamic process in which learners actively engage and maintain thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that are methodically focused on achieving personal objectives.

Due to university students' need to self-organize their studies, SRL is particularly significant in higher education (Broadbent, 2017; Broadbent & Poon, 2015). Higher education students who use

more effective SRL techniques do better academically (Schneider & Preckel, 2017) and report higher levels of study satisfaction (Liborius et al., 2019).

In order to develop language competence, it is necessary to have both input and output. Input provides learners with exposure of the context-specific target language (Mackey, A., & Gass, 2015), while output enables them to produce written or spoken language (Swain, 1985). However, according to Dornyei (1990), some Setting in a foreign language does not provide sufficient input or opportunities for output, which results in more challenging language learning and requires learners to make more effort in learning the language. In this situation, an independent language learning process concerning what, when, how and where to learn (Kellenberg et al., 2019) which is referred to as self-regulated learning (SRL) (Ore et al., 2018) becomes an alternative solution to deal with the complexities of learning foreign languages. Self-regulated learning is concerned with the regulation of various aspects of learning including cognitive, affective, behavioral, and motivational aspects.

For enhancing their EFL speaking in university contexts where lecturers and students have limited opportunities to practice English speaking inside the classroom, some self-motivated students embrace SRL to create and catch opportunities to speak English outside the classroom. Moreover, they make use of in person and virtual human interaction supported by technology, to enhance their language learning (M Alotumi, 2020). With the support of available and portable technology such as mobile devices, university students could learn EFL anywhere (M Alotumi, 2020). SRL enables students to learn more flexibly in terms of time and place, which is energized by their motivational beliefs (Bai & Wang, 2021; Ge, 2021; Kryshko et al., 2020).

Self-regulated Motivation (SRM) refers to motivational orientation of Pintrich's (2004) SRL conceptual framework (Uztosun (2020). Furthermore, Uztosun (2020) defined SRM as techniques or tactics used by students to preserve their self-regulation (SRL) by controlling their motivational beliefs. Despite the evident necessity of integrating SRM into EFL instruction, few studies have been conducted in this area—as far as the researcher is concerned—looking into students' SRM to improve their EFL speaking. In the Indonesian context particularly, there has been no study concerning SRM for improving EFL speaking. Several existing studies on SRM have shown mixed results concerning the connection between self-regulated motivation of college students' and their gender and academic level (e.g. Sun & Wang, 2020; Teng & Zhang, 2020; Yan et al., 2020). This study is therefore intended to investigate EFL students' SRMIS-EFL in Indonesian higher education context and examine if students' SRMIS-EFL differ across academic levels.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Self-regulated Learning (SRL)

A number of descriptions concerning SRL have been suggested by different authors as it plays important role in the learning process (Uztosun, 2021). The term SRL encompasses various aspects of learning, including motivation, metacognition, and the regulation of cognitive skills and strategies (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). Winne (1996) defined SRL with more emphasis on the function of metacognition; SLR refers to metacognitively guided behavior to regulate cognitive strategies when dealing with a learning task. As this study is concerned with students' motivation to speak English outside the classroom for their English speaking skills development, the goal-oriented nature of SRM becomes relevant. A model which informed this study' theoretical framework is the model suggested by Pintrich (2004), which is based on the social-cognitive theory of Bandura (1986).

In addition to some definitions of SRL conceptualized from an goal-oriented viewpoint, other definitions put emphasis on the SRL metacognitive aspect (Huh & Reigeluth, 2017). SRL was defined by Schunk, D.H., Zimmerman (2012) as the process by which students maintain and engage in thoughts, actions, and emotions that are methodically focused on achieving their objectives. This

study is focused on the goal-oriented perspective of SRL as establishing specific goals suitable with the nature of speaking is prominent to develop speaking skills.

Self-regulated learners control their behaviors while learning by activating their cognitive processes in ways suitable to the learning tasks. They control their emotion by developing positive states (e.g., self-confidence, and interest) and minimizing negative states such as anxiety and frustration. Self-regulated learners are autonomous learners with a capacity to take control of their learning goals suitable with their learning contexts (Klimas, 2017) and other aspects of learning such as various learning strategies to achieve their goals (Barry J. Zimmerman, 2002). Moreover, self-regulated learners control their cognitive processes (Butler & Winne, 1995) and cope with difficulties in their learning (Hwang & Lee, 2019). They have a capacity to critically reflect on their learning experiences (Mekala, S., & Radhakrishnan, 2019) and develop internal feedback (Hattie, J., & Timperley, 2007). Instead of attributing failure to outside forces, they grow in self-awareness (Nakata, 2019).

SRL places a strong emphasis on how students may consciously activate, sustain, and modify their affect, cognition, and behavior in order to meet their learning objectives (Barry J. Zimmerman, 2013). SRL involves a cyclical and dynamic process wherein students must use a variety of techniques to actively manage their thoughts, convictions, observable behaviors, and learning situations (Barry J. Zimmerman, 2013). As a result, SRL techniques incorporate a variety of elements to control motivation, social behavior, metacognition, and cognition in various learning environments (Oxford, 2017; Barry J. Zimmerman, 2013). Promoting SRL strategies necessitates motivational support to assist students commence, sustain, and improve their learning efforts (Schunk, D.H., & Greene, 2018; Zimmerman, B.J., & Schunk, 2008).

SRL incorporates various components of skills; determining learning objectives, utilizing effective learning strategies, monitoring learning progress, reorganizing the physical and social environment, managing time, self-evaluating learning strategies and results, and modifying future approaches (Barry J. Zimmerman, 2002). Restructuring the social context is one of the most important of these since it affects goal setting and can thus result in different goal pathways (Boekaerts, M., & Niemivirta, 2000). Thus, it is reasonable to say that students control their learning according to their understanding of the context, and that self-regulation is started by looking at the elements of the learning context (Boekaerts, M., & Niemivirta, 2000).

This element is highly pertinent to the study's objectives because it highlights the need for effective analysis of the drawbacks of a monolingual learning environment and learning regulation to address issues with input/output opportunities. Enhancing foreign language speaking proficiency requires these components. Based on this presumption, this study defines self-regulating learners as people who take initiative to address the insufficient chances for input and output in their learning environments and actively search for new opportunities to learn and communicate in a foreign language. With its characteristics and requirements, SRL could promote academic achievement (Bai & Wang, 2020; Theobald, 2021), and self-regulated learners could succeed in foreign language learning (Atay, 2022; Puspitasari & Ishak, 2023).

Self-regulated Motivation (SRM)

With regards to the motivational aspects, the term Self-regulated motivation (SRM) is referred to as the degree to which students make an effort to establish, sustain, and encourage motivation (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). Several learning characteristics, including learner effort, perseverance, self-efficacy, outcome anticipation, and goal orientation, are likely to be impacted by SRM. (Huh & Reigeluth, 2017; Uztosun, 2021; Christopher A. Wolters, 2003).

In the context of learning, SRM establishes the degree to which students start, continue, or increase their willingness to begin, put effort into, or finish a specific task or objective (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). This perspective acknowledges SRM as the founder of SRL and highlights the highly driven nature of self-regulated learners (B. J. Zimmerman, 2021) who make a conscious effort to affect their motivation level, primarily by their intrinsic motivation (Wolters, C. A., & Benzon, 2013). This calls for understanding the fundamental mechanisms that govern motivation and control ideas, and/or behaviors in order to make wise decisions, put in consistent effort, and/or persevere through learning activities (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003).

The concept of SRM relates to Deci and Ryan's (Deci, E. L., & Ryan, 1985) self-determination theory (SDT) of motivation, which examines how self-determined and self-motivated a person's activities are. The theory is based on the idea that various motivational styles are linked to various regulatory styles and behavioral attributes. Deci and Ryan (2002) suggested different motivation and regulation types in the self-determination continuum ranging from amotivation, extrinsic motivation, and intrinsic motivation. Amotivation, at the leftmost of the spectrum refers to nonregulation and non-self-determined behavior. On the other hand, intrinsic motivation, which is at the right end of the continuum, deals with intrinsic regulation and self-determined actions. Understanding the relationship between various motivation, regulation, and self-determined behavior requires an understanding of SDT and its continuum.

Another view of SRM suggests that SRM comprises three important aspects: motivation awareness, motivation monitoring, and motivation control (Wolters, C. A., & Benzon, 2013). In order to control motivation, individuals need to learn about motivational regulating techniques and how to hold views about subjects, fields, and assignments (Uztosun, 2021). In order to regulate motivation, learners also need to monitor their motivation during their learning tasks. Moreover, learners have to understand what deliberate actions need to take to manage their effort, motivation, and perseverance.

According to Wolters (2003), there are a variety of strategies that are applicable to regulate motivation. The first strategy is self-consequating; a learner promises him/herself a reward after doing a task. Goal-oriented self-talk is another strategy when a learner reminds himself of his/her learning goal. The third strategy is interest enhancement; a learner promotes interest toward the learning task. Other strategies include environmental structuring such as setting up a physical study environment, selhandicapping, such as blaming external factors for failure, control over attribution, such as attributing success internally, efficacy management, such as raising perceived level of self-efficacy, and emotion control, such as managing affect.

SRM plays an important role in foreign language learning as it affects students' effort, perseverance, expectations for their results, and goal-orientedness (Huh & Reigeluth, 2017; Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). In this present study, the term self-regulated speaking motivation (SRSM) is used as the measure of how well students manage their intrinsic motivation to improve their speaking abilities. (Uztosun, 2021).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study is intended to investigate Indonesian junior and senior EFL university students' SRMIS-EFL. Moreover, it looks at the connection between students' academic level and their SRMIS-EFL.

Research Design

Utilizing a quantitative survey design, this study investigates Indonesian EFL college students' overall level of SRMIS-EFL and examine the correlation between students' academic levels and their levels of RSMIS-EFL. Survey enables researcher to gain a numerical depiction of patterns,

beliefs, and attitudes as well as to examine connections among a population's variables, by investigating the sample of the population (Creswell, John W., 2017). According to Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison (2018), surveys are conducted to gather facts at a specific moment in time to characterize the nature of the current circumstances, or examining the relationships between specific events. In this study, data collection by means of questionnaire as the best instrument to measure students' motivational self-regulatory strategies (Dörrenbächer-Ulrich et al., 2021), was conducted during the 2021/2022 academic year.

Subject

The participants of the study comprised 156 students of a private university in Jakarta majoring in English at the English Department. 78 were juniors – first- and second-year students who were still having speaking courses, and 78 students were seniors – third- and fourth-year students who were no longer taking any speaking course. In an English as a foreign language learning context, students' opportunities to practice their speaking outside the classroom are limited. To get better at speaking in English as a foreign language, they must rely on themselves. As for the seniors, there are no longer any formal speaking courses offered in their curriculum. This study applied convenience sampling in where responders were selected in accordance with their availability and convenience (Creswell, John W., 2017). University students majoring in English at the Faculty of teachers training and pedagogy participated in this research voluntarily.

Instruments

This study applied online questionnaire to collect the data concerning students' SRMIS-EFL. The questionnaire contained two primary sections; the first section was about demographics, and a modified online version of Uztosun's (2020) self-regulated motivation for improving speaking English as a foreign language (SRMIS-EFL) scale was included in the second section. The demographics section comprised two questions that aimed to gather data on the respondents' gender and academic level. However, the aspect of gender was excluded in this article since this study is intended to examine the levels of SRMIS-EFL across academic levels. The SRMIS-EFL scale's section incorporated four subsections. The first part is concerned with students' task value activation. It consists of seven items (items 1–7) which measure the importance of EFL speaking skill development for students. The second subsection deals with students' control over learning environment. This second part comprises five items (items 8–12), measuring the degree to which students surpassed the limitations of EFL environments with little input to be exposed to a variety of English-language references. The third subsection with three items (items 13–15) addressed regulation of affect. This subsection examined students' ability to control emotional aspects that can prevent them from becoming proficient EFL speakers. The fourth subsection comprising five items (items 16–20), are concerned with students' regulation of classroom environment. It assessed students' active engagement in classroom tasks and activities. Every item of the questionnaire was measured using a 5-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5). The questionnaires were then presented in the online version by means of Google Form. The online questionnaire enabled the researcher to obtain numerical data from many participants with less cost, effort and time. Moreover, the use of online survey could reduce errors of data entry and enable the gathering of data into structured spreadsheets for data analysis (Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, 2018).

Through WhatsApp groups of students from year one, year two, year three and year four, the researcher informed the students about the objectives of the study and invited students' participation. The researcher expressed an appreciation of students' willingness to voluntarily take part in this study before distributing the online questionnaire and collecting the data. Students were asked to fill in the online questionnaire once with their utmost honesty. The link of the online questionnaire could be

accessed through students' WhatsApp groups, and students could fill in it from 22 June until 14 July 2022. During three weeks, 78 EFL junior students (year 1 and 2) and 78 EFL university senior students (year 3 and 4) responded to the online questionnaire.

According to Uztosun (2020), the SRMIS-EFL scale demonstrated strong validity and reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$), with excellent reliabilities across all sub-scales (Cronbach's $\alpha > .80$). However, as the questionnaires were translated into Indonesian and targeted for Indonesian respondents, the validity and reliability of the instruments were checked with the data collected from 156 respondents.

The Result of validity and reliability test of the instrument

To be regarded as valid instrument, every item in the questionnaire that was translated into Indonesian was examined for validity and reliability. According to the table of r value, with the number of 156 participants, the instrument's validity test results in r value of 0.1313. Every item in the questionnaire has an r value that is higher than the r table, according to the findings of the validity analysis conducted using SPSS. It could be concluded every item in the questionnaire is valid. Furthermore, the reliability test of the instrument using SPSS results in alpha cronbach of $0.920 > 0.6$., indicating that the instrument in this study is reliable.

Data Analysis

The responses from the participants in Google Form were downloaded for data tabulation and analysis. The data were then sorted based on respondents' academic levels: one answered by senior students, and the other one by junior students. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v. 26) for descriptive and inferential statistics.

Descriptive statistics were calculated to find the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of respondents' perceptions toward their level of SRMIS-EFL. As for the inferential statistics, independent t-test was conducted to draw conclusion whether there is a significant difference of students' SRMIS-EFL across academic levels.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

This study is intended to investigate students' SRMIS-EFL and examine its correlation with their academic level. The data collected through questionnaires from 156 EFL students respondents were then analyzed, and the next section presents the data analysis results.

Demographic Data of The Respondents

The demographic information of the participants could be seen in table 1.
Table 1. Demographic data of the participants

No	Demographic Characteristics	Students	
		Total	%
1.	Gender		
	Male	23	
	Female	83	
2.	Academic level		
	Senior (year 3 and 4)	78	50
	Junior (year 1 and 2)	78	50
3.	Reasons for taking English Department		
	Students' own choice	18	
	Suggestions from others	86	

Data from 156 EFL university students were gathered and analyzed. The number of junior students is the same as that of senior students (78 juniors and 78 seniors). The frequencies and percentages of students by academic level are shown in Table 2.

Senior Students' Levels of SRMIS-EFL

Students from higher semesters responded to the 20 questions in the questionnaire. The percentages of their responses could be seen in able 2

Table 2. Frequency percentages for SRMIS-EFL among senior EFL college students (n = 78).

No.	Statements/Items	Percent (%)				
		SD	D	U	A	SA
1	I remind myself that I need to speak English Well	0	0	5.1	38.5	56.4
2	When the teacher speaks in English, I listen to him/her carefully	0	0	2.6	34.6	62.8
3	I develop my interest and willingness to learn English	0	1.3	15.4	38.5	44.9
4	When I speak English, I learn from my mistakes.	0	0	6.4	37.2	56.4
5	I learn from the mistakes other people make in order to speak English more correctly.	1.3	2.6	16.7	33.3	46.2
6	I try to pay attention all the time in English lessons.	0	1.3	6.4	44.9	47.4
7	I try various ways to increase my motivation to speak English.	0	2.6	10.3	30.8	56.4
8	I try to find friends from different countries to practice English.	0	14.1	29.5	23.1	33.3
9	I try to communicate with foreigners in English on the internet,	1.3	9	16.7	38.5	34.6
10	I make contact with English native speakers.	10.3	26.9	35.9	12.8	14.1
11	I try to visit places with lots of foreign tourists to improve my English-speaking skills.	15.4	30.8	34.6	9	10.3
12	I try to practice my English when I meet foreigners.	7.7	14.1	24.4	38.5	15.4
13	When I speak English, I can overcome my fear.	2.6	16.7	44.9	23.1	12.8
14	When I speak English, I can cope with my anxiety.	3.8	24.4	35.9	28.2	7.7
15	When I speak English, I try to maintain a high level of my confidence.	1.3	5.1	19.2	50	24.4
16	I use every opportunity during lessons to speak English.	1.3	3.8	37.2	39.7	17.9
17	I speak in English with the people I know (e.g., classmates, friends).	0	2.6	23.1	42.3	32.1
18	In class, I try to take part in English speaking activities as much as possible.	2.6	9	38.5	35.9	14.1
19	I support the idea of speaking English in class.	1.3	2.6	34.6	35.9	25.6
20	I spend time with friends who motivate each other to speak English.	5.1	7.7	15.4	44.9	26.9
SD: Strongly Disagree D: Disagree U: Undecided A: Agree						
SA: Strongly Agree						

Using a Likert-type scale, the senior student participants answered 20 statements to determine their SRMIS-EFL level. Table 2 shows the frequency of responses to the 20-item SRMIS-EFL scale comprising students' level of task value activation (items1-7), students' level of regulating learning environment (8–12), students' level of regulating affect (13–15) and students' level of regulating classroom environment (16–20). Referring to Alotumi's (2021) mean score interpretation framework, the SRM levels are categorized into five levels. The mean score of 1.0 to ≤ 1.8 is considered a very low motivation level, 1.8 to ≤ 2.6 is considered as low, 2.6 to ≤ 3.4 is considered medium, 3.4 to ≤ 4.2 is considered as high and a mean score of 4.2 to ≤ 5.0 is considered a very high motivation level.

Overall, the following table shows that the SRMIS-EFL level of senior students was high, with an overall response mean of 3.8 and a standard deviation of 0.5.

Table 3. Distribution of SRMIS-EFL mean scores for senior students.

Scale	Mean	Median	Mode	SD	Range
Task value activation	4.4	4.4	5	0.5	2
Regulation of learning environment	3.3	3.4	2.6	0.8	3.6
Regulation of affect	3.4	3.3	3.3	0.8	4
Regulation of classroom environment	3.8	3.8	4.2	0.7	3.6
Overall senior SRMIS-EFL	3.8	3.8	3.7	0.6	2.4

As can be seen in table 3, concerning task value activation, senior students' mean score was 4.4 (SD = 0.5), indicating a very high level of activating task value. Majority of the senior student participants agreed or strongly agreed about reminding themselves that they need to speak English well (94.4 %), listening to the teacher carefully when he/she speaks in English (96.8%), developing their interest and willingness to learn English (83.4%), learning from their mistakes when they speak English (93.6%), learning from the mistakes other people make in order to speak English more correctly (79.5%), trying to pay attention all the time in English lessons (92.3), and trying various ways to increase their motivation to speak English (87.2%).

Regarding regulation of learning environment, the responses from senior students had a mean score of 3.3. (SD = 0.8), demonstrating a medium level of control over the learning environment. The majority of senior student participants (73.1%) agreed and strongly agreed that they try to use English to communicate with foreigners online. More than half of the participants (56.4 %) agreed and strongly agreed that they try to find friends from different countries to practice their English. Only a small number of participants (36.9 %) made contact with English native speakers. Majority of student respondents try to practice their English when meeting foreigners (53.9%). About half of senior student participants (46.2%) disagreed and strongly disagreed about attempting to visit places where there are lots of foreigners to improve their English skills.

With regards to the control of affect, the mean score of senior students' responses was 3.4 (SD = 0.8), representing a medium degree of affect regulation. Almost half of the senior student participants (44.0%) were undecided whether they could overcome their fear when they speak English. 48% of them agreed or strongly agreed with keeping a high level of self-confidence. Only 35.9% of the participants claimed that they could cope with their nervousness when conversing in English (35.9%).

The mean score for senior students' replies regarding controlling their classroom environment was 3.8 (SD = 0.7), showing a medium level of control over classroom environment. Majority of senior student respondents agreed or strongly agreed about making use of every opportunity to speak English in class (66%) and speaking in English with the people they know (74.4%). Half of the student participants agree and strongly agree about trying to take part in as many English-speaking activities as possible (50 %), and most of them supported the idea of speaking English in class (81.5%). 71.8% of participants agree and strongly agree about spending time with friends who encourage one another to speak English.

Junior Students' Levels of SRMIS-EFL

The same SRMIS-EFL questionnaire that was given to the senior students was answered by the junior student participants. The percentages of junior students' responses to the questionnaire items are shown in the following table.

Table 4. Frequency percentages for SRMIS-EFL among junior EFL college students (n = 78).

No.	Statements/Items	Percent (%)				
		SD	D	U	A	SA
1	I remind myself that I need to speak English Well	0	1.3	6.4	23.1	69.2
2	When the teacher speaks in English, I listen to him/her carefully	1.3	0	3.8	16.7	78.2
3	I develop my interest and willingness to learn English	0	0	6.4	33.3	60.3

4	When I speak English, I learn from my mistakes.	0	0	3.8	24.4	71.8
5	I learn from the mistakes other people make in order to speak English more correctly.	0	0	6.4	33.3	60.3
6	I try to pay attention all the time in English lessons.	0	1.3	7.7	24.4	66.7
7	I try various ways to increase my motivation to speak English.	0	0	2.6	28.2	69.2
8	I try to find friends from different countries to practice English.	2.6	5.1	34.6	23.1	34.6
9	I try to communicate with foreigners in English on the internet,	2.6	6.4	24.4	30.8	35.9
10	I make contact with English native speakers.	10.3	26.9	32.1	12.8	17.9
11	I try to visit places with lots of foreign tourists to improve my English-speaking skills.	12.8	21.8	32.1	17.9	15.4
12	I try to practice my English when I meet foreigners.	2.6	7.7	19.2	41	29.5
13	When I speak English, I can overcome my fear.	0	6.4	44.9	24.4	24.4
14	When I speak English, I can cope with my anxiety.	0	7.7	47.4	20.5	24.4
15	When I speak English, I try to maintain a high level of my confidence.	0	2.6	9	46.2	42.3
16	I use every opportunity during lessons to speak English.	1.3	2.6	14.1	41	41
17	I speak in English with the people I know (e.g., classmates, friends).	0	1.3	30.8	24.4	43.6
18	In class, I try to take part in English speaking activities as much as possible.	2.6	5.1	24.4	30.8	37.2
19	I support the idea of speaking English in class.	0	1.3	17.9	39.7	41
20	I spend time with friends who motivate each other to speak English.	1.3	0	26.9	35.9	35.9
SD: Strongly Disagree D: Disagree U: Undecided A: Agree						
SA: Strongly Agree						

As for the junior students' overall SRMIS-EFL level can be seen in the table 5. A greater SRMIS-EFL level was indicated by higher scores, and a lower SRMISEFL level was indicated by lower scores.

Table 5. Distribution of SRMIS-EFL mean scores for junior students.

Scale	Mean	Median	Mode	SD	Range
Task value activation	4.6	4.7	5	0.4	2
Regulation of learning environment	3.5	3.4	3.4	0.8	3.6
Regulation of affect	3.9	3.7	3.3	0.8	3
Regulation of classroom environment	4.1	4.1	5	0.7	3.4
Overall junior SRMIS-EFL	4.1	4	4	0.5	2.5

The SRMIS-EFL score of junior students was generally high, with a mean score of 4.1 and a standard deviation of 0.5 (see Table 5).

The frequency of junior students' responses to the 20-item SRMIS-EFL scale is shown in Table 5. The mean score of the responses from junior students indicated that their level of task value activation was 4.6 (SD = 0.4 indicating a high degree of task value activation. Majority of junior students responded agreed or strongly agreed that they should remind themselves to speak English fluently (92.3%), listening to the teacher carefully when him/her speaks in English (94.9 %), developing their interest and willingness to learn English (93.6 %), learning from their mistakes when they speak English (96.2 %), learning from the mistakes made by others in order to speak English more accurately (96.2%), trying to pay attention in English lessons all the time (91.1%), and trying various ways to enhance their motivation to speak English (97.4 %).

With regards to the control over learning environment, the responses from junior students had a mean score of 3.2. (SD = 0.8), demonstrating a medium level of control over learning environment. Majority of junior students (70.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that they should attempt to speak English when interacting with foreigners. 66.7% of junior students agreed or strongly agreed with the idea of making overseas acquaintances in order to practice speaking English and conversing with foreigners online, and 30.7% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that speaking with English

native speakers is a good idea. Less than half of the junior student respondents (33.3%) agreed or strongly agreed about visiting places with lots of foreigners.

Junior students' responses on the regulation of affect had a mean score of 3.9 (SD = 0.8), confirming a high level of affect regulation. 48.8% of the student participants either strongly agreed or agreed that they can overcome their fear speaking English. Almost half of the junior student participants strongly agreed or agreed that they can cope with their anxiety when they speak English. However, 88.5 of the junior student participants stated that they tried to maintain a high level of my confidence when they speak English.

Concerning junior students' responses on regulation of classroom environment, the mean score was 3.8.(SD = 0.7), indicating a medium level of control over classroom environment. Majority of them (82%), agreed or strongly agreed about using every opportunity during lessons. 68% of them stated that they speak in English with the people they know try to take part in as many English-speaking activities as possible. Majority of junior student participants agreed with the idea of speaking English in class (81.5%) and spending time with companions who inspire one another to learn English (70.8%).

Difference of students SRM across academic levels

As mentioned earlier, to assess if there is a statistically significant difference of students' overall SRMIS-EFL between juniors and seniors, independent t-test was conducted using SPSS version 26.

Table 6. Output of SPSS independent t-test

Group Statistics										
	Academic levels	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean					
Overall	Junior	78	4.0987	0.53464	0.06054					
	Senior	78	3.8385	0.55531	0.06288					

Independent Samples Test										
Lavene's Tests for Equality of Variances						t-test for Equality of Means				
						95% Confidence interval of the Difference				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig (3-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Overall	Equal variances assumed	0.034	0.853	2.982	154	0.003	0.26026	0.08728	0.08783	0.43268
	Equal variances not assumed			2.982	153.779	0.003	0.26026	0.08728	0.08783	0.43268

The table above shows that the average SRMIS-EFL score for junior students is 4.0987, while the average SRMIS-EFL score for the senior student sample is 3.8385. Thus, descriptive statistics can be concluded that there is a difference in the average SRMIS-EFL between senior students and junior students, where SRMIS-EFL of senior students are lower than SRMIS-EFL of junior students. The Independent Sample T-Test results in a sig (2-tailed) value of 0.863 where $0.03 < 0.05$. Thus it can be concluded that there is significant difference between the average SRMIS-EFL of junior students and that of senior students.

Discussion

This study investigated EFL university students' level of SRMIS-EFL and examined whether or not the level of senior students differ from that of junior students. As presented in the research

findings, the participants generally had a high level of SRMIS-EFL. The overall mean of senior students' SRMIS-EFL was 3.8 ($SD = 0.6$), indicating a high SRMIS-EFL level. The subdomain of task value activation was very high ($M=4.4$, $SD=0.5$), indicating that senior students were able to remind themselves when they need to speak English well, listen to their teachers carefully when he/she speaks in English, develop their interest and willingness to learn English, learn from their mistakes when they speak English, learn from others' mistakes to speak English better, pay attention to English lessons and try different strategies to enhance their motivation to speak English. This finding is in line with previous studies conducted by Chou (2018), Uztosun (2020), Zhang et al. (2020) revealing that students with more enthusiasm to engage in oral communication in English may show a greater task value as a result of their belief that improving their EFL speaking skills is important. Consequently, students use more self-regulated learning techniques in their pursuit of enhancing their EFL proficiency (Cho et al., 2020; Sekar Diasti & Laos Mbato, 2020; Teng & Zhang, 2020; Uztosun, 2021).

The very high level of senior students' task value activation subdomain could be due to senior students' awareness of the relevance of English learning tasks to their interests, goals, and future aspirations. For senior students, this can entail talking about how fluency in English can help them in their academic endeavors, professional aspirations, or leisure activities. Senior students also have more exposure to the real-world situations which require them to be competent in English speaking. This could include more experiences of course projects that require senior students to apply English skills in practical contexts relevant to their lives and their position as a pre-service teachers. The senior student respondents in this study were taking either peer-teaching or internship program which require them to speak English fluently.

Although senior students showed very high levels of their task value activation in speaking English, the other three subdomains of senior students' SRMIS-EFL which include control over learning environment, control over affect, and control over classroom environment were in medium level. Hence, their overall level of SRMIS-EFL is lower than that of junior students. This finding contradicts a previous study conducted by Alotumi (2021) which found that the SRMIS-EFL scores of students were not significantly impacted by their academic level; students' EFL speaking competence did not differ significantly between juniors and seniors. Students from both junior and senior groups in Alotumi's (2021) study were not offered any speaking course in the college. Meanwhile, junior student participants in this study were still having speaking courses which were formally offered to enhance students' speaking skills. This result confirms the consensus of earlier studies, showing that in situations where there is official upskilling in EFL proficiency, students' motivational self-regulation may vary depending on their educational level (Teng & Zhang, 2020). As students at both academic levels did not receive any instruction that could have assisted them in developing self-regulatory skills, university motivational self-regulation training is required (Wang, H., Yang, J., Li, 2021). The value of teacher participation in helping students develop a self-awareness of their motivating tendencies to modify their learning becomes important (Teng & Zhang, 2020; Yan et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020).

Self-regulated motivation is necessary in enhancing EFL speaking skills as English learners in EFL context have limited opportunity to practice their English both inside and outside the classroom. Individuals with high levels of self-regulated motivation are more likely to set specific goals for improving their English-speaking skills. These goals could be related to achieving a certain score on a language proficiency test or being able to communicate fluently in specific contexts. In terms of strategy use, self-regulated learners actively seek out and employ various strategies to enhance their English-speaking abilities. This could include practicing speaking with native speakers, using language learning apps, or participating in language exchange programs.

Individuals with self-regulated motivation are more likely to persist in their language learning efforts despite challenges or setbacks. They are more resilient and proactive in seeking out opportunities to practice and improve their speaking skills. Ultimately, individuals who possess high levels of self-regulated motivation are more likely to achieve higher academic levels in speaking English. Their proactive approach to learning, combined with effective goal-setting and strategy use, contributes to improved language proficiency over time.

When it came to the affect regulation, senior students showed a lower level of control over affect than junior students did, which indicates that junior students could cope with their anxiety and fear as well as enhancing their self-confidence. The results support the idea that EFL students with positive emotional views can make better use of their cognitive and metacognitive SRL methods (Sun and Wang, 2020; Teng et al., 2020). Students could increase their proficiency in EFL speaking by continuing to participate in English-speaking assignments while suppressing their negative affective responses (Uztosun, 2020, 2021; Zhang et al., 2020).

Furthermore, senior and junior students' classroom environment regulation were in the medium level. It might be the result of students participating in diverse class-based assignments and activities with different classmates, which should be promoted. Teachers' roles in the classroom can be assigned to the medium level of this SRMIS-EFL subsection since research indicates that teachers are crucial in fostering student engagement through engaging and cooperative activities that meet students' needs. (Seli and Dembo, 2020; Teng et al., 2020).

Both junior and senior students demonstrated a medium level of regulation of their learning environment, indicating that their attempts to find additional opportunities to practice and enhance their learning experience outside of the classroom were moderate. It confirms pertinent research showing that EFL students with stronger environmental regulation might locate richer informal EFL-input contexts to practice speaking EFL and overcome the constraints of their limited EFL-input in formal learning environments (Uztosun, 2020).

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to look at the SRMIS-EFL of EFL students in the setting of higher education in Indonesia and see whether there are any differences between academic levels. A total of 156 EFL college students' data were collected and examined. There are exactly the same number of junior and senior students—78 juniors and 78 seniors.

The SRMIS-EFL level of senior students was high generally, as seen in the accompanying table, with an overall answer mean of 3.8 and a standard deviation of 0.5. The mean score for senior students in terms of task value activation was 4.4 (SD = 0.5), which suggests a very high degree of activating task value. In reference to the regulation of the learning environment, the average score of senior students' answers was 3.3 (standard deviation = 0.8), signifying a moderate degree of regulation. The replies of senior students indicated a medium degree of emotion control, with a mean score of 3.4 (SD = 0.8) in this regard. A medium level of control over classroom environment was indicated by the senior students' mean score of 3.8 (SD = 0.7) on their responses about managing their classroom.

The junior students' level of SRMIS-EFL was found to be usually high, with an overall mean score of 4.1 and a standard deviation of 0.5. The junior students' responses showed a mean score of 4.6 (SD = 0.4) on the task value activation scale, which is relatively high. Junior students' answers indicated a medium degree of learning environment regulation, with a mean score of 3.2 (SD = 0.8) in relation to controlling their learning environment. Junior students' replies on affect regulation had a mean score of 3.9 (SD = 0.8), indicating a strong degree of affect regulation. Junior students gave a mean score of 3.8 (SD = 0.7) when asked about the regulation of the classroom environment, indicating a medium level of regulation.

Concerning the difference between senior and junior students' level of SRMIS-EFL, this study revealed that for junior students, the average SRMIS-EFL score is 4.0987, whereas for the senior student group, it is 3.8385. Descriptive statistics thus indicate that there is a difference in the average SRMIS-EFL between senior and junior pupils, with the former having a lower SRMIS-EFL than the latter. A sig (2-tailed) value of 0.863 is obtained from the Independent Sample T-Test, where $0.03 < 0.05$. Thus, it can be said that there is a notable variation between junior and senior students' average SRMIS-EFL scores.

Limitations

There are sample size limitations in the study. Even though the study's sample is representative of all English teachers in the study environment, additional participants will yield more accurate results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author expresses gratitude to the University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr, Hamka research institute for the research funding and all the support. Appreciation is also addressed to all students in the English Department of University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr, Hamka Jakarta for their time and effort to take part in the study.

REFERENCES

- Alotumi, M. (2020). EFL learning beyond the wall with MALL: College students' perceptions. In *Enhancements and limitations to ICT-based informal language learning: Emerging research and opportunities* (pp. 138–160). IGI Global.
- Alotumi, Mohialdeen. (2021). EFL college junior and senior students' self-regulated motivation for improving English speaking: A survey study. *Heliyon*, 7(4), e06664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06664>
- Atay, D. (2022). *The Relationship between Self-Regulated Learning and EFL Achievement in Synchronous Online Language Education 1*. 46(3), 0–2.
- Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2020). *The role of growth mindset , self-efficacy and intrinsic value in self-regulated learning and English language learning achievements*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820933190>
- Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2021). Hong Kong secondary students' self-regulated learning strategy use and English writing: Influences of motivational beliefs. *System*, 96, 102404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102404>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *No Title Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Boekaerts, M., & Niemivirta, M. (2000). Self-regulated learning: Finding a balance between learning goals and ego-protective goals. In & M. Z. M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich (Ed.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 417–450). Academic Press.
- Broadbent, J. (2017). Comparing online and blended learner's self-regulated learning strategies and academic performance. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 33, 24–32.
- Broadbent, J., & Poon, W. L. (2015). Self-regulated learning strategies & academic achievement in online higher education learning environments: A systematic review. *Internet and Higher Education*, 27, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.04.007>
- Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and Self-Regulated Learning: A Theoretical Synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 65(3), 245–281. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543065003245>
- Cho, H. J., Yough, M., & Levesque-Bristol, C. (2020). Relationships between beliefs about assessment and self-regulated learning in second language learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 99(January 2019), 101505. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.101505>
- Chou, M. H. (2018). Speaking Anxiety and Strategy Use for Learning English as a Foreign Language in Full and Partial English-Medium Instruction Contexts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(3), 611–633. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.455>











- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education*. routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. (fifth ed.). SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Creswell, John W., and J. D. C. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. In E. L. D. & R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3–33). The University of Rochester Press.
- Dent, A. L., & Koenka, A. C. (2016). The Relation Between Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Achievement Across Childhood and Adolescence: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(3), 425–474. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9320-8>
- Dornyei, Z. (1990). *Conceptualizing Motivation in Foreign_language Learning_Dornyei. March*, 45–78.
- Dörrenbächer-Ulrich, L., Weißenfels, M., Russer, L., & Perels, F. (2021). Multimethod assessment of self-regulated learning in college students: different methods for different components? *Instructional Science*, 49(1), 137–163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-020-09533-2>
- Ge, X. (2021). Emotion matters for academic success: Implications of the Article by Jarrell, Harley, Lajoie, and Naismith (2017) for creating nurturing and supportive learning environments to help students manage their emotions. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 69(1), 67–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09925-8>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.
- Huh, Y., & Reigeluth, C. M. (2017). Self-Regulated Learning: The Continuous-Change Conceptual Framework and a Vision of New Paradigm, Technology System, and Pedagogical Support. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 46(2), 191–214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239517710769>
- Hwang, M., & Lee, H. K. (2019). Development and Validation of a Self-regulated Language Learning Inventory. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 28(6), 543–562. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-019-00454-4>
- Kellenberg, F., Schmidt, J., & Werner, C. (2019). The Adult Learner: Self-Determined, Self-Regulated, and Reflective. *Journal of Pedagogy and Psychology “Signum Temporis,”* 9(1), 23–29. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sigtem-2017-0001>
- Klimas, A. (2017). A goal-setting logbook as an instrument fostering learner autonomy. In A. M. Pawlak & J. B. Mystkowska-Wiertelak (Eds.), *Autonomy in second language learning* (pp. 21–33). Springer International Publishing.
- Kryshko, O., Fleischer, J., Waldeyer, J., Wirth, J., & Leutner, D. (2020). Do motivational regulation strategies contribute to university students’ academic success? *Learning and Individual Differences*, 82(November 2019), 101912. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101912>
- Liborius, P., Bellhäuser, H., & Schmitz, B. (2019). What makes a good study day? An intraindividual study on university students’ time investment by means of time-series analyses. *Learning and Instruction*, 60(February 2016), 310–321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.10.006>
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2015). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Routledge.
- Mekala, S., & Radhakrishnan, G. (2019). Promoting self-regulated learning through metacognitive

strategies. *IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, 13(2), 21–27.

- Nakata, Y. (2019). Encouraging student teachers to support self-regulated learning: A multiple case study on prospective language teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 95(July 2018), 200–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.01.007>
- Ore, D. I. N., Chen, C. M., Chen, L. C., Yang, S. M., Li, Y., Francisco, S., Su, Y., Zheng, C., Liang, J. C., Tsai, C. C., Choi, Y., Zhang, D., Lin, C., & Zhang, Y. (2018). Self-regulated learning of vocabulary in English as a Foreign Language The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly Volume 20 , Issue 1 Senior Editors : Paul Robertson and John Adamson. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 32(3), 105–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1485708>
- Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 385–407. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0006-x>
- Puspitasari, T., & Ishak, C. N. (2023). LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Learning <http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT> Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Learning*, 25(1), 132–148. <http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT>
- Schneider, M., & Preckel, F. (2017). Variables associated with achievement in higher education: A systematic review of meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(6), 565–600. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000098>
- Schunk, D.H., & Greene, J. . (2018). Historical, contemporary, and future perspectives on selfregulated learning and performance. In & J. A. G. Schunk, D.H. (Ed.), *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (2nd edition).
- Schunk, D.H., Zimmerman, B. . (2012). Self-regulation and learning. In I. B. Weiner (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychology* (Second, pp. 45–68).
- Sekar Diasti, K., & Laos Mbato, C. (2020). Exploring Undergraduate Students' Motivation-regulation Strategies in Thesis Writing. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 14(2). <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/LC>
- Sun, T., & Wang, C. (2020). College students' writing self-efficacy and writing self-regulated learning strategies in learning English as a foreign language. *System*, 90, 102221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102221>
- Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Empowering learners in the second/foreign language classroom: Can self-regulated learning strategies-based writing instruction make a difference? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 48(November), 100701. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100701>
- Theobald, M. (2021). Self-regulated learning training programs enhance university students' academic performance, self-regulated learning strategies, and motivation: A meta-analysis. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 66(May), 101976. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2021.101976>
- Uztosun, M. S. (2020). The development of a scale for measuring the self-regulated motivation for improving speaking English as a foreign language. *Language Learning Journal*, 48(2), 213–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1335766>
- Uztosun, M. S. (2021). Foreign language speaking competence and self-regulated speaking motivation. *Foreign Language Annals*, 54(2), 410–428. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12559>
- Wang, H., Yang, J., Li, P. (2021). *How and when goal-oriented self-regulation improves college students' well-being: a weekly diary study*. *Curr. Psychol.*

- Winne, P. H. (1996). A metacognitive view of individual differences in self-regulated learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 8(4), 327–353. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1041-6080\(96\)90022-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1041-6080(96)90022-9)
- Wolters, C. A., & Benzon, M. B. (2013). Assessing and predicting college students' use of strategies for the selfregulation of motivation. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 81(2), 199–221.
- Wolters, C. A. (2003). Regulation of motivation: Evaluating an underemphasized aspect of self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 38, 189–205.
- Wolters, Christopher A. (2003). Regulation of Motivation: Evaluating an Underemphasized Aspect of Self-Regulated Learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 38(4), 189–205. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3804_1
- Yan, C., Gao, Y., & He, C. (2020). Examining Chinese EFL Postgraduates' Motivational Regulation Strategies. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 15(2), 250–278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11516-020-0012-x>
- Zhang, X., Dai, S., & Ardasheva, Y. (2020). Contributions of (de)motivation, engagement, and anxiety to English listening and speaking. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 79(March), 101856. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101856>
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2011). No Title. In *Handbook of Self-Regulation of Learning and Performance* (pp. 15–26).
- Zimmerman, B.J., & Schunk, D. . (2008). Motivation: An essential dimension of self-regulated learning. In & B. J. Z. Schunk, D.H. (Ed.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2021). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational Psychologist*, 25, 3–17.
- Zimmerman, Barry J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2
- Zimmerman, Barry J. (2013). From Cognitive Modeling to Self-Regulation: A Social Cognitive Career Path. *Educational Psychologist*, 48(3), 135–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2013.794676>

2. Bukti Review dan Hasil Review (28 Februari 2024)






NOTIFICATIONS

[View \(6 new\)](#)
[Manage](#)

Journal Help

OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS

FONT SIZE



#10870 Review

[SUMMARY](#) [REVIEW](#) [EDITING](#)

Submission



Authors	Silih Warni, Tri Wintolo Apoko, Martriwati Martriwati, Angsu-orn Na Nongkhaj
Title	A Study on University Students' Self-Regulated Motivation to Improve EFL Speaking Skills Across Academic Levels
Section	Articles
Editor	Cut Meutia

Peer Review

Round 1

Review Version	10870-39099-2-RV.DOCX	2024-02-27
Initiated	2024-02-27	
Last modified	2024-03-04	
Uploaded file	Reviewer B 10870-39472-1-RV.DOCX	2024-02-28
	Reviewer A 10870-39470-1-RV.DOCX	2024-02-28

Editor Decision

Decision	Accept Submission	2024-04-17
Notify Editor	 Editor/Author Email Record	 2024-04-17
Editor Version	10870-39425-1-ED.DOCX	2024-02-27
Author Version	10870-39867-1-ED.DOCX	2024-03-12
	10870-39867-2-ED.DOCX	2024-04-17
	10870-39867-3-ED.DOCX	2024-04-17
		DELETE
		DELETE
		DELETE

FOCUS AND SCOPE

PUBLICATION ETHICS

EDITORIAL TEAM

REVIEWER

OPEN ACCESS POLICY

SCREENING PLAGIARISM

AUTHOR GUIDELINES

ONLINE SUBMISSION

AUTHOR FEES


CONTACT

ABSTRACTING/INDEXING

JOURNAL HISTORY

LICENSE TERM

IN COLLABORATION WITH



Komentar Reviewer 1

JOLTT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching
<https://e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/joltt>
Email: joltt@ikipmataram.ac.id & joltt@undikma.ac.id
DOI: <https://doi.org/>

Month Year, Vol. , No.
p-ISSN: 2338-0810
e-ISSN: 2621-1378
pp.

A STUDY ON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' SELF-REGULATED MOTIVATION TO IMPROVE EFL SPEAKING ACROSS ACADEMIC LEVELS

Article Info

Article History

Received:

Revised:

Published:

Abstract

Students in most universities in non-English Speaking countries have limited opportunities to speak English in class. Self-regulated learning enables some self-motivated students to find opportunities outside the classroom to have face to face and virtual interaction to enhance their English speaking. This study is intended to examine the level of self-regulated motivation of university students to improve their Speaking of English as a foreign language (SRMIS-EFL). Moreover, this study investigates if students' SRMIS-EFL differ across academic levels. 156 EFL students from an English Department in a private university in Jakarta took part in this study. Self-reported SRMIS-EFL questionnaire was used as the data collecting method. Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis was then conducted. The findings showed that the overall SRMIS-ELF level of students was high. Moreover, students used various self-regulatory motivation strategies to enhance their EFL speaking skills. As for the aspect of academic level, the results of this study shows that SRMIS-EFL of senior students are lower than SRMIS-EFL of junior students, and there is a statistically significant difference of students' SRMIS-EFL across academic levels. The findings of this study suggest the need for motivational regulation training into EFL programs to increase students' awareness of motivational self-regulation strategies to enhance their self-regulated motivation.

Keywords

self-regulated learning,
self-regulated motivation,
academic level,
EFL speaking

How to cite:

INTRODUCTION

Self-regulated learning (SRL) is an essential competence that contributes to the foundation for lifelong learning (Dent & Koenka, 2016). According Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk (2011) SRL is described as a dynamic process in which students actively engage and maintain attitudes, behaviors, and cognitions that are systematically focused on achieving their personal objectives. Higher education places SRL as important concept since university students need to be able to self-organize their coursework (Broadbent, 2017; Broadbent & Poon, 2015). Higher education students that use more effective SRL strategies show better academic achievement (Schneider & Preckel, 2017) and higher satisfaction with their studies (Liborius et al., 2019).

In order to develop language competence, both input and output are essential. Input provides learners with exposure of the target language in context (Mackey, A., & Gass, 2015), while output enables them to produce written or spoken language (Swain, 1985). However, according to Dornyei (1990), some foreign language contexts do not offer sufficient input or opportunities for output, which results in more challenging language learning and requires

NM

Namlude Moxom

Self-regulated learning is interesting topic. But make sure the skill is speaking or speaking skills?

NM

Namlude Moxom

Provide research background deals with self-regulated learning efficacy in language skills.

Provide the research methods, research instruments, research participants, and data analysis technique. Then, I suggest you articulate the problem you are addressing or the research question you aim to answer. This helps the reader understand the context and motivation behind your study.

NM

Namlude Moxom

Provide background information and set the context of the implementation of SRL in language skills. Show some previous studies to support your claims.

Introduce the specific topic of your research and explain why it is important.

Mention past attempts to solve the research problem or to answer the research question.

Conclude the introduction by mentioning objectives of your research.

learners to make more effort in learning the language. In this situation, an independent language learning process concerning what, when, how and where to learn (Kellenberg et al., 2019) which is referred to as self-regulated learning (SRL) (Ore et al., 2018) becomes an alternative solution to deal with the complexities of learning foreign languages. Self-regulated learning is concerned with the regulation of various aspects of learning including cognitive, affective, behavioral, and motivational aspects.

For enhancing their EFL speaking in university contexts where lecturers and students have limited opportunities to practice English speaking inside the classroom, some self-motivated students embrace SRL to create and catch opportunities to speak English outside the classroom. Moreover, they make use of physical and virtual human interaction supported by technology, to enhance their language learning (M Alotumi, 2020). With the support of available and portable technology such as mobile devices, university students could learn EFL anywhere (M Alotumi, 2020). SRL enables students to learn more flexibly in terms of time and place, which is energized by their motivational beliefs (Bai & Wang, 2021; Ge, 2021; Kryshko et al., 2020).

The motivational orientation of Pintrich's (2004) SRL conceptual model is referred to as Self-regulated Motivation (SRM) (Uztosun, 2020). Furthermore, Uztosun (2020) defined SRM as students' self-regulatory attempts or strategies to control their motivational beliefs to maintain their SRL. Even though the need for incorporating SRM in EFL learning is obvious, there has been limited number of studies—as far as the researcher is concerned—looking into students' SRM to improve their EFL speaking. In the Indonesian context particularly, there has been no study concerning SRM for improving EFL speaking. Several existing studies on SRM have shown mixed results concerning the correlation between higher education students' self-regulated motivation and their academic level and gender (e.g. Sun & Wang, 2020; Teng & Zhang, 2020; Yan et al., 2020). This study is therefore intended to investigate EFL students' SRMIS-EFL in Indonesian higher education context and examine if students' SRMIS-EFL differ across academic levels.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Self-regulated Learning (SRL)

A number of descriptions concerning SRL have been suggested by different authors as it plays important role in the learning process (Uztosun, 2021). The term SRL encompasses various aspects of learning, including motivation, metacognition, and the regulation of cognitive skills and strategies (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). Winne (1996) defined SRL with more emphasis on the function of metacognition; SLR refers to metacognitively guided behavior to regulate cognitive strategies when dealing with a learning task. As this study is concerned with students' motivation to speak English outside the classroom for their English speaking skills development, the goal-oriented nature of SRM becomes relevant. A model which informed this study's theoretical framework is the model suggested by Pintrich (2004), which is based on the social-cognitive theory of Bandura (1986).

In addition to some definitions of SRL conceptualized from a goal-oriented perspective, other definitions put emphasis on the SRL metacognitive aspect (Huh & Reigeluth, 2017). SRL was defined by Schunk, D.H., Zimmerman (2012) as "the process whereby students activate and sustain cognitions, behaviors, and affects, which are systematically oriented toward attainment of their goals" (p. 309). This study is focused on the goal-oriented perspective of SRL as establishing specific goals suitable with the nature of speaking is prominent to develop speaking skills.

Self-regulated learners manage their actions during the learning process by utilizing their mental processes in ways that are appropriate for the tasks at hand. By fostering positive



Namlude Moxom

I suggest the author should end with research questions, research aims, and the novelty of your study.

that govern motivation and control ideas, and/or behaviors in order to make wise decisions, put in consistent effort, and/or persevere through learning activities (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003).

The concept of SRM relates to Deci and Ryan's (Deci, E. L., & Ryan, 1985) self-determination theory (SDT) of motivation, which examines how self-determined and self-motivated a person's activities are. The theory is based on the idea that different types of motivation are associated to different forms of regulation and behavior quality. Deci and Ryan (2002) suggested in different types of motivation and regulation in the self-determination continuum ranging from amotivation, extrinsic motivation, and intrinsic motivation. Amotivation, at the left end of the continuum refers to nonregulation and non-self-determined behavior. On the other hand, intrinsic motivation at the right end of the continuum, deals with intrinsic regulation and self-determined actions. Understanding the relationship between various motivation, regulation, and self-determined behavior requires an understanding of SDT and its continuum.

Another view of SRM suggests that SRM comprises three important aspects: knowledge of motivation, monitoring of motivation, and control of motivation (Wolters, C. A., & Benzon, 2013). In order to control motivation, individuals need to learn about motivational regulating techniques and how to hold views about subjects, fields, and assignments (Uztosun, 2021). In order to regulate motivation, learners also need to monitor their motivation during their learning tasks. Moreover, learners have to understand what deliberate actions need to take to manage their effort, motivation, and perseverance.

According to Wolters (2003), there are a number of strategies that can be used to regulate motivation. The first strategy is self-consequating; a learner promises him/herself a reward after doing a task. Goal-oriented self-talk is another strategy when a learner reminds himself of his/her learning goal. The third strategy is interest enhancement; a learner promotes interest toward the learning task. Other strategies include environmental structuring such as setting up a physical study environment, selfhandicapping, such as attributing failure externally, attribution control, such as attributing success internally, efficacy management, such as raising perceived level of self-efficacy, and emotion control, such as managing affect.

SRM plays an important role in foreign language learning as it affects students' effort, perseverance, expectations for their results, and goal-orientedness (Huh & Reigeluth, 2017; Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). In this present study, the term self-regulated speaking motivation (SRSM) is used as the measure of how well students control their intrinsic motivation to become more proficient speakers (Uztosun, 2021).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study is intended to investigate Indonesian junior and senior EFL university students' SRMIS-EFL. Moreover, it examines the relationship between students' academic level and their SRMIS-EFL.

Research Design

This research applied a quantitative survey design to investigate Indonesian EFL college students' overall level of SRMIS-EFL and examine the correlation between students' academic levels and their levels of SRMIS-EFL. Survey enables researcher to gain a quantitative description of trends, attitudes, and opinions as well as to examine connections among variables of a population, by investigating the sample of the population (Creswell, John W., 2017). According to Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison (2018), surveys are conducted to gather data at a particular point in time in order to describe the nature of existing conditions, or examining the relationships between specific events. In this study, data collection by means of



Namlude Moxom February 27, 2024

In the research design, I suggest you describe the overall design of your study. Justify why this design was chosen and how it aligns with your research objectives.

[Reply](#)

[Resolve](#)

questionnaire as the best instrument to measure students' motivational self-regulatory strategies (Dörnyei-Ulrich et al., 2021), was conducted during the academic year 2021/2022.

Subject

The participants of the study comprised 156 students of a private university in Jakarta majoring in English at the English Department. 78 were juniors – first- and second-year students who were still having speaking courses, and 78 students were seniors – third- and fourth-year students who were no longer taking any speaking course. In an English as a foreign language learning context, students have limited opportunity to practice their speaking outside the classroom. They need to depend on themselves to improve their EFL speaking competence. As for the seniors, there is no more formal speaking course offered. This study applied convenience sampling in which respondents were chosen based on their convenience and availability (Creswell, John W., 2017). University students majoring in English at the Faculty of teachers training and pedagogy were chosen for their willingness to take part in this research.

Instruments

This study applied online questionnaire to collect the data concerning students' SRMIS-EFL. The questionnaire contained two main sections; the first section was about demographics, and the second part contained an online modified version of Uztosun's (2020) self-regulated motivation for improving speaking English as a foreign language (SRMIS-EFL) scale. The demographics section included two sections that sought information on the respondents' demographic information in terms of academic level and gender. However, the aspect of gender was excluded in this article since this study is intended to examine the levels of SRMIS-EFL across academic levels. The section of the SRMIS-EFL scale incorporated four subsections. The first part is concerned with students' task value activation. It consists of seven items (items 1–7) which measure students' value of developing EFL speaking skills. The second subsection deals with students' regulation of learning environment. This second part comprises five items (items 8–12), measuring the extent to which students surpassed the constraints of EFL situations with little input to be exposed to a variety of English-language sources. The third subsection with three items (items 13–15) addressed regulation of affect. This subsection examined students' ability to control emotional aspects that can prevent them from becoming proficient EFL speakers. The fourth subsection comprising five items (items 16–20), are concerned with students' regulation of classroom environment. It assessed students' active engagement in classroom tasks and activities. Every item of the questionnaire was measured using a 5-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5). The questionnaires were then presented in the online version by means of Google Form. The online questionnaire enabled the researcher to collect numerical data from many respondents with less cost, effort and time. Moreover, the use of online survey could reduce errors of data entry and could facilitate data collection into organized spreadsheets for data analysis (Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, 2018).

Through WhatsApp groups of students from year one, year two, year three and year four, the researcher informed the students about the objectives of the study and invited students' participation. The researcher expressed an appreciation of students' willingness to voluntarily take part in this study before distributing the online questionnaire and collecting the data. Students were asked to fill in the online questionnaire once with their utmost honesty. The link of the online questionnaire could be accessed through students' WhatsApp groups, and students could fill in it from 22 June until 14 July 2022. During three weeks, 78 EFL junior students (year 1 and 2) and 78 EFL university senior students (year 3 and 4) responded to the online questionnaire.



Namlude Moxom

Research Participants

In the context of research participants, specify the characteristics of the participants or sample population involved in your study. Include relevant details such as sample size, selection criteria, and any demographic information. Explain how the sample represents the target population.

According to Uztosun (2020), SRMIS-EFL scale had high validity and reliability (Cronbach's α .90)—all sub-scales had high reliabilities (Cronbach's α > .80). However, as the questionnaires were translated into Indonesian and targeted for Indonesian respondents, the validity and reliability of the instruments were checked with the data collected from 156 respondents.

The Result of validity and reliability test of the instrument

In order to be claimed as valid instrument, all items translated into Indonesian in the questionnaire were analyzed for their validity and reliability. According to the table of r value, with the number of 156 participants, the r value for the validity test of the instrument is 0.1313. The results of the validity analysis using SPSS show that all items in the questionnaire have r value which are higher than the r table. It could be concluded that all items in the questionnaire are valid. Furthermore, the reliability test of the instrument using SPSS results in alpha cronbach of $0.920 > 0.6$, indicating that the instrument in this research is reliable.

Data Analysis

The responses from the participants in Google Form were downloaded for data tabulation and analysis. The data were then sorted based on respondents' academic levels: one answered by senior students, and the other one by junior students. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v. 26) for descriptive and inferential statistics.

Descriptive statistics were calculated to find the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of respondents' perceptions toward their level of SRMIS-EFL. As for the inferential statistics, independent t-test was conducted to draw conclusion whether there is a significant difference of students' SRMIS-EFL across academic levels.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

This study is intended to investigate students' SRMIS-EFL and examine its association with their academic level. The data collected through questionnaires from 156 EFL students respondents were then analyzed, and the results of the data analysis can be seen in the following section.

Demographic Data of The Respondents

The demographic data of the respondents can be seen in table 1.

Table 1. Demographic data of the participants

No	Demographic Characteristics	Students	
		Total	%
1.	Gender		
	Male	23	
	Female	83	
2.	Academic level		
	Senior (year 3 and 4)	78	50
	Junior (year 1 and 2)	78	50

NM

Namlude Moxom

Explain how you intend to analyze your results the Research methods section structure should: describe the materials used in the study, explain how the materials were prepared for the study, describe the research protocol, explain how measurements were made and what calculations were performed, and state which statistical tests were done to analyze the data.

NM

Namlude Moxom

I suggest you should enhance the presentation of your findings by incorporating tables, graphs, or charts. Visual representations can help readers grasp complex information quickly and allow for better comparison and interpretation of the results.

Equal variances not assumed	2.982	153.779	0.003	0.26026	0.08728	0.08783	0.43268
-----------------------------	-------	---------	-------	---------	---------	---------	---------

The table above shows that the average SRMIS-EFL score for junior students is 4.0987, while the average SRMIS-EFL score for the senior student sample is 3.8385. Thus, descriptive statistics can be concluded that there is a difference in the average SRMIS-EFL between senior students and junior students, where SRMIS-EFL of senior students are lower than SRMIS-EFL of junior students. The Independent Sample T-Test results in a sig (2-tailed) value of 0.863 where $0.03 < 0.05$. Thus it can be concluded that there is significant difference between the average SRMIS-EFL of junior students and that of senior students.

Discussion

This study investigated EFL university students' level of SRMIS-EFL and examined whether or not the level of senior students differ from that of junior students. As presented in the research findings, the participants generally had a high level of SRMIS-EFL. The overall mean of senior students' SRMIS-EFL was 3.8 (SD = 0.6), indicating a high SRMIS-EFL level. The subdomain of task value activation was very high ($M=4.4$, $SD=0.5$), indicating that senior students were able to remind themselves when they need to speak English well, listen to their teachers carefully when he/she speaks in English, develop their interest and willingness to learn English, learn from their mistakes when they speak English, learn from others' mistakes to speak English better, pay attention to English lessons and try different strategies to enhance their motivation to speak English. This finding is in line with previous studies conducted by Chou (2018), Uztosun (2020), Zhang et al. (2020) revealing that students with more enthusiasm to engage in oral communication in English may show a greater task value as a result of their belief that improving their EFL speaking skills is important. Consequently, students use more self-regulated learning techniques in their pursuit of enhancing their EFL proficiency (Cho et al., 2020; Sekar Diasti & Laos Mbato, 2020; Teng & Zhang, 2020; Uztosun, 2021).

[The very high level of senior students' task value activation subdomain could be due to senior students' awareness of the relevance of English learning tasks to their interests, goals, and future aspirations. For senior students, this can entail talking about how fluency in English can help them in their academic endeavors, professional aspirations, or leisure activities. Senior students also have more exposure to the real-world situations which require them to be competent in English speaking. This could include more experiences of course projects that require senior students to apply English skills in practical contexts relevant to their lives and their position as a pre-service teachers. The senior student respondents in this study were taking either peer-teaching or internship program which require them to speak English fluently.]

Although senior students showed very high levels of their task value activation in speaking English, the other three subdomains of senior students' SRMIS-EFL which include regulation of learning environment, regulation of affect, and regulation of classroom environment were in medium level. Hence, their overall level of SRMIS-EFL is lower than that of junior students. This finding contradicts a previous study conducted by Alotumi (2021) which revealed that students' academic level had no significant effect on their SRMIS-EFL; students' EFL speaking competence did not differ significantly between juniors and seniors. Students from both junior and senior groups in Alotumi's (2021) study were not offered any speaking course in the college. Meanwhile, junior student participants in this study were still having speaking courses which were formally offered to enhance students' speaking skills. This result confirms the consensus of earlier studies, showing that in situations where there is official upskilling in EFL proficiency, students' motivational self-regulation may vary depending on their educational level (Teng & Zhang, 2020). As students at both academic levels did not

Namlude Moxom

Please, elaborate the research findings here. It is important part for readers to know the answers of research questions.

The discussion section is where you explore the underlying meaning of your research, its possible implications in other areas of study, and the possible improvements that can be made in order to further develop the concerns of your research. Place your study within the context of previous studies.

Namlude Moxom

The author mentions some claims here but no references to support those.

Provide theoretical or empirical evidence

receive any instruction that could have assisted them in developing self-regulatory skills, university motivational self-regulation training is required (Wang, H., Yang, J., Li, 2021). The value of teacher participation in helping students develop a self-awareness of their motivating tendencies to modify their learning becomes important (Teng & Zhang, 2020; Yan et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020).

Self-regulated motivation is necessary in enhancing EFL speaking skills as English learners in EFL context have limited opportunity to practice their English both inside and outside the classroom. Individuals with high levels of self-regulated motivation are more likely to set specific goals for improving their English-speaking skills. These goals could be related to achieving a certain score on a language proficiency test or being able to communicate fluently in specific contexts. In terms of strategy use, self-regulated learners actively seek out and employ various strategies to enhance their English-speaking abilities. This could include practicing speaking with native speakers, using language learning apps, or participating in language exchange programs.

Individuals with self-regulated motivation are more likely to persist in their language learning efforts despite challenges or setbacks. They are more resilient and proactive in seeking out opportunities to practice and improve their speaking skills. Ultimately, individuals who possess high levels of self-regulated motivation are more likely to achieve higher academic levels in speaking English. Their proactive approach to learning, combined with effective goal-setting and strategy use, contributes to improved language proficiency over time.

Regarding regulation of affect, senior students exhibited a lower level of affect regulation than junior students did, which indicates that junior students could overcome their anxiety and fear as well as enhancing their self-confidence. The results support the idea that EFL students with positive emotional views can make better use of their cognitive and metacognitive SRL methods (Sun and Wang, 2020; Teng et al., 2020). Students could increase their proficiency in EFL speaking by continuing to participate in English-speaking assignments while suppressing their negative affective responses (Uztosun, 2020, 2021; Zhang et al., 2020).

Furthermore, senior and junior students' classroom environment regulation were in the medium level. It might be the result of students participating in diverse class-based assignments and activities with different classmates, which should be promoted. Teachers' roles in the classroom can be assigned to the medium level of this SRMIS-EFL subsection since research indicates that teachers are crucial in fostering student engagement through engaging and cooperative activities that meet students' needs. (Seli and Dembo, 2020; Teng et al., 2020).

When it came to their efforts to find more chances to practice and improve their learning outside of the classroom, both senior and junior students reported a medium level of regulation of their learning environment. It validates relevant research indicating that EFL students may seek out richer informal EFL-input contexts to practice speaking the language and get around the limitations of their restricted formal EFL-input learning environments (Uztosun, 2020).

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to look at the SRMIS-EFL of EFL students in the setting of higher education in Indonesia and see whether there are any differences between academic levels. A total of 156 EFL college students' data were collected and examined. There are exactly the same number of junior and senior students—78 juniors and 78 seniors.

The SRMIS-EFL level of senior students was high generally, as seen in the accompanying table, with an overall answer mean of 3.8 and a standard deviation of 0.5. The mean score for senior students in terms of task value activation was 4.4 (SD = 0.5), which suggests a very high degree of activating task value. In reference to the regulation of the learning environment, the average score of senior students' answers was 3.3 (standard deviation = 0.8),

Namlude Moxom

The author should provide a final statement and end your research conclusion with a concise and impactful statement that summarizes the key takeaways from the study.

signifying a moderate degree of regulation. The replies of senior students indicated a medium degree of emotion control, with a mean score of 3.4 (SD = 0.8) in this regard. A medium level of classroom environment regulation was indicated by the senior students' mean score of 3.8 (SD = 0.7) on their responses about managing their classroom.

It was discovered that junior students' SRMIS-EFL level was typically high, with a mean score of 4.1 overall and a standard deviation of 0.5. The task value activation scale revealed a comparatively high mean score of 4.6 (SD = 0.4) for the junior students' responses. With a mean score of 3.2 (SD = 0.8) for managing their learning environment, junior students' responses suggested a medium level of learning environment regulation. A strong level of affect regulation was indicated by the junior students' replies, which had a mean score of 3.9 (SD = 0.8). When asked about the level of regulation in the classroom, junior students gave a mean score of 3.8 (SD = 0.7), which indicates a medium level of regulation.

Concerning the difference between senior and junior students' level of SRMIS-EFL, this study revealed that for junior students, the average SRMIS-EFL score is 4.0987, whereas for the senior student group, it is 3.8385. Descriptive statistics thus indicate that there is a difference in the average SRMIS-EFL between senior and junior pupils, with the former having a lower SRMIS-EFL than the latter. A sig (2-tailed) value of 0.863 is obtained from the Independent Sample T-Test, where $0.03 < 0.05$. Thus, it can be said that there is a notable variation between junior and senior students' average SRMIS-EFL scores.

Limitations

There are sample size limitations in the study. Even though the study's sample is representative of all English teachers in the study environment, additional participants will yield more accurate results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The first author expresses gratitude to the University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka research institute for the research funding and all the support. Appreciation is also addressed to all students in the English Department of University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka Jakarta for their time and effort to take part in the study.

REFERENCES

- Alotumi, M. (2020). EFL learning beyond the wall with MALL: College students' perceptions. In *Enhancements and limitations to ICT-based informal language learning: Emerging research and opportunities* (pp. 138–160). IGI Global.
- Alotumi, Mohialdeen. (2021). EFL college junior and senior students' self-regulated motivation for improving English speaking: A survey study. *Heliyon*, 7(4), e06664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06664>
- Atay, D. (2022). *The Relationship between Self-Regulated Learning and EFL Achievement in Synchronous Online Language Education 1*. 46(3), 0–2.
- Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2020). *The role of growth mindset, self-efficacy and intrinsic value in self-regulated learning and English language learning achievements*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820933190>
- Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2021). Hong Kong secondary students' self-regulated learning strategy use and English writing: Influences of motivational beliefs. *System*, 96, 102404.



Namlude Moxom

Make sure presenting the references must be in APA style

The references should be 30 references of articles from reputable journals

In the JOLIT, as far as I know. References are strongly suggested in the latest 5 years

Komentar Reviewer 2

JOLTT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching
<https://e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/joltt>
 Email: joltt@ikipmataram.ac.id & joltt@undikma.ac.id
 DOI: <https://doi.org/>

Month Year. Vol. , No.
 p-ISSN: 2338-0810
 e-ISSN: 2621-1378
 pp.

A STUDY ON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' SELF-REGULATED MOTIVATION TO IMPROVE EFL SPEAKING ACROSS ACADEMIC LEVELS

Article Info	Abstract
Article History	
Received:	Students in most universities in non-English Speaking countries have limited opportunities to speak English in class. Self-regulated learning enables some self-motivated students to find opportunities outside the classroom to have face to face and virtual interaction to enhance their English speaking. This study is intended to examine the level of self-regulated motivation of university students to improve their Speaking of English as a foreign language (SRMIS-EFL). Moreover, this study investigates if students' SRMIS-EFL differ across academic levels. 156 EFL students from an English Department in a private university in Jakarta took part in this study. Self-reported SRMIS-EFL questionnaire was used as the data collecting method. Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis was then conducted. The findings showed that the overall SRMIS-ELF level of students was high. Moreover, students used various self-regulatory motivation strategies to enhance their EFL speaking skills. As for the aspect of academic level, the results of this study shows that SRMIS-EFL of senior students are lower than SRMIS-EFL of junior students, and there is a statistically significant difference of students' SRMIS-EFL across academic levels. The findings of this study suggest the need for motivational regulation training into EFL programs to increase students' awareness of motivational self-regulation strategies to enhance their self-regulated motivation.
Revised:	
Published:	
Keywords	
self-regulated learning,	
self-regulated motivation,	
academic level,	
EFL speaking	
How to cite:	

INTRODUCTION

Self-regulated learning (SRL) is an essential competence that contributes to the foundation for lifelong learning (Dent & Koenka, 2016). According Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk (2011) SRL is described as a dynamic process in which students actively engage and maintain attitudes, behaviors, and cognitions that are systematically focused on achieving their personal objectives. Higher education places SRL as important concept since university students need to be able to self-organize their coursework (Broadbent, 2017; Broadbent & Poon, 2015). Higher education students that use more effective SRL strategies show better academic achievement (Schneider & Preckel, 2017) and higher satisfaction with their studies (Liborius et al., 2019).

In order to develop language competence, both input and output are essential. Input provides learners with exposure of the target language in context (Mackey, A., & Gass, 2015), while output enables them to produce written or spoken language (Swain, 1985). However, according to Dornyei (1990), some foreign language contexts do not offer sufficient input or opportunities for output, which results in more challenging language learning and requires

LW Lan Wang
 I suggest the author make the title become a clear ~~usage~~ Self-regulated motivation??

LW Lan Wang
 I suggest the author provide research background before stating the research aims. Provide the research methods, research instruments, research participants, and data analysis technique. Then, I suggest you articulate the problem you are addressing or the research question you aim to answer.

LW Lan Wang
 The research topics look interesting to be elaborated in detail including the academic reasons why the topics are studied.

Background information in your Introduction should indicate the root of the problem being studied, its scope, and the extent to which previous studies have successfully investigated the problem, noting, in particular, where gaps exist that your study attempts to address.

learners to make more effort in learning the language. In this situation, an independent language learning process concerning what, when, how and where to learn (Kellenberg et al., 2019) which is referred to as self-regulated learning (SRL) (Ore et al., 2018) becomes an alternative solution to deal with the complexities of learning foreign languages. Self-regulated learning is concerned with the regulation of various aspects of learning including cognitive, affective, behavioral, and motivational aspects.

For enhancing their EFL speaking in university contexts where lecturers and students have limited opportunities to practice English speaking inside the classroom, some self-motivated students embrace SRL to create and catch opportunities to speak English outside the classroom. Moreover, they make use of physical and virtual human interaction supported by technology, to enhance their language learning (M Alotumi, 2020). With the support of available and portable technology such as mobile devices, university students could learn EFL anywhere (M Alotumi, 2020). SRL enables students to learn more flexibly in terms of time and place, which is energized by their motivational beliefs (Bai & Wang, 2021; Ge, 2021; Kryshko et al., 2020).

The motivational orientation of Pintrich's (2004) SRL conceptual model is referred to as Self-regulated Motivation (SRM) (Uztosun, 2020). Furthermore, Uztosun (2020) defined SRM as students' self-regulatory attempts or strategies to control their motivational beliefs to maintain their SRL. Even though the need for incorporating SRM in EFL learning is obvious, there has been limited number of studies—as far as the researcher is concerned—looking into students' SRM to improve their EFL speaking. In the Indonesian context particularly, there has been no study concerning SRM for improving EFL speaking. Several existing studies on SRM have shown mixed results concerning the correlation between higher education students' self-regulated motivation and their academic level and gender (e.g. Sun & Wang, 2020; Teng & Zhang, 2020; Yan et al., 2020). This study is therefore intended to investigate EFL students' SRMIS-EFL in Indonesian higher education context and examine if students' SRMIS-EFL differ across academic levels.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Self-regulated Learning (SRL)

A number of descriptions concerning SRL have been suggested by different authors as it plays important role in the learning process (Uztosun, 2021). The term SRL encompasses various aspects of learning, including motivation, metacognition, and the regulation of cognitive skills and strategies (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). Winne (1996) defined SRL with more emphasis on the function of metacognition; SLR refers to metacognitively guided behavior to regulate cognitive strategies when dealing with a learning task. As this study is concerned with students' motivation to speak English outside the classroom for their English speaking skills development, the goal-oriented nature of SRM becomes relevant. A model which informed this study's theoretical framework is the model suggested by Pintrich (2004), which is based on the social-cognitive theory of Bandura (1986).

In addition to some definitions of SRL conceptualized from a goal-oriented perspective, other definitions put emphasis on the SRL metacognitive aspect (Huh & Reigeluth, 2017). SRL was defined by Schunk, D.H., Zimmerman (2012) as "the process whereby students activate and sustain cognitions, behaviors, and affects, which are systematically oriented toward attainment of their goals" (p. 309). This study is focused on the goal-oriented perspective of SRL as establishing specific goals suitable with the nature of speaking is prominent to develop speaking skills.

Self-regulated learners manage their actions during the learning process by utilizing their mental processes in ways that are appropriate for the tasks at hand. By fostering positive

LW

Lan Wang

Provide the research questions and the novelty of the study

LW

Lan Wang

Make sure the literature review dealing with the research variables.

In line with the problem formulation → which topic or field is being examined and what are its components issues.

that govern motivation and control ideas, and/or behaviors in order to make wise decisions, put in consistent effort, and/or persevere through learning activities (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003).

The concept of SRM relates to Deci and Ryan's (Deci, E. L., & Ryan, 1985) self-determination theory (SDT) of motivation, which examines how self-determined and self-motivated a person's activities are. The theory is based on the idea that different types of motivation are associated to different forms of regulation and behavior quality. Deci and Ryan (2002) suggested [in](#) different types of motivation and regulation in the self-determination continuum ranging from amotivation, extrinsic motivation, and intrinsic motivation. Amotivation, at the left end of the continuum refers to nonregulation and non-self-determined behavior. On the other hand, intrinsic motivation at the right end of the continuum, deals with intrinsic regulation and self-determined actions. Understanding the relationship between various motivation, regulation, and self-determined behavior requires an understanding of SDT and its continuum.

Another view of SRM suggests that SRM comprises three important aspects: knowledge of motivation, monitoring of motivation, and control of motivation (Wolters, C. A., & Benzon, 2013). In order to control motivation, individuals need to learn about motivational regulating techniques and how to hold views about subjects, fields, and assignments (Uztosun, 2021). In order to regulate motivation, learners also need to monitor their motivation during their learning tasks. Moreover, learners have to understand what deliberate actions need to take to manage their effort, motivation, and perseverance.

According to Wolters (2003), there are a number of strategies that can be used to regulate motivation. The first strategy is self-consequating; a learner promises him/herself a reward after doing a task. Goal-oriented self-talk is another strategy when a learner reminds himself of his/her learning goal. The third strategy is interest enhancement; a learner promotes interest toward the learning task. Other strategies include environmental structuring such as setting up a physical study environment, [selfhandicapping](#), such as attributing failure externally, attribution control, such as attributing success internally, efficacy management, such as raising perceived level of self-efficacy, and emotion control, such as managing affect.

SRM plays an important role in foreign language learning as it affects students' effort, perseverance, expectations for their results, and goal-orientedness (Huh & Reigeluth, 2017; Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). In this present study, the term self-regulated speaking motivation (SRSMS) is used as the measure of how well students control their intrinsic motivation to become more proficient speakers (Uztosun, 2021).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study is intended to investigate Indonesian junior and senior EFL university students' SRMIS-EFL. Moreover, it examines the relationship between students' academic level and their SRMIS-EFL.

Research Design

This research applied a quantitative survey design to investigate Indonesian EFL college students' overall level of SRMIS-EFL and examine the correlation between students' academic levels and their levels of SRMIS-EFL. Survey enables researcher to gain a quantitative description of trends, attitudes, and opinions as well as to examine connections among variables of a population, by investigating the sample of the population (Creswell, John W., 2017). According to Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison (2018), surveys are conducted to gather data at a particular point in time in order to describe the nature of existing conditions, or examining the relationships between specific events. In this study, data collection by means of

LW

Lan Wang

Introduce the overall methodological approach for investigating your research problem

Indicate how the approach fits the overall research design

Describe the specific methods of the data collection you are going to use

Explain how you intend to analyze your results

According to Uztosun (2020), SRMIS-EFL scale had high validity and reliability (Cronbach's α .90)—all sub-scales had high reliabilities (Cronbach's α > .80). However, as the questionnaires were translated into Indonesian and targeted for Indonesian respondents, the validity and reliability of the instruments were checked with the data collected from 156 respondents.

The Result of validity and reliability test of the instrument

In order to be claimed as valid instrument, all items translated into Indonesian in the questionnaire were analyzed for their validity and reliability. According to the table of r value, with the number of 156 participants, the r value for the validity test of the instrument is 0.1313. The results of the validity analysis using SPSS show that all items in the questionnaire have r value which are higher than the r table. It could be concluded that all items in the questionnaire are valid. Furthermore, the reliability test of the instrument using SPSS results in alpha crumbach of $0.920 > 0.6$, indicating that the instrument in this research is reliable.

Data Analysis

The responses from the participants in Google Form were downloaded for data tabulation and analysis. The data were then sorted based on respondents' academic levels: one answered by senior students, and the other one by junior students. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v. 26) for descriptive and inferential statistics.

Descriptive statistics were calculated to find the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of respondents' perceptions toward their level of SRMIS-EFL. As for the inferential statistics, independent t-test was conducted to draw conclusion whether there is a significant difference of students' SRMIS-EFL across academic levels.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

This study is intended to investigate students' SRMIS-EFL and examine its association with their academic level. The data collected through questionnaires from 156 EFL students respondents were then analyzed, and the results of the data analysis can be seen in the following section.

Demographic Data of The Respondents

The demographic data of the respondents can be seen in table 1.

Table 1. Demographic data of the participants

No	Demographic Characteristics	Students	
		Total	%
1.	Gender		
	Male	23	
	Female	83	
2.	Academic level		
	Senior (year 3 and 4)	78	50
	Junior (year 1 and 2)	78	50

LW

Lan Wang

Provide a rationale for selecting the chosen analysis techniques and explain how they addressed the research questions or objectives.

LW

Lan Wang

I suggest the author revise the data performance in meaningful chart or graphic.

The author provides the findings which are related to the research questions only. Then, the author should avoid making unsupported claims or overgeneralizing your findings beyond what your study can reasonably support.

Equal variances not assumed	2.982	153.779	0.003	0.26026	0.08728	0.08783	0.43268
-----------------------------	-------	---------	-------	---------	---------	---------	---------

The table above shows that the average SRMIS-EFL score for junior students is 4.0987, while the average SRMIS-EFL score for the senior student sample is 3.8385. Thus, descriptive statistics can be concluded that there is a difference in the average SRMIS-EFL between senior students and junior students, where SRMIS-EFL of senior students are lower than SRMIS-EFL of junior students. The Independent Sample T-Test results in a sig (2-tailed) value of 0.863 where $0.03 < 0.05$. Thus it can be concluded that there is significant difference between the average SRMIS-EFL of junior students and that of senior students.

Discussion

This study investigated EFL university students' level of SRMIS-EFL and examined whether or not the level of senior students differ from that of junior students. As presented in the research findings, the participants generally had a high level of SRMIS-EFL. The overall mean of senior students' SRMIS-EFL was 3.8 (SD = 0.6), indicating a high SRMIS-EFL level. The subdomain of task value activation was very high (M=4.4, SD=0.5), indicating that senior students were able to remind themselves when they need to speak English well, listen to their teachers carefully when he/she speaks in English, develop their interest and willingness to learn English, learn from their mistakes when they speak English, learn from others' mistakes to speak English better, pay attention to English lessons and try different strategies to enhance their motivation to speak English. This finding is in line with previous studies conducted by Chou (2018), Uztosun (2020), Zhang et al. (2020) revealing that students with more enthusiasm to engage in oral communication in English may show a greater task value as a result of their belief that improving their EFL speaking skills is important. Consequently, students use more self-regulated learning techniques in their pursuit of enhancing their EFL proficiency (Cho et al., 2020; Sekar Diasti & Laos Mbato, 2020; Teng & Zhang, 2020; Uztosun, 2021).

[The very high level of senior students' task value activation subdomain could be due to senior students' awareness of the relevance of English learning tasks to their interests, goals, and future aspirations. For senior students, this can entail talking about how fluency in English can help them in their academic endeavors, professional aspirations, or leisure activities. Senior students also have more exposure to the real-world situations which require them to be competent in English speaking. This could include more experiences of course projects that require senior students to apply English skills in practical contexts relevant to their lives and their position as a pre-service teachers. The senior student respondents in this study were taking either peer-teaching or internship program which require them to speak English fluently.]

Although senior students showed very high levels of their task value activation in speaking English, the other three subdomains of senior students' SRMIS-EFL which include regulation of learning environment, regulation of affect, and regulation of classroom environment were in medium level. Hence, their overall level of SRMIS-EFL is lower than that of junior students. This finding contradicts a previous study conducted by Alotumi (2021) which revealed that students' academic level had no significant effect on their SRMIS-EFL; students' EFL speaking competence did not differ significantly between juniors and seniors. Students from both junior and senior groups in Alotumi's (2021) study were not offered any speaking course in the college. Meanwhile, junior student participants in this study were still having speaking courses which were formally offered to enhance students' speaking skills. This result confirms the consensus of earlier studies, showing that in situations where there is official upskilling in EFL proficiency, students' motivational self-regulation may vary depending on their educational level (Teng & Zhang, 2020). As students at both academic levels did not

LW Lan Wang

I suggest the author to address any unexpected or negative results and provide potential explanations. Explore alternative interpretations or factors that might have influenced the outcomes. This demonstrates critical thinking and a nuanced understanding of the research findings.

LW Lan Wang

No supporting theories? Or empirical evidence?

receive any instruction that could have assisted them in developing self-regulatory skills, university motivational self-regulation training is required (Wang, H., Yang, J., Li, 2021). The value of teacher participation in helping students develop a self-awareness of their motivating tendencies to modify their learning becomes important (Teng & Zhang, 2020; Yan et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020).

Self-regulated motivation is necessary in enhancing EFL speaking skills as English learners in EFL context have limited opportunity to practice their English both inside and outside the classroom. Individuals with high levels of self-regulated motivation are more likely to set specific goals for improving their English-speaking skills. These goals could be related to achieving a certain score on a language proficiency test or being able to communicate fluently in specific contexts. In terms of strategy use, self-regulated learners actively seek out and employ various strategies to enhance their English-speaking abilities. This could include practicing speaking with native speakers, using language learning apps, or participating in language exchange programs.

Individuals with self-regulated motivation are more likely to persist in their language learning efforts despite challenges or setbacks. They are more resilient and proactive in seeking out opportunities to practice and improve their speaking skills. Ultimately, individuals who possess high levels of self-regulated motivation are more likely to achieve higher academic levels in speaking English. Their proactive approach to learning, combined with effective goal-setting and strategy use, contributes to improved language proficiency over time.

Regarding regulation of affect, senior students exhibited a lower level of affect regulation than junior students did, which indicates that junior students could overcome their anxiety and fear as well as enhancing their self-confidence. The results support the idea that EFL students with positive emotional views can make better use of their cognitive and metacognitive SRL methods (Sun and Wang, 2020; Teng et al., 2020). Students could increase their proficiency in EFL speaking by continuing to participate in English-speaking assignments while suppressing their negative affective responses (Uztosun, 2020, 2021; Zhang et al., 2020).

Furthermore, senior and junior students' classroom environment regulation were in the medium level. It might be the result of students participating in diverse class-based assignments and activities with different classmates, which should be promoted. Teachers' roles in the classroom can be assigned to the medium level of this SRMIS-EFL subsection since research indicates that teachers are crucial in fostering student engagement through engaging and cooperative activities that meet students' needs. (Seli and Dembo, 2020; Teng et al., 2020).

When it came to their efforts to find more chances to practice and improve their learning outside of the classroom, both senior and junior students reported a medium level of regulation of their learning environment. It validates relevant research indicating that EFL students may seek out richer informal EFL-input contexts to practice speaking the language and get around the limitations of their restricted formal EFL-input learning environments (Uztosun, 2020).

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to look at the SRMIS-EFL of EFL students in the setting of higher education in Indonesia and see whether there are any differences between academic levels. A total of 156 EFL college students' data were collected and examined. There are exactly the same number of junior and senior students—78 juniors and 78 seniors.

The SRMIS-EFL level of senior students was high generally, as seen in the accompanying table, with an overall answer mean of 3.8 and a standard deviation of 0.5. The mean score for senior students in terms of task value activation was 4.4 (SD = 0.5), which suggests a very high degree of activating task value. In reference to the regulation of the learning environment, the average score of senior students' answers was 3.3 (standard deviation = 0.8),

LW Lan Wang
No references?

LW Lan Wang
No references?

LW Lan Wang
I suggest you review the research objectives. Start by revisiting the objectives or research questions you set out to address at the beginning of your study.

signifying a moderate degree of regulation. The replies of senior students indicated a medium degree of emotion control, with a mean score of 3.4 (SD = 0.8) in this regard. A medium level of classroom environment regulation was indicated by the senior students' mean score of 3.8 (SD = 0.7) on their responses about managing their classroom.

It was discovered that junior students' SRMIS-EFL level was typically high, with a mean score of 4.1 overall and a standard deviation of 0.5. The task value activation scale revealed a comparatively high mean score of 4.6 (SD = 0.4) for the junior students' responses. With a mean score of 3.2 (SD = 0.8) for managing their learning environment, junior students' responses suggested a medium level of learning environment regulation. A strong level of affect regulation was indicated by the junior students' replies, which had a mean score of 3.9 (SD = 0.8). When asked about the level of regulation in the classroom, junior students gave a mean score of 3.8 (SD = 0.7), which indicates a medium level of regulation.

Concerning the difference between senior and junior students' level of SRMIS-EFL, this study revealed that for junior students, the average SRMIS-EFL score is 4.0987, whereas for the senior student group, it is 3.8385. Descriptive statistics thus indicate that there is a difference in the average SRMIS-EFL between senior and junior pupils, with the former having a lower SRMIS-EFL than the latter. A sig (2-tailed) value of 0.863 is obtained from the Independent Sample T-Test, where $0.03 < 0.05$. Thus, it can be said that there is a notable variation between junior and senior students' average SRMIS-EFL scores.

Limitations

There are sample size limitations in the study. Even though the study's sample is representative of all English teachers in the study environment, additional participants will yield more accurate results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The first author expresses gratitude to the University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka research institute for the research funding and all the support. Appreciation is also addressed to all students in the English Department of University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka Jakarta for their time and effort to take part in the study.

REFERENCES

- Alotumi, M. (2020). EFL learning beyond the wall with MALL: College students' perceptions. In *Enhancements and limitations to ICT-based informal language learning: Emerging research and opportunities* (pp. 138–160). IGI Global.
- Alotumi, Mohialdeen. (2021). EFL college junior and senior students' self-regulated motivation for improving English speaking: A survey study. *Heliyon*, 7(4), e06664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06664>
- Atay, D. (2022). *The Relationship between Self-Regulated Learning and EFL Achievement in Synchronous Online Language Education 1*. 46(3), 0–2.
- Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2020). *The role of growth mindset, self-efficacy and intrinsic value in self-regulated learning and English language learning achievements*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820933190>
- Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2021). Hong Kong secondary students' self-regulated learning strategy use and English writing: Influences of motivational beliefs. *System*, 96, 102404.



Lan Wang

The references should be 30 references of articles from reputable journals

References are strongly suggested in the latest 5 years

3. Artikel hasil revisi yang disubmit(4 Maret 2024) dan bukti submit artikel hasil revisi

A STUDY ON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' SELF-REGULATED MOTIVATION TO IMPROVE EFL SPEAKING SKILLS ACROSS ACADEMIC LEVELS

¹*Silih Warni, ²Tri Wintolo Apoko, ³Martriwati, ⁴Angsu-orn Na Nongkhai

¹²³English Lecturer, Department of English, Faculty of Teachers Training and Pedagogy,
Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. Hamka, Indonesia

⁴Lecturer, Department of Liberal Arts and Education, Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, Khon
Kaen University, Thailand

*Corresponding Author Email: silihwarni@uhamka.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract (10pt, Bold)
Article History	
Received:	<i>Students in most universities in non-English Speaking countries have limited opportunities to speak English in class. Self-regulated learning enables some self-motivated students to find opportunities outside the classroom to have face to face and virtual interaction to enhance their English speaking. This study is intended to examine the level of self-regulated motivation of university students to improve their Speaking of English as a foreign language (SRMIS-EFL). Moreover, this study investigates if students' SRMIS-EFL differ across academic levels. This research applied a quantitative survey design, and 156 EFL students from an English Department in a private university in Jakarta took part in this study. Self-reported SRMIS-EFL questionnaire was used as the data collecting method. Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis was then conducted to address the research objectives. The findings showed that the overall SRMIS-ELF level of students was high. Moreover, students used various self-regulatory motivation strategies to enhance their EFL speaking skills. As for the aspect of academic level, the results of this study shows that SRMIS-EFL of senior students are lower than SRMIS-EFL of junior students, and there is a statistically significant difference of students' SRMIS-EFL across academic levels. The findings of this study suggest the need for motivational regulation training into EFL programs to increase students' awareness of motivational self-regulation strategies to enhance their self-regulated motivation.</i>
Revised:	
Published:	
Keywords	
self-regulated learning, self-regulated motivation, academic level, EFL speaking	
How to cite:	

INTRODUCTION

Self-regulated learning (SRL) is an essential competence that contributes to the foundation for lifelong learning (Dent & Koenka, 2016; Theobald, 2021). According to

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk (2011) SRL is described as a dynamic process in which students actively engage and maintain attitudes, behaviors, and cognitions that are systematically focused on achieving their personal objectives. Higher education places SRL as important concept since university students need to be able to self-organize their coursework (Broadbent, 2017; Broadbent & Poon, 2015). Higher education students that use more effective SRL strategies show better academic achievement (Schneider & Preckel, 2017) and higher satisfaction with their studies (Liborius et al., 2019).

In order to develop language competence, both input and output are essential. Input provides learners with exposure of the target language in context (Mackey, A., & Gass, 2015), while output enables them to produce written or spoken language (Swain, 1985). However, according to Dornyei (1990), some foreign language contexts do not offer sufficient input or opportunities for output, which results in more challenging language learning and requires learners to make more effort in learning the language. In this situation, an independent language learning process concerning what, when, how and where to learn (Kellenberg et al., 2019) which is referred to as self-regulated learning (SRL) (Ore et al., 2018) becomes an alternative solution to deal with the complexities of learning foreign languages. Self-regulated learning is concerned with the regulation of various aspects of learning including cognitive, affective, behavioral, and motivational aspects.

For enhancing their EFL speaking in university contexts where lecturers and students have limited opportunities to practice English speaking inside the classroom, some self-motivated students embrace SRL to create and catch opportunities to speak English outside the classroom. Moreover, they make use of physical and virtual human interaction supported by technology, to enhance their language learning (M Alotumi, 2020). With the support of available and portable technology such as mobile devices, university students could learn EFL anywhere (M Alotumi, 2020). SRL enables students to learn more flexibly in terms of time and place, which is energized by their motivational beliefs (Bai & Wang, 2021; Ge, 2021; Kryshko et al., 2020).

The motivational orientation of Pintrich's (2004) SRL conceptual model is referred to as Self-regulated Motivation (SRM) (Uztosun, 2020). Furthermore, Uztosun (2020) defined SRM as students' self-regulatory attempts or strategies to control their motivational beliefs to maintain their SRL. Students could apply a range of self-regulatory motivational strategies in improving their EFL speaking skills, and the levels of SRMIS-EFL could vary among students (Mohialdeen Alotumi, 2021). Even though the need for incorporating SRM in EFL learning is obvious, there has been limited number of studies—as far as the researcher is concerned—looking into students' SRM to improve their EFL speaking skills in different contexts. In the Indonesian context particularly, there has been no study concerning SRM for improving EFL speaking. Several existing studies on SRM have shown mixed results concerning the correlation between higher education students' self-regulated motivation and their academic level and gender (e.g. Sun & Wang, 2020; Teng & Zhang, 2020; Yan et al., 2020). This study is therefore intended to investigate EFL students' SRMIS-EFL in Indonesian higher education context and examine if students' SRMIS-EFL differ across academic levels.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Self-regulated Learning (SRL)

A number of descriptions concerning SRL have been suggested by different authors as it plays important role in the learning process (Uztosun, 2021). The term SRL encompasses various aspects of learning, including motivation, metacognition, and the regulation of cognitive skills and strategies (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). Winne (1996) defined SRL with more emphasis on the function of metacognition; SLR refers to metacognitively guided behavior to regulate cognitive strategies when dealing with a learning task. As this study is concerned with students' motivation to speak English outside the classroom for their English speaking skills development, the goal-oriented nature of SRM becomes relevant. A model which informed this study's theoretical framework is the model suggested by Pintrich (2004),

which is based on the social-cognitive theory of Bandura (1986).

In addition to some definitions of SRL conceptualized from a goal-oriented perspective, other definitions put emphasis on the SRL metacognitive aspect (Huh & Reigeluth, 2017). SRL was defined by Schunk, D.H., Zimmerman (2012) as “the process whereby students activate and sustain cognitions, behaviors, and affects, which are systematically oriented toward attainment of their goals” (p. 309). This study is focused on the goal-oriented perspective of SRL as establishing specific goals suitable with the nature of speaking is prominent to develop speaking skills.

Self-regulated learners manage their actions during the learning process by utilizing their mental processes in ways that are appropriate for the tasks at hand. By fostering positive emotions like curiosity and self-assurance and reducing negative ones like worry and annoyance, they are able to regulate their emotions. Self-regulated learners are independent thinkers who can decide what kind of learning objectives are appropriate for the circumstances in which they are learning (Klimas, 2017) and other aspects of learning such as various learning strategies to achieve their goals (Barry J. Zimmerman, 2002). Moreover, self-regulated learners control their cognitive processes (Butler & Winne, 1995) and cope with difficulties in their learning (Hwang & Lee, 2019). They have a capacity to critically reflect on their learning experiences (Mekala, S., & Radhakrishnan, 2019) and develop internal feedback (Hattie, J., & Timperley, 2007). Instead of attributing failure to outside forces, they grow in self-awareness (Nakata, 2019).

SRL places a strong emphasis on how students may consciously activate, sustain, and modify their affect, cognition, and behavior in order to meet their learning objectives (Barry J. Zimmerman, 2013). SRL involves a cyclical and dynamic process wherein students must use a variety of techniques to actively manage their thoughts, convictions, observable behaviors, and learning situations (Barry J. Zimmerman, 2013). As a result, SRL techniques incorporate a variety of elements to control motivation, social behavior, metacognition, and cognition in various learning environments (Oxford, 2017; Barry J. Zimmerman, 2013). Promoting SRL strategies necessitates motivational support to assist students commence, sustain, and improve their learning efforts (Schunk, D.H., & Greene, 2018; Zimmerman, B.J., & Schunk, 2008).

SRL incorporates various components of skills; determining learning objectives, utilizing effective learning strategies, monitoring learning progress, reorganizing the physical and social environment, managing time, self-evaluating learning techniques and outcomes, and modifying future approaches (Barry J. Zimmerman, 2002). Restructuring the social context is one of the most important of these since it affects goal setting and can thus result in different goal pathways (Boekaerts, M., & Niemivirta, 2000). Thus, it is reasonable to say that learners regulate their learning based on their understanding of the context, and that self-regulation is started by looking at the elements of the learning context (Boekaerts, M., & Niemivirta, 2000).

This element is highly pertinent to the study's objectives because it highlights the need for effective analysis of a monolingual learning environment's shortcomings and learning regulation to address issues with input/output opportunities. Enhancing foreign language speaking proficiency requires these components. Based on this presumption, this study defines self-regulating learners as people who take initiative to address the lack of input and output opportunities in their learning contexts and actively search for new opportunities to learn and communicate in a foreign language. With its characteristics and requirements, SRL could promote academic achievement (Bai & Wang, 2020; Theobald, 2021), and self-regulated learners could succeed in foreign language learning (Atay, 2022; Puspitasari & Ishak, 2023)

Self-regulated Motivation (SRM)

With regards to the motivational aspects, the term Self-regulated motivation (SRM) is referred to as the extent to which learners attempt to initiate, maintain, and promote motivation (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). SRM is likely to affect several factors of learning

such as learner effort, perseverance, self-efficacy, outcome expectation, and goal orientation (Huh & Reigeluth, 2017; Uztosun, 2021; Christopher A. Wolters, 2003).

In the context of learning, SRM determines the extent to which learners begin, continue, or increase their willingness to begin, put effort into, or finish a specific task or objective (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). This perspective acknowledges SRM as the founder of SRL and highlights the highly driven nature of self-regulated learners (B. J. Zimmerman, 2021) who make a conscious effort to affect their motivation level, primarily by their intrinsic motivation (Wolters, C. A., & Benzon, 2013). This calls for understanding the fundamental mechanisms that govern motivation and control ideas, and/or behaviors in order to make wise decisions, put in consistent effort, and/or persevere through learning activities (Christopher A. Wolters, 2003).

The concept of SRM relates to Deci and Ryan's (Deci, E. L., & Ryan, 1985) self-determination theory (SDT) of motivation, which examines how self-determined and self-motivated a person's activities are. The theory is based on the idea that different types of motivation are associated to different forms of regulation and behavior quality. Deci and Ryan (2002) suggested In different types of motivation and regulation in the self-determination continuum ranging from amotivation, extrinsic motivation, and intrinsic motivation. Amotivation, at the left end of the continuum refers to nonregulation and non-self-determined behavior. On the other hand, intrinsic motivation at the right end of the continuum, deals with intrinsic regulation and self-determined actions. Understanding the relationship between various motivation, regulation, and self-determined behavior requires an understanding of SDT and its continuum.

Another view of SRM suggests that SRM comprises three important aspects: knowledge of motivation, monitoring of motivation, and control of motivation (Wolters, C. A., & Benzon, 2013). In order to control motivation, individuals need to learn about motivational regulating techniques and how to hold views about subjects, fields, and assignments (Uztosun, 2021). In order to regulate motivation, learners also need to monitor their motivation during their learning tasks. Moreover, learners have to understand what deliberate actions need to take to manage their effort, motivation, and perseverance.

According to Wolters (2003), there are a number of strategies that can be used to regulate motivation. The first strategy is self-consequating; a learner promises him/herself a reward after doing a task. Goal-oriented self-talk is another strategy when a learner reminds himself of his/her learning goal. The third strategy is interest enhancement; a learner promotes interest toward the learning task. Other strategies include environmental structuring such as setting up a physical study environment, selhandicapping, such as attributing failure externally, attribution control, such as attributing success internally, efficacy management, such as raising perceived level of self-efficacy, and emotion control, such as managing affect.

SRM plays an important role in foreign language learning as it affects students' effort, perseverance, expectations for their results, and goal-orientedness (Huh & Reigeluth, 2017; Christopher A. Wolters, 2003). In this present study, the term self-regulated speaking motivation (SRSM) is used as the measure of how well students control their intrinsic motivation to become more proficient speakers (Uztosun, 2021).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study is intended to investigate Indonesian junior and senior EFL university students' SRMIS-EFL. Moreover, it examines the relationship between students' academic level and their SRMIS-EFL.

Research Design

This research applied a quantitative survey design to investigate Indonesian EFL college students' overall level of SRMIS-EFL and examine the correlation between students'

academic levels and their levels of SRMIS-EFL. Survey enables researcher to gain a quantitative description of trends, attitudes, and opinions as well as to examine connections among variables of a population, by investigating the sample of the population (Creswell, John W., 2017). According to Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison (2018), surveys are conducted to gather data at a particular point in time in order to describe the nature of existing conditions, or examining the relationships between specific events. In this study, data collection by means of questionnaire as the best instrument to measure students' motivational self-regulatory strategies (Dörrenbächer-Ulrich et al., 2021), was conducted during the academic year 2021/2022.

Subject

The participants of the study comprised 156 students of a private university in Jakarta majoring in English at the English Department. 78 were juniors – first- and second-year students who were still having speaking courses, and 78 students were seniors – third- and fourth-year students who were no longer taking any speaking course. In an English as a foreign language learning context, students have limited opportunity to practice their speaking outside the classroom. They need to depend on themselves to improve their EFL speaking competence. As for the seniors, there is no more formal speaking course offered. This study applied convenience sampling in which respondents were chosen based on their convenience and availability (Creswell, John W., 2017). University students majoring in English at the Faculty of teachers training and pedagogy were chosen for their willingness to take part in this research. The demographic data of the respondents can be seen in table 1.

Table 1. Demographic data of the participants

No	Demographic Characteristics	Students	
		Total	%
Gender			
1.	Male	23	
	Female	83	
Academic level			
2.	Senior (year 3 and 4)	78	50
	Junior (year 1 and 2)	78	50
Reasons for taking English Department			
3.	Students' own choice	18	
	Suggestions from others	86	

Instruments

This study applied online questionnaire to collect the data concerning students' SRMIS-EFL. The questionnaire contained two main sections; the first section was about demographics, and the second part contained an online modified version of Uztosun's (2020) self-regulated motivation for improving speaking English as a foreign language (SRMIS-EFL) scale. The demographics section included two sections that sought information on the respondents' demographic information in terms of academic level and gender. However, the aspect of gender was excluded in this article since this study is intended to examine the levels of SRMIS-EFL across academic levels. The section of the SRMIS-EFL scale incorporated four subsections. The first part is concerned with students' task value activation. It consists of seven items (items 1–7) which measure students' value of developing EFL speaking skills. The second subsection deals with students' regulation of learning environment. This second part comprises five items (items 8–12), measuring the extent to which students surpassed the constraints of EFL situations with little input to be exposed to a variety of English-language

sources. The third subsection with three items (items 13-15) addressed regulation of affect. This subsection examined students' ability to control emotional aspects that can prevent them from becoming proficient EFL speakers. The fourth subsection comprising five items (items 16-20), are concerned with students' regulation of classroom environment. It assessed students' active engagement in classroom tasks and activities. Every item of the questionnaire was measured using a 5-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5). The questionnaires were then presented in the online version by means of Google Form. The online questionnaire enabled the researcher to collect numerical data from many respondents with less cost, effort and time. Moreover, the use of online survey could reduce errors of data entry and could facilitate data collection into organized spreadsheets for data analysis (Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, 2018).

Through WhatsApp groups of students from year one, year two, year three and year four, the researcher informed the students about the objectives of the study and invited students' participation. The researcher expressed an appreciation of students' willingness to voluntarily take part in this study before distributing the online questionnaire and collecting the data. Students were asked to fill in the online questionnaire once with their utmost honesty. The link of the online questionnaire could be accessed through students' WhatsApp groups, and students could fill in it from 22 June until 14 July 2022. During three weeks, 78 EFL junior students (year 1 and 2) and 78 EFL university senior students (year 3 and 4) responded to the online questionnaire.

According to Uztosun (2020), SRMIS-EFL scale had high validity and reliability (Cronbach's α .90)—all sub-scales had high reliabilities (Cronbach's α > .80). However, as the questionnaires were translated into Indonesian and targeted for Indonesian respondents, the validity and reliability of the instruments were checked with the data collected from 156 respondents.

The Result of validity and reliability test of the instrument

In order to be claimed as valid instrument, all items translated into Indonesian in the questionnaire were analyzed for their validity and reliability. According to the table of r value, with the number of 156 participants, the r value for the validity test of the instrument is 0.1313. The results of the validity analysis using SPSS show that all items in the questionnaire have r value which are higher than the r table. It could be concluded that all items in the questionnaire are valid. Furthermore, the reliability test of the instrument using SPSS results in alpha cronbach of $0.920 > 0.6$., indicating that the instrument in this research is reliable.

Data Analysis

The responses from the participants in Google Form were downloaded for data tabulation and analysis. The data were then sorted based on respondents' academic levels: one answered by senior students, and the other one by junior students. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v. 26) for descriptive and inferential statistics.

Descriptive statistics were calculated to find the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of respondents' perceptions toward their level of SRMIS-EFL. As for the inferential statistics, independent t-test was conducted to draw conclusion whether there is a significant difference of students' SRMIS-EFL across academic levels.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

This study is intended to investigate students' SRMIS-EFL and examine its association with their academic level. The data collected through questionnaires from 156 EFL students respondents were then analyzed, and the results of the data analysis can be seen in the following section.

Senior Students' Levels of SRMIS-EFL

Students from higher semesters responded to the 20 questions in the questionnaire. The percentages of their responses could be seen in the following table

Table 2. Frequency percentages for SRMIS-EFL among senior EFL college students (n = 78).

No.	Statements/Items	Percent (%)				
		SD	D	U	A	SA
1	I remind myself that I must speak English fluently.	0	0	5.1	38.5	56.4
2	I pay close attention to the teacher when she speaks in English.	0	0	2.6	34.6	62.8
3	I increase my enthusiasm and willingness to learn English.	0	1.3	15.4	38.5	44.9
4	I learn from my mistakes when speaking English.	0	0	6.4	37.2	56.4
5	I learn from others' mistakes in order to speak English better	1.3	2.6	16.7	33.3	46.2
6	I always try to pay attention in English class.	0	1.3	6.4	44.9	47.4
7	I try a variety of methods to boost my motivation to speak English.	0	2.6	10.3	30.8	56.4
8	To improve my English skills, I make friends from various countries.	0	14.1	29.5	23.1	33.3
9	I use English to communicate with foreigners online.	1.3	9	16.7	38.5	34.6
10	I interact with English native speakers.	10.3	26.9	35.9	12.8	14.1
11	To get better at speaking English, I try to go to locations that attract a lot of foreign visitors.	15.4	30.8	34.6	9	10.3
12	When I interact with foreigners, I try to practice my English.	7.7	14.1	24.4	38.5	15.4
13	Speaking English helps me get over my fear.	2.6	16.7	44.9	23.1	12.8
14	I can manage my anxiety when I communicate in English.	3.8	24.4	35.9	28.2	7.7
15	I try to speak with a lot of confidence when I speak in English.	1.3	5.1	19.2	50	24.4
16	I speak in English during class whenever I can.	1.3	3.8	37.2	39.7	17.9
17	When I'm around people I know, like friends and classmates, I talk in English.	0	2.6	23.1	42.3	32.1
18	I try to participate in as many English-speaking activities as possible during class.	2.6	9	38.5	35.9	14.1
19	I agree that students should speak English in class.	1.3	2.6	34.6	35.9	25.6
20	My friends and I spend time together encouraging each other to speak English.	5.1	7.7	15.4	44.9	26.9
SD: Strongly Disagree D: Disagree U: Undecided A: Agree						
SA: Strongly Agree						

Using a Likert-type scale, the senior student participants answered 20 statements to indicate their SRMIS-EFL level. The frequency of responses to the 20-item SRMIS-EFL scale, which includes items 1–7 measuring task value activation, items 8–12 measuring learning environment regulation, items 13–15 measuring affect regulation, and items 16–20 measuring classroom environment regulation, is displayed in Table 1. Referring to Alotumi's (2021) mean score interpretation framework, the SRM levels are categorized into five levels. A mean score between 1.0 and ≤ 1.8 is regarded as extremely low motivation, between 1.8 and ≤ 2.6 as low, between 2.6 and ≤ 3.4 as medium, between 3.4 and ≤ 4.2 as high, and between 4.2 and ≤ 5.0 as a very high motivation level.

Overall, senior students' SRMIS-EFL level was high, with an overall response mean of 3.8 and a standard deviation of 0.5, as can be seen in the following table.

Table 3. Distribution of SRMIS-EFL mean scores for senior students.

Scale	Mean	Median	Mode	SD	Range
Task value activation	4.4	4.4	5	0.5	2
Regulation of learning environment	3.3	3.4	2.6	0.8	3.6
Regulation of affect	3.4	3.3	3.3	0.8	4
Regulation of classroom environment	3.8	3.8	4.2	0.7	3.6
Overall senior SRMIS-EFL	3.8	3.8	3.7	0.6	2.4

Table 3 demonstrates that senior students had a very high level of activating task value, as seen by their mean score of 4.4 (SD = 0.5) regarding task value activation. The majority of senior student participants agreed or strongly agreed that they should remind themselves that they need to speak English fluently (94.4%), pay close attention in class (92.3%), pay attention to the teacher when they speak in English (96.8%), develop their interest in and willingness to learn the language (83.4%), learn from their mistakes when they speak English (93.6%), learn

from other people's mistakes to speak English more correctly (79.5%), and try a variety of ways to promote their motivation to speak English (87.2%).

Regarding regulation of learning environment, the mean score of senior students' responses was 3.3 (SD = 0.8), indicating a medium level of learning environment regulation. Most senior student participants (73.1%) agreed and strongly agreed that they try to communicate with foreigners in English on the internet. More than half of the participants (56.4 %) agreed and strongly agreed that they try to find friends from different countries to practice their English. Only a small number of participants (36.9 %) made contact with English native speakers. Majority of student respondents try to practice their English when meeting foreigners (53.9%). About half of senior student participants (46.2%) disagreed and strongly disagreed about trying to visit places with lots of foreigners to improve their English skills.

Senior students' responses on affect regulation had a mean score of 3.4 (SD = 0.8), which indicates a medium level of affect regulation. Approximately 44.0% of the senior student participants were unsure about their ability to get over their fear of speaking English. and roughly half of them (48 percent) agreed or strongly agreed with continuing to have a high level of self-confidence. Out of all the participants, only 35.9% said they could manage their anxiety when speaking in English (35.9%).

The mean score for senior students' replies regarding controlling their classroom environment was 3.8 (SD = 0.7), showing a medium level of classroom environment regulation. More than half of senior student respondents (66%) and majority of them (74.4%), respectively, agreed or strongly agreed about making use of every opportunity during lessons to speak English and speaking in English with the people they know. Half of the student participants agree and strongly agree about trying to take part in English speaking activities as much as possible (50 %), and most of them supported the idea of speaking English in class (81.5%). 71.8% of participants agree and strongly agree about spending time with friends who motivate each other to speak English.

Junior Students' Levels of SRMIS-EFL

The same SRMIS-EFL questionnaire that was given to the senior students was answered by the junior student participants. The percentages of junior students' responses to the questionnaire items are shown in the following table.

Table 4. Frequency percentages for SRMIS-EFL among junior EFL college students (n = 78).

No.	Statements/Items	Percent (%)				
		SD	D	U	A	SA
1	I remind myself that I must speak English fluently.	0	1.3	6.4	23.1	69.2
2	I pay close attention to the teacher when she speaks in English.	1.3	0	3.8	16.7	78.2
3	I increase my enthusiasm and willingness to learn English.	0	0	6.4	33.3	60.3
4	I learn from my mistakes when speaking English.	0	0	3.8	24.4	71.8
5	I learn from others' mistakes in order to speak English better	0	0	6.4	33.3	60.3
6	I always try to pay attention in English class.	0	1.3	7.7	24.4	66.7
7	I try a variety of methods to boost my motivation to speak English.	0	0	2.6	28.2	69.2
8	To improve my English skills, I make friends from various countries.	2.6	5.1	34.6	23.1	34.6
9	I use English to communicate with foreigners online.	2.6	6.4	24.4	30.8	35.9
10	I interact with English native speakers.	10.3	26.9	32.1	12.8	17.9
11	To get better at speaking English, I try to go to locations that attract a lot of foreign visitors.	12.8	21.8	32.1	17.9	15.4
12	When I interact with foreigners, I try to practice my English.	2.6	7.7	19.2	41	29.5
13	Speaking English helps me get over my fear.	0	6.4	44.9	24.4	24.4
14	I can manage my anxiety when I communicate in English.	0	7.7	47.4	20.5	24.4
15	I try to speak with a lot of confidence when I speak in English.	0	2.6	9	46.2	42.3
16	I speak in English during class whenever I can.	1.3	2.6	14.1	41	41
17	When I'm around people I know, like friends and classmates, I talk in English.	0	1.3	30.8	24.4	43.6
18	I try to participate in as many English-speaking activities as possible during class.	2.6	5.1	24.4	30.8	37.2
19	I agree that students should speak English in class.	0	1.3	17.9	39.7	41
20	My friends and I spend time together encouraging each other to speak English.	1.3	0	26.9	35.9	35.9

As for the junior students' overall SRMIS-EFL level can be seen in the table 5. A greater SRMIS-EFL level was indicated by higher scores, and a lower SRMISEFL level was indicated by lower scores.

Table 5. Distribution of SRMIS-EFL mean scores for junior students.

Scale	Mean	Median	Mode	SD	Range
Task value activation	4.6	4.7	5	0.4	2
Regulation of learning environment	3.5	3.4	3.4	0.8	3.6
Regulation of affect	3.9	3.7	3.3	0.8	3
Regulation of classroom environment	4.1	4.1	5	0.7	3.4
Overall junior SRMIS-EFL	4.1	4	4	0.5	2.5

Junior students' overall SRMIS-EFL level was generally high, with a mean score of 4.1 overall and a standard deviation of 0.5 (see Table 5).

The frequency of responses to the 20-item SRMIS-EFL scale is shown in Table 5. The mean score of the responses from junior students indicated that their level of task value activation was 4.6 (SD = 0.4 indicating a high degree of task value activation. Majority of junior students responded agreed or strongly agreed that they should remind themselves to speak English fluently (92.3%), listening to the teacher carefully when him/her speaks in English (94.9 %), developing their interest and willingness to learn English (93.6 %), learning from their mistakes when they speak English (96.2 %), learning from the mistakes other people make in order to speak English more correctly (96.2%), trying to pay attention all the time in English lessons (91.1%), and trying various ways to enhance their motivation to speak English (97.4 %).

With regards to regulating their learning environment, the responses from junior students had a mean score of 3.2. (SD = 0.8), pointing to a medium level of learning environment regulation. Majority of junior students (70.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that they should attempt to practice their English when they interact with foreigners. 66.7% of junior students agreed or strongly agreed with the idea of making overseas acquaintances in order to practice speaking English and conversing with foreigners online, and 30.7% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that speaking with English native speakers is a good idea. Less than half of the junior student respondents (33.3%) agreed or strongly agreed about visiting places with lots of foreigners.

As for the regulation of affect, junior students' responses had a mean score of 3.9 (SD = 0.8), confirming a high level of affect regulation. 48.8% of the student participants agreed or strongly agreed that they can overcome their fear speaking English. Almost half of the junior student participants agreed or strongly agreed that they can cope with their anxiety when they speak English. However, 88.5 of the junior student participants stated that they tried to maintain a high level of my confidence when they speak English.

Concerning junior students' responses on regulation of classroom environment, the mean score was 3.8.(SD = 0.7), pointing to a medium level of classroom environment regulation. Majority of them (82%), agreed or strongly agreed about using every opportunity during lessons. 68% of them stated that they speak in English with the people they know try to take part in English speaking activities as much as possible. Majority of junior student participants agreed with the idea of speaking English in class (81.5%) and spending time with companions who inspire one another to learn English (70.8%).

Difference of students SRM across academic levels

As mentioned earlier, to assess whether there is a statistically significant difference of students' overall SRMIS-EFL between juniors and seniors, independent t-test was conducted using SPSS version 26. The output of SPSS independent t-test can be seen in the following table.

Table 6. Output of SPSS independent t-test

Group Statistics										
	Academic levels	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean					
Overall	Junior	78	4.0987	0.53464	0.06054					
	Senior	78	3.8385	0.55531	0.06288					

Independent Samples Test										
Lavene's Tests for Equality of Variances						t-test for Equality of Means				
						95% Confidence interval of the Difference				
						Sig (3-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Overall	Equal variances assumed	F	Sig.	t	df	0.003	0.26026	0.08728	0.08783	0.43268
	Equal variances not assumed			2.982	153.779	0.003	0.26026	0.08728	0.08783	0.43268

The table above shows that the average SRMIS-EFL score for junior students is 4.0987, while the average SRMIS-EFL score for the senior student sample is 3.8385. Thus, descriptive statistics can be concluded that there is a difference in the average SRMIS-EFL between senior students and junior students, where SRMIS-EFL of senior students are lower than SRMIS-EFL of junior students. The Independent Sample T-Test results in a sig (2-tailed) value of 0.863 where $0.03 < 0.05$. Thus it can be concluded that there is significant difference between the average SRMIS-EFL of junior students and that of senior students.

Discussion

This study investigated EFL university students' level of SRMIS-EFL and examined whether or not the level of senior students differ from that of junior students. As presented in the research findings, the participants generally had a high level of SRMIS-EFL. The overall mean of senior students' SRMIS-EFL was 3.8 (SD = 0.6), indicating a high SRMIS-EFL level. The subdomain of task value activation was very high (M=4.4, SD=0.5), indicating that senior students were able to remind themselves when they need to speak English well, listen to their teachers carefully when he/she speaks in English, develop their interest and willingness to learn English, learn from their mistakes when they speak English, learn from others' mistakes to speak English better, pay attention to English lessons and try different strategies to enhance their motivation to speak English. This finding is in line with previous studies conducted by Chou (2018), Uztosun (2020), Zhang et al. (2020) revealing that students with more enthusiasm to engage in oral communication in English may show a greater task value as a result of their belief that improving their EFL speaking skills is important. Consequently, students use more self-regulated learning techniques in their pursuit of enhancing their EFL proficiency (Cho et al., 2020; Sekar Diasti & Laos Mbato, 2020; Teng & Zhang, 2020; Uztosun, 2021).

The very high level of senior students' task value activation subdomain could be due to senior students' awareness of the relevance of English learning tasks to their interests, goals, and future aspirations (Uztosun, 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). For senior students, this can entail talking about how fluency in English can help them in their academic endeavors, professional aspirations, or leisure activities (Arnó-Macià, E., Aguilar-Pérez, M., & Tatzl, 2020). Senior students also have more exposure to the real-world situations which require them to be competent in English speaking. This could include more experiences of course projects that require senior students to apply English skills in practical contexts relevant to their lives and their position as a pre-service teachers. The senior student respondents in this study were taking either peer-teaching or internship program which require them to speak English fluently.

Although senior students showed very high levels of their task value activation in speaking English, the other three subdomains of senior students' SRMIS-EFL which include regulation of learning environment, regulation of affect, and regulation of classroom environment were in medium level. Hence, their overall level of SRMIS-EFL is lower than that of junior students. This finding contradicts a previous study conducted by Alotumi (2021) which revealed that students' academic level had no significant effect on their SRMIS-EFL; students' EFL speaking competence did not differ significantly between juniors and seniors. Students from both junior and senior groups in Alotumi's (2021) study were not offered any speaking course in the college. Meanwhile, junior student participants in this study were still having speaking courses which were formally offered to enhance students' speaking skills. This result confirms the consensus of earlier studies, showing that in situations where there is official upskilling in EFL proficiency, students' motivational self-regulation may vary depending on their educational level (Teng & Zhang, 2020). As students at both academic levels did not receive any instruction that could have assisted them in developing self-regulatory skills, university motivational self-regulation training is required (Wang, H., Yang, J., Li, 2021). The value of teacher participation in helping students develop a self-awareness of their motivating tendencies to modify their learning becomes important (Teng & Zhang, 2020; Yan et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020).

Self-regulated motivation is necessary in enhancing EFL speaking skills as English learners in EFL context have limited opportunity to practice their English both inside and outside the classroom (Mohialdeen Alotumi, 2021). Individuals with high levels of self-regulated motivation are more likely to set specific goals for improving their English-speaking skills. These goals could be related to achieving a certain score on a language proficiency test or being able to communicate fluently in specific contexts. In terms of strategy use, self-regulated learners actively seek out and employ various strategies to enhance their English-speaking abilities (Uztosun, 2020). This could include practicing speaking with native speakers, using language learning apps, or participating in language exchange programs.

Individuals with self-regulated motivation are more likely to persist in their language learning efforts despite challenges or setbacks (Uztosun, 2021). They are more resilient and proactive in seeking out opportunities to practice and improve their speaking skills. Ultimately, individuals who possess high levels of self-regulated motivation are more likely to achieve higher academic levels (Kryshko et al., 2020). Their proactive approach to learning, combined with effective goal-setting and strategy use, contributes to improved language proficiency over time.

Regarding regulation of affect, senior students exhibited a lower level of affect regulation than junior students did, which indicates that junior students could overcome their anxiety and fear as well as enhancing their self-confidence. The results support the idea that EFL students with positive emotional views can make better use of their cognitive and metacognitive SRL methods (Sun and Wang, 2020; Teng et al., 2020). Students could increase their proficiency in EFL speaking by continuing to participate in English-speaking assignments while suppressing their negative affective responses (Uztosun, 2020, 2021; Zhang et al., 2020).

Furthermore, senior and junior students' classroom environment regulation were in the medium level. It might be the result of students participating in diverse class-based assignments and activities with different classmates, which should be promoted. Teachers' roles in the classroom can be assigned to the medium level of this SRMIS-EFL subsection since research indicates that teachers are crucial in fostering student engagement through engaging and cooperative activities that meet students' needs. (Seli and Dembo, 2020; Teng et al., 2020).

When it came to their efforts to find more chances to practice and improve their learning outside of the classroom, both senior and junior students reported a medium level of regulation of their learning environment. It validates relevant research indicating that EFL students may seek out richer informal EFL-input contexts to practice speaking the language and get around the limitations of their restricted formal EFL-input learning environments (Uztosun, 2020).

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to look at the SRMIS-EFL of EFL students in the setting of higher education in Indonesia and see whether there are any differences between academic

levels. A total of 156 EFL college students' data were collected and examined. There are exactly the same number of junior and senior students—78 juniors and 78 seniors.

The SRMIS-EFL level of senior students was high generally, as seen in the accompanying table, with an overall answer mean of 3.8 and a standard deviation of 0.5. The mean score for senior students in terms of task value activation was 4.4 (SD = 0.5), which suggests a very high degree of activating task value. In reference to the regulation of the learning environment, the average score of senior students' answers was 3.3 (standard deviation = 0.8), signifying a moderate degree of regulation. The replies of senior students indicated a medium degree of emotion control, with a mean score of 3.4 (SD = 0.8) in this regard. A medium level of classroom environment regulation was indicated by the senior students' mean score of 3.8 (SD = 0.7) on their responses about managing their classroom.

It was discovered that junior students' SRMIS-EFL level was typically high, with a mean score of 4.1 overall and a standard deviation of 0.5. The task value activation scale revealed a comparatively high mean score of 4.6 (SD = 0.4) for the junior students' responses. With a mean score of 3.2 (SD = 0.8) for managing their learning environment, junior students' responses suggested a medium level of learning environment regulation. A strong level of affect regulation was indicated by the junior students' replies, which had a mean score of 3.9 (SD = 0.8). When asked about the level of regulation in the classroom, junior students gave a mean score of 3.8 (SD = 0.7), which indicates a medium level of regulation.

Concerning the difference between senior and junior students' level of SRMIS-EFL, this study revealed that for junior students, the average SRMIS-EFL score is 4.0987, whereas for the senior student group, it is 3.8385. Descriptive statistics thus indicate that there is a difference in the average SRMIS-EFL between senior and junior pupils, with the former having a lower SRMIS-EFL than the latter. A sig (2-tailed) value of 0.863 is obtained from the Independent Sample T-Test, where $0.03 < 0.05$. Thus, it can be said that there is a notable variation between junior and senior students' average SRMIS-EFL scores.

The findings of this study, which are summarized above, indicates the need to train teachers and students on motivational regulation strategies particularly in improving skills speaking English as a foreign language. This way, students from various academic levels could regulate their motivation to speak English both inside and outside the classrooms. Moreover, teachers must use a variety of inspiring and cooperative learning activities that align with the needs and goals of their students.

Limitations

There are sample size limitations in the study. Even though the study's sample is representative of all English teachers in the study environment, additional participants will yield more accurate results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The first author expresses gratitude to the University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka research institute for the research funding and all the support. Appreciation is also addressed to all students in the English Department of University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka Jakarta for their time and effort to take part in the study.

REFERENCES

- Alotumi, M. (2020). EFL learning beyond the wall with MALL: College students' perceptions. In *Enhancements and limitations to ICT-based informal language learning: Emerging research and opportunities* (pp. 138–160). IGI Global.
- Alotumi, Mohialdeen. (2021). EFL college junior and senior students' self-regulated motivation for improving English speaking: A survey study. *Heliyon*, 7(4), e06664.

- Arnó-Macià, E., Aguilar-Pérez, M., & Tatzl, D. (2020). Engineering students' perceptions of the role of ESP courses in internationalized universities. *English for Specific Purposes*, 58, 58–74.
- Atay, D. (2022). *The Relationship between Self-Regulated Learning and EFL Achievement in Synchronous Online Language Education 1*. 46(3), 0–2.
- Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2020). *The role of growth mindset , self-efficacy and intrinsic value in self-regulated learning and English language learning achievements*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820933190>
- Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2021). Hong Kong secondary students' self-regulated learning strategy use and English writing: Influences of motivational beliefs. *System*, 96, 102404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102404>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *No Title Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Boekaerts, M., & Niemivirta, M. (2000). Self-regulated learning: Finding a balance between learning goals and ego-protective goals. In & M. Z. M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich (Ed.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 417–450). Academic Press.
- Broadbent, J. (2017). Comparing online and blended learner's self-regulated learning strategies and academic performance. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 33, 24–32.
- Broadbent, J., & Poon, W. L. (2015). Self-regulated learning strategies & academic achievement in online higher education learning environments: A systematic review. *Internet and Higher Education*, 27, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.04.007>
- Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and Self-Regulated Learning: A Theoretical Synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 65(3), 245–281. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543065003245>
- Cho, H. J., Yough, M., & Levesque-Bristol, C. (2020). Relationships between beliefs about assessment and self-regulated learning in second language learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 99(January 2019), 101505. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.101505>
- Chou, M. H. (2018). Speaking Anxiety and Strategy Use for Learning English as a Foreign Language in Full and Partial English-Medium Instruction Contexts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(3), 611–633. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.455>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education*. routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. (fifth ed.). SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Creswell, John W., and J. D. C. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. In E. L. D. & R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3–33). The University of Rochester Press.
- Dent, A. L., & Koenka, A. C. (2016). The Relation Between Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Achievement Across Childhood and Adolescence: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(3), 425–474. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9320-8>
- Dornyei, Z. (1990). *Conceptualizing Motivation in Foreign_language Learning_Dornyei*. *March*, 45–78.
- Dörrenbächer-Ulrich, L., Weißenfels, M., Russer, L., & Perels, F. (2021). Multimethod

assessment of self-regulated learning in college students: different methods for different components? *Instructional Science*, 49(1), 137–163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-020-09533-2>

- Ge, X. (2021). Emotion matters for academic success: Implications of the Article by Jarrell, Harley, Lajoie, and Naismith (2017) for creating nurturing and supportive learning environments to help students manage their emotions. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 69(1), 67–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09925-8>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.
- Huh, Y., & Reigeluth, C. M. (2017). Self-Regulated Learning: The Continuous-Change Conceptual Framework and a Vision of New Paradigm, Technology System, and Pedagogical Support. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 46(2), 191–214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239517710769>
- Hwang, M., & Lee, H. K. (2019). Development and Validation of a Self-regulated Language Learning Inventory. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 28(6), 543–562. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-019-00454-4>
- Kellenberg, F., Schmidt, J., & Werner, C. (2019). The Adult Learner: Self-Determined, Self-Regulated, and Reflective. *Journal of Pedagogy and Psychology "Signum Temporis,"* 9(1), 23–29. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sigtem-2017-0001>
- Klimas, A. (2017). A goal-setting logbook as an instrument fostering learner autonomy. In A. M. Pawlak & J. B. Mystkowska-Wiertelak (Eds.), *Autonomy in second language learning* (pp. 21–33). Springer International Publishing.
- Kryshko, O., Fleischer, J., Waldeyer, J., Wirth, J., & Leutner, D. (2020). Do motivational regulation strategies contribute to university students' academic success? *Learning and Individual Differences*, 82(November 2019), 101912. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101912>
- Liborius, P., Bellhäuser, H., & Schmitz, B. (2019). What makes a good study day? An intraindividual study on university students' time investment by means of time-series analyses. *Learning and Instruction*, 60(February 2016), 310–321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.10.006>
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2015). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Routledge.
- Mekala, S., & Radhakrishnan, G. (2019). Promoting self-regulated learning through metacognitive strategies. *IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, 13(2), 21–27.
- Nakata, Y. (2019). Encouraging student teachers to support self-regulated learning: A multiple case study on prospective language teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 95(July 2018), 200–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.01.007>
- Ore, D. I. N., Chen, C. M., Chen, L. C., Yang, S. M., Li, Y., Francisco, S., Su, Y., Zheng, C., Liang, J. C., Tsai, C. C., Choi, Y., Zhang, D., Lin, C., & Zhang, Y. (2018). Self-regulated learning of vocabulary in English as a Foreign Language The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly Volume 20 , Issue 1 Senior Editors : Paul Robertson and John Adamson. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 32(3), 105–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1485708>
- Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 385–407. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0006-x>
- Puspitasari, T., & Ishak, C. N. (2023). LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Learning <http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT> Sanata Dharma University,

Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Learning*, 25(1), 132–148. <http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT>

- Schneider, M., & Preckel, F. (2017). Variables associated with achievement in higher education: A systematic review of meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(6), 565–600. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000098>
- Schunk, D.H., & Greene, J. . (2018). Historical, contemporary, and future perspectives on self-regulated learning and performance. In & J. A. G. Schunk, D.H. (Ed.), *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (2nd editio).
- Schunk, D.H., Zimmerman, B. . (2012). Self-regulation and learning. In I. B. Weiner (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychology* (Second, pp. 45–68).
- Sekar Diasti, K., & Laos Mbato, C. (2020). Exploring Undergraduate Students' Motivation-regulation Strategies in Thesis Writing. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 14(2). <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/LC>
- Sun, T., & Wang, C. (2020). College students' writing self-efficacy and writing self-regulated learning strategies in learning English as a foreign language. *System*, 90, 102221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102221>
- Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Empowering learners in the second/foreign language classroom: Can self-regulated learning strategies-based writing instruction make a difference? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 48(November), 100701. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100701>
- Theobald, M. (2021). Self-regulated learning training programs enhance university students' academic performance, self-regulated learning strategies, and motivation: A meta-analysis. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 66(May), 101976. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2021.101976>
- Uztosun, M. S. (2020). The development of a scale for measuring the self-regulated motivation for improving speaking English as a foreign language. *Language Learning Journal*, 48(2), 213–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1335766>
- Uztosun, M. S. (2021). Foreign language speaking competence and self-regulated speaking motivation. *Foreign Language Annals*, 54(2), 410–428. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12559>
- Wang, H., Yang, J., Li, P. (2021). *How and when goal-oriented self-regulation improves college students' well-being: a weekly diary study*. Curr. Psychol.
- Winne, P. H. (1996). A metacognitive view of individual differences in self-regulated learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 8(4), 327–353. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1041-6080\(96\)90022-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1041-6080(96)90022-9)
- Wolters, C. A., & Bizon, M. B. (2013). Assessing and predicting college students' use of strategies for the self-regulation of motivation. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 81(2), 199–221.
- Wolters, C. A. (2003). Regulation of motivation: Evaluating an underemphasized aspect of self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 38, 189–205.
- Wolters, Christopher A. (2003). Regulation of Motivation: Evaluating an Underemphasized Aspect of Self-Regulated Learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 38(4), 189–205. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3804_1
- Yan, C., Gao, Y., & He, C. (2020). Examining Chinese EFL Postgraduates' Motivational Regulation Strategies. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 15(2), 250–278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11516-020-0012-x>
- Zhang, X., Dai, S., & Ardasheva, Y. (2020). Contributions of (de)motivation, engagement, and anxiety to English listening and speaking. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 79(March), 101856. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101856>
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2011). No Title. In *Handbook of Self-Regulation of*

Learning and Performance (pp. 15–26).

Zimmerman, B.J., & Schunk, D. . (2008). Motivation: An essential dimension of self-regulated learning. In & B. J. Z. Schunk, D.H. (Ed.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.


Zimmerman, B. J. (2021). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational Psychologist*, 25, 3–17.

Zimmerman, Barry J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2


Zimmerman, Barry J. (2013). From Cognitive Modeling to Self-Regulation: A Social Cognitive Career Path. *Educational Psychologist*, 48(3), 135–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2013.794676>

Bukti Submit Artikel Revisi (4 Maret 2024)

e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/jollt/author/submissionReview/10870











JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching
2338-0810 (Print), 2621-1378 (Online) Website: ojs.e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/jollt/index
Accredited Sinta by Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia
Decree No. 79/E/KPT/2023, July 2023



HOMEABOUTUSER HOMESearchCURRENTARCHIVESANNOUNCEMENTS

INDEXED/LISTED BY






NOTIFICATIONS

[View](#)
[Manage](#)

Journal Help

OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS

FONT SIZE



JOURNAL CONTENT

Home > User > Author > Submissions > #10870 > Review

#10870 Review

SUMMARYREVIEWEDITING

Submission

AuthorsSilih Wami, Tri Wintolo Apoko, Martriwati Martriwati, Angsu-orn Na Nongkhai

TitleA Study on University Students' Self-Regulated Motivation to Improve EFL Speaking Skills Across Academic Levels

SectionArticles

EditorCut Meutia

Peer Review

Round1

Review Version10870-39099-2-RV.DOCX 2024-02-27

Initiated2024-02-27

Last modified2024-03-04

Uploaded fileReviewer B 10870-39472-1-RV.DOCX 2024-02-28
Reviewer A 10870-39470-1-RV.DOCX 2024-02-28

Editor Decision

DecisionAccept Submission 2024-04-17

Notify EditorEditor/Author Email Record 2024-04-17

Editor Version10870-39425-1-ED.DOCX 2024-02-27

Author Version10870-39867-1-ED.DOCX 2024-03-12 DELETE
10870-39867-2-ED.DOCX 2024-04-17 DELETE
10870-39867-3-ED.DOCX 2024-04-17 DELETE

Upload Author VersionChoose File No file chosen Upload

ADDITIONAL MENU

FOCUS AND SCOPE

PUBLICATION ETHICS

EDITORIAL TEAM

REVIEWER

OPEN ACCESS POLICY

SCREENING PLAGIARISM

AUTHOR GUIDELINES

ONLINE SUBMISSION

AUTHOR FEES


CONTACT

ABSTRACTING/INDEXING


JOURNAL HISTORY

LICENSE TERM

IN COLLABORATION WITH













4.Konfirmasi Artikel Accepted: 17 April 2024



5. Bukti Artikel Published Online (22 April 2024)

→ e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/joltt/article/view/10870

INDEXED/LISTED BY



NOTIFICATIONS

[View](#)
[Subscribe](#)

Journal Help

OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS

FONT SIZE

Home > Vol 12, No 2 (2024) > Warni

A Study on University Students' Self-Regulated Motivation to Improve EFL Speaking Skills Across Academic Levels

Silih Warni, Tri Wintolo Apoko, Martriwati Martriwati, Angsu-orn Na Nongkhai

Abstract


opportunities to speak English in class. Self-regulated learning enables some self-motivated students to find opportunities outside the classroom to have face to face and virtual interaction to enhance their English speaking. This study is intended to examine the level of self-regulated motivation of university students to improve their Speaking of English as a foreign language (SRMIS-EFL). Moreover, this study investigates if students' SRMIS-EFL differ across academic levels. 156 EFL students from an English Department in a private university in Jakarta took part in this study. Self-reported SRMIS-EFL questionnaire was used as the data collecting method. Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis was then conducted. The findings showed that the overall SRMIS-ELF level of students was high. Moreover, students used various self-regulatory motivation strategies to enhance their EFL speaking skills. As for the aspect of academic level, the results of this study shows that SRMIS-EFL of senior students are lower than SRMIS-EFL of junior students, and there is a statistically significant difference of students' SRMIS-EFL across academic levels. The findings of this study suggest the need for motivational regulation training into EFL programs to increase students' awareness of motivational self-regulation strategies to enhance their self-regulated motivation.

Keywords


Self-regulated learning; Self-regulated motivation; Academic level; EFL speaking;

ADDITIONAL MENU


[FOCUS AND SCOPE](#)
[PUBLICATION ETHICS](#)
[EDITORIAL TEAM](#)
[REVIEWER](#)
[OPEN ACCESS POLICY](#)
[SCREENING PLAGIARISM](#)
[AUTHOR GUIDELINES](#)
[ONLINE SUBMISSION](#)
[AUTHOR FEES](#)
[CONTACT](#)
[ABSTRACTING/INDEXING](#)
[JOURNAL HISTORY](#)
[LICENSE TERM](#)
[IN COLLABORATION WITH](#)



e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/joltt/author/submission/10870













JOLTT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching
2338-0810 (Print), 2621-1378 (Online) Website: ojs e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/joltt/index
Accredited Sinta by Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia
Decree No. 79/E/KPT/2023, July 2023



HOME | ABOUT | USER HOME | SEARCH | CURRENT | ARCHIVES | ANNOUNCEMENTS

INDEXED/LISTED BY



NOTIFICATIONS

[View](#)
[Manage](#)

Home > User > Author > Submissions > #10870 > Summary

#10870 Summary

SUMMARY REVIEW EDITING

Submission

Authors	Silih Warni, Tri Wintolo Apoko, Martriwati Martriwati, Angsu-orn Na Nongkhai
Title	A Study on University Students' Self-Regulated Motivation to Improve EFL Speaking Skills Across Academic Levels
Original file	10870-39098-5-SM.DOCX 2024-02-16
Supp. files	None
Submitter	Dr Silih Warni
Date submitted	February 16, 2024 - 04:07 PM
Section	Articles
Editor	Cut Meutia
Abstract Views	591

Status

Status	Published Vol 12, No 2 (2024)
Initiated	2024-04-22
Last modified	2024-04-22

ADDITIONAL MENU

[FOCUS AND SCOPE](#)
[PUBLICATION ETHICS](#)
[EDITORIAL TEAM](#)
[REVIEWER](#)
[OPEN ACCESS POLICY](#)
[SCREENING PLAGIARISM](#)
[AUTHOR GUIDELINES](#)
[ONLINE SUBMISSION](#)
[AUTHOR FEES](#)
[CONTACT](#)
[ABSTRACTING/INDEXING](#)
[JOURNAL HISTORY](#)
[LICENSE TERM](#)