International Journal of Sustainability and Advanced Integrated Research
Volume 2, Issue 1 (January-March 2026) | ISSN: 3107-7854
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/ijsair.V2.I1.69

From Strategies to Success: Examining Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and Expectancy-Value as Predictors of Academic Performance in English at San Francisco National High School

Romulo A. Alcantara Jr.
Secondary School Teacher III, San Francisco National High School, San Francisco, Sablayan, Occidental Mindoro, Philippines

Publication history: Received: December 28, 2025; Revised: February 9, 2026; Accepted: February 11, 2026
Email of Corresponding Author: romulojr.alcantara001@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

This study examined whether students' Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) use and Expectancy-Value beliefs significantly relate to and predict academic performance in English among learners in San Francisco National High School. Anchored on a language learning strategy taxonomy operationalized through SILL and an expectancy–value motivation framework, the study employed descriptive-correlational and descriptive-predictive research designs. Using simple random sampling, 120 students (30 each from Grades 7–10) were selected from a population of 198 during the third grading period of Academic Year 2025–2026. Data were collected using SILL version 5.1 and an Expectancy-Value Theory questionnaire, and were analyzed through descriptive statistics, Pearson product–moment correlation, and regression analysis. Results showed generally medium use of language learning strategies across SILL categories and an average English academic performance ($M = 85.29$, $SD = 5.455$). Overall SILL was significantly and positively related to English performance ($r = 0.234$, $p = 0.010$), while overall expectancy-value was not significant ($r = -0.088$, $p = 0.338$). Task value ($r = 0.214$, $p = 0.019$) and mastery approach goal ($r = 0.187$, $p = 0.041$) were positively related to performance, whereas work avoidance ($r = -0.229$, $p = 0.012$) and procrastination ($r = -0.208$, $p = 0.022$) were negatively related. In predictive models, memory ($\beta = -0.305$, $p = 0.038$) and social strategies ($\beta = -0.226$, $p = 0.044$) emerged as significant negative predictors, while task value was the only significant positive predictor ($\beta = 0.193$, $p = 0.049$). The findings support strategy training and motivation-support approaches emphasizing task value and self-regulation. The study aligns with SDG 4 (Quality Education) and is relevant to SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) through its focus on strengthening English learning outcomes and future readiness. Its sustainability impact is reflected in evidence that can guide school-based, learner-centered interventions to improve and sustain English achievement over time.

Keywords: Academic performance in English; Expectancy- Value; Language learning strategies; Regression analysis; Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL); Task value

1. Introduction

English academic performance is positioned as a key competency for learners to meet global competitiveness expectations (Calixtro, 2022), yet persistent concerns on English learning outcomes in the Philippines are reflected in international and school-based performance indicators (Decena, 2021). In response, this study examines whether students' Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) use and their Expectancy- Value beliefs can significantly predict academic performance in English among learners in San Francisco National High School.

The Philippine basic education context continues to emphasize improved academic performance in English, but reported outcomes have raised issues on learners' English proficiency and literacy readiness (Decena, 2021). National concerns parallel global measures, where the 2018 assessment results cited low reading and comprehension performance among Filipino learners (Manaog, 2020), and the 2022 results likewise indicated continued lagging performance, described as a signal that "much work" is needed (Malipot, 2023). At the school level, San Francisco National High School's 2023 NAT results placed the school under a low performance group in English, with reported gaps in problem solving, information literacy, and critical thinking competencies. Within this context, language learning strategies and motivation frameworks are considered actionable levers for improving learning outcomes. Petrogiannis and Gavriilidou (2015) emphasized that SL/FL research has long focused on identifying the strategies that characterize successful learners and those associated with less successful learning. Building on this, the present study examines SILL and Expectancy- Value as predictors of English academic performance in the local school setting.

Literature on language learning strategies consistently frames successful learning as partly dependent on learners' deliberate strategic actions. Ruba et. al (2014) notes that "good" language learners use a larger number of strategies than "Poor" learners, and Ellis (1994) as cited by Ruba et. al (2014) highlights the relevance of learning strategies for language

pedagogy and explaining individual differences in L2 learning. Griffiths (2007) defines Language Learning Strategies (LLS) as "specific actions consciously employed by the learner," while Griffiths (2003) positions this LLS system as a theoretical foundation for SILL. SILL is widely used in LLS research, grouping strategies into memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social domains (Oxford's, 1990), and it has been reported as extensively translated and used in major research outputs (Oxford, 1999). Benson and Voller (2014) as cited by Decman and Danko (2019) further suggests that strategy awareness and learner decision-making can foster greater autonomy and responsibility, while Oxford et al. (2014) associates proficient language learning with autonomy, responsible decision-making, and critical reflection. Cohen and Griffiths (2015) argues that deeper research on strategy instruction remains beneficial, while Saad et al., (2015) and Cohen (2011) emphasize that learners often use strategy clusters, with orchestration being more effective than linear strategy use (Macaro, 2006). Evidence from school-aged L2 learners similarly indicates performance-linked strategy patterns. Studies summarized report that more successful students used more strategies than less successful students (Tretter and Ardasheva, 2013), with preferences varying by age group (Ardasheva and Tretter). Magogwe and Oliver (2007) also found an association between overall strategy use and self-efficacy beliefs. Conceptually, learning strategies are tied to broader psychological processes of storing and retrieving information (Dörnyei, 2005), and are described as conscious thoughts and actions toward learning goals (Chamot (2003)). In parallel, motivation literature supports expectancy-value as a robust explanatory framework for achievement-related behavior. Motivation is a crucial antecedent influencing choices, engagement, and achievement (Schunk and Printrich, 2002). Eccles (1983) as cited by Jiang et al., (2018) identifies expectancy-value as a major framework for linking motivation to learning behavior and achievement (Jiang, 2018), and Eccles et al., (1983) as cited by Flake et al., (2012) presents EVT as influential for understanding motivation. EVT is also used to explain and predict learning performance, persistence, and aspirations (Loh, 2012), including in L2 contexts where expectancy-value based motivation can be a better predictor of L2 performance than purely linguistic factors (Wigfield and Eccles, 2000).

Globally oriented education demands highlight English competence as a key outcome tied to competitiveness (Calixtro, 2022). Nationally, concerns on English and literacy outcomes have been reinforced through cited PISA findings (Manaog, 2020) and continuing performance issues in the 2022 assessment results (Malipot, 2023). Locally, San Francisco National High School's reported NAT outcomes in English further contextualize the need for school-based evidence on what learner factors (strategic behaviors and motivation beliefs) may predict English academic performance.

This study is anchored on Rebecca Oxford's (1990) language learning strategy taxonomy operationalized through SILL, which frames learner strategy use across memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. For motivation, the study is anchored on John Atkinson (1960) Theory, which integrates needs, expectancies, and values, viewing behavior as shaped by motives, probability of success, and incentive value. In support of expectancy-value modeling, Eccles and Wigfield (2002) as cited by Loh (2012) defines expectancy for success as competence beliefs about accomplishing tasks, while clarifying that expectancy and self-efficacy are conceptually distinct, with self-efficacy focusing on believed outcomes (Eccles and Wigfield, 2002). EVT further frames achievement choices as driven by expectancies and subjective task values (Eccles, 2009), with development traced through earlier models and later elaborations (Wigfield et al., (2004) as cited by Verhoeven (2010); Schunk et al., 2008). Task value is commonly described through components such as interest, attainment, utility, and perceived costs (Alipio (2020)), and early formal motivation models are linked to Atkinson's theory (1964) as cited by Roberts (2007), alongside conceptual distinctions between efficacy expectations and outcome expectancies (Bandura (1997) as cited by Roberts (2007)). Conceptually, the study positions Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and Expectancy- Value as independent variables expected to contribute significant effects to academic performance in English (measured through students' grades), aligning the framework to examine predictive relationships between strategy use, motivation beliefs, and achievement outcomes.

Although SILL has been widely used to explore language learning strategies and their role in successful learning (Oxford (1990); Oxford, 1999), literature continues to emphasize that strategy instruction and strategic orchestration warrant deeper research attention (Cohen and Griffiths (2015); Cohen (2011); Macaro (2006)). Likewise, EVT is well-established for predicting learning performance and persistence (Loh, 2012; Wigfield and Eccles, 2000), but the complexity of L2 classroom contexts supports calls for more pedagogical intervention studies applying EVT in real classroom settings (Lazowski and Hulleman, 2016; DeKeyser, 2013). Given the locally documented English performance concerns and the practical need for evidence-based interventions at the school level, the study is designed to test whether SILL and Expectancy- Value indicators significantly relate to and predict English academic performance among students in San Francisco National High School.

This research aligns with SDG 4 – Quality Education by focusing on determinants of English academic performance and identifying learner-centered factors (strategies and motivation) that can inform instruction, intervention design, and learning support systems within basic education. It also connects with SDG 8 – Decent Work and Economic Growth because English competence is framed in the study context as linked to global competitiveness and future readiness (Calixtro, 2022), which is commonly treated as a human-capital dimension of employability and workforce participation.

Finally, the study is consistent with SDG 17 – Partnerships for the Goals in its stakeholder-facing intent (learners, teachers, school program implementers, and future researchers) to support coordinated improvement initiatives in English learning outcomes.

The study contributes to educational sustainability by supporting evidence-based teaching and learner development strategies that can strengthen long-term literacy and English learning outcomes. It contributes to socio-economic sustainability by linking improved English performance to broader competitiveness goals (Calixtro, 2022) and by informing targeted school programs for learners identified as low and poor performing in English. It also supports institutional and community sustainability by providing a basis for school-level project development and implementation aimed at addressing persistent performance gaps, strengthening instructional practice, and improving learning conditions over time.

The study focuses on students enrolled during the 3rd quarter of Academic Year 2025-2026 at San Francisco National High School, examining academic performance in English as influenced by the Strategies Inventory for Language Learning and Expectancy- Value Model, with respondents limited to 120 students across Grades 7–10. It tests working hypotheses on the non-significance of relationships between SILL and academic performance in English, and between Expectancy- Value and academic performance in English, while also examining which indicators best predict performance outcomes.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Research Design

With the nature of the problems of the study, descriptive- correlation and descriptive- predictive research designs were used. The study first correlated SILL to Academic Performance in English and Expectancy- Value to Academic Performance in English, then identified which among the indicators of the independent variables best predicts the Academic performance in English of the respondents to describe the significant relationship of the variables.

2.2 Research Setting

The study was conducted during S.Y. 2025-2026 at San Francisco National High School, San Francisco, Sablayan, Occidental Mindoro, where the learners served as the respondents of the current study.

2.3 Respondents

The respondents of this study were students of San Francisco National High School during the third grading period of Academic Year 2025-2026. This study made use of probability sampling specifically simple random sampling, selecting a fixed number of students per year level to represent the whole population. From a total of 198 students, 120 learners represented the population: 30 from Grade 7 (out of 54), 30 from Grade 8 (out of 68), 30 from Grade 9 (out of 35), and 30 from Grade 10 (out of 41). With the total of 120 samples, the study satisfied the requirements needed to test the significance of the hypotheses listed in the previous chapter.

2.4 Research Instruments

The study used two questionnaires. First, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) instrument version 5.1 developed by Oxford (1990), described as an 80-question self-rating survey for English language learners as their second language. It measures frequency of strategy usage for L2 learning through self-ratings from 5 (“almost always”) to 1 (“almost never”), and consists of six parts: memory (question 1–15), cognitive (question 16–40), compensating (question 41–48), metacognitive (question 49–64), affective (question 65–71), and social strategies (question 72–76). The categories were noted as based on results of previous studies conducted by Oxford and cover listening, reading, writing, and speaking; the instrument was selected because it has been used often globally and locally, with evidence cited for reliability and validity. Second, an Expectancy- Value Theory Questionnaire (EVT) aligned with the theory initiated and developed by Lewin (1947) and Atkinson (2003). It is composed of 10 parts: Self- efficacy (6 questions), Task- Value (6 questions), Mastery Approach Goals (3 questions), Performance Approach Goals (3 questions), Wok Avoidance Goals (5 questions), Positive Classroom effect (3 questions), Negative Classroom effect (4 questions), Disorganization (5 questions), Procrastination (5 questions), and Avoidance Intentions (2 questions). Items were based on seven-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (not true at all) to 7 (very true). The instrument was chosen from the study conducted by Jiang, Rosenzweig and Gaspard (2018), noting its reliability checks using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients and Spearman-Brown coefficient for the two-item scale.

2.5 Data Collection

The researcher identified the expected number of respondents per year level through consultation with advisers. After securing approval from the Schools Division Superintendent and the school Principal, the researcher consulted advisers regarding the respondents’ grades in English for the third grading period, then administered questionnaires to at least 30 respondents per grade level (Grades 7–10). Respondents were randomly selected and classified as poor performing (70–75), low performing (75–79), average (80–87), and high performing (88–100) based on their grades.

2.6 Data Analysis

To measure and interpret gathered data, descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, and weighted mean) were utilized. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to determine the significant relationship between SILL and Academic Performance in English, and between Expectancy- Value and Academic Performance in English. Regression analysis was used to identify which indicators of the independent variables best predict the respondents' academic performance in English.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Extent of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

3.1.1 Memory Strategies

Respondents demonstrated a medium level of memory strategy use (overall mean = 3.050, SD = 0.5733), with the highest item reflecting visualizing the spelling of a new word (mean = 3.58, SD = 1.135) and comparatively lower ratings for flashcard use (mean = 2.70, SD = 1.157). This pattern indicates that mnemonic support is present but not intensive, with stronger reliance on visualization-based recall than on more mechanical rehearsal methods. This aligns with the broader observation that strategy use may remain moderate rather than systematic, implying a need for more deliberate strategy development as suggested in discussions of strategy progression (Oxford (1990)).

3.1.2 Cognitive Strategies

Respondents reported a medium level of cognitive strategy use (overall mean = 3.255, SD = 0.556), with several strategies at the usually used level such as practicing English sounds (mean = 3.67), rereading for comprehension (mean = 3.58), skimming then rereading (mean = 3.59), and taking notes in English (mean = 3.71). Lower means were observed for comparing English with one's own language (mean = 2.73) and joining English-speaking activities outside class (mean = 2.83). The results suggest frequent use of practice-oriented and comprehension-support strategies, but less consistent engagement with transfer and extended practice beyond classroom contexts. This supports the view that learners employ cognitively oriented approaches more than memory-based strategies, consistent with reported patterns in other EFL contexts (Alhaisoni (2012)).

3.1.3 Compensating Strategies

Respondents demonstrated medium use of compensating strategies (composite mean = 3.147, SD = 0.629), including guessing meaning from context (mean = 3.38, SD = 1.203) and asking others for the correct word (mean = 3.36, SD = 1.180). These findings indicate that learners use adaptive techniques to handle linguistic gaps, but not at a consistently high frequency. As with overall moderate strategy use patterns, the results imply potential benefits from more explicit development of strategic competence (Oxford (1990)).

3.1.4 Metacognitive Strategies

Respondents showed medium use of metacognitive strategies (composite mean = 3.207, SD = 0.602), with usually used behaviors including noticing errors (mean = 3.53, SD = 1.053) and learning from mistakes (mean = 3.51, SD = 1.108), alongside moderate planning and practice-seeking behaviors. This pattern suggests awareness of monitoring and self-evaluation but incomplete consistency in planning and regulation. The broader profile indicates that metacognitive development may be strengthened through more systematic instruction and scaffolding, similar to observations that moderate strategy use may not yet translate to optimized learning outcomes (Rismayana (2017); Oxford (1990)).

3.1.5 Affective Strategies

Respondents reported medium affective strategy use (composite mean = 3.203, SD = 0.694), including moderate use of relaxation when anxious (mean = 3.40, SD = 1.072) and self-encouragement (mean = 3.36, SD = 1.091), with relatively lower use of tangible self-rewards (mean = 2.99, SD = 1.000). These results indicate that learners sometimes regulate emotions and motivation, though not uniformly across affective techniques. This fits with the broader conclusion that learners possess awareness of multiple strategies but may apply them only moderately without fully systematic patterns (Oxford (1990)).

3.1.6 Social Strategies

Respondents demonstrated medium social strategy use (composite mean = 3.278, SD = 0.642), including usually used pronunciation correction-seeking (mean = 3.90, SD = 1.205) and moderate clarification/verification behaviors (means ≈ 3.27–3.28). This suggests a reliance on interaction and feedback, particularly for pronunciation accuracy, while other collaborative practices remain moderate. Such emphasis on socially mediated learning is consistent with reports of social strategy dominance among learners with overall moderate strategy use profiles (Rismayana (2017); Alhaisoni (2012)).

3.1.7 Overall SILL Profile

Across categories, strategy means were interpreted as medium use: Memory Strategy 3.05 (SD = 0.573), Cognitive Strategy 3.26 (SD = 0.556), Compensating Strategy 3.15 (SD = 0.629), Metacognitive Strategy 3.21 (SD = 0.602), Affective Strategy 3.20 (SD = 0.694), Social Strategy 3.28 (SD = 0.642), and Overall Strategy Inventory 2.64 (SD = 0.389), all interpreted as medium use. Overall, the pattern indicates moderate strategy use with relatively stronger social and cognitive orientations than memory reliance, reflecting moderate awareness but not yet highly frequent or systematic application. This is consistent with other EFL strategy studies reporting moderate strategy use and suggesting the value of explicit strategy training (Alhaisoni (2012); Rismayana (2017); Oxford (1990)).

3.2. Expectancy-Value Motivation toward English Learning

3.2.1 Expectancy Beliefs, Task Value, and Perceived Cost

Respondents showed moderate self-efficacy (overall mean = 3.16, SD = 0.758), high task value (overall mean = 3.89, SD = 0.769) with strong importance ratings (mean = 4.19; mean = 4.18), and moderate cost perceptions (overall mean = 2.93, SD = 0.631) with the highest cost related to effort needed for good grades (mean = 3.68). This indicates that learners generally value English highly while holding only moderate confidence and moderate workload/opportunity trade-off perceptions. The combined profile reflects the expectancy-value view that sustained effort is supported when learners value tasks and believe success is attainable, with study organization moderating how these beliefs translate into outcomes (Wigfield and Eccles, 2000).

3.2.2 Goals, Classroom Affect, and Study Dispositions

Goal orientations were moderate across mastery (Mean = 3.48, SD = 0.866), performance approach (overall mean = 3.05, SD = 0.928), performance avoidance (overall mean = 3.103, SD = 0.940), and work avoidance (overall mean = 2.765, SD = 0.718). Classroom affect showed high positive classroom affect (overall mean = 3.544, SD = 0.878) and low negative classroom affect (overall mean = 2.040, SD = 0.854). Study dispositions showed moderate disorganization (overall mean = 2.532, SD = 0.806), low procrastination (overall mean = 2.418, SD = 0.799), and low avoidance intentions (overall mean = 2.183, SD = 1.098). These results suggest generally positive classroom experience and low avoidance tendencies, alongside moderate motivational goal patterns and some organization-related challenges. This mirrors the interpretation that learners may maintain value and positive classroom experience while still needing support for organizational and engagement barriers (Wigfield and Eccles, 2000).

3.2.3 Overall Expectancy-Value Profile

The overall expectancy level in English class was moderate (Mean = 2.60, SD = 0.429), reflecting the combined pattern of moderate confidence, high task value, generally positive classroom climate, and mixed self-regulation indicators. The pattern was interpreted as consistent with contexts where learners show high value but only moderate expectancy for success and require organizational supports for beliefs to translate into stronger outcomes (Wigfield and Eccles, 2000).

3.3. Academic Performance in English

Respondents demonstrated an overall academic performance mean of 85.29 (SD = 5.455), described within the 80–87 range and interpreted as “Average,” with relatively consistent performance across learners. This indicates generally satisfactory English achievement with room for movement toward higher performance, particularly by strengthening factors associated with achievement variability within the sample.

3.4. Relationships between Variables and Academic Performance

3.4.1 SILL and Academic Performance

Cognitive strategy showed a significant positive relationship with academic performance ($r = 0.321$, $p = 0.000$), and compensating ($r = 0.203$, $p = 0.026$) and affective strategies ($r = 0.217$, $p = 0.017$) were also significantly and positively related. Memory ($r = 0.021$, $p = 0.823$), metacognitive ($r = 0.130$, $p = 0.156$), and social strategies ($r = 0.030$, $p = 0.743$) were not significant. Overall SILL was significantly and positively related to performance ($r = 0.234$, $p = 0.010$). These results align with prior findings reporting positive associations between overall SILL scores and English achievement, including evidence of significant positive relationships between SILL and achievement outcomes and GPA (Javanmardi and Khaliliaqdam (2013); Hayati (2014); UNTIRTA (2013)).

3.4.2 Expectancy-Value and Academic Performance

Task value was significantly and positively related to academic performance ($r = 0.214$, $p = 0.019$), and mastery approach goal also showed a significant positive relationship ($r = 0.187$, $p = 0.041$). Work avoidance ($r = -0.229$, $p = 0.012$) and procrastination ($r = -0.208$, $p = 0.022$) showed significant negative relationships, while overall expectancy-value was not significant ($r = -0.088$, $p = 0.338$) and several components were also not significant. This pattern is consistent with expectancy-value interpretations emphasizing stronger achievement when learners value tasks and adopt mastery-oriented engagement, and weaker achievement when avoidance and delay behaviors increase disengagement (Wigfield and Eccles,

2000). The lack of significance for the overall expectancy-value score and for some components was also discussed as reflecting mixed motivational profiles and domain differences (Guo et al. (2017)).

3.5. Predictive Models of Academic Performance in English

3.5.1 SILL Indicators as Predictors

In regression analysis, memory strategy ($\beta = -0.305$, $t = -2.097$, $p = 0.038$) and social strategy ($\beta = -0.226$, $t = -2.033$, $p = 0.044$) significantly predicted academic performance, both with negative beta coefficients, while cognitive ($\beta = 0.308$, $p = 0.070$), metacognitive ($\beta = -0.381$, $p = 0.067$), and affective ($\beta = 0.056$, $p = 0.744$) were not significant predictors when modeled together. The negative direction was discussed as potentially reflecting patterns where excessive reliance on rote memorization and heavy dependence on peers may coincide with underachievement rather than advancement, similar to reports among underachieving learners (Rismayana (2017); Takeuchi (2003)).

3.5.2 Expectancy-Value Indicators as Predictors

Only task value significantly predicted academic performance ($\beta = 0.193$, $t = 1.991$, $p = 0.049$), while other indicators (including self-efficacy, cost, goals, classroom affect, disorganization, procrastination, and avoidance intentions) did not significantly predict performance when included simultaneously. This indicates that perceiving English learning tasks as important, useful, and worthwhile was the most meaningful expectancy-value contributor to performance in the predictive model, consistent with the expectancy-value emphasis on the motivational function of task value for sustaining effort and investment (Wigfield and Eccles, 2000).

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The study found that students' Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) use was generally moderate, showing stronger social, cognitive, and metacognitive tendencies than memory-based strategies (as indicated by the SILL Oxford, 1999), while expectancy-value beliefs reflected moderate expectancy for success with strong task value and generally positive learning-related dispositions; students' English performance was at an average level, overall SILL was significantly and positively related to English academic performance, overall expectancy-value was not significantly related to performance, and in predictive terms memory and social strategies emerged as significant (negative) predictors while task value was the only significant positive predictor of English academic performance.

The findings support implementing strategy training that strengthens mastery experience, language form analysis, self-monitoring, and systematic planning while reducing overreliance on memorization and purely cooperative approaches; reinforcing motivation through authentic real-world tasks that connect English learning to career, intercultural communication, and problem-solving relevance with strengthened parental and instructor support for task value; conducting school-based self-regulation and planning workshops that emphasize goal setting and progress monitoring while reducing work-avoidance and procrastination; and pursuing forward-looking, longer-term investigations across multiple semesters using pretests and posttests to directly examine the effects of strategy training and task value promotion on achievement and related learning outcomes.

This study was limited to the academic performance in English of students enrolled during the 3rd quarter of Academic Year 2025–2026 at San Francisco National High School, as examined in relation to the Strategies Inventory for Language Learning and the Expectancy- Value Model. The respondents were confined to 120 students from the same school—30 each from Grades 7, 8, 9, and 10—and were considered based on their academic grades in English. Other potentially relevant factors and variables, including demographic profile, school location, school facilities, and socio- economic status, were not given emphasis in this study.

Compliance with ethical standards

The author declares no conflict of interest. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors and was self-funded. The author thanks San Francisco National High School, the student respondents (Grades 7–10), and the school administrators and advisers for their cooperation and support during the conduct of the study.

REFERENCES

Alhaisoni, E. (2012). Language learning strategy use of Saudi EFL students in an intensive English learning context. Asian Social Science, 8(13), 115–127. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n13p115

Alipio, M. (2020). Predicting academic performance of college freshmen in the Philippines using psychological variables and expectancy-value beliefs to outcomes-based education: A path analysis. [Manuscript]. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340666890

Aljuaid, H. T. K. (2015). Language learning strategies used by a group of Saudi Arabian EFL learners (PhD thesis, Griffith University). https://doi.org/10.25904/1912/2905

Andersen, L., & Ward, T. J. (2014). Expectancy-value models for the STEM persistence plans of ninth-grade, high-ability students: A comparison between Black, Hispanic, and White students. Science Education, 98(2), 216–242. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21092

Bernat, E., & Lloyd, R. (2007). Exploring the gender effect in EFL learners' beliefs about language learning. Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology, 7, 79–91.

Casanova, J. R., Almeida, L. S., Peixoto, F., Ribeiro, R.-B., & Marôco, J. (2019). Academic Expectations Questionnaire: A proposal for a short version. SAGE Open, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018824496

Chamot, A. U., & Keatley, C. (2003). Learning strategies of adolescent low literacy Hispanic ESL students. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, United States.

Chen, J., & Sheu, S. (2005). Applying the expectancy-value theory to foreign language learning motivation: A case study on Taiwanese college students. Journal of National Taipei Teachers College, 18(1), 201–218. https://www.academic.ntue.edu.tw/ezfiles/7/1007/img/41/18-1-8.pdf

Cohen, A. D. (2011). Strategies in learning and using a second language (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Cohen, A. D., & Griffiths, C. (2015). Revisiting LLS research 40 years later. [Source details not provided.]

Cooper, K. M., Ashley, M., & Brownell, S. E. (2017). Using expectancy value theory as a framework to reduce student resistance to active learning: A proof of concept. Journal of Microbiology & Biology Education, 18(2). https://doi.org/10.1128/jmbe.v18i2.1289

Danko, M., & Dečman, M. (2019). The strategy inventory for second language learning: Tested, adapted, and validated in the Slovenian higher education context. ESP Today, 7(2), 207–230. https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2019.7.2.5

DeKeyser, R. M. (2013). Age effects in second language learning: Stepping stones toward better understanding. Language Learning, 63(S1), 52–67. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00737.x

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eccles, J. S. (2009). Who am I and what am I going to do with my life? Personal and collective identities as motivators of action. Educational Psychologist, 44(2), 78–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520902832368

Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. Annual Review of Psychology, 53, 109–132.

Flake, J. K., Barron, K. E., Hulleman, C., McCoach, D. B., & Welsh, M. E. (2015). Measuring cost: The forgotten component of expectancy-value theory. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 41, 232–244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2015.03.002

Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. System, 31(3), 367–383. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00048-4

Griffiths, C. (2007). Language learning strategies: Students' and teachers' perceptions. ELT Journal, 61(2), 91–99.

Habók, A., & Magyar, A. (2018). The effect of language learning strategies on proficiency, attitudes and school achievement. Frontiers in Psychology, 8, Article 2358. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02358

Hayati, A. M. (2014). The relationship between language learning strategies and English academic achievement among ESP students. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5(5), 995–1002. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.5.995-1002

Hood, M., Creed, P. A., & Neumann, D. L. (2012). Using the expectancy value model of motivation to understand the relationship between student attitudes and achievement in statistics. Statistics Education Research Journal, 11(2), 72–85. https://doi.org/10.52041/serj.v11i2.330

Javanmardi, F., & Khaliliaqdam, S. (2013). A correlation study on the use of language learning strategies and English academic achievement of Iranian EFL university students. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4(2), 372–380. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.2.372-380

Jiang, Y., Rosenzweig, E. Q., & Gaspard, H. (2018). An expectancy-value-cost approach in predicting adolescent students' academic motivation and achievement. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 54, 139–152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2018.06.005

Lazowski, R. A., & Hulleman, C. S. (2016). Motivation interventions in education: A meta-analytic review. Review of Educational Research, 86(2), 602–640. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315617832

Loh, E. K. Y. (2019). What we know about expectancy-value theory, and how it helps to design a sustained motivating learning environment. System, 86, 102–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102119

Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. The Modern Language Journal, 90(3), 320–337.

Magogwe, J. M., & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. System, 35, 338–352. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.01.003

Mizumoto, A., & Takeuchi, O. (2018). Modelling a prototypical use of language learning strategies: Decision tree-based methods in multiple contexts. In R. L. Oxford & C. M. Amerstorfer (Eds.), Language learning strategies and individual learner characteristics: Situating strategy use in diverse contexts (pp. 99–122). Bloomsbury.

Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an oral communication strategy inventory. The Modern Language Journal, 90(2), 151–168. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00390.x

Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. Newbury House/HarperCollins.

Oxford, R. L., Rubin, J., Chamot, A. U., Schramm, K., Gunning, P., & Nel, C. (2014). The learning strategy prism: Perspectives of learning strategy experts. System, 43, 30–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.02.004

Petrogiannis, K., & Gavriilidou, Z. (2015). Strategy inventory for language learning: Findings of a validation study in Greece. In M. Carmo (Ed.), Education applications & developments (pp. 223–236). inScience Press.

Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (2002). The role of goals and goal orientation. In Motivation in education: Theory, research and application (2nd ed., pp. 190–242). Simon & Schuster.

Rahmawati, Y., & Susanto, H. (2013). The correlation between students' language learning strategies and their achievement in learning English vocabulary. ELTIN Journal, 1(2), 1–10. https://e-journal.stkipsiliwangi.ac.id/index.php/eltin/article/view/53

Rismayana, I. (2017). The correlation between language learning strategies and language proficiency level among English department students at Universitas Negeri Makassar. Exposure, 6(2), 142–159. https://eprints.unm.ac.id/8019/

Roberts, J. (2007). The expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation and the enumeration of possible selves: Evidence as outcomes during emerging adulthood. [Thesis/Dissertation]. Eastern Michigan University. http://commons.emich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=...

Robson, G., & Midorikawa, H. (2002). How reliable and valid is the Japanese version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL)? JALT Journal, 23(2), 202–226.

Ruba, H., Habiba, U., Amir, A., Aslam, A., & Kiran, S. (2014). Strategy Inventory for Language Learning. European Journal of Psychology Research, 1, 341–245.

Saad, N., Yunus, M. B. M., & Embi, M. A. B. (2015). Exploring the connection between out-of-class language learning strategies and in-class activities. Journal of Applied Research in Education, 19, 36–49.

Takeuchi, O. (2003). What can be predicted/suggested by learners' self-reported frequency of strategy use? JACET Journal, 37, 1–16.

Trautwein, U., Niggli, A., Schnyder, I., & Lüdtke, O. (2012). Between observable and unobservable effort: The role of expectancy-value and ability beliefs in students' homework motivation. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 37(2), 139–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.11.002

Tretter, T., & Ardasheva, Y. (2013). Strategy Inventory for Language Learning student forum: Testing for factorial validity. The Modern Language Journal. https://www.eri.louisville.edu/papers_pres/tretter_MLJ_2013.pdf

Verhoeven, P. (2010). Quality in statistics education: Applying expectancy value models to predict student outcomes in statistics education. Roosevelt Academy. https://icots.info/icots/8//cd/pdfs/invited/ICOTS8_8E1_VERHOEVEN.pdf

Warahmah, M., Fakhri, R., & Nababan, H. (2015). A study on language learning strategies used by the second year students of English study program of FKIP Universitas Riau in learning English. https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/202229-none.pdf

Wentworth, B. L. (2015). Using expectancy–value theory to predict intent to conform in elementary school students (Master's thesis). Appalachian State University. https://appstate.figshare.com/articles/thesis/Using_Expectancy-Value_Theory_to_predict_intent_to_conform_in_elementary_school_students/29860862

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25(1), 68–81. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1015

Yli-Piipari, S., & Kokkonen, J. (2014). An application of the expectancy–value model to understand adolescents' performance and engagement in physical education. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2013-0067

Zhu, X. (2009). Examining the relation between student expectancy-value motivation, achievement in middle-school physical education, and after-school physical activity participation (Doctoral dissertation). University of Maryland. https://drum.lib.umd.edu/items/c6acaf10-3415-4555-8d7b-835782bffef8