A Study of English as a Foreign Language on Bali Island: Self-Efficacy and Learning Strategies in Learners' Performance

Putu Ayu Asty Senja Pratiwi*

〔Abstract〕

This study aims to explore self-efficacy, learning strategies, and learners' performance; whether self-efficacy and learning strategies affect learners' performance; and whether correlations among those variables exist in the Balinese EFL learner's context.

The in-depth interviews and quantitative analysis demonstrated the findings of the empirical study and the Balinese case study attempts to present these findings. First, the Balinese EFL learners are highly self-efficacious in their speaking and writing ability; however, there is discrepancy between self-efficacy and learners' performance. With better job prospects, a sense of self-efficacy motivates learners to continue learning; however, it does not fully predict their performance. Second, the results reveal that there is no significant difference in the learning strategies used by the self-efficacious learners. Consequently, regardless of their self-efficacy and goal in learning, they use similar types of learning strategies without considering whether those strategies are suitable to support their learning development. Third, the learning strategies do not correlate with learners' performance, signifying a lacuna that causes inhibition in language learning.

The research on Balinese EFL learners illustrates that, self-efficacy must be treated carefully because it may cause a discrepancy that could hinder the learners' performance.

Keywords: self-efficacy, learning strategies, learners' performance, discrepancy, EFL.

Introduction

Researchers have focused their attention on the learners' individual differences in foreign language learning that encompasses a broad scope of domains, including self-efficacy, learning strategies, the role of age, gender, aptitude, and other affective factors, to understand why some learners are more successful and perform better than others in learning a foreign language (Bandura, 1977; Oxford, 1990), suggesting that learning a language is a highly individual process comprising a combination of factors.

Learners vary enormously in how successful they are in learning a language and how well they can perform. When previous research related to performance was reviewed, self-efficacy and learning strategies were regarded as important aspects in learners' performance (Bandura and Schunk, 1981; Caprara et al., 2011; Zimmerman, 2000).

* 山口大学大学院東アジア研究科博士課程 3 年（The Graduate School of East Asian Studies, Yamaguchi University）

However, despite various attempts to determine the relation between self-efficacy, learning strategies, and learners' performance, the findings of existing research give us little information about what lies beneath the correlation. Additionally, previous research is not enough to clarify the different characteristics and conditions of different types of EFL learners who may have different self-efficacies. This study aims to explore the self-efficacy, learning strategies, and learners' performance; whether self-efficacious learners act differently based on their self-efficacy and whether correlations exist among those variables. Hence, a case study was conducted on Balinese EFL learners, who have a different perspective about their self-efficacy compared to the other EFL learners. The Balinese EFL learners focus their self-efficacy for productive language skills not only in writing but also in speaking, a rare observation among Asian EFL learners who are mostly shy and hesitate to speak in English. This paper argues that the correlation of self-efficacy, learning strategies, and learners' performance does not always exist and suggests that the way they are interrelated may differ depending on the type of self-efficacy the learners possess.

In the following sections, the concepts of self-efficacy, learning strategy, and learners' performance used in this paper are introduced first. Then, discussions and investigation methodologies in existing literature will be reviewed. Following the literature review, the empirical research methodology used in Bali Island will be explained, and based on the data analysis, the aforementioned argument on the interrelations between self-efficacy, learning strategy, and learners' performance will be tested.

This study attempts to fill in the gap in the variables relating to self-efficacy and learning strategies and its effect on learners' performance, especially in their productive language skills. The author assumes that learners cannot depend only on their self-efficacy to achieve a better performance because self-efficacy may not predict performance and influence learning strategies.

Concepts of Self-efficacy, Learning Strategy and Performance

Bandura (1977) initiated the concept of self-efficacy, which refers to the personal beliefs and an individual's confidence in their own ability to perform specified tasks effectively. Existing research defines self-efficacy as people's level of confidence (Bandura, 1977; Zimmerman, 2000), perception (Pajares and Schunk, 2002), and judgment (Bandura and Schunk, 1981), of their capabilities that influence their individual ability and action, to predict, organize, and execute their ability to set and achieve a specific goal and subsequent performance (Bandura, 1997; Bandura and Schunk, 1981; Pajares and Schunk, 2002). In addition, self-efficacy has both positive and negative impacts on learners' perceptions of their ability to learn a particular task or skill (Schunk, 1996). As an example of the negative impact, Stone (1994) discovered that high self-efficacy leads to overconfidence in one's abilities. Whyte et al. (1997) added that, individuals who

have been successful in the past in domains where they display high self-efficacy may develop overconfidence.

Personality traits describe the inherent character and potential of a person (McCrae and Costa, 1999), whereas self-efficacy develops through perceived ability, feedback, and reflection, which then regulate behavior accordingly (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy may allow inherent personality traits to be expressed as behavior, suggesting a mediating function for self-efficacy (Fosse et al., 2015). In relation to performance, conscientiousness is considered as the strongest and most consistent predictor of the Big Five personality traits (Caprara et al., 2011).

Bandura (1997) notes that self-efficacy is influenced by four factors: (1) previous experience of success or failure; (2) modeling (vicarious experience), in which observing a peer's success or failure serves to increase or decrease one's self-efficacy; (3) social persuasion (encouragement or discouragement) from others; and (4) the person's belief in their ability.

Referring to the definition given above, self-efficacy is related to what learners think and believe about their capability to accomplish a task. Self-efficacy is believed to be another factor that is likely to be considered as a variable defining and determining academic performance, as Bandura (1997) mentioned, self-efficacy is a prime variable and plays a vital role in predicting learners' performance better than actual abilities. However, these beliefs may or may not accurately reflect a person's ability.

In this paper, self-efficacy is defined as people's perception and individual judgment about their ability, about what they think they can do, and it is not about the reality that they are capable of accomplishing. Self-efficacy is like the double side of a coin. On one hand, self-efficacy can facilitate learning and motivate learners to reflect on their potential power and direct them to the goal they want to accomplish. However, on the other hand, self-efficacy may hinder learning or build a barrier to learning and may demotivate learners. Students with low self-efficacy tend to believe that difficult tasks are not achievable and lack confidence in their ability (Bandura, 1997). In contrast, when the learners feel highly efficacious, they can reduce their effort and affect their performance.

In addition to self-efficacy, learning strategy is another factor that is likely to be considered as a variable defining and determining performance, and past studies have revealed a direct relationship between learning strategies and performance (Woodrow, 2011). Learning strategies have been defined as techniques or devices (Rubin, 1975), tendencies or characteristics of approach (Stern, 1983), activity and techniques (Horwitz, 2013), and attempt and effort (Oxford, 2011). All the different yet relatable terms of learning strategy have the same focus or goal, that is, to support the language learner in acquiring, storing, decoding, remembering, comprehending, and using the knowledge, and taken by the learners from partially to fully conscious efforts to make the learning more comfortable and enjoyable. The ultimate goal of adopting certain strategies is to become a successful learner. Language learning strategies are important for learners to help them become more autonomous, independent, responsible, and successful

in their learning (Oxford, 2011; Safitri et al., 2018). Existing studies define learning strategies as techniques, devices, and other tools to ensure learners' success in learning. However, this does not mean that by applying these strategies, the learner will perform well. In learning, the emphasis depends not only on the strategy, but also on the learner who uses it, how frequently, and with how much effort someone uses it.

This research defines learning strategies as a particular learning technique or an action taken or created by learners to help them enhance their learning development, it could be obtained formally from teaching and learning in classrooms, or informally outside the classroom in a casual or ordinary situation. However, like self-efficacy, learning strategies may not guarantee the learners' performance. Therefore, an appropriate strategy is needed to support the learners' learning development and achieve better performance.

The academic performance of students in a classroom setting is thought to be determined by self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and learning strategies that the students employ in the learning process (Weda et al., 2018). Performance is defined as how well students demonstrate language ability at various points along the language-learning continuum (ACTFL 2012). Touré-Tillery and Fishbach (2014) stated that performance assessments reflect purposeful communication tasks, mirroring real-world uses of language, and it can be measured in many ways, including fluency, accuracy, and amount (i.e., how much has been done) or the highest level of achievement that can be reviewed through Grade Point Average (GPA) (Weda et al., 2018). In this study, learners' performance is defined as the ability to use language that has been learned and practiced in an instructional setting, and it focuses on the mastery of productive language skills in speaking and writing (how accurate and fluent the learners are).

This research focuses on productive language skills because in the Balinese EFL context, it is related to better job prospects. In addition, unlike Asian learners in general, who are passive and hesitate to speak, and focus on writing skills, Balinese EFL learners are also speaking self-efficacious learners. However, their conscious awareness is more intense when they write rather than when they speak.

Contradicting Discussion on the Relationship between Self-efficacy, Learning Strategies and Learners' Performance in Existing Literature

Based on previous studies related to the relationship between self-efficacy, learning strategies, and performance, contradictions among variables exist. Research has found a significant positive correlation between self-efficacy and learning strategies. However, other researchers could not find a positive correlation; instead, they found a significant negative correlation or no correlation at all.

According to previous research, self-efficacy is claimed to have a positive influence on the

use of learning strategies (Martin and Santos, 2018; Wong, 2005; Yang and Wang, 2015). Martin and Santos (2018) investigated Brazilian students, while Yang and Wang (2015) investigated Taiwanese EFL learners, and they found a positive correlation between language learning strategies and English self-efficacy, and learners who applied more strategies in their language learning were possibly those who possessed higher levels of self-efficacy. Wong (2005) examined Malaysian ESL undergraduates, and the results revealed that students with a higher level of perceived self-efficacy used language learning strategies more frequently than those with a lower level of self-efficacy.

To date, many previous studies have reported that a learner's self-efficacy is strongly associated with academic performance (e.g., Chen, 2007; Honicke and Broadbent, 2016; Kim and Lorshbach, 2005; Locke and Latham, 1991; Woodrow, 2011). Locke and Latham (1991) mentioned that self-efficacy includes all factors that could lead one to perform well at a task and self-efficacy is positively correlated with performance. Woodrow (2011) found a significant correlation between Chinese EFL learners' self-efficacy and their writing performance. Learners with high self-efficacy levels have more confidence in their speaking ability and display better performance than those with low efficacy beliefs (Kim and Lorshbach, 2005). Chen (2007) found that self-efficacy predicts students' language performance. In addition, self-efficacy emerged as a partial mediator in the relationship between conscientiousness and performance (Fosse et al., 2015). Self-efficacy is the belief in one's capability to succeed in a particular task or subject (Bandura, 1997), and in an academic context, it can both affect and be affected by performance.

Safitri et al. (2018) used qualitative approaches to promote students' performance through the use of learning strategies and found a relationship between learning strategies and performance. Learners' performance is determined by students' self-efficacy and learning strategies that the students employ in the learning process (Weda et al., 2018).

Previous research concluded that high self-efficacy relates to positive and desired results, such as good performance, and there is a positive correlation between self-efficacy, learning strategies, and performance. However, some research has discovered its insignificance. Contradictions exist regarding the relation of self-efficacy, learning strategies, and learners' performance. Research that is partially inconsistent with existing theories, such as Anyadubalu (2010), who investigated Thai EFL learners did not find a correlation between English language performance and general self-efficacy. In the context of Spanish, Turkish, and Czech EFL learners, memory and practical strategies in a test-taking situation had a significant negative relationship with learners' test performance in grammar and vocabulary (Purpura, 1997). No significant relationship between self-efficacy and academic performance was found by Cho and Shen (2013) and Gebka (2014). Furthermore, self-efficacy is negatively link with affective strategies and some L2 proficiency measures in Thai learners (Mullins, 1992) and negatively related to performance of individuals, increased overconfidence, and the chances of committing logical errors (Vancouver and Kendall, 2006).

Due to the contradiction in the previous results, measuring self-efficacy, learning strategies, and performance is vital for understanding and deepening the study of their relationship and to determine whether one variable influences others and may contribute or influence language learning. Previous research that could find the correlation among variables, mostly focused on the quantitative data and analysis. Research with significant negative correlation or no correlation focuses on specific aspects such as the correlation between and within a person's level of analysis with performance (Vancouver and Kendall, 2006) or the cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies with the learners' performance. This study uses both quantitative and qualitative analysis to provide a deeper understanding of self-efficacy, learning strategies, and learners' performance in the Balinese EFL learners' context, and it specifically focuses on the learners' productive language skills with their learning strategies and learners' performance.

Despite many theories that have been proposed to explain the correlation, previous studies did not investigate learners' productive language skills and the difference of self-efficacious groups in productive language skills with learning strategies and performance. This provides a better opportunity to observe discrepancies between self-efficacy and performance, which have not been obtained in previous research. Therefore, a case study on Balinese EFL learners, who are self-efficacious not only in their writing skills but also in their speaking skills was conducted.

Unlike Asian EFL learners in general who are passive learners and remain silent because they are shy to communicate in English (Aubrey, 2014), Balinese EFL learners are self-efficacious in learning and do not hesitate to communicate in English (Permatasari and Arianti, 2006). Balinese EFL learners are different from Indonesian EFL learners in general who are reluctant to speak, rarely respond, and hardly raise questions because the prior learning experience only exposed them to grammar and memorizing (Tresnawati and Musthafa, 2015). Balinese EFL learners are also different from Japanese EFL learners who tend to show a passive attitude and remain silent in class. Learning English plays a less important role in Japan because they learn English mostly to write entrance examinations (Aubrey, 2014).

The author conducted empirical research on Balinese EFL learners to test whether a positive relationship exists between self-efficacy, learning strategies, and performance, and whether gaps or discrepancies occur in those variables.

Research Questions

This study specifically sought to address the following questions:

1. What is the Balinese EFL learners' self-efficacy in their productive language skills and is their self-efficacy reflected in their performance?
2. What are the learning strategies used by the Balinese EFL learners and do self-efficacious learners use learning strategies differently?

3. Does a correlation between learners' self-efficacy, learning strategies, and learners' performance exists?

Methodology

This chapter presents the designs and methods used in the study, the participants, the procedure for data collection, the method for data analysis, and several assessment instruments to explore self-efficacy, learning strategies, and learners' performance in productive English skills.

Participants

The approval to conduct this empirical research was obtained from the English Department at *A* university in Bali (pseudonym). After the students were informed that their participation in the study was completely voluntary and would not affect their grade in the courses, they signed the voluntary consent form. Utilizing mix-method research, eighty-six students in the 19–23 age-group participated in this research (24% male, 76% female). The participants were randomly selected from fifth-semester students and had a low to advanced level of proficiency. All participants had studied English for around 10–12 years since elementary school; none of the participants had less than ten years of English study. Of the eighty-six students, eighteen were randomly selected to be interviewed. The semi-structured interview lasted approximately 20–25 minutes. All students voluntarily participated without any material reward offered as an incentive to participate.

Research Instruments

The instruments used in this study included an in-depth interview, self-efficacy assessment, Horwitz's (1988) Strategies Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire, a speaking test, and a writing test. The self-efficacy assessment questionnaire was used to determine the level of learners' self-efficacy in their productive language skills, which is related to the learners' speaking and writing interaction, and production skills. An initial in-depth interview was conducted to validate the self-efficacy questionnaire. The interview questions were related to the learners' judgment of their skills, which skills they were confident about, whether their actual performance reflected their self-efficacy. The learning strategy questionnaire used in this study was not the original SILL version but was adjusted according to the local context of Bali Island. The speaking and writing tests were made by adjusting the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) guidelines. During the speaking test, students were required to participate in an interactive speaking assessment in an interview test format with the examiner. The researcher asked questions based on the previously prepared outline, and all questions had the same difficulty level

and explored the students' speaking skills. For the writing test, the students were required to write a short essay about a given topic. After administering a speaking and writing test, this research also conducted another interview to explore the learners' development and learning phases to validate the responses of the learning strategy questionnaire.

The interviews were recorded with two types of audio-recording equipment and were backed up on a laptop to avoid data loss. Although the participants' major was English Language and Literature, the interviews were mostly conducted in Indonesian to relax the participants so they could answer all questions easily. The interview results were then transcribed and translated from Indonesian into English and then analyzed. During the interview sessions, the interviewer asked questions based on the material guidelines and took notes on the critical parts of the students' answers.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. To answer research question one, the results of the in-depth interview on self-efficacy were analyzed qualitatively, and the questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), version 26. Spearman rank correlation was used to find the correlation between self-efficacy, learners' learning strategies and performance. Principal Component Analyses were used to identify and compute composite scores for the factors underlying the learning strategies. Then, to evaluate the effects of self-efficacy on learning performance and the comparison of mean score on strategy use between the self-efficacious learners, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. For clarity, the results are sequentially presented using each research question as an organizing framework in the following section.

Result and Discussion

The Balinese EFL Learners' Self-Efficacy

This research aims to investigate the learners' viewpoint of their self-efficacy in their performance in productive English skills. Based on the self-efficacy assessment, a majority of the Balinese EFL learners are highly efficacious in their ability, and in-depth interviews revealed their perspective, and the reason lies within their self-efficacy.

The transcription below is related to learners' self-efficacy and their actual performance in productive English skills. The data were collected through interviews with the learners. All names are pseudonyms.

Dewa : *"Since I was in the elementary school, I have believed in my speaking skill because I am more confident in speaking rather than writing. I am confident of expressing something directly, although sometimes I speak ungrammatically, but so far the communication is going well."*

Komang: *"I am a speaking self-efficacious learner. When I was in high school, I paid more attention to improving my speaking skills rather than my writing skills. Moreover, my English teacher taught me in a fun method by interacting and communicating more. But since I study in this faculty, I have focused on both speaking and writing to support my learning development. I have gotten good scores both in my speaking and writing skill, but my passion is still in speaking skill."*

Ara : *"I am an introvert learner, and I think my self-efficacy reflects in my writing. I do realize that my writing is far from the so-called good-quality writing. I face issues regarding writing and speaking. I feel both are difficult and I lack an understanding of those skills. But I choose writing to express my self-efficacy, even though my writing skills were not good because I am anxious when facing other people."*

The interview revealed that the Balinese EFL learners are highly efficacious in their ability. Predominantly, the Balinese EFL learners' perspectives on their self-efficacious attitude is due to the thoughts and feelings that made an impression on their skills. In this case, when they enjoy, feel comfortable, confident, and are passionate about one skill compared to others, when they think/feel that one skill is easier than the other; or when they judge that one skill is better than the other skills. The interview data revealed that the learners feel that many factors influence their self-efficacy, including personality, previous education, experience, and school. From the five basic personality dimensions proposed by McCrae and Costa (1999), the Balinese EFL learners display the tendency of the extraversion dimension, which includes the extrovert and introvert personalities. Extraversion relates to sociability and activity. The extrovert is talkative, friendly, and active; in contrast, the introverts are closed, reserved, and sensitive. Learners who like to express their ideas directly and do not hesitate to speak in public are extrovert learners. They choose to be speaking self-efficacious learners because of their character and personality. However, learners who do not feel confident and are shy speaking in front of many people tend to display an introverted personality, and they choose writing as their self-efficacy belief. Ara, an example of the introvert learner, prefers writing rather than speaking because the anxiety to face other people or the public makes it difficult to explain her ideas directly. Meanwhile, Dewa, the extrovert learner, does not feel anxiety or hesitation, and he is confident in communicating with other people.

As Ellis (2008) stated, foreign language learners mostly gain experience in learning English at school, and the Balinese EFL learners admit that they gain their self-efficacy from their school, especially their previous level of education, from elementary to high school. The experience, especially from school, can be viewed as the most influential because a school serves as an immediate context that shapes children's learning and development through instruction, relationships with teachers and peers, and school culture (Ellis, 2008).

Self-efficacy Cannot Fully Reflect and Predict the Learners' Actual Performance

The learners' self-efficacy was measured through an interview and self-efficacy assessment questionnaire. After the interview and self-efficacy questionnaire were done, the learners' performance in productive language skills was tested to determine whether self-efficacy was reflected in their actual performance. The speaking and writing test materials were adjusted from the CEFR Guidelines to assess the learners' production and interaction in the spoken and written forms. CEFR provides a level of qualification on a six-point scale, from A1 and A2 (basic user), B1 and B2 (independent user), up to the proficient user C1 and near native speaker level C2.

After the actual performance test, the self-efficacious learners were classified based on their test results. Following the CEFR guidelines, the learners were labeled based on their self-efficacy and actual performance test result. Table 1 presents the mismatch between self-efficacious learners and their actual performance.

Table 1. The mismatch classification of the learners' self-efficacy and their actual performance

		A1	A2	B1	B2	C1
Self-efficacy	Speaking	9	21	22	14	20
	Writing	4	12	22	19	29
Actual performance	Speaking	18	40	17	7	4
	Writing	7	30	39	9	1

After the actual performance test, mismatches were found among the learners' self-efficacy and their actual performance. Based on the self-efficacy questionnaire, the learners are highly self-efficacious in their speaking and writing skills. Twenty students believed in their speaking self-efficacy and twenty-nine students believed in their writing self-efficacy at the C1 level. However, in the actual performance tests, only four learners at speaking performance and one learner performed well and reach the C1 level. In addition, there are many mismatches between learners' self-efficacy and actual performance in each level.

The biggest mismatch between learners' self-efficacy beliefs and actual performance was evident in the basic user and proficient user. In the speaking self-efficacy, thirty students mentioned they are at basic user level; however, in the actual performance, most of the learners are basic user. Twenty learners mentioned their speaking ability is at C1 level; but only four learners could reach this level in the actual performance. The writing self-efficacy also had the same problem. Twenty-nine learners believed they are highly self-efficacious in writing at the C1 level. However, only one learner could reach C1 in writing actual performance. In contrast to the learners in the A and C level, the B learners are most likely more conscious in their ability; thus, they could reflect their self-efficacy into speaking and writing performance with only small numbers of mismatch in their self-efficacy and performance. However, the speaking self-efficacious learners in the A and C levels could not do so, resulting in a large number of

mismatches between their self-efficacy and actual performance.

Table 1 indicates that learners' self-efficacy might not be fully reflected and predicted in their actual performance. In the Balinese EFL learners' context, the learners may not depend only on their self-efficacy to achieve a better performance because self-efficacy may not predict performance. The learners do not behave and act as per their self-efficacy, resulting in a mismatch between what they believe in and their actual performance. There is an inconsistency between the learners' perspectives on their self-efficacy and performance. For example, Dewa, a speaking self-efficacious learner, is confident in his speaking skill but has a low score in the speaking test. Meanwhile, Komang has high scores in his speaking and writing test, signifying that he has balanced ability in both speaking and writing, yet he mentioned that he is a speaking self-efficacious learner. The correlation between learners' self-efficacy and performance is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The relationship between self-efficacy and actual performance

			Actual Performance Speaking	Actual Performance Writing
Spearman's rho	Self-efficacy Speaking	Correlation Coefficient	.392**	.174
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.110
		N	86	86
	Self-efficacy Writing	Correlation Coefficient	.243*	.234*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.024	.030
		N	86	86

Note :
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

A Spearman's correlation was run to determine the relationship between self-efficacy and learners' performance. The significant correlation coefficient value (ρ= .392, p= .000) confirms there appears to be a weak positive correlation between speaking self-efficacy and speaking actual performance test. Self-efficacy writing has weak positive significant with speaking actual performance test (ρ= .243, p= .024) and writing actual performance test (ρ= .234, p= .030). This indicates the higher self-efficacy in writing, the higher actual performance in speaking and writing; however, the higher speaking self-efficacy may only cause the higher speaking actual performance.

Based on the result, self-efficacy may not predict performance because the writing self-efficacy is correlated with writing performance and surprisingly with speaking performance as well; however, the speaking self-efficacy only correlates with speaking performance.

Bandura (1997) stated that belief in one's capability (self-efficacy) contributes uniquely to motivation and action. There is an imbalance of language learning development in the speaking and writing self-efficacious groups. Such self-efficacy misgivings undermine performance. This research found that more writing self-efficacious groups may reflect their self-efficacy. They

may control their self-efficacy and resulted in equal development in their speaking and writing skills.

The learners with writing self-efficacy are conscious of their ability and may use their self-efficacy to develop their speaking and writing ability. In contrast, the speaking self-efficacy learners may think they are speaking self-efficacious learners because they feel they are fluent in speaking; however, to perform well, fluency and accuracy also matter. This may be the reason speaking and writing self-efficacious learners behave differently. Writing self-efficacious learners tend to conscious more on accuracy; however, the speaking self-efficacious learners are more conscious on fluency. There may be fewer discrepancies between the self-efficacious learners if they are more conscious of their self-efficacy and their actual performance.

The existing research proposed multiple factors that lead to the alignment of self-efficacy and performance (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 2000). First, a central source of self-efficacy is prior performance feedback (Bandura, 1997). Second, self-efficacy can influence performance (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 2000). Third, factors that directly influence self-efficacy can also directly influence performance. This present study partially agrees with the factors mentioned above. The first factor mentioned that prior performance feedback was the central source of self-efficacy. In Balinese EFL learners, prior performance is an important aspect; however, the source of self-efficacy is not only from prior performance feedback but also from learners' personality. From the actual performance test results, the author found that self-efficacy did not fully influence performance. Even though the writing self-efficacious learners mostly can reflect their self-efficacy in speaking and writing performance, the speaking self-efficacious learners may not behave the same. These factors may influence performance and self-efficacy in different ways, so success may not be fully aligned with self-efficacy. Whyte et al. (1997) postulated that self-efficacy may act as a source of inappropriate persistence; that is, individuals who have been successful in the past in the domains where they display high self-efficacy may develop overconfidence.

Bandura (1997) and Zimmerman (2000) mentioned that performance and self-efficacy relationships may be distinct from learning strategies. Therefore, the influence of learning strategies, self-efficacy, and performance is worth exploring to determine whether the aforementioned theory is also applicable in the Balinese EFL learners' context.

Self-Efficacy does not Influence Learning Strategies

This section aims to determine whether self-efficacy influences and differentiates learners' learning strategies. This research has found that self-efficacy does not influence the overall learning strategies and suggests that learners need to choose the appropriate learning strategies to improve their performance. Inappropriate learning strategies inhibit learners' language learning development.

The Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990) was used to investigate learners' learning strategies, it is one of the most widely used strategy scales around the globe. The investigation fixed method was performed using principal component analyses. The scree plot with Eigenvalue 2.0 obtains six components that fill the requirement, and an eigenvalue less than 2.0 is deleted. This research confirms six factors on the SILL and makes its interpretation easier and more reliable.

The six factors accounted for 45.649% of the total variance. A varimax rotation test was used to make the factors more interpretable. Items with loading factors below ± .30 in the SILL were eliminated from the factor analysis because they did not contribute to a simple factor structure and failed to meet the minimum criteria of having a primary factor loading of .30 or above. Table 2 also presents the mean score of each factor. A mean score in the range above 3.5 on all SILL items is considered high use of a given strategy, 2.5 to 3.4 indicates medium use, and below 2.4 shows low use of a strategy (Oxford, 1990).

Table 3. Rotated factor, factor loading and mean score of the SILL variables

Category	SILL			
	Item	Loading	Mean	Std Deviation
Social & Organizational Strategies	I ask the native speakers to correct me when I talk	.853	2.61	1.15
	I ask for help from native English speakers	.738	2.87	1.32
	I ask my lecturers to correct me when I talk	.751	2.88	.975
	I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand	.618	2.95	1.05
	I write my feelings in a diary in English language	.599	2.62	1.31
	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English	.591	2.73	1.22
	I ask my friends to correct me when I talk	.358	3.40	1.01
	I try to guess what the other person will say next in English	.311	3.09	.965
General Learning Management Strategies	I pay attention when someone speaks in English	.809	4.31	.723
	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better	.685	4.04	.630
	I try to find out how to be a better learner of English	.608	4.18	.774
	If I cannot think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing	.559	3.86	.769
	I like learning English through discussions with others	.463	3.79	.921
	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the person to slow down or repeat it	.350	3.89	.920
	I like to learn English by listening to English songs	.325	4.40	.831
	I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read it carefully	.715	3.46	.903

Mental Process & Managing Emotion Strategies	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	.609	3.40	.998
	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English	.552	3.89	.826
	I think of the relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English	.459	3.84	.789
	I encourage myself to speak in English even when I am afraid of making a mistake	.365	3.93	.878
	To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses	.360	3.95	.750
	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or speaking English	.345	3.93	.878
Memory & Practical Strategies	I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word	.808	3.25	1.09
	I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them	.554	3.44	.791
	I practice English with other students	.515	3.50	.979
	I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used	.429	3.55	.953
	I use the English words I know in different ways	.482	3.58	.846
Metacognitive & Cognitive Strategies	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English	.768	3.70	.943
	I have clear goals for improving my English skills	.659	3.94	.937
	I say or write new English words several times	.440	3.48	.942
	I am thinking of my improvement in English	.409	4.13	.842
	I practice the sounds of English	.353	4.22	.601
	I try to talk like native English speakers	.795	4.04	.765
Communication and Practical Learning Strategies	I ask questions in English	.658	3.50	.850
	I start the conversation in English	.345	3.29	.838
	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English	.326	3.02	1.31
	I look for people I can talk to in English	.320	3.74	.922

Note: n: 86.

Table 3 presents the rotated factors with the principal component analysis extraction method and varimax with the Kaiser normalization rotation method. The result presents the preferred learning strategies used by Balinese EFL learners. Social and organizational strategies loaded reliability 0.83; general learning management strategies, loaded reliability 0.75; mental process and managing emotions (related with affective strategies and the mental process) the reliability is 0.69; memory and practical strategies with reliability is 0.69; metacognitive and cognitive strategies with reliability is 0.66; and communication and practical learning strategies the reliability is 0.62.

General Learning Management Strategies is related to how to be a better learner of

English with the highest loading indicating the most common learning strategies used by Balinese EFL learners. In contrast, the least often used learning strategy is social and organizational strategies. It is quite surprising because although Balinese EFL learners do not hesitate to speak and have high self-efficacy in speaking, they use the social and organizational strategies less often.

Balinese learners have high self-efficacy in their speaking and writing ability; they could maintain communication and interaction with other people. However, in terms of speaking performance, the majority of the learners are at a basic level. This is in line with Citra (2019), who mentioned in terms of English skill level, some people may speak English extremely fluently, but some just speak English for interaction, not very fluently and accurately.

Language adequacies are complicated and can cause insecurities, embarrassment, and feelings of discomfort socially, which can then cause stagnation and inhibit the expansion of communication skills (Freiermuth, 2001). The students' performance is attributed to other factors such as the goal in learning and their learning strategies. One of the aims of English language learning in Bali is to develop the ability to communicate, to interact with foreigners, and to get a better job in the future (Permatasari and Arianti, 2006). To achieve these goals, learners need to use more learning strategies related to speaking and writing skills.

An ANOVA analysis was computed to test the effects of individual background variables on self-efficacy and learning strategies to determine whether self-efficacy influences learners' learning strategies. The Tukey HSD post-hoc test was computed to determine whether any statistically significant differences in self-efficacy and strategy use may exist. The multivariate comparison in table 4 presents the ANOVA results of the SILL for the self-efficacy groups, whether self-efficacy influences the six learning strategies (social and organizational strategies, learning management strategies, mental process and managing emotion strategies, memory and practical strategies, metacognitive and cognitive strategies, and communication and practical learning strategies). From the analysis, overall self-efficacy does not influence learning strategies, except mental process and managing emotion strategies.

Table 4 F-test for mean difference of the individual strategy use by self-efficacy belief

Strategy	Variable	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
Mental Process & Managing Emotion Strategies	**Self-efficacy speaking**					
	Between Groups	243.022	4	60.756	6.650	.000**
	Within Groups	740.012	81	9.136		
	Total	983.035	85			
Mental Process & Managing Emotion Strategies	**Self-efficacy writing**					
	Between Groups	187.807	4	46.952	4.782	.002*
	Within Groups	795.228	81	9.818		
	Total	983.035	85			

Note: n = 86
* =$p < .05$
** : $p < 0.001$

Table 4 presents the significant influence of learning strategies used by self-efficacious learners. The independent between-groups ANOVA yielded a statistically significant effect in mental process and managing emotion strategies in the speaking self-efficacy [$F(4,83)=$ 6.650, p= .000**] and in the writing self-efficacy [$F(4,83)=$ 4.782, p= .002**]

Based on post-hoc test Tukey HSD, the high self-efficacious learners were most likely to use mental process and managing emotion strategies more frequently than the low self-efficacious learners because many of the items in the categories are related to how the learners control their mental and emotion when they are studying and speaking English.

The mental process and managing emotion strategies items are—noticing the tense and nervous when studying or speaking English, encouraging themselves and trying to relax whenever they are afraid to use English, making guesses to understand unfamiliar words, remembering English words or phrases and thinking the relationship of what they already know and new things in learning English.

These items are related to students' feelings and emotions and influenced by previous experiences, social context, and personal goals. It is important to understand feeling and emotion because it plays a significant role as the reasons for deciding to study a foreign language or keep up with the task, motivating the students, and related to effective teaching in learning processes (Pekrun et al., 2002).

Despite the significant influence of self-efficacy on mental process and managing emotion strategies, overall self-efficacy did not influence other learning strategies. Overall, the result signifies that the self-efficacious learners do not use learning strategies differently based on their self-efficacy because the significance only occurs in one out of six learning strategy categories. Previous research mentioned that self-efficacy influences learning strategies; however, it does not significantly influence learning strategies in the present study. The learners use similar learning strategies, no matter their self-efficacy.

In the case of the relationship between learning strategies and learners' performance, Spearman rank correlation analysis was used to investigate the correlation. The results are presented in table 5.

Table 5. Correlation between learning strategies and actual performance

		Social and Organizational Strategies	General Learning Management Strategies	Mental Process & Managing Emotion Strategies	Memory and Practical Strategies	Metacognitive and Cognitive Strategies	Communication and Practical Learning Strategies
	N	86	86	86	86	86	86
Actual Performance Speaking	Correlation Coefficient	.088	.038	.165	.050	.126	.038
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.422	.728	.130	.650	.247	.731
	N	86	86	86	86	86	86
Actual Performance-Writing	Correlation Coefficient	-.069	.063	.255*	.106	.136	.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.529	.563	.018	.333	.211	.878
	N	86	86	86	86	86	86

Correlation : Spearman's rho
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Spearman rank correlation result indicates no relationship between learning strategies and learners' performance in speaking. However, there is a weakly significant correlation in learners' learning strategies with writing actual performance in mental process and managing emotion strategies, yet it does not represent the whole correlation between learners' actual performance and their learning strategies. Empirical studies found that learning strategies do not determine learners' performance, and self-efficacy also does not influence learners' learning strategies.

This result is in line with the learners' interview data that they do not choose their learning strategies based on self-efficacy, but rather choose any strategy that makes them enjoy and eases their learning. Based on the interviews, most of the learners utilized many learning strategies that did not always relate to their self-efficacy and revealed that they could not reflect their self-efficacy in performance.

According to Putu, a learner who is self-efficacious in his speaking and writing skills, he uses all learning strategies he knows to improve his skills. He said he is highly motivated, and if he encounters any difficulty, instead of giving up he will try his best to make some efforts. He said that his self-efficacy did not determine his learning strategy.

Ananta, a learner with self-efficacy in speaking, mentioned that choosing the learning strategy, depends on which skills he wants to improve. To improve his speaking skills, he finds other friends as counterparts to practice speaking. He reads books other than his school textbooks and practices writing short essays to improve his writing skills. He believes that the more he learns and practices, the better his skill will be. For him, self-efficacy keeps his motivation to learn, but it will not help him improve his performance without practicing.

Purnama, a learner with self-efficacy in writing, spends more than six hours to learn English. Her self-efficacy in writing came from her prior learning experience. She was a shy girl when she was younger, so she pushed herself to study other skills, and she can perform

well not only in writing but also in speaking.

Based on the interview and the actual performance test results, it was found that self-efficacy might not fully predict and reflect the learners' performance. Among all learners, the learners with writing self-efficacy could project their self-efficacy into their performance, which means they can predict their actual performance through their self-efficacy, and they also can balance their self-efficacy, resulting in writing and speaking actual performance. Unlike learners with writing self-efficacy who can perform well in writing and speaking, learners with self-efficacy in speaking can only reflect their self-efficacy into speaking actual performance. Their self-efficacy causes this discrepancy between self-efficacy and language performance. The inability of the learners to control their self-efficacy resulted in imbalance performance. The discrepancy refers to how learners choose and believe their self-efficacy and how they choose and use the learning strategies. When the learner consciously chooses the appropriate strategy, or chooses the strategies that fit his or her learning styles and uses it frequently and effectively, then these strategies become a "useful toolkit for active, conscious, and purposeful self-regulation of learning," which can lead them to become successful learners (Oxford, 2003:2). Oxford emphasizes that when an appropriate strategy is chosen and learners use it frequently and effectively, it will become useful to support the success of the learners, implying that when the learners choose the inappropriate learning strategy, it will become useless and it may not lead the learners to become successful in learning development.

The inability of learners with speaking self-efficacy to perform well in writing actual performance and the inexistent relationship between learning strategies and performance indicates that learners' performance does not depend only on their self-efficacy and the learning strategies they use; however, there must be other factors that provoke the discrepancy.

Little is known about other possibilities that could explain why most Balinese EFL learners with speaking self-efficacy cannot perform well in writing performance and why the learners use similar learning strategies regardless of their self-efficacy. Besides the source of self-efficacy and inappropriate learning strategies, the most possible reasons that cause the gap or discrepancies that resulted in the insignificant correlation between those variables are the different conscious awareness of their ability, where the learners with speaking self-efficacy tend to focus more on fluency, and learners with writing self-efficacy are more conscious of accuracy. Another possible reason is the different goals in learning owned by the learners, the time they spent, the effort they put in learning, or the overconfidence that increased their chance of making errors in their performance. Further studies are needed to investigate the gap or discrepancies in self-efficacy, learning strategies, and actual performance.

Conclusion

This study investigated the relationship between self-efficacy, learning strategies, and

learners' performance in the EFL learners' context on Bali Island. The Balinese case study tries to contribute and reveal that the interrelations among self-efficacy, learning strategies, and actual performance do not always exist, and self-efficacy does not always correlate with learning strategies and performance.

Based on the interview, the learners chose their self-efficacy based on personality, previous education, experience, and school. The results prove that learners cannot depend only on their self-efficacy to achieve a better performance; however, self-efficacy provides the motivation to learn for a future job.

In addition, there was no significant difference and influence of the learners' self-efficacy and learning strategies. This indicates that regardless of their self-efficacy and goal in learning, they use almost similar learning strategies and use all types of learning strategies without considering whether the learning strategies are suitable to support their learning development. Moreover, the learning strategies do not correlate with learners' performance, signifying that there is a gap that causes inhibition in language learning. Based on the results in the present study, it may be possible that inappropriate learning strategy hinders a better performance, so learners need to be guided to choose the appropriate learning strategies to improve their performance.

Self-efficacy must be treated carefully because, based on the Balinese EFL learners' findings, self-efficacy may cause a discrepancy in learners' performance and learning strategies that could impede the learners' language learning development. Learners need to control their self-efficacy; possessing high efficacy is good for motivation, however, overconfidence must be avoided. Possessing low self-efficacy means they must motivate themselves more to improve language learning.

Further research is needed to confirm the discrepancies and other factors that could influence learners' performance, especially the difference between learners with speaking and writing self-efficacy.

With the current findings, English language teachers and learners are expected to conscious more on the learners' self-efficacy because, as can be seen in the Balinese EFL learners' case, unlike what has been believed so far, self-efficacy is not fully related with performance and learning strategies are not significantly related with performance. Furthermore, English language learners also need to control their self-efficacy and be more selective in adopting proper language learning strategies that can help them boost their performance.

References

Anyadubalu, C. C. (2010). Self-efficacy, anxiety, and performance in the English language among middle-school students in English language program in Satri Si Suriyothai School, Bangkok. *International Journal of Human and Social Sciences, 5*(3), 193-198. http://www.waset.org/journals/ijhss/v5/v5-3-29.pdf

Aubrey, S. (2014). Development of the L2 motivational self-system: English at a University in Japan. *JALT Journal, 36*(2), 153-174. http://jalt-publication.org.ij

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Bandura, A., Schunk, D.H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 41*, 586–598.

Barcelos, A.M.F. (1995). The culture of learning a foreign language (English) of language students. [Unpublished Master Thesis]. UNICAMP. San Paolo. Brazil.

Caprara, G.V., Vecchione, M., Alessandri, G., Gerbino, M., Barbaranelli, C. (2011). The contribution of personality traits and self-efficacy beliefs to academic achievement: A longitudinal study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology 81*, 78–96. http://www.doi.org/10.1348/2044-8279.002004

Chen, H. (2007). The relationship between EFL learners' self-efficacy beliefs and English performance. [PhD dissertation]. US: The Florida State University. https://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/islandora/object/fsu%3A254251

Cho, M. H., Shen, D. (2013). Self-regulation in online learning. *Distance Educ. 34*, 290–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2013.835770

Citra, P. 2019. Is English widely spoken in Bali? What language is spoken in Bali? https://masteringbahasa.com/is-english-widely-spoken-in-bali

Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fosse, T.H., Buch, R., Säfvenbom, R., Martinussen, M. (2015). The Impact of personality and self-efficacy on academic and military performance: the mediating role of self-efficacy. *Journal of Military Studies 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1515/jms-2016-0197

Freiermuth, M. (2001). Native Speakers or Non-Native Speakers: Who Has the Floor? Online and Face-to-Face Interaction in Culturally Mixed Small Groups. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 14*(2), 169-199.

Gebka, B. (2014). Psychological determinants of university students' academic performance: an empirical study. *Further High. Educ. 38*, 813–837. http://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2013.765945

Honicke, T., Broadbent, J. (2016). The Relation of Academic Self-Efficacy to University Student Academic Performance: A Systematic Review. *Educational Research Review 17*, 63-84. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.11.002

Horwitz, E. K. (1988). Beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal, 72*, 283-294. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1988.tb04190.x

Horwitz, E. K. (2013). *Becoming a language teacher*. Upper Saddle River, USA: Pearson

Kim, J. Lorsbach, A. W. (2005). Writing self-efficacy in young children: Issues for the early grade environment. *Learning Environments Research, 8*, 157-175. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10984-005-7248-5

Locke, E.A., Latham, G.P. (1991). A Theory of goal setting and task performance. *The Academy of Management Review 16*(1). https://doi.org/10.2307/258875

Martin, R.M.M., Santos, A.A.A. (2018). Learning strategies and academic self-efficacy in university students: a correlational study. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional.* (23): e176346 https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-35392019016346

McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T. (1999). A Five-Factor Theory of Personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality* (2 ed.). New York: The Guilford press.

Mullins, P. (1992) Successful English language learning strategies of students enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand. [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. United States International University, San Diego, CA.

Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: Newbury House

Oxford, R.L. (2011). *Language Learning Strategies. The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge University Press

Oxford, R.L. (2003). Language Learning Styles and Strategies: An Overview. *GALA*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254446824

Pajares, F., Schunk, D. H. (2002). Self and self-belief in psychology and education: A historical perspective. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp.3–21). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012064455-1/50004-X

Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Titz, W., Perry, R. P. (2002). Academic emotions in students' self-regulated learning and achievement: A program of qualitative and quantitative research. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(2), 91-105. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3702_4

Permatasari, N. P. I. Arianti, N. M. M. (2016). Learner autonomy and culture in Bali: Perspective from secondary school Indonesian EFL context. *7th Annual International Conference on TESOL 2016*, Vietnam. http://www.vnseameo.org/wp-content/uploads/

Purpura, J. (1997). An analysis of the relationships between test takers' cognitive and metacognitive strategy use and second language test performance. *Language Learning 42*(2), 289-325. https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.91997009

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "Good Language Learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly* 9(1),41-51. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3586011

Safitri, I.D., Sumardi, S. Supriyadi, S. (2018). Learning strategies used by the students in performance assessment in EFL classroom. *Humaniora 9*(3): 291. https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v9i3.5025

Schunk, D. (1996). Self-efficacy for learning and performance. Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (New York). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED394663.pdf

Stern, H.H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts in language teaching: History and interdisciplinary perspective on applied linguistics research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stone, D. N. (1994). Overconfidence in Initial Self-Efficacy Judgments: Effects on Decision Processes and Performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 59*: 452-474. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1994.1069

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). ACTFL Performance Descriptor. https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/publications/ACTFLPerformance_Descriptors.pdf

Tresnawati, F., Musthafa, B. (2015). Expressive writing in minimizing students' public speaking anxiety. Proceedings of the 1st UPI International Conference on Sociology Education. https://doi.org/10.2991/icse-15.2016.85

Vancouver, J. B., Kendall, L. N. (2006). When self-efficacy negatively related to motivation and performance in a learning context. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 1146–1153. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1146

Wang, C. (2004). Self-regulated learning strategies and self-efficacy beliefs of children learning English as a second language. [Unpublished PhD Dissertation]. The Ohio State University

Weda, S., Samad, I., Patak, A.A., F.S.S. (2018). The Effects of Self-Efficacy Belief, Motivation, and Learning Strategies on Students' Academic Performance in English in Higher Education. *Asian EFL Journal*. 140-168. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327954392

Whyte, G., Saks, A. M., Hook, S. (1997). When success breeds failure: The role of self-efficacy in escalating commitment to a losing course of action. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*(5), 415–432. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379

Woodrow, L. (2011). College English writing affect: Self-efficacy and anxiety. *Fuel and Energy Abstracts 39*(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.10.017

Wong, M.S.L. (2005). Language learning strategies and language self-efficacy: Investigating the relationship in Malaysia. *RELC Journal 36*(3), 245-269. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688205060050

Yang, N.D. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System 27*, 515–535. http://www.elsevier.com/locate/

Yang, P.L., Wang, A.L. (2015). Investigating the relationship among language learning strategies, self-Efficacy, and explicit strategy instructions. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL 12*(1), 35-62. https://files.eric.ed.gov/

fulltext/EJ1078937.pdf

Zimmerman. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 82–91. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1078937.pdf