

MEASUREMENT OF MOTIVATION AND BELIEF FOR SELECTIVE COURSE ‘ACADEMIC ENGLISH FOR PHD STUDENTS’

***Chandu Chandrakar**
Tsinghua University, China

ABSTRACT

This study is designed to report the motivation level for academic English and improved beliefs among the regular University students enrolled in the course ‘English for PhD Students’ at Beijing Normal University during the period of 2012 and 2013 spring semesters, in Beijing. A total of ‘N=104’ students volunteered for this research. The findings were clear and robust indicating that the participants’ belief for academic English changed from the beginning to the end of the semesters. The research was mainly focused on finding the statistical correlation among the motivation, learning strategies, and student management of different resources pertaining to domicile (rural or urban) and sex of the students. This study is an exploratory investigation based on distributive statistics, correlation coefficients, and T-tests. No significant difference was reported in motivation strategy for learning by the students in terms of their sex and domicile. Besides the urban students and male students tend to show the significant correlation among their intrinsic goal orientation and self-efficacy for learning and performance. Male students also reported a significant correlation between the components of Test anxiety and their motivated strategy for learning academic English.

Keywords: Academic English, Motivation for Learning English, Belief, China, MSLQ

INTRODUCTION

China, by virtue of her culture rather than the market, would localise everything foreign before making it socially available for its people. English, in turn, as a language is a part of Indo-European language family and has a well-established western group of Germanic roots. Without doubt it reserves the right to be the most prominent academic language in the world (Ammon, 2008; Crystal, 2005; Davidson, 2007; Kayman, 2004; Melitz, 2016; Neeley, 2012; Nunan & Nunan, 2003; Todd, 2003; Varshney, 2007). Despite this prominence, the English language too has been ‘glocalised’ before being used in China. This research is guided by the postmodern critical concepts of Marxism and Feminism that work with the intent of mainstreaming the deprived and marginalised sections by situating them in a socio-political context. Many Chinese researchers have indicated that the urban-rural divide pertaining to education is shrinking owing to the effective policy initiatives taken by the Chinese Government (Jinzhong, 2010; Li, Wang, Zhu, & Zhao, 2014). In 2001 Chinese government brought a new policy initiative introducing English as a compulsory course to be taught to the students starting right from the primary school (Jiaoji [2001] 2, 2001).

This policy led the foundation to English language learning in China at academic level. Another recent important policy emphasising effective learning for English language education in China was introduced in 2007 which clearly was intended to cultivate higher education English language talents (Jiaogaoting [2007]3, 2007) from the universities. According to the government statistics from 1993 to 2013, an estimated 33,597,588 people graduated from the Universities in China (Education Statistics, 2013). Moreover, almost all research institutions offer academic English as a selective or compulsory course to their undergraduate and graduate students (Education Statistics, 2013; Jiaogaoting [2004]1, 2004; Jiaogaoting [2006]4, 2006; Jiaogaoting [2007]3, 2007). The English language has been a necessary tool for globalization. It deserves a global identity and should not be identified with or attributed to certain culture and nation. The Kachru model of world English, (Kachru, 1986; Kachru, 1986; Kachru & Keith Brown, 2006; Schmitz, 2014) that defines the world into three zones of proficiency, is of little significance today. China is already one of the largest English speaking countries in the world and the technological advancements in the spate of media revolution are making English learning more momentous (ibid.). A survey was conducted twice on Chinese students at Beijing Normal University. The research was designed to measure motivation, learning strategies, and management of different resources pertaining to domicile (rural or urban) and sex. A 4-item questionnaire was also administered in order to measure the change of belief for academic English among the students at the commencement and culmination of the non-major academic English course for two consecutive years, 2012 and 2013. This article reports that research.

BACKGROUND

According to the Google citation, more than 4000 researchers and academic writers have underpinned their faith in motivation strategy for learning questionnaire (MSLQ), published in 1991. This research surrounds the correlation among motivation for learning strategy components for non-major academic English course. The related terminologies have been conceptualised in the next section of this research.

Academic English

It is perceived that academic English skills necessary for academic study are different from both conversational fluency and discrete English language skills (Gee, 2008). It could be defined as the ability to understand and express the complexity of the language characterised by a higher level of syntax, hence the vocabulary comprising of ideas. It is then delivered with authority in a precise way as required for the accomplishments in academics (Berman & Cheng, 2010; Cummins & Man Yee-fun, 2007; Krashen & Brown, 2007; Snow, 2010; Turner, 2004). This research is conducted on the English course offered for the PhD students at Beijing Normal University during the spring semesters of the years 2012 and 2013.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The 'Academic English for PhD' Course is designed for students from non-English majors. The objective of the course is to develop a familiarity with how academic English is different from the daily use English and the basic principle of academic research that fundamentally shapes the academic language. The course was designed to make the learners self-reliant on educational technologies and advanced use of online materials for writing academic research. The entire course was taught in English by the highly experienced Chinese teachers returned from abroad. The course format was 2 hours of lecture per week and some takeaway assignments. The lecture portion of the course was taught in a single section. The instructors

were assisted by 2-3 students for the entire semesters. Besides, the textbook so used in this course was: ‘Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills’, (Swales & Feak, 1996).

MOTIVATED STRATEGY FOR LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE

The motivation for Learning Strategy is a self-reported questionnaire and it essentially consists of all three sections of the MSLQ, a motivation section (31 items), a learning strategies section (31 items) and a management strategies section (19 items) scored on a 7 point Likert scale. According to the Google citation report, it has been cited and administered more than 2810 times¹ ever since published in 1991. It scores through 81 items designed to measure 15 kinds of strategies for learning motivation among college students, briefed below. Intrinsic goal orientation is the perception of the participants to the degree to which s/he attributes the reason to join in the course. This is measured through 4 items scored on a 7 point Likert scale measuring perception of challenges, curiosity, comprehension, and choice. Extrinsic goal orientation which complements intrinsic goal orientation is a 4 item scale. It measures the degree to which the students are motivated to participate in the course. Task value differs from goal orientation as it measures the object of perception pertaining to relevance for joining the course content. It is measured through 6 items on 7 points Likert scale based on their perception to use, learn, likeness, interest, the usefulness of the content, and the importance of the course. Control of learning refers to students' belief that measures the extent to which participants' perception outcomes are contingent on their effort, in contrast to the external factors e.g. the teacher. The 4 items scale specifically measure the perception and accountability of the students towards their own effort pertaining to their outcome in the course. There are 8 items comprising in this section that would measure expectancy for task performance and self-appraisal of one's ability to master the task assigned in the course. Most of the research have proved that test anxiety is negatively related to the students' performance as it works as a diversion from the self (relevant) to less-relevant, i.e. other students, other parts of the test, consequences, feeling an exam, and voluntary actions. Test anxiety is measured through 5 items on a 7 point scale. Rehearsal strategies are related to working memory rather than acquisition, integration, and interconnections of the information due to prior knowledge. The basic strategies measured through the 4 items are the frequency of practice, readings over and over again, memorising, and listing of the important information. Elaboration is related to long-term memory and the strategies that are mainly centered towards making relations, assimilations, inferences, and applications among a different set of information. There are altogether 8 items that measure elaboration strategies.

Organization strategies are mainly concerned with the efficacy of the students to select the information of choice and significance of the given course. It is measured through 4 items in this questionnaire. Critical thinking is one of the most important skills among the higher education students. Critical thinking refers to the degree to which students report applying previous knowledge to new situations in order to solve problems, reach decisions, or make critical evaluations with respect to standards of excellence (Pintrich, Smith, Garcia, & McKeachie, 1991). It has been measured through 5 items. Metacognition here refers to the control and self-regulation. MSLQ is framed considering the fact that metacognitive self-regulatory activities include planning, monitoring, and regulating. It has been measured through 12 items. Among these items, number 33 and 57 of the MSLQ are reversed. Managing time according to the holistic

educational need is one of the most significant factors in higher education. It has been measured based on the 8 items to be scored on course work, availability of time, space, and revision. Among these 3 items including item number 52, 77 and 80 are reversed. Effort regulation is students' ability to manage and regulate themselves against uninteresting and difficult tasks. It has been measured on 4 items. Among these 2 items, i.e. 37 and 60 are reversed. Repertoire and collaboration with peers for course material have positive effects on the outcome of the students. This has been measured on 3 items scored on 7 points scale. Help seeking is a strategy to cope with the overwhelming situation. It includes seeking help from the instructor and the fellow classmates. It has been measured on a set of 4 items among which one item is reversed. The domicile of the students was counted on the basis of their reporting on the questionnaire. They were asked to tick either Urban or Rural.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- 1: To what degree gender is related to the motivation for learning strategies in English among students registered in the course of Academic English for PhD students at BNU?
- 2: To what degree domicile is related to the motivation for learning strategies in English among students registered in the course of Academic English for PhD students at BNU?
- 3: To what extent the belief for academic English changes among the BNU students after attending the course entitled 'Academic English for PhD'?

The research is based on pre-test post-test design which epistemologically informs the research through the survey based on Motivated Strategy for Learning Questionnaire and a 4-item questionnaire to evaluate participants' change in belief for the academic English course.

THEORY IN ACTION

According to Kerlinger (1986): "Theory is a set of interrelated constructs (concepts), definitions, and propositions that present a systematic view of the phenomenon by specifying relations among the variables, with the purpose of explaining and predicting phenomena" (p9). Nonetheless, theories and policies both work as guiding principles. However, they differ from each other to a great extent. Theories are not concrete whereas policies are contingent. This research is guided by the definition of policy contextualized in the light of postmodern theories of Marxism (class disparity) and Feminism (gender disparity). According to Bryson and Crosby (1992): "Policy is substantive decisions, commitments, and actions made by those who hold or affect government positions of authority, as they are interpreted by stakeholders" (p63). These concepts have been operationalized as building blocks of the validity in this study. The research methods, its findings, and the successive interpretations have been designed, as explained, in the following sections.

METHODOLOGY

Participants were graduate students enrolled in 'English for PhD' course at BNU. A total of 104 students participated in this research. Among these, 56 students participated in the spring semester 2012, and 48 students participated in the spring semester 2013. The results are presented specifically in the light of the research questions of this study.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

The validity of this research instrument could be inferred from the fact that Motivated Strategy for Learning (MSLQ) is an extensively used inventory. From the predictive validity point of view, MSLQ measures motivation and belief of the students for the course they are entitled to study in. In this way, it also validates a4 item belief questionnaire instrumented for this research that is administered to measure the changing belief among the respondents. Pertaining to reliability, the research was not measured by two or more researchers, therefore, internal consistency reliability is most likely to be robust. See Table 1, 2, 3 below and for details, see Appendix 2. Nevertheless, while considering the construct validity, there are three instances where MSLQ could be improved. First, the set of items measuring intrinsic goal orientation component is weak in the sense it tries to measure 5 values e.g. grades, rewards, performance, evaluation, and competition using 4 items in the questionnaire. Second, since the norms for the MSLQ are not available, it is too generalised, last but not least, this version of the MSLQ (1991) was administered towards the end of the winter 1990 (January to May) semester. Practically, it would not perfectly be true for the spring semester (July to January). Besides, the concurrent reliability of the instrument is extremely robust in the sense that the MSLQ has been extensively used on Chinese and non-Chinese college students (Ho, Nesbit, Jepsen, & Demirian, 2012; Pintrich, Smith, Garcia, & McKeachie, 1991; Nirmala Rao & Sachs, 1999).

Table 1. Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	104	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	104	100.0
a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Table 2. Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.712	81

Table 3. Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
428.7692	172.102	13.11875	81

NORMALITY TEST

A normality test was conducted on the raw MSLQ data-set in order to ensure if the data could be administered for parametric tests. The skewness and standard deviation were compared. The results directed to transform the data as a normal distribution. It was found that the skewness and normal distribution of the fractionalized rankings of the dataset had preferably a normal distribution result (Table 4).

Table 4. Normality Statistics

		MSLQ T	Fractional Rank of MSLQT
N	Valid	104	104
	Missing	0	0
Mean		428.7692	.504808
Median		429.5000	.495192
Mode		414.00 ^a	.1346 ^a
Skewness		.022	.001
Std. Error of Skewness		.237	.237
Kurtosis		-.352	-1.201
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.469	.469
a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown			

FINDINGS

This section adheres to the consistency in reporting the findings pertaining to each research question mentioned above. The research question follows the hypothesis so framed, and there after results are

reported statistically. The discussion section follows the interpretation of the findings in the milieu of the Policy definition situated in the postmodern critical theories of Feminism (Driscoll & Krook, 2012; Mackinnon, 1982; Offen, 1988; Spivak, 1978; Stone, 2010; Wiegman, 2002) and Marxism (Cole, 2012; Dahms, 1997; Gouldner, 1974; Parker, 2009; Parkin, 2008).

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS AND RESULTS

Research Question 1: How gender is statistically related to the motivation for learning strategies among students registered in the course of academic English for PhD students at BNU? Pertaining to Research Question 1 the following hypothetical statement could be framed as an alternate and null hypothesis. H1: There is a significant difference in Motivation for Learning Strategies among the students registered in the selective course of academic English for PhD at BNU on the basis of their sex. The Null hypothesis H0 corresponding to the Alternate hypothesis H1 based on the Research Question 1 would be tested statistically. H (Null): There is no significant difference in Motivation for Learning Strategies among the students registered in the selective course of academic English for PhD at BNU on the basis of their sex. On the basis of the research question 1, the null hypothesis statement so framed contains a conjecture between the two variables i.e. gender (dichotomous) and MSLQ (categorical). In order to figure out the degree of statistical difference on the overall MSLQ in terms of students' sex a Mann-Whitney non-parametric test is conducted. The data produced no evidence of any difference between male and female students in terms of their MSLQ scores reported for academic English ($p > 0.05$, Mann-Whitney $U = 1035$, $Z = 1.638$, $N = 104$, male = 64). According to the statistical figures, male students have a higher mean rank than that of the female, indicating that they have scored better than the girls on the Motivation for Learning Strategy Questionnaire (MSLQ). The relationship between the two sex and the MSLQ is fairly weak; Effect Size, $r = 0.1606$. See table 5 and 6 below.

Table 5. Mann-Whitney Test Ranks pertaining to Sex

	Participant Sex	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
MSLQT	Male	64	56.33	3605.00
	Female	40	46.38	1855.00
	Total	104		

Table 6. Test Statistics

	MSLQT
Mann-Whitney U	1035.000
Wilcoxon W	1855.000

Z	-1.638
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.101
a. Grouping Variable: Participant Sex	

In order to testify the results of the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test with a parametric test, an Independent Samples t-test was conducted on the MSLQ survey data. It is found that the mean of the male students (0.541617) is higher than the mean of the female students (0.445913). Moreover, as illustrated in table 7 and 8 below, the significance of the Levene's Test is higher than 0.05 ($p=0.390$). It could, therefore, be assumed that the variances of the data reported are equal among these variables. Furthermore, in the light of the t-test results, it could also be stated that no significant difference was found ($p=0.390$, $t=1.652$, $df=102$) between male and female students in terms of their motivation for learning strategies (MSLQ) for academic English at BNU. On the basis of the two statistical results, it could be concluded that there is no evidence of a relationship between the students' sex and motivation of learning strategies for academic English at BNU. It is, therefore, the null hypothesis for research question 1 is retained.

Table 7. Independent T-Test Group Statistics pertaining to Sex

	Participant Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Fractional Rank of MSLQ T	Male	64	.541617	.2766617	.0345827
	Female	40	.445913	.3042128	.0481003

Research Question 2: How domicile is statistically related to the motivation for learning strategies among the students registered in the course of 'academic English for PhD' at BNU? H1: There is a significant difference in Motivation for Learning Strategies among the students registered in the selective course of academic English for PhD at BNU on the basis of their reported domicile. The Null hypothesis H0 corresponding to the Alternate Hypothesis H1 based on the Research Question 2 would be tested statistically. H (Null): There is no significant difference in Motivation for Learning Strategies among the students registered in the selective course of academic English for PhD at BNU on the basis of their reported domicile.

The two variables of concern in this research hypothesis are domicile (dichotomous) and MSLQ

(categorical). In order to figure out the degree of statistical difference on the overall MSLQ pertaining to students' domicile status, so reported, a Mann-Whitney non-parametric test is conducted. It should be noted that the domicile was only categorised into urban and rural. The data produced no evidence of any difference between male and female students in terms of MSLQ scores for academic English ($p > 0.05$, Mann-Whitney $U = 761.5$, $Z = 1.119$, $N = 104$, urban = 82). Urban students have a higher mean rank than that of the rural students, indicating that they have scored better than the rural students on the Motivated Strategy for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). The relationship between the categories of domicile and the MSLQ scores is fairly weak; Effect Size, $r = 0.1097$. See table 9 and 10 below. In order to testify the results of the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test, with a parametric test, an Independent Samples t-test ($p < 0.05$) was conducted on the MSLQ survey data. It is found that the mean of the students from urban domicile (0.5212) is higher than that of the rural students (0.4434). As indicated in table 11 and 12, the significance of the Levene's test is higher than 0.05 ($p = 0.641$). It could, therefore, be assumed that the variances among the domiciles are almost equal. The t-test results confirm that there is no significant difference ($p = 0.641$, $t = 1.120$, $df = 102$) between scores of the students from different domiciles pertaining to their motivation for learning strategies (MSLQ) for academic English at BNU. It is, therefore, the null hypothesis so framed for the research question 2 is retained. We shall go into further statistical details of the MSLQ components in the next sections to explore the relationship between them on the basis of this data set.

Research Question 3: To what extent the belief for academic English changes among the Beijing Normal University students after attending the course entitled 'Academic English for PhD students'? H (Null): The mean of belief for academic English among the students registered in the course does not change after attending the course ($p = 0.01$). H1: The mean of belief for academic English among the students registered in the course does change after attending the course ($p = 0.01$). As illustrated in the clustered bar-chart (2-related samples tests) in table 13 and 14, those students who attended the course 'Academic English for PhD' rated their belief for academic English much more highly at the end of the semesters as compared to their belief at the commencement of the semesters ($p < 0.001$, Wilcoxon Test, $Z = 3.974$ for rural, and Wilcoxon Test, $Z = 6.527$ for urban students). Results in table 15, indicate that there was a positive change (78%) in the beliefs of the urban students ($n = 82$). Moreover, 12 of them (15%) reported no change whereas, 6 urban students (7%) rated decreasing trend in their belief for academic English.

In terms of rural students ratings on their belief for academic English, 20 students (91%) reported a positive change, whereas 9% of them rated no change in their belief for academic English at the end of the semesters in compared to their values at the commencement of the semesters. The change in attitude pertaining to this belief was found to be relatively strong ($r = 0.640$) among rural students whereas there was a moderate change reported by the urban students ($r = 0.389$). In terms of gender as illustrated in the clustered bar-chart (2-related samples tests) table 15 and 16, the students who attended the course entitled 'Academic English for PhD students' rated their belief for academic English significantly higher at the end of the semesters as compared to their belief at the commencement of the semesters ($p < 0.001$, Wilcoxon Test, $Z = 5.637$ for male, and Wilcoxon Test $Z = 5.132$ for female students). As indicated in table 15 there was a positive change in the beliefs of the overall 78% ($n = 64$) male students. Moreover, 9 of them (14% approximately) reported no change whereas 6 male students (8%) rated decreasing trend in their belief for

academic English. In terms of female students ($n=40$) ratings on their belief for academic English, 34 (85%) of them reported positive change, 5 (12.5%) of them rated no change, and 1 (2.5%) of them showed a decreasing trend in their belief for academic English at the end of the semesters in compared to that of theirs at the commencement of the semesters. The change in attitude pertaining to this belief is found to be relatively strong ($r=0.552$) among the male students as compared to that of the female students ($r=0.503$). The epistemological and ontological evidence supporting the null hypothesis would be briefed in the discussion section of this report.

Table 8. Independent Samples Test Result pertaining to Sex

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Fractional Rank of MSLQT	Equal variances assumed	.744	.390	1.652	102	.102	.0957031	.0579491	-.0192386	.2106448
	Equal variances not assumed			1.615	77.003	.110	.0957031	.0592419	-.0222624	.2136687

Note. $p<0.05$

Table 9. Mann-Whitney Ranks pertaining to Domicile

	Domicile	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
MSLQT	Urban	82	54.21	4445.50
	Rural	22	46.11	1014.50
	Total	104		

Table 10. Mann-Whitney Test Statistics

	MSLQT
Mann-Whitney U	761.500
Wilcoxon W	1014.500
Z	-1.119
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.263
a. Grouping Variable: Domicile	

Table 11. Independent T-Test Group Statistics pertaining to Domicile

	Domicile	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Fractional Rank of MSLQT	Urban	82	.521283	.2848049	.0314514
	Rural	22	.443400	.3071694	.0654887

Table 12. Independent Samples Test Result pertaining to Domicile

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Fractional Rank of MSLQT	Equal variances assumed	.219	.641	1.120	102	.265	.0778825	.0695221	-.0600143	.2157792
	Equal variances not assumed			1.072	31.372	.292	.0778825	.0726496	-.0702163	.2259812

	assumed									
--	---------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note $p < 0.05$

Table 13. 2-related samples tests statistics pertaining to Domicile

Domicile		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Urban	AebPrT	82	21.9878	1.11659	19.00	25.00
	AebPoT	82	23.8171	1.15607	20.00	26.00
Rural	AebPrT	22	22.0455	.95005	20.00	24.00
	AebPoT	22	23.8636	.94089	22.00	25.00

Table 14. 2-related samples tests ranks pertaining to Domicile

Domicile			N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Urban	AebPoT – AebPrT	Negative Ranks	6 ^a	22.58	135.50
		Positive Ranks	64 ^b	36.71	2349.50
		Ties	12 ^c		
		Total	82		
Rural	AebPoT – AebPrT	Negative Ranks	0 ^a	.00	.00
		Positive Ranks	20 ^b	10.50	210.00
		Ties	2 ^c		

		Total	22		
--	--	-------	----	--	--

a. AebPoT < AebPrT, b. AebPoT > AebPrT, c. AebPoT = AebPrT

Table 15. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Participant Sex			N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Male	AebPoT - AebPrT	Negative Ranks	5 ^a	20.50	102.50
		Positive Ranks	50 ^b	28.75	1437.50
		Ties	9 ^c		
		Total	64		
Female	AebPoT - AebPrT	Negative Ranks	1 ^a	5.00	5.00
		Positive Ranks	34 ^b	18.38	625.00
		Ties	5 ^c		
		Total	40		
a. AebPoT < AebPrT					
b. AebPoT > AebPrT					
c. AebPoT = AebPrT					

Table 16. Test Statistics

Participant Sex		AebPoT - AebPrT
Male	Z	-5.637 ^b
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
Female	Z	-5.132 ^b
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

ANALYSES OF MSLQ SCALE

According to the statistical tests administered on the data set for the addressal of the Research Questions (1 and 2) and the results so obtained illustrated that sex (male and female) and domicile (rural and urban) status did not vary significantly on the reported MSLQ. It is desirable to understand the relationships among the components of MSLQ separately. This would provide an in-depth entomological and ontological understandings of the phenomenon on the basis of these data. A correlation test was conducted in PAWS version-20 and Pearson correlation table was obtained for the 15 MSLQ components and MSLQ-total on their respective normalised data (fractional rank). Moreover, as there are (15+1) 16 components of MSLQ, 256 comparisons were produced. Among these 240 were eligible for investigation. This led to consider the significance at a lower level, from $p = 0.01$ to $p < 0.01$, for this test. On the basis of the test-outcome of the data, it could clearly be stated that reported normalized scores on the items of Intrinsic Goal Orientation ($r_p < 0.423$, $p < 0.001$), and Self-Efficacy for Learning and Performance ($r_p < 0.485$, $p < 0.001$) regarding domicile the urban students were significantly related to the total normalized scores of MSLQ ($p < 0.001$). This, in turn, indicates that with respect to MSLQ the above components share 17.89% and 23.52% respectively of their variation in common when counted for the urban students. Rural students did not report any correlation ($p < 0.001$) to MSLQ total. See Appendix 3. The correlation outcome also illustrates that the normalized scores (Fractional Rank) of Intrinsic Goal Orientation ($r_p < 0.433$, $p < 0.001$), Self-Efficacy for Learning and Performance ($r_p < 0.547$, $p < 0.001$), and Test Anxiety ($r_p < 0.428$, $p < 0.001$) of the male students were significantly correlated to the normalized scores (Fractional Rank) of the MSLQ. In terms of male students the reported data share 18.74% of the Intrinsic Goal Orientation, 29.9% of Self-Efficacy for Learning and Performance, 18.31% of Test Anxiety variations in common with that of the normalised scores (Fractional Rank) of MSLQ. See Appendix 3.

DISCUSSION

The analysis is the search for meaning (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1989 p43) in relation to the research purpose and interpreting it in the milieu of the designed hypothesis corresponding to the research questions framed for research purpose. This section involves the analysis of the plausible meanings guided by the research findings on the basis of the reported data.

University Profile: BNU is one among the 985 project² research institutions that were also selected for the Mount Everest initiative³ taken by the central Government. Both the initiatives are entitled to make a few excellent world class institutions in China (Chinese University Ranking, 2013). In accordance with the results, the students so recruited and retained for studies at PhD level would be highly motivated for their academic accomplishments irrespective of their sex and domicile. In terms of the Course profile: Reporting and publishing research academically in international journals is one of the necessary requirements for the scholars learning at research institutions. The motivation and belief results for academic English from this data sample is in coherence with the repute of the Beijing Normal University. In terms of the student's Profile: Beijing Normal University is a 5-star research University and ranks under

top 15 institutions. It is centrally located in Beijing and has contributed highly to the development of China. It attracts students par excellence from China and abroad.

Relevant policies: Ever since 2001, English was made compulsory for primary school students in China (Jiaoji [2001]2, 2001). In 2003, Government further introduced a policy for extensive English learning for secondary school students (Jiaxue [2003]1, 2003). In 2004, Government tried to universalize English learning at higher education level (Jiaogaoting [2004]1, 2004). English learning has been made compulsory for the undergraduate students across China. In 2006, policies regarding English Assessments and Evaluation was implemented (Jiaogaoting [2006]4, 2006). In 2007, Government invested heavily for the improvement of academic English among University students (Jiaogaoting[2007]3, 2007). As a consequence, presently there are more than 40 million Chinese people who could proficiently speak English (Education Statistics, 2013; Jingying, 2013). The data for this study have been sampled during 2012 and 2013 at BNU. This already was a reaping time and seeking a return from the previously implemented policies. The results of this study, thus, also support the effectiveness of the Chinese government policies.

Relevant Technology: Technology is an essential part of education. In 2004 in order to universalize the use of English in higher education, the Chinese government initiated policy for extensive use of technology and media for learning (Jiaogaoting [2004]1, 2004). The feminist politics of technology is intended to achieve gender equality (Consortium, 2010; Musawi, 2011; Selwyn, 2011; Wajcman, 2009; Woodhead, 2012) which in turn shows a high level of consistency with the results of the reported data (Rhode, 1990).

In terms of theory: This research is guided by the Grand theories of postmodern Critical Marxism that advocates promoting equality between different classes of the society (Ladson & Tate, 1995; Rhode, 1990; Wajcman, 2009). The feminist extension of this theory is the postmodern critical Feminism that stands for promoting equality between men and women at all levels (Rhode, 1990; Wajcman, 2009). More specifically, postmodern critical Marxism as a theory has best thrived and survived in China. The results of this study support the success of the postmodern Critical Marxist theory in this context.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the findings and the meanings so contextualised, it could be concluded that the male and female students do not much differ when counted in terms of their motivated strategy for academic English learning at Beijing Normal University. However, male students tend to show strong correlation pertaining to their intrinsic goal orientation, self-efficacy for learning and performance, and test anxiety. Furthermore, urban students tend to show a stronger intrinsic goal orientation and self-efficacy for learning and performance when counted on the basis of the motivated strategy for learning scale.

FURTHER RESEARCH

The data were treated for both the parametric and non-parametric tests adjusting the higher levels of significance if ever required. The research has retained the null hypothesis. It indicates that more profound cross-sectional studies are needed to explore the effectiveness of Chinese Education Policies in a

‘decentralised design’ at local levels pertaining to the improvement of Academic English in the present, during the past and into the perspectives. I have avoided using the expression, ‘failed to reject the null hypotheses’ instead of have used the expression, ‘retain the null hypotheses’ in this research. The problem of the confused direction of causality and its endogeneity are very common in social world research. Descriptive and in-depth case studies strengthen the purpose of inferential studies. This study would motivate the Chinese scholars to administer such research in order to address the remaining urban-rural disparity issue, if any, at each research University, on each course in China.

NOTE

1. H-Index for MSLQ. Retrieved on February 6, 2017, from https://scholar.google.co.uk/scholar?q=mslq+pintrich+1991&hl=en&as_sdt=0&as_vis=1&oi=scholar&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj62di64f3RAhUMUbwKHV63BH4QgQMIFzAA#
2. “985 工程” [985 project], MOE.GOV.CN (1998). Retrieved from <http://www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/s6183/201112/128828.html>
3. MOE. “基础学科拔尖学生培养试验计划,[A test plan for the college curriculum outstanding talents cultivation]” moe.edu.cn (2009). Retrieved from http://www.moe.edu.cn/s78/A08/gjs_left/moe_742/s5631/s7969/201210/t20121010_166817.html
4. This paper was a part of poster presentation at Tsinghua University, Beijing on May 22nd 2017. I am certified for this by the Institute of Education, Tsinghua University.
5. There is no conflict of interest associated with this research paper.

REFERENCES

- Ammon, U. 2008. *English Next. Why global English may mean the end of “English as a Foreign Language.”* *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 32(2), 203–207. <http://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.32.1.08amm>
- Berman, R., & Cheng, L. 2010. *English academic language skills: Perceived difficulties by undergraduate and graduate students, and their academic achievement.* *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 25–40. <http://doi.org/10.1002/wdev.86>
- Bryson, J.M., & Crosby, B. C. 1992. *Leadership for the common good: tackling public problems in a shared-power world.* Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Chinese University Ranking. 2013. *中国大学评价研究报告 2013 [A Report on Chinese University Evaluation and Ranking, 2013]*. Retrieved February 6, 2017, from <http://www.cuaa.net/cur/2013/01.shtml>
- Cole, M. 2012. *Critical race theory in education, Marxism and abstract racial domination.* *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 33(2), 167–183. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2011.649830>
- Consortium, C. C. 2010. *Education Technology.* *New York Times Magazine*, 323(Ccc), 82–85.
- Crystal, D. 2005. *David Crystal. English as a Global Language, 2nd ed. Language Problems Language Planning.*
- Cummins, J., & Man Yee-fun, E. 2007. *Academic language: What is it and how do we acquire It? In*

- International handbook of English language teaching*. <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-46301-8>
- Dahms, H. F. 1997. *Theory in Weberian Marxism: Patterns of Critical Social Theory in Lukacs and Habermas*. *Sociological Theory* (Vol. 15/3). <http://doi.org/10.1111/0735-2751.00032>
- Davidson, K. 2007. *The nature and significance of English as a global language*. *English Today*, 23(1), 48–50. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078407001095>
- Driscoll, A., & Krook, M. L. 2012. *Feminism and rational choice theory*. *European Political Science Review*, 4, 195–216. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S175577391100018X>
- Education Statistics. 2013. 发展规划司, 教育部门户网站 [Development Planning Division, Ministry of education portal 2013]. Retrieved from http://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A03/moe_560/s8492/
- Gee, J. P. (2008). *Essay: What is Academic Language? Teaching Science to English Language Learners: Building on Students' Strengths*, 57–70. Retrieved from <http://www.jamespaulgee.com/sites/default/files/pub/TeachingSciencetoELL-Ch07.pdf>
- Gouldner, A. W. 1974. *Marxism and social theory*. *Theory and Society*, 1(1), 17–35. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00208221>
- Hitchcock, G., & Hughes, D. 1989. *Research and the Teacher: A Qualitative Introduction to School-Based Research*. Routledge. Routledge.
- Ho, J., Nesbit, P. L., Jepsen, D., & Demirian, S. 2012. *Extending self-leadership research to the East: Measurement equivalence of the Chinese and English versions of the MSLQ*. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(2), 101–111. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-839X.2011.01366.x>
- Jiaogaoting [2004]1. 2004. 大学英语课程教学要求 (试行) [College English curriculum requirements (Trial implementation)]. Retrieved February 6, 2017, from http://www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_734/200408/729.html
- Jiaogaoting[2006]4. 2006. 教育部办公厅关于进一步 提高质量, 全面实施大学英语教学改革的通知, 教育部门户网站 [Ministry of Education regarding further quality improvement. Notice for the full implementation of the reform of college English teaching, the Ministry of education portal]. Retrieved from http://www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_745/200609/17559.html
- Jiaogaoting [2007]3. (2007). 大学英语课程教学要求 [College English curriculum requirements]. Retrieved February 6, 2017, from <http://www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/s3857/201011/110825.html>
- Jiaoji [2001]2. 教育部关于积极推进小学开设英语课程的 指导意见, 教育部门户网站 [The Ministry of education's guidance on promoting English courses at primary school, education portal sites]. Retrieved from http://www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_711/200407/665.html
- Jiaxue[2003]1. 2003 年普通高等学校招生工作规定, 教育部 门户网站 [College enrollment provisions 2013, the Ministry of education portal]. Retrieved from http://www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_32/200501/5322.html
- Jingying, L. 2013. 英语成国内本科院校开设最多的专业. 中国青年报 [English becomes the most opened undergraduate program in China. China Youth Daily]. Retrieved from http://zqb.cyol.com/html/2013-09/15/nw.D110000zgqnb_2013_0915_3-03.htm
- Jinzhong, Q. (2010). *On the Rural-Urban Disparity in Access to Higher Education Opportunities in China*. *Chinese Education & Society*, 43(4), 22–31. <http://doi.org/10.2753/CED1061-1932430402>
- Kachru, B. B. 1986a. *The alchemy of English : the spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*.
- Submit Date: 01.09.2017, Acceptance Date: 15.11.2017, DOI NO: 10.7456/1070DSE/197 2125
- Copyright © The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art and Communication

English in the international context. (Vol. 1).

Kachru, B. B. 1986b. *The power and politics of English. World Englishes*, 5(2–3), 121–140. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1986.tb00720.x>

Kachru, B. B., & Keith Brown. 2006. *English: World Englishes. In World Englishes (pp. 195–202).* <http://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00645-3>

Kayman, M. A. 2004. *The state of English as a global language: communicating culture. Textual Practice*, 18(1), 1–22. <http://doi.org/10.1080/0950236032000140131>

Kerlinger, F.N. 1986. *Foundations of behavioral research (3rd ed.)* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Krashen, S. D., & Brown, C. L. 2007. *What is academic language proficiency? Singapore Tertiary English Teachers Society*, 6(1), 1–4. Retrieved from http://www.sdkrashen.com/articles/Krashen_Brown_ALP.pdf

Ladson, B. G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). *Toward a Critical Race Theory of education. Teachers College Record.* <http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033007003>

Li, Y., Wang, X., Zhu, Q., & Zhao, H. (2014). *Assessing the spatial and temporal differences in the impacts of factor allocation and urbanization on urban–rural income disparity in China, 2004–2010. Habitat International*, 42, 76–82. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2013.10.009>

Mackinnon, C. A. (1982). *Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: An Agenda for Theory. Source: Signs*, 7(3), 515–544. <http://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.ObO13e31812e5535>

Melitz, J. (2016). *English as a global language. In The Palgrave Handbook of Economics and Language (pp. 583–615).* <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-32505-1>

MOE.GOV.CN. “985 工程”简介 [985 project introduction], MOE.GOV.CN 1998. Retrieved from <http://www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/s6183/201112/128828.html>

Musawi, A. S. Al. 2011. *Redefining Technology Role in Education. Creative Education.* <http://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2011.22018>

Neeley, T. 2012. *Global business speaks English. Harvard Business Review.*

Nunan, D., & Nunan. 2003. *The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educational Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pacific Region*. Tesol Quarterly*, 37(4), 589–613. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3588214>

Offen, K. 1988. *Defining Feminism: A Comparative Historical Approach. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 14(1), 119. <http://doi.org/10.1086/494494>

Parker, I. 2009. *Critical Psychology and Revolutionary Marxism. Theory & Psychology*, 19(1), 71–92. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0959354308101420>

Parkin, F. 2008. *Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique. In Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective (pp. 143–158).*

Pintrich, R., Smith, D., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. 1991. *A manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). Ann Arbor. Michigan*, 48109(August 2016), 1259. <http://doi.org/ED338122>

Rao, N., & Sachs, J. 1999. *Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Chinese Version of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire. Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 59(6), 1016–1029. <http://doi.org/10.1177/00131649921970206>

Rhode, D. L. (1990). *Feminist Critical Theories. Stanford Law Review*, 42(3), 617–638. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1228887>

Rush, F. 2004. *The Cambridge Companion to Critical Theory. Society*, 389.

Submit Date: 01.09.2017, Acceptance Date: 15.11.2017, DOI NO: 10.7456/1070DSE/197

2126

Copyright © The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art and Communication

<http://doi.org/10.1177/009430610603500162>

Schmitz, J. R. 2014. *Looking under Kachru's (1982, 1985) Three Circles Model of World Englishes: The Hidden Reality and Current Challenges*. *RBLA, Belo Horizonte*, 14(2), 373–411.

Selwyn, N. 2011. *Does Technology Make Education Fairer? Education and Technology Key Issues and Debates*, 92–115.

Snow, C. E. 2010. *Academic Language and the Challenge of Reading for Learning About Science*. *Science*, 328(5977), 450–452. <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1182597>

Spivak, G. 1978. *Feminism and critical theory*. *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, 1(3), 241–246. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-0685\(78\)90170-7](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-0685(78)90170-7)

Stone, L. 2010. *Feminism*. In *International Encyclopedia of Education* (pp. 56–62). <http://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00558-3>

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. 1996. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills*. *College Composition and Communication*, 47, 443. <http://doi.org/10.2307/358319>

Todd, L. 2003. *Global English*. *English Today*. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078400010865>

Turner, J. 2004. *Language as academic purpose*. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585\(03\)00054-7](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(03)00054-7)

Varshney, R. 2007. *English in the World: Global Rules, Global Roles*. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00337_5.x

Wajcman, J. 2009. *Feminist theories of technology*. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 34(1), 143–152. <http://doi.org/10.1093/cje/ben057>

Wiegman, R. 2002. *Academic feminism against itself*. *NWSA Journal*, 14(2), 18–37. <http://doi.org/10.1353/nwsa.2002.0052>

Woodhead, R. 2012. *What is Technology? International Journal of Sociotechnology and Knowledge Development*, 4(2), 1–13. <http://doi.org/10.4018/jskd.2012040101>

Table 17. MSQL Items Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Intrinsic Goal Orientation	5.5096	.59112	104
Igo2	5.7212	.68912	104
Igo3	5.8558	.71622	104
Igo4	5.7019	.76170	104

Extrinsic Goal Orientation	5.1442	.44977	104
Ego2	6.2981	.84623	104
Ego3	6.1154	.90637	104
Ego4	6.2596	1.11473	104
Task Value	6.2981	.91248	104
Tv2	6.3942	.82930	104
Tv3	6.3173	.87316	104
Tv4	5.2596	.55730	104
Tv5	5.6827	.71413	104
Tv6	5.3846	.68702	104
Control of Learning Belief	6.0096	.63084	104
Clb2	5.9327	.67211	104
Clb3	6.0481	.54648	104
Clb4	5.5962	.75709	104
Self-Efficacy for Learning and Performance	5.4904	.66821	104
Selp2	5.9904	.85327	104
Selp3	6.1538	.76029	104
Selp4	5.9615	.78732	104
Selp5	5.9615	.78732	104
Selp6	6.0865	.72555	104
Selp7	5.6635	.51408	104
Selp8	6.0962	.76981	104

Test Anxiety	3.2981	.77434	104
Te2	4.1923	1.30031	104
Te3	4.3077	1.29283	104
Te4	5.3365	1.31171	104
Te5	5.5673	1.15552	104
Rehearsal	5.1442	.78107	104
Rh2	5.5000	.66828	104
Rh3	6.0288	.84137	104
Rh4	3.8654	.65445	104
Elaboration	5.2404	.56595	104
Eln2	5.2404	.64605	104
Eln3	5.3654	.59214	104
Eln4	4.7788	.76268	104
Eln5	5.3942	.58157	104
Eln6	5.0577	.60462	104
Organization	5.4423	.70816	104
Org2	5.8269	.64526	104
Org3	5.2212	.82388	104
Org4	5.4327	.88969	104
Critical	4.7596	1.03806	104
Crt2	4.6538	1.01225	104
Crt3	4.7981	.89638	104
Crt4	4.9327	.86197	104
Crt5	5.2500	.84474	104

Meta-Cognitive Self-Regulation	4.8558	.71622	104
Msr2	3.4038	.78232	104
Msr3	5.8173	.60362	104
Msr4	4.7308	.77873	104
Msr5	4.9519	.84048	104
Msr6	4.6250	.89429	104
Msr7	4.9423	.83407	104
Msr8	5.2115	.74616	104
Msr9	5.3077	.73837	104
Msr10	6.1538	.53552	104
Msr11	5.9231	.83250	104
Msr12	6.1635	.86024	104
Test and Study Environment	5.4519	.62130	104
Tse2	4.6346	.78897	104
Tse3	3.6635	.87700	104
Tse4	3.8077	.84849	104
Tse5	4.4135	.86586	104
Tse6	5.2500	1.02161	104
Tse7	4.2885	.89955	104
Tse8	5.5865	.60114	104
Effort Regulation	4.2115	.91028	104
Er2	5.1250	.67820	104
Er3	5.4615	.69566	104

Er4	5.5577	.72174	104
Peer Learning	5.2885	.56899	104
Pl	5.7115	.49606	104
Pl	5.7885	.41038	104
Help Seeking	4.1346	.89288	104
Hs	4.8558	.71622	104
Hs	5.0481	.67378	104
Hs	4.8365	.88252	104

Note: $p < 0.05$

Table 18. MSLQ Items Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach' s Alpha if Item Deleted
Intrinsic Goal Orientation	423.2596	168.718	.198	.708
Igo2	423.0481	168.532	.173	.709
Igo3	422.9135	165.963	.305	.704
Igo4	423.0673	165.792	.292	.704
Extrinsic Goal Orientation	423.6250	170.528	.117	.711
Ego2	422.4712	170.815	.026	.714
Ego3	422.6538	169.180	.089	.712
Ego4	422.5096	167.476	.117	.711
Task Value	422.4712	167.339	.166	.709

Tv2	422.3750	168.178	.150	.709
Tv3	422.4519	168.017	.147	.709
Tv4	423.5096	170.524	.087	.711
Tv5	423.0865	171.478	.006	.714
Tv6	423.3846	169.812	.102	.711
Control of Learning Belief	422.7596	169.582	.129	.710
Clb2	422.8365	169.478	.124	.710
Clb3	422.7212	167.834	.280	.706
Clb4	423.1731	165.348	.317	.703
Self-Efficacy for Learning and Performance	423.2788	168.222	.198	.708
Selp2	422.7788	164.349	.321	.703
Selp3	422.6154	168.957	.130	.710
Selp4	422.8077	166.468	.247	.706
Selp5	422.8077	166.895	.225	.707
Selp6	422.6827	169.403	.115	.711
Selp7	423.1058	167.921	.294	.706
Selp8	422.6731	165.950	.280	.705
Test Anxiety	425.4712	170.892	.030	.714
Te2	424.5769	163.645	.203	.707
Te3	424.4615	163.532	.209	.707
Te4	423.4327	161.005	.282	.702

Te5	423.2019	163.619	.242	.705
Rehearsal	423.6250	171.576	-.004	.715
Rh2	423.2692	172.548	-.051	.716
Rh3	422.7404	170.718	.031	.714
Rh4	424.9038	173.719	-.119	.717
Elaboration	423.5288	168.989	.190	.709
Eln2	423.5288	168.057	.217	.707
Eln3	423.4038	168.301	.225	.708
Eln4	423.9904	170.087	.072	.712
Eln5	423.3750	168.839	.194	.708
Eln6	423.7115	168.265	.221	.708
Organization	423.3269	167.290	.235	.707
Org2	422.9423	168.851	.169	.709
Org3	423.5481	166.503	.231	.706
Org4	423.3365	164.536	.297	.703
Critical	424.0096	164.747	.236	.705
Crt2	424.1154	166.258	.185	.708
Crt3	423.9712	165.096	.269	.704
Crt4	423.8365	164.332	.318	.703
Crt5	423.5192	165.068	.291	.704
Meta-Cognitive Self-Regulation	423.9135	171.886	-.016	.715
Msr2	425.3654	171.923	-.021	.715
Msr3	422.9519	172.687	-.060	.715

Msr4	424.0385	168.775	.134	.710
Msr5	423.8173	168.054	.153	.709
Msr6	424.1442	167.115	.181	.708
Msr7	423.8269	165.892	.257	.705
Msr8	423.5577	168.948	.134	.710
Msr9	423.4615	170.367	.062	.712
Msr10	422.6154	168.239	.257	.707
Msr11	422.8462	169.025	.110	.711
Msr12	422.6058	169.678	.075	.712
Test and Study Environment	423.3173	170.219	.092	.711
Tse2	424.1346	170.584	.043	.713
Tse3	425.1058	169.163	.095	.712
Tse4	424.9615	168.290	.140	.710
Tse5	424.3558	167.396	.177	.708
Tse6	423.5192	163.864	.275	.704
Tse7	424.4808	169.339	.083	.712
Tse8	423.1827	170.423	.084	.711
Effort Regulation	424.5577	166.812	.190	.708
Er2	423.6442	175.552	-.218	.721
Er3	423.3077	169.283	.129	.710
Er4	423.2115	168.790	.149	.709
Peer Learning	423.4808	170.349	.096	.711

Pl	423.0577	173.705	-.141	.716
Pl	422.9808	172.932	-.093	.715
Help Seeking	424.6346	167.593	.161	.709
Hs	423.9135	170.138	.078	.712
Hs	423.7212	169.582	.118	.710
Hs	423.9327	171.248	.003	.715

Appendix 4: List of Abbreviations

Igo	Intrinsic Goal Orientation
IgoT	Intrinsic Goal Orientation Total
Ego	Extrinsic Goal Orientation
EgoT	Extrinsic Goal Orientation Total
Tv	Task Value
TvT	Task Value Total
Clb	Control of Learning Belief
Clb	Control of Learning Belief Total
Selp	Self-Efficacy for Learning and Performance
SelpT	Self-Efficacy for Learning and Performance Total
TeTest	Anxiety
TeT Test	Anxiety Total
Rh	Rehearsal
RhT	Rehearsal Total
Eln	Elaboration
ElnT	Elaboration Total
Org	Organization

OrgT	Organization Total
Crt	Critical
CrtT	Critical Total
Msr	Meta-Cognitive Self-Regulation
MsrT	Meta-Cognitive Self-Regulation Total
Tse	Test and Study Environment
TseT	Test and Study Environment Total
Er	Effort Regulation
ErT	Effort Regulation Total
Pl	Peer Learning
PlT	Peer Learning Total
Hs	Help Seeking
HsT	Seeking Total
MSLQ (MLSQ)	Motivation Strategy for Learning Questionnaire