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

[1]*Silih Warni, [1]Tri Wintolo Apoko, [1]Martriwati, [2]Angsu-orn Na Nongkhai
[1]English Lecturer, Department of English, Faculty of Teachers Training and Pedagogy, Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. Hamka, Indonesia
[2]Lecturer, Department of Liberal Arts and Education, Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, Khon Kaen University, Thailand

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

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: February 2024 Revised: March 2024 Published: April 2024 **Keywords** *Self-regulated learning;* *Self-regulated motivation;* *Academic level;* *EFL speaking;*	*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.*

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' 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, observablele 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 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
Research Design
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. 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 RSMIS-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.

Research Participants

        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		
	Senior (year 3 and 4)	78	50
2.	Junior (year 1 and 2)	78	50
	Reasons for taking English Department		
3.	Students' own choice	18	
	Suggestions from others	86	

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 sevenitems (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 crombach 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	(%)				
		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
Overal 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.

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

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

No.	Statements/Items	Percent (%)				
		SD	D	U	A	SA
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
	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

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 %).

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

		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
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 (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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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

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 TitleSocial 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 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

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