

A SURVEY OF INDONESIAN EFL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' SELF-REGULATED MOTIVATION TO SPEAK ENGLISH

Dwika Salsabila & Ista Maharsi

Universitas Islam Indonesia

dwikasalsabila11@gmail.com, ista.maharsi@uii.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Self-Regulated Motivation (SRM) is one of the Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) aspects focusing only on motivation control or regulation. This study aims to identify college students' SRM levels in speaking English and the difference between males and females. The participants were 92 English Language Department students at a private university in Yogyakarta. The data were collected through the SRMIS-EFL questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of four factors (task value evaluation, regulation of learning environment, regulation of affect, and regulation of classroom environment) with 20 total items. A descriptive statistic was used to analyze students' SRM levels. An independent sample t-test was also used to see the difference in SRM levels between male and female students. The data analysis showed that, generally, students had a high SRM level. The highest factor was task value evaluation, and the lowest was regulation of learning environment. Related to gender, this study revealed that male and female students show similar SRM levels and had no difference. This implied that both male and female students had a high SRM level, were aware of the importance of English speaking for English Language Education students, and were willing to improve their speaking skills.

Keywords: self-regulated motivation, English speaking, self-regulated learning

INTRODUCTION

Self-regulated motivation (SRM) can be defined as an individual's behavior to establish, sustain, or augment their willingness to perform, work toward, or accomplish a specific task or objective (Wolters, 2003). Meanwhile, Boekaerts (1996) defined SRM as various behavior characteristics, including propensity, sensitivity, choice, level, duration of participation, and effort expenditure. The process of self-regulation of motivation was assessing one's level of motivation for academic work and making adjustments to maintain or improve that level of motivation (Wolters & Benzon, 2013). According to Bademcioglu, Karatas, and Ergin (2017), students' perceptions, attitudes, and judgments of their environment could influence their motivation level. Wolters (2003) stated that SRM affected students' learning and achievement. This was in line with

Kryshko et al. (2020) that SRM improved academic performance and different SRM strategies could affect students' academic success. The ability of students to regulate their motivation is one of the determining aspects of the effectiveness of the learning process.

Aspects of self-regulation that come under the umbrella of SRL include motivation, cognitive, and metacognitive (Wolters, 2003). Self-regulated learning (SRL) refers to developing one's ideas, feelings, and behaviors to achieve personal learning goals (Hacker et al., 2009). According to Pintrich (2000), SRL is integrated into four phases, each with distinct regulation areas. The phases of SRL were forethought, planning, activation, monitoring, control, reaction, and reflection; meanwhile, the areas of each phase were cognition, motivation and affect, behavior, and context. Therefore, self-regulated learners know various

cognitive learning strategies and can select, monitor, and regulate their performance in academic activities Wolters (2003). According to Collins (2009), motivation can be a predictor, influence the process, and be the outcome of SRL. (Wolters & Benzon 2013) also emphasized that self-regulated learners were extremely motivated, typically by interest, mastery objectives, or other intrinsic sources of motivation. The importance of motivation in SRL is significant.

The SRL incorporates behavioral, cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, and emotional factors of learning (Panadero, 2017). As one of many aspects of SRL, SRM only focused on "meta motivation, self-motivation, motivational regulation, and motivational control" (Wolters & Benzon, 2013, p. 200). Therefore, students with high levels of motivation tend to implement motivational strategies to maintain a continuous performance when completing tasks.

Motivational strategies include self-efficacy, attribution orientation, action control methods, and feedback (Hacker et al., 2009). Boekaerts (1996) framed motivational skills, which she later called SRM strategies. First, students must be able to comprehend their behavioral intentions. The second is linking a behavioral purpose to an action plan using cognitive and incentive strategies. The third is monitoring one's behavioral intention, maintaining and performing it, and allocating resources (time and effort) to the learning process (pp. 109-110). Additionally, Wolters (2003) highlighted several core activities considered SRM strategies. The activities included self-consequating, goal-oriented self-talk, interest enrichment, environmental structuring, self-handicapping, attribution control, proximal goal setting, efficacy management, defensive pessimism, efficacy self-talk, and emotion regulation (pp. 194-199). Students were attempting to regulate their motivation to complete a task that may be tiring or challenging (Pintrich, 2000). Thus,

each student may implement a different strategy to control and regulate their motivation since only some of the strategies outlined are implemented.

In measuring students' SRM levels, Uztosun (2020) developed a self-regulated motivation scale for speaking to measure students' motivation levels. He concluded that four factors could be used to measure SRM in English-speaking. The four factors were task value evaluation, regulation of the learning environment, regulation of affect, and regulation of classroom environment (pp. 6-8). Each factor has motivational strategies that students may apply to control their motivation levels.

According to Uztosun (2021), task value evaluation in speaking assigns students' motivation, interest, and willingness to speak English and improve their linguistic competence. Alotumi (2021) found that students had a high SRM level. This indicated that students were aware of the importance of SRM, interested in and willing to control their motivation and improve their speaking skills (Uztosun, 2021). The second factor is the regulation of learning environment. This factor relates to students' control over their learning environment outside of the classroom (Pintrich, 2004). In the speaking context, students attempt to find friends overseas, chat with foreigners, or talk to people whose mother tongue is English (Uztosun, 2021). Regulation of affect involves students' attempts to regulate their negative feelings, for example, anxiety and fear of speaking English (Pintrich, 2004). Lastly, regulation of the classroom environment involves students' participation in classroom tasks and activities (Pintrich, 2004).

Regarding motivational strategies, Kryshko et al. (2020) stated that motivational regulation strategies (e.g., mastery self-talk, environmental control, performance approach self-talk, and self-consequating) can potentially improve academic performance. Furthermore, students consistently reported employing a

performance self-talk strategy, highlighting or emphasizing performance goals connected to task completion (Wolters, 1998). Schwinger, Steinmayr, and Spinath (2009) asserted that significant indirect impacts of motivational regulation strategies on accomplishment are mediated by an enhanced willingness to be more engaged in learning than usual. This is consistent with Uztosun (2021) that motivational regulation strategies implemented in SRM factors, such as task value evaluation and regulation of affects play an essential role in enhancing EFL students' speaking competence. The motivational regulation strategies that the students used were considered potential predictors of improvements in their speaking skills.

Wolters and Benzoni (2013) stated that motivational regulation is associated with other aspects of SRL, such as cognitive, metacognitive, and behavioral aspects (p. 217). This was demonstrated by students who used cognitive and metacognitive tactics more frequently and reported using motivational strategies. Moreover, Uztosun (2021) suggested that learners must learn how to regulate their motivation and implement motivational strategies since building an awareness of the role of SRM could promote foreign language speaking development.

Considering the importance of SRM in improving students' English-speaking proficiency, the research on SRM to speak English in the Indonesian context is still limited. Diasti and Mbato (2020) researched SRM focused on writing skills. They investigated students' strategies to regulate their motivation to write and finish their thesis. Therefore, this study aimed to identify students' self-regulated motivation and focused on students' speaking skills to enrich the literature.

METHOD

This was a quantitative study employing a survey as the Instrument. The survey can be

defined as a quantitative analysis of a population's trends, behaviors, or thoughts by researching a representative sample (Creswell, 2014). The study's goal was to answer these questions:

1. What is the SRM level of EFL undergraduate students to speak English?
2. Is there any significant difference in SRM levels between male and female students?

The study was conducted at the English Language Education Department of a private university in Yogyakarta. This study's participants were English language education students in their first, second, and third years of college. Selecting the participants was based on their major, where they needed to learn four English skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) to teach those skills to their students finally. However, this study focused only on their strategies to improve their speaking skill.

This study used a total population sampling in which the entire population was used as a sample. The total number of students in their first, second, and third years of college was 113. However, the responses received were 92 (60 females and 32 males).

This study used a questionnaire from Uztosun (2020), namely SRM for Improving Speaking English as a Foreign Language (SRMIS-EFL) scale. The Instrument had 4 factors that consist of 20 items: (1) Task Value Evaluation (items 1-7), (2) Regulation of Learning Environment (items 8-12), (3) Regulation of Affect (items 13-15), and (4) Regulation of Classroom Environment (items 16-20). To collect the data, the researcher used Google Forms. Before distribution, the questionnaire was translated into Bahasa Indonesia to give the participants a better understanding of each questionnaire statement. The questionnaire was distributed to the chosen sample through WhatsApp. The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first section discussed

participants' information for research requirements such as name, gender, and batch. The second section was the SRMIS-EFL items. The study used a 5 Likert-type scale for the respondent to respond to each statement. The scale indicated participants' SRM level in speaking English. The 5 Likert-scale ranged from 1= strongly disagree (minimum value) to 5= strongly agree (maximum value).

After collecting the data, the researcher examined the validity and reliability of the questionnaire first. All questionnaire items were valid and had high reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .93$). Further, the data was proceed using Microsoft Excel and analyzed the data using the SPSS v.26 descriptive analysis (mean score and standard deviation) to measure students' SRM levels and independent samples T-test to see the difference between male and female students.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this finding, the researcher shows the overall factor of the questionnaire and each item of the SRMIS-EFL factors. According to the result, of 92 respondents, female students predominated. There were 60 female responders (65.2%) and 32 male respondents (34.8%).

SRM in Speaking Factors	Mean	SD
Task Value Evaluation	4,40	0.93
Regulation of Learning Environment	3,79	0.22
Regulation of Affect	3,86	0.20
Regulation of Classroom Environment	3,82	0.73
Overall SRMIS-EFL	3,96	0.28

Table 1. Mean Score of All SRMIS-EFL Factors

Based on the table above, the highest mean score of the SRM factor was task value evaluation (M= 4,40, SD= 0.93). The result showed that most students responded positively to each item of this factor. This factor consists of seven items related to the interest and goals of students to speak English proficiently. After task value evaluation, regulation of effect received the second-highest mean score of 3.86 and SD of 0.20. This factor associated with students' strategies for overcoming fear and maintaining self-confidence is significant.

The mean score of the regulation of the classroom environment factor was 3.82, and the SD was 0.73. This factor was related to students' self-control to participate in class speaking activities actively. The last factor with the lowest mean score was the regulation of the learning environment. The mean score was 3.79, and the SD was 0.22. This factor is related to the efforts made by students to study and practice speaking English with tourists or native English speakers.

Alotumi (2021) created a mean score interpretation framework to indicate the SRM level. 1.0 to ≤ 1.8 M is considered a very low motivation level. The mean score of 1.8 to ≤ 2.6 is considered as low. 2.6 to ≤ 3.4 M is considered medium. 3.4 to ≤ 4.2 is considered as high. Lastly, a mean score of 4.2 to ≤ 5.0 is considered a very high motivation level.

According to the findings, SRMIS-EFL participants demonstrated a high to very high level. The factor with the highest mean score was task value evaluation (M= 4.40, SD= 0.93), whereas the variable with the lowest mean score was regulation of learning environment (M= 3.79, SD= 0.73). However, the mean score for all factors was 3.96. This indicated that the participants had a high SRM level in speaking English.

Task Value Evaluation Factor

Table 2. Mean Score of Task Value Evaluation Factor

No.	Statement	N	Mean	SD
1.	I remind myself that I need to speak English well.	92	4.50	1.04
2.	When the teacher speaks English, I listen carefully to his/her speech.	92	4.41	0.80
3.	I try to be interested in and willing to learn English.	92	4.51	0.95
4.	When I speak English, I learn from my mistakes.	92	4.36	0.92
5.	In order to speak English more correctly, I learn from the mistakes other people make when they speak English.	92	4.25	0.93
6.	In English lesson, I try to pay attention all the time.	92	4.34	0.88
7.	I try to find ways to increase my motivation to speak English	92	4.45	0.95

The highest item statement of task value evaluation was "I try to be interested in and willing to learn English," with a mean score of 4.51 and a standard deviation of 0.95. Meanwhile, the lowest statement was, "In order to speak English more correctly, I learn from the mistakes other

people make when they speak English," with a mean score of 4.25 and a standard deviation of 0.93. However, all statements of the factor were indicated to be very high.

Among other SRMIS-EFL factors, task value evaluation was the most regulated and could predict students' self-regulated motivation. This factor was associated with students' learning goals, willingness, and interest to speak English proficiently. According to the findings, prospective teachers regarding the speaking task are valuable. Therefore, students always attempt to enhance their motivation and interest in speaking English because they know the importance of speaking skills. This study's findings support (Collins, 2009) that task values are a motivational source that plays an important role in self-regulation.

The concept of task value evaluation is a part of intrinsic motivation, in which both high and low levels of motivation come from within the individual learner. In most cases, situational and personal interests and objectives are the sources of intrinsic motivation (Ilishkina et al., 2022). Each item on the questionnaire demonstrates that students have strategies for regulating their effort and perseverance in academic tasks (Wolters, 1998). Students with a high task value evaluation demonstrate a high willingness to learn, the ability to complete speaking-related educational tasks, and clear goals, so they know how to prepare and what to do to accomplish the goal.

Regulation of Affect Factor

Table 3. Mean Score of Regulation of Affect Factor

No.	Statement	N	Mean	SD
13.	I can overcome my fear when I speak English.	92	3.79	0.97
14.	I can overcome my anxiety when I speak English.	92	3.70	0.95
15.	I try to keep a high level of self-confidence when I speak English.	92	4.10	0.85

There were only three item statements in the regulation of the affect factor. However, the mean score for this factor was relatively high. The highest item of regulation of the affect factor was statement number 15, "I try to keep a high level of self-confidence when I speak English" (Mean = 4.10, SD = 0.85). Meanwhile, the lowest statement of the factor was item number 14, "I can overcome my anxiety when I speak English" (Mean = 3.70, SD = 0.95). However, all statements showed a high mean score, concluding that students apply strategies to overcome unpleasant feelings, such as anxiousness, when speaking English.

This study revealed that regulation of affect is the highest factor following task value evaluation. To support empirical evidence, Uztosun (2021) emphasized that regulating affect predicts EFL speaking competency significantly. The regulation of affect is associated with the anxiety and fear that students experience when speaking English. Previous research established that anxiety had a negative effect on students' speaking and communication skills (Aguila & Harjanto, 2016).

Students with a high regulation of affect typically exert considerable effort to reduce negative feelings associated with language acquisition, particularly speaking. According to (Bown & White, 2010),

unpleasant feelings have been shown to have specialization in various aspects of language acquisition. Negative emotions also absorb students' cognitive resources. When students experience strong negative emotions, it will impair their ability to concentrate on language, remember the forms of the target language, or process language in a productive manner (p. 441).

The third item of regulation of affect factor, "I try to keep a high level of self-confidence when I speak English," showed that students committed to preserving their English-speaking confidence in and out of the classroom. Building self-confidence is essential to successful language acquisition, particularly when speaking English. If an individual is willing to practice speaking English confidently, their ability will improve. Krashen (1981) confirmed that self-confidence is associated with motivational factors that impact second language acquisition success.

However, the findings of this study revealed that students might control or overcome their fear and anxiety and attempt to maintain a high level of confidence when speaking English. Students who control their negative emotional state have more chances to enhance their EFL speaking ability (Uztosun, 2021).

Regulation of Classroom Environment Factor

Table 4. Mean Score of Regulation of Classroom Environment Factor

No.	Statement	N	Mean	SD
16.	I use every opportunity to speak English during lessons.	92	3.93	0.92
17.	I talk English with people I know (e.g classmates, flatmates).	92	3.73	1.09

18.	I try to participate as much as possible in English speaking activities class.	92	3.84	0.89
19.	I make a point of speaking English in class.	92	3.79	0.87
20.	I spend time with friends who encourage each other to speak English.	92	3.83	0.99

The third highest factor was the regulation of the classroom environment. Regulation of classroom environment factor relates to how students control themselves to participate in class speaking activities actively. The highest score for this factor was statement number 16, "I use every opportunity to speak English during lessons" (Mean = 3.93 and SD = 0.92). Moreover, the lowest statement was number 17, "I talk English with people I know (e.g., classmates, flatmates)" (Mean = 3.73 and SD = 1.09). From the highest score of the factor, it can be assumed that students always try to engage in English-speaking classes. This factor item emphasized student strategies to actively engage in class activities and find opportunities to speak more English with classmates.

The classroom environment is one of the essential factors in determining whether students will feel comfortable studying (Bima & Adi, 2021). According to Ali, Masroor, and Khan (2020), a stressful classroom environment can cause students not to feel comfortable when learning. It can also have a negative impact on their confidence when communicating in English. Consequently, teachers and

classmates play a crucial role. According to the study's findings, students always attempted to participate in every class speaking activity and regularly practiced speaking English with their colleagues. This indicates that participants (students) are highly motivated. Therefore, highly motivated students tend to participate in classroom activities and seek opportunities to speak English with their classmates or friends (Uztosun, 2021).

Regulation of Learning Environment Factor

Table 5. Mean Score of Regulation of Learning Environment Factor

No.	Statement	N	Mean	SD
8.	I try to find friends from abroad.	92	3.87	1.12
9.	I try to chat with foreigners from abroad in English on the internet.	92	4.00	0.98
10.	I make contact with people whose mother tongue is English.	92	3.70	1.03
11.	During the holidays, I try to visit places with many tourists to improve my spoken English.	92	3.45	1.08
12.	When I meet foreigners, I try to practice my English.	92	3.95	1.07

Regulation of learning environment factor refers to students' effort to find other ways to learn and practice English speaking to overcome learning distractions. All statements in table 4.3 refer to strategies students may employ to learn and practice English beyond the classroom. The highest mean score was 4.00 for item number 9, "I try to chat with foreigners from abroad in English on the internet." The standard deviation was 0.98. The lowest mean score was 3.45 with a standard deviation of 1.08 for statement 11 "During the holidays, I try to visit places with many tourists to improve my spoken English."

The last factor with the lowest mean score (3.79) was the regulation of learning environment. Nonetheless, the data indicated a high SRM level. Regulation of learning environment pertains to how students discover opportunities to learn and improve speaking English beyond the

classroom by interacting with tourists or native English speakers. Students' high level of SRM might be affected because participants reside in tourist-heavy cities, where they have greater possibilities to communicate with foreigners. The learning environment can impact students' autonomous motivation (Baeten, Dochy, & Struyven, 2013).

The city where the students (participants) reside has many tourist attractions frequented by many tourists, so they have a great opportunity to practice their English by communicating directly with travelers. The statement "I try to chat with foreigners from abroad in English on the internet" indicated that students attempt to communicate face-to-face and via the internet and social media. This means that students with a high SRM level will practice their English-speaking skills in various manners.

SRM Level Difference Based on Gender

Figure 1. The Result of SRM Level Difference Based on Gender

Group Statistics										
		Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
Total Semua Item	Female		60	78.65	13.274	1.714				
	Male		32	83.91	11.501	2.033				

Independent Samples Test										
		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
Total Semua Item	Equal variances assumed	.001	.971	-1.892	90	.062	-5.256	2.778	-10.775	.263
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.977	71.682	.052	-5.256	2.659	-10.557	.045

From Figure. 1, it can be seen that the Sig. (2-tailed) value was 0.06. If the Sig. The value was <0.05. It is possible to conclude that there was a significant difference between SRM level and gender; however, the Sig. The value of the result was 0.06, which means $p > 0.05$. It can be concluded that there was no significant difference between SRM level and gender.

In terms of gender, this study found no significant difference between the SRM

level between male and female students. This indicated that the SRM level of male and female students was comparable. This suggests that gender does not affect students' SRM levels. Both male and female students apply SRM strategies and are willing to improve their speaking ability. However, the prior study showed contradictory results. Alotumi (2021) discovered that SRM had a small but significant effect on gender; female

students generally had higher levels of SRM than male students.

CONCLUSION

This study identified the SRM level of English Language Education Department students in their first, second, and third years of a private university in Yogyakarta. This study aims to identify the SRM level of students and the difference between male and female students. This study gives data regarding EFL students' motivation to enhance their speaking ability and implications for both teachers and students on the use of SRM in enhancing EFL speaking in the teaching and learning process. Students had a high level of SRM, indicating that they utilized all motivational regulation strategies to enhance their speaking abilities. Their awareness of the importance, goals, and interests of speaking encourages them to seek ways to preserve their motivation, willingness, and self-confidence to learn and practice speaking inside and outside the classroom.

All SRMIS-EFL factors were crucial in improving students' speaking skills, particularly task value evaluation and regulation of affect. Participants have proven they can manage their anxiety and fear while speaking English. Speaking is closely related to anxiety. Therefore, anxiety and fear can influence the development of their speaking abilities. Students must find strategies to overcome their anxiety and fear of speaking English, but teachers also play a crucial role, particularly in the classroom. Teachers should provide a favorable, secure, and comfortable learning environment in the classroom, particularly while students are improving their speaking skills. The teachers should allow students to speak English in class and encourage them to be all right about making mistakes while learning.

Teachers should encourage students' participation in class activities and implement more peer collaboration

activities to enhance classmate communication. Teachers should also emphasize to students the significance of regulating their motivation (Uztosun, 2021). Understanding the importance of SRM and controlling their speaking motivation could help foreign language speaking proficiency (p. 423). Therefore, training teachers to understand students' backgrounds and adjust the classroom according to their learning needs is important. It is also important for teachers to teach students how to control their learning motivation.

As future English teachers, students with a high SRM can educate their future students on how to control their motivation so that they can acquire all the skills associated with learning English. In addition, they will be able to adapt instructional strategies and materials to the needs of the students.

There is a limitation that can be addressed. The Research is limited to university settings. This study's findings cannot be applied to all contexts, such as middle or high school. Therefore, it is recommended to investigate the self-regulated speaking motivation of junior or senior high school students. They may implement various SRM strategies to regulate their motivation to improve their English-speaking skills.

REFERENCES

- Aguila, Kathreen B., and Ignatius Harjanto. 2016. "Foreign Language Anxiety and Its Impacts on Students' Speaking Competency." *ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal* 32(1):29–40. doi: 10.24123/aipj.v32i1.582.
- Ali, Zulfiqar, Farzana Masroor, and Tariq Khan. 2020. "Creating Positive Classroom Environment For Learners' Motivation Towards Communicative Competence In The English Language." *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan* 1(57):317–28.
- Alotumi, Mohialdeen. 2021. "EFL College

- Junior and Senior Students' Self-Regulated Motivation for Improving English Speaking: A Survey Study." *Heliyon* 7(4). doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06664.
- Bademcioglu, Mehtap, Hakan Karatas, and Atilla Ergin. 2017. "The Prediction of Undergraduates' Self-Regulation Strategies, Motivational Beliefs, Attitudes towards English, and Speaking Anxiety on Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety." *Journal of Human Sciences* 14(1):571. doi: 10.14687/jhs.v14i1.4132.
- Baeten, Marlies, Filip Dochy, and Katrien Struyven. 2013. "The Effects of Different Learning Environments on Students' Motivation for Learning and Their Achievement." *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 83(3):484–501. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8279.2012.02076.x.
- Bima, M. Fadjar, and Sugeng Susilo Adi. 2021. "Classroom Environment, Students Motivation, and Speaking Anxiety Among Vocational High School Students in English Lesson." *Erudio Journal of Educational Innovation* 8(1):83–94. doi: 10.18551/erudio.8-1.8.
- Boekaerts, Monique. 1996. "Self-Regulated Learning at the Junction of Cognition and Motivation." *European Psychologist* 1(2):100–112. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040.1.2.100.
- Birgit Spinath. 2009. "How Do Motivational Regulation Strategies Affect Achievement: Mediated by Effort Management and Moderated by Intelligence." *Learning and Individual Differences* 19(4):621–27. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2009.08.006.
- Bown, Jennifer, and Cynthia J. White. 2010. "Affect in a Self-Regulatory Framework for Language Learning." *System* 38(3):432–43. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2010.03.016.
- Hacker, Douglas J., John Dunlosky, Arthur C. Graesser, Barry J. Zimmerman, and Adam R. Moylan. 2009. "Self-Regulation from: Handbook of Metacognition in Education Routledge." 1. doi: 10.4324/9780203876428.ch16.
- Ilishkina, Daria I., Anique de Bruin, Andrey I. Podolskiy, Marina I. Volk, and Jeroen J. G. van Merriënboer. 2022. "Understanding Self-Regulated Learning through the Lens of Motivation: Motivational Regulation Strategies Vary with Students' Motives." *International Journal of Educational Research* 113(February):1–14. doi: 10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101956.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). Attitude and Aptitude in Second Language Acquisition and Learning . In *Second language acquisition and Second language learning* (pp. 19–39). essay, Oxford University Press.
- Kryshko, Olena, Jens Fleischer, Julia Waldeyer, Joachim Wirth, and Detlev Leutner. 2020. "Do Motivational Regulation Strategies Contribute to University Students' Academic Success?" *Learning and Individual Differences* 82. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101912.
- Nancy Collins. 2009. "Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning: Theory, Research, and Applications (Review)." *The Journal of Higher Education* 80(4):476–79. doi: 10.1353/jhe.0.0057.
- Panadero, Ernesto. 2017. "A Review of Self-Regulated Learning: Six Models and Four Directions for Research." *Frontiers in Psychology* 8(APR).
- Pintrich, Paul R. 2000. *THE ROLE OF GOAL ORIENTATION IN SELF-REGULATED LEARNING*. Zimmerman.
- Uztosun, Mehmet Sercan. 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):213–25. doi: 10.1080/09571736.2017.1335766.

- Uztosun, Mehmet Sercan. 2021. "Foreign Language Speaking Competence and Self-Regulated Speaking Motivation." *Foreign Language Annals* 54(2):410–28. doi: 10.1111/flan.12559.
- Wolters, Christopher A. 1998. *Self-Regulated Learning and College Students' Regulation of Motivation*. Vol. 90.
- Wolters, Christopher A. 2003. "Regulation of Motivation: Evaluating an Underemphasized Aspect of Self-Regulated Learning." *Educational Psychologist* 38(4):189–205. doi: 10.1207/S15326985EP3804_1.
- Wolters, Christopher A., and Maria B. Benzon. 2013. "Assessing and Predicting College Students Use of Strategies for the Self-Regulation of Motivation." *Journal of Experimental Education* 81(2):199–221. doi: 10.1080/00220973.2012.699901.