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Foreword


The descriptive-qualitative study of Tamayo examined how powerful language is in spoken discourse inside the classroom. She noted that teachers’ use of effective turn taking techniques combined with expert choice on topic management contributed to the level of interactivity in the class.

The advent of educational technology, internet-based learning and mobile-accessible learning made possible the creation of a new modality in education, online teaching and learning. Presley De Vera’s study investigated the use of rhetoric skills in a classroom devoid of personal touch or physicality. It was found that teachers who had a good command of rhetoric skills and efficient choice of rhetoric to employ increased learner talk and participation in this online classroom.

Teachers are finding a way to maximize the use of computer technology in improving lesson delivery and instruction. Fooks and Asraf studied the use of Coh-Metrix system to analyze students’ writing output and it was found that it can be combined with teachers’ analysis in determining the weaknesses of students in their writing skills therefore identifying what needs to be addressed when planning their lessons.

When dealing with more formal language, it has been a culture that students are referred to newspaper reading to observe how grammar and lexical resource help each other in the delivery of a perfect message. In this study of Lavadia and Temporal, it was found that all three opinion articles under investigation exhibited general tendencies toward the use of grammatical cohesion as well as the use of lexical cohesion.

Padmadewi and Artini contrasted the use of conventional reward system and innovative reward system in analyzing student achievement with focus on literacy skills development. The findings of the study implied that literacy skills can be enhanced by empowering rewards systematically and innovatively.
The Asistido husband and wife tandem analyzed the politeness strategies prevalent during the interactive senate hearings on the Mamasapano incident in the Philippines. It was found that the pervasiveness of question-answer combination among the adjacency pair patterns implies senators’ passionate pursuit of those missing pieces of information in aid of legislation and that positive politeness proves to be the most preferred politeness strategy during the hearing.

Can motivation and socioeconomic status affect academic achievement in English? Weda in his study proved that students’ motivation has strong relationship to students’ English academic achievement and students’ family socioeconomic status. It was suggested that motivation, either intrinsic or extrinsic needs to be activated in the EFL classroom.

Rahman and Weda explored students’ perceptions in appreciating English literary works through critical comment and was found that students strongly agree that English literary works in various genres present social values and could become a cornerstone of harmony and tolerance development.

Tonogbanua believed that the inclination to examination amongst Vietnamese people brought negative backwash towards teaching and learning, affecting students’ overall achievement. Due to this observation, he initiated the use of collaborative e-portfolio project to replace periodic tests and help reinforce formative assessment in academic writing.

Mabuan, Ramos, Matala, Navarra and Ebron looked at how teachers see MOOCs as a platform for professional development. The study revealed that, in general, the participants viewed MOOCs as a practical and effective means for professional development because of its open, free and flexible features, while MOOC camps were seen as a community of practice that engages MOOC participants and sustains their motivation in completing the courses.

Penera ventured into investigating Philippine English in its grammatical features as used in this technology-driven age. She suggests that language teachers who are responsible for the learners’ language acquisition should still underscore grammar and accuracy or strike a balance between these two as well as communication and fluency development in classroom instruction especially in the basic education.

A descriptive-correlational study conducted by Santillan, Martin, Santos and Yambao examined international students’ linguistic challenges and cultural adaptation in the Philippines. The results show
that cultural empathy and open-mindedness were negatively correlated with length of stay while flexibility was positively correlated with length of stay.

Facebook, being the most popular social media platform, is now being examined of its use in computer-mediated communication and second language learning. Angoluan emphasized that language could accommodate technologies that the new generations of Facebook users utilize to express themselves further and that understanding paralinguistic features which aid in meaning-making can contribute to the optimum utilization of CMC as instructional technologies in ESL classrooms.

Mustafa and Sofyan explored the differences of an unsupervised online language test versus the conventional paper-delivered supervised test. The study revealed that the scores of the unsupervised online language test were significantly different from those of the supervised paper-delivered test and it was concluded that an unsupervised online English language test cannot be used even for a no-stakes test such as a placement test if it is delivered without supervision.
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Abstract

Students’ achievement in English as a foreign language (EFL) or second language (ESL/L2) at schools and universities is influenced by many factors. One of the vital factors is motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Another vital factor is students’ family socioeconomic status (FSES). This study aims to investigate: (1) the effects of students’ motivation on their English academic achievement, and (2) the effects of students’ family socioeconomic status on their English academic achievement. This study employed quantitative approach and the instrument used was questionnaire. The data obtained are from students of English Department Faculty of Languages and Literature Universitas Negeri Makassar (UNM). The results of the study show that students’ motivation has strong relationship to students’ English academic achievement and students’ family socioeconomic status. The educational implication of the study is that motivation, either intrinsic or extrinsic motivation needs to be activated in the EFL classroom. The teachers or lecturers are also recommended to encourage students, motivation in the classroom teaching - learning process.
**Keywords**: motivation, family socioeconomic status, English, academic achievement

**Introduction**

In Indonesian context, knowing English means getting a good job, career, and many other benefits (Weda, 2012, p. 23). Being able to share ideas and thoughts in English, one can obtain many advantages. Fromkin, et.al. (2007) argue that knowing a language means one has the capacity to produce sounds that signify certain meanings and to understand or interpret the sounds produced by other speakers.

Knowing English as a foreign language (EFL) or a second language (ESL/L2) is not easy, one needs to know the language competence (grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation) and language performance (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). In Indonesia, English has been taught as a compulsory subject at secondary schools to tertiary level, but the graduate’s English communicative competence is low. Hamied, Nur, and Haryanto in (Weda, 2012) report that the teaching of English as an EFL in Indonesia is unsuccessful. One of the causes of the students’ low learning achievement in English is the students’ demotivation. Therefore, the teacher at schools and the lecturers at the university need to enhance students’ interest and motivation to learn English. This is because motivation is one of the most vital factors contributing to the achievement of students’ learning outcomes is motivation (Weda, 2018).

Trang, Moni & Baldauf in Weda & Sakti (2018, p. 718) state that there are a variety of factors that might influence foreign language or second language learning faced by a number of students when learning a foreign or second language: attitude, motivation, anxiety, and beliefs. Of these affective factors, motivation has been given much attention by language researchers and practitioners.

In the area of English as a foreign language (EFL), motivation becomes cornerstone of the students’ success. Subekti (2018, p. 57) argues that motivation has become an important issue in studies on second language learning. Many research reports reveal that motivation has significant correlation with students’ academic achievement (Nasihah & Cahyono, 2017; El Aouri & Zerhouni, 2017; Simons, et al., 2004; Bernaus, et.al., 2009; Liibo, et.al., 2016; Wilson & Trainin, 2007; and Pajares, 2003).

Second language motivation studies have been traditionally at the forefront of English applied linguistics research in the past decades, as motivation is considered to be one of the most
important individual difference (ID) variables contributing to the success of second language learning (Piniel & Csizér, 2013). The modeling of structural equations confirmed that stability, the motivation of the second language and the demotivation of the second language contribute to an increase in the level of proficiency in the second language (Isatayeva, et.al., 2018, p. 146). Selivanova, et.al. (2018, p. 218) argue that to take into account students’ individual cognitive characteristics and educational requirements in learning the second foreign language; the teacher should be aware of the fact that it is necessary to increase students’ motivation for a second language (L2) or foreign language (FL) learning.

Therefore, Isatayeva, et al (2018, p. 154) state that the motivation for learning L2 consists of six subcomponents: self-esteem L2, ideal self L2, instrumental motivation, parental support, academic challenge and awareness of importance. It was also found that the demonization of L2 training includes six components: a negative perception of English-speaking countries, compulsory EFL training, perceived discrepancy of textbooks or tasks, low self-esteem, inappropriate learning environment and untrained teachers.

**Research Questions**

The issues as put forward in the introduction as the rationale of this study give augmentation to problems. The problems of the current study are formulated in the following research questions:

1. Is there any correlation between students’ motivation and students’ academic achievement?
2. Is there any correlation between students’ family socioeconomic status (FSES) and students’ academic achievement?

**Beliefs about English Academic Achievement**

Researchers in the field of English learning outcome have focused their study on academic achievement and other English learning skills. Some researchers have attempted to address their study by investigating the influential factors that influence students’ academic achievement.
Students’ academic achievement in a variety of forms, like students’ writing achievement, academic performance, second language achievement, achievement for reading, writing, spelling, achievement in writing, and so on.

Pajares (2003, p. 139) argues that the relationship between writing self-efficacy, other motivation constructs related to writing, and writing outcomes in academic settings. Bernaus, et, al. (2009, p. 25) reveal that teacher’s motivation is related to teacher’s use of motivating strategies, which in turn are related to student motivation and English achievement. Llubo, et. al. (2016, p. 209) present their study findings that the respondents had a good to very good motivation in learning science and in general, the extent of their motivation did not vary across their sex, age, and curriculum year. Llubo et. al. therefore add that the respondents had good academic performance in science.

El Aouri & Zerhouni (2017, p. 52) state that Moroccan university EFL science students use language learning strategies (LLSs) at a medium level and exhibit a high level of motivation, and their motivation to learn English and use of LLSs are strongly and positively correlated. Nasiah & Cahyono (2017, p. 250) argue that there is a significant correlation between motivation and writing achievement and their study recommend to the teachers to arouse students’ motivation to write to boost EFL students’ writing achievement.

Assessing Motivation

Nunan, David & Lamb, Clarice (1996) revealed that most studies report a high correlation between motivation and achievement, and this correlation is taken as an evidence that a highly motivated student will do well in school.

The results of Bernaus, et.al study suggest that teacher motivation is related to teacher use of motivating strategies, which in turn are related to student motivation and English Achievement. Thus, any change in the educational system that promotes higher levels of teacher motivation should result in improved levels of education of the students (Bernaus, et.al., 2009, p. 25).

Brown (1994) stated that motivation is commonly thought of as an inner drive, impulse, emotion, or desire that moves one to a particular action. Brown (1994) added that in more technical terms, motivation refers to “the choices people make as to what experiences or goals they will approach to avoid, and the degree of effort they will exert in that respect.”
Dörnyei & Ottó’s definition of L2 motivation in Dörnyei & Ushioda (2011) that in general sense, motivation is the dynamically changing cumulative arousal in a person that initiates, directs, coordinates, implies, terminates, and evaluates the cognitive and motor processes whereby initial wishes and desires are selected, prioritized, operationalized and (successfully or unsuccessfully) acted out.

Daskalovska, et al (2012) found in their study that there are a lot of factors which influence the success in language learning, one of the most important factors is learners’ motivation to learn the language. In keeping with Daskalovska, et al, Weda, et al (2018, p. 143) said that one of the successfulness determinants in learning a second language (L2) or a foreign language (FL) is motivation. Therefore, Weda, et al (2018, p.159) reported in their study that there was a significant correlation of motivation and students’ academic performance at State University of Makassar (Universitas Negeri Makassar/UNM).

**Assessing Family Socioeconomic Status (FSES)**

Socioeconomic status (SES) remains a topic of great interest to those who study children’s development (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002, p. 371). Recently, SES becomes familiar issue in language learning.

Other than motivation as the most pivotal factor in the EFL classroom, family socioeconomic status also determines the success of students’ learning outcomes. Bandura, et al. (1996, p. 126) argue that familial socioeconomic status was linked to children’s academic achievement only indirectly through its effects on parental aspirations and children’s prosocialness. Students’ family socioeconomic status (FSES) can enhance students’ motivation to learn. This in keeping with Ersanti (2015) who reports the study results about language learning motivation of the students in terms of the education level of the parents indicate a significant difference in students whose parents are more educated with those of less educated. This indicates that students who are from high socioeconomic status have high motivation and in turn, students’ high motivation can boost students’ academic achievement.
Research Method

Participants

A total of 56 (42 female and 14 Male) students participated in this present study. Ages ranged from 17 to 24 years. The students are English department major of Faculty of Languages and Literature Universitas Negeri Makassar in Indonesia.

Data Collection Tools

To collect the data on motivation, instrument adapted from Tuan, Chin, & Shieh (2005) is used and to collect the data on family economic status of the participants, and instrument of FSES is used. Meanwhile, students’ English academic achievement was measured using Grade Point Average (GPA). The GPA was obtained from the questionnaire in which the students were asked to write down their GPA on the questionnaire. The classification of academic performance level of some universities in Indonesia justifies low academic performance is GPA ≤ 3.0; moderate is within the range 3.1 - 3.6; and high is ≥ 3.7 – 4. The interpretation of Motivation (MOT), family socioeconomic status (FSES), and GPA level are revealed in table 1 and table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOT Score</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 &gt; MOT</td>
<td>3.0 &gt; GPA</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 &lt; MOT</td>
<td>3.0 &lt; GPA</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FES Score</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 &gt; FES</td>
<td>3.0 &gt; GPA</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 &lt; FES</td>
<td>3.0 &lt; GPA</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures

Socioeconomic Status

Eleven questions of family socioeconomic status variables were considered. Those questions are parents’ education, employment, household income, residence, family general health, vehicle, picnic, and shopping.

Data Analysis

This descriptive study examines a possible correlation between the motivation and English academic achievement, and family socioeconomic status and English academic achievement at students of English department Faculty of Languages and Literature Universitas Negeri Makassar. The SPSS for descriptive and inferential statistics used to measure the correlation between motivation and English academic achievement, and between family socioeconomic status and English academic achievement. The correlation between X and Y variables is analyzed by Pearson Correlation Coefficient.

Results and Discussion

There were fifty six students who participated in this present study to examine the relationship between motivation and students’ academic achievement, and the relationship between family socioeconomic status (FSES) and students’ academic achievement. The students were from English Department Faculty of Languages and Literature, State University of Makassar. The participants’ age ranged from 17 – 24 years old and they were from semester 3 (38 or 67.86% students) and semester 5 (14 or 32.14% students). The demographic profile of participants is revealed in detail in table 2 as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Semester 3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Semester 5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 17 – 20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>96.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows the students’ perception on motivation, mean score, and standard deviation (SD) of the study.

**Table 3. Students’ Motivation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Variable*</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Even the English learning topic is difficult for me, I am sure that I can understand it and finish it.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>4.0714 (0.75936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I am not confident in understanding difficult English learning topics.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4821 (0.71328)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am sure that I can do well the English tests.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3.9464 (0.67203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>No matter how much effort I put in, I cannot learn English well.</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.8750 (0.93541)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>When the learning exercises in English subject are too difficult, I always give up or only do the easy parts.</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0714 (0.87089)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>To finish the English assignment in the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom, I tend to ask my friends for the answers rather than thinking of by myself.</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2321 (0.78604)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>When I found the content or the material in English difficult, I used to ignore it.</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1964 (0.90292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I encourage myself to succeed in English.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>4.4643 (0.80824)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I try to behave to learn all difficult topics or materials in English.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>4.0179 (0.67396)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe that I can maintain communication well in English with my friends and lecturers.

Cronbach alpha = 0.7

*Refer to Appendix for item description

The scale that was used to measure motivation was reliable, with a Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.7 (table 4). Approximately 78.6% of students gave comments on agree and strongly agree to “Even the English learning topic is difficult for me, I am sure that I can understand it and finish it.” Approximately 8.9% of students experienced “I am not confident in understanding difficult English learning topics.” Approximately 78.6% of students indicated experiencing “I am sure that I can do well the English tests.” Approximately 3.6% of students exhibited “No matter how much effort I put in, I cannot learn English well.” 7.1% of students exhibited “When the learning exercises in English subject are too difficult, I always give up or only do the easy parts.” There were 3.6% of students revealed that “To finish the English assignment in the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom, I tend to ask my friends for the answers rather than thinking of by myself.” There were 8.9% of the students indicated that “When I found the content or the material in English difficult, I used to ignore it.” Approximately 89.3% of the students revealed “I encourage myself to succeed in English.” Approximately 78.6% of the students exhibited “I try to behave to learn all difficult topics or materials in English,” and there were 84% of the students indicated “I believe that I can maintain communication well in English with my friends and lecturers.”

Table 4 reveals the students’ family socioeconomic status (FSES), mean score, and standard deviation (SD) of the study.

**Table 4. Students’ Family Socioeconomic Status (FSES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Variables*</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Which of the following best describes the highest level of education your father has completed?</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.6964</td>
<td>.85109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Which of the following best describes the highest level of</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.6071</td>
<td>.90812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
education your mother has completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>What is your father current employment status?</th>
<th>3.6</th>
<th>12.5</th>
<th>26.8</th>
<th>57.1</th>
<th>3.3750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is your mother current employment status?</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which category best describes your family yearly household income before taxes? Do not give the dollar amount, just give the category. Include all income received from employment, social security, support from children or other family.</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.3036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Please describe the residence where your family lives.</th>
<th>7.1</th>
<th>3.6</th>
<th>12.5</th>
<th>76.8</th>
<th>3.5893</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How would you describe your family general health?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>3.1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please describe the vehicle your family has.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>3.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please describe how often does your family go to picnic.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>3.2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please describe how often does your family go to shopping.</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>3.3393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See appendix for choice: a, b, c, and d
*Refer to Appendix for item description

The scale that was used to measure family socioeconomic status (FSES) was reliable, with a Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.7 (table 5). Approximately 50% of students gave comments that their father’s highest level of education was Senior High School and this was the highest responses from the students. There were 62% of the students gave comments that their mother’s highest level of education was Senior High School and this was the highest responses from the students. There were 57.1% of the students gave comments “working full time for pay” on their father’s current employment status. There were 39.3% of the students gave comments “working full time for pay” on their mother’s current employment status. Therefore, detail information of item number 5 to item number 11 can be seen in table 5.

Table 5. Results of Correlation between Motivation and English Academic Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>2.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Pearson correlation examines the relationship between motivation and academic achievement. The results reveal a mean and standard deviation (SD) of Motivation/MOT (M= 31.50 (moderate) out of a possible maximum of 5 (very high); SD= 2.730 and English Academic Achievement (M= 3.69; SD= .193), a significant correlation (p=0.000), the correlation coefficient is small with r= .001, and the sample size yield n= 56. Motivation is positively related to students’ academic achievement. Therefore, the finding implies that there is a significant relationship between motivation and students’ academic achievement among English students at English Department, Faculty of Languages and Literature, State University of Makassar, Indonesia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSES</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>4.004</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Academic Achievement</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSES-English Academic Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. P <0.01

The Pearson correlation examines the relationship between motivation and academic achievement. The results reveal a mean and standard deviation (SD) of Family Socioeconomic Status (FSES) (M= 31.59 (moderate) out of a possible maximum of 5 (very high); SD= 4.004 and English Academic Achievement (M= 3.69; SD= .193), a significant correlation (p=0.000), the correlation coefficient is small with r= .013, and the sample size yield n= 56. Family Socioeconomic Status (FSES) is positively related to students’ academic achievement. Therefore, the finding implies that there is a significant relationship between motivation and students’ academic achievement among English students at English Department, Faculty of Languages and Literature, State University of Makassar, Indonesia.
Conclusion

This present study represents an attempt to investigate the relationship between motivation and students’ English academic achievement, and the relationship between family socioeconomic status (FSES) and students’ English academic achievement. The results revealed that there was a significant correlation of students’ motivation and students’ English academic achievement among English students at Faculty of Languages and Literature Universitas Negeri Makassar, with significant correlation ($p=0.000$) and the correlation coefficient is small with $r= 0.001$ and there was a significant correlation of students’ family socioeconomic status (FSES) and students’ English academic achievement among English students at Faculty of Languages and Literature Universitas Negeri Makassar, with significant correlation ($p= 0.000$) and the correlation coefficient is small with $r= 0.13$. Further studies in a wide variety of settings with students who have different family socioeconomic background, gender, and other disciplines with students’ academic achievements are recommended.

Implication

At this point, I have to note the implications of the study. It has to be pointed out that the study investigated the relationship between motivation and English academic achievement, and the relationship between family socioeconomic status and English academic achievement. The study therefore suggests that the teachers at schools and the lecturers at universities need to toil students’ motivation in the language learning process. The participation of family in achieving the learning outcome and curriculum target becomes vital in the second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) learning – teaching process.
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**Respondent Identity:**
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Study Program:
Semester :
GPA/IPK :

**Questionnaire**

Choose one of the following choices which reveal how much you agree or disagree by circling around. Remember that there is no right or wrong answers.

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Disagree
(3) Neither agree nor disagree
(4) Agree
(5) Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy Belief</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Even the English learning topic is difficult for me, I am sure that I can understand it and finish it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I am not confident in understanding difficult English learning topics. (-)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am sure that I can do well the English tests.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>No matter how much effort I put in, I cannot learn English well. (-)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>When the learning exercises in English subject are too difficult, I always give up or only do the easy parts. (-)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>To finish the English assignment in the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom, I tend to ask my friends for the answers rather than thinking of by myself. (-)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>When I found the content or the material in English difficult, I used to ignore it. (-)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. I encourage myself to succeed in English. 

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

9. I try to behave to learn all difficult topics or materials in English. 

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

10. I believe that I can maintain communication well in English with my friends and lecturers. 

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Adapted from Tuan, Chin, & Shieh (2005)

**Family Socioeconomic Status (FSES)**

Choose one of the following choices (a, b, c, or d) which reveals how much the choice describes yourself by circling around.

1. Which of the following best describes the highest level of education your father has completed?
   - a. Senior High School (SMA)
   - b. Undergraduate degree (S1)
   - c. Master’s degree (S2)
   - d. Doctoral degree (S3)

2. Which of the following best describes the highest level of education your mother has completed?
   - a. Senior High School (SMA)
   - b. Undergraduate degree (S1)
   - c. Master’s degree (S2)
   - d. Doctoral degree (S3)

3. What is your father current employment status?.
   - a. Not currently employed, looking for work
   - b. Retired
   - c. Working part time for pay
   - d. Working full time for pay

4. What is your mother current employment status?.
   - a. Not currently employed, looking for work
   - b. Retired
   - c. Part time working
   - d. Full time working

5. Which category best describes your family yearly household income before taxes? Do not give the dollar amount, just give the category. Include all income received from employment, social security, support from children or other family.
   - a. Less than Rp. 2.000.000,-
   - b. Rp. 2.000.000,- – Rp. 5.000.000,-
   - c. Rp. 5.000.000,- – Rp. 10.000.000,-
d. Above Rp. 10,000,000,-

6. Please describe the residence where your family lives.
   a. We have no permanent residence.
   b. It is rented by my family.
   c. It is credited by my family.
   d. It is owned or being bought by my family.

7. How would you describe your family general health?
   a. Poor
   b. Fair
   c. Good
   d. Very Good

8. Please describe the vehicle your family has.
   a. Bicycle
   b. Tricycle
   c. Motorcycle
   d. Car

9. Please describe how does your family go to work.
   a. By bicycle
   b. By grab (online transportation)
   c. By motorcycle
   d. By own car

10. Please describe how often does your family go to picnic.
    a. Once in four years
    b. Once in three years
    c. Once in two years
    d. Once a year

11. Please describe how often does your family go to shopping.
    a. Once in four months
    b. Once in three months
    c. Once in two months
    d. Once a month