ONLINE INFORMAL LEARNING OF ENGLISH AND MOTIVATION TO LEARN EFL: CORRELATIONAL STUDY
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Abstract
The trend of online learning has been intensifying and present is the need for study to align this phenomenon to motivation in order for language teachers to boost students’ achievement. This research is about to inquire the correlation between online informal learning of English and motivation to learn English. Quantitative method was used to measure the correlation between variables. Subjects were students in a boarding school selected with random sampling. To obtain data, questionnaire and interview were conducted. There were 55 students in total that participated in completing the questionnaire and only 16 of them were taken to be considered for the interview. The questionnaire was in Likert Scale about the frequency of English use and about the motivation in learning. Semi-structured interview was used to confirm and expand the data. Statistical analysis of two questionnaire resulted in a positive correlation (correlation coefficient \( r \) = 0.48). This means that higher values of one variable tend to be associated with higher values of other variable. Suggestion was to increase English use in online activities, to observe other factors affecting the results, and more research is needed to be conducted.
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INTRODUCTION
In the new global economy, digital technology has become a central issue in many fields, including education. This remark is strengthened by the rising of computer-assisted language learning (CALL)-based approaches and studies in the field of foreign language education due to its beneficial characteristics of providing sufficient resources of language input and ease of use of the digital technology. While learning through technology grew as new feasible practices and theories in language education, evaluation of CALL effectiveness is necessary to reduce its ineffectuality in the practice. A study by Bodnar, S., Cucchiarini, C., Strik, H., and van Hout, R. (2016) has evaluated an amount of studies on the motivational impact of CALL system and suggests that CALL needs to be ‘aligned’ with second language (L2) motivation theory, which impacted to learners’ motivation to improve their achievement in learning a foreign language.
A considerable amount of literature has been published on motivation in language learning. It is believed that motivation plays a great role in second language learning. As said by Dörnyei (2014), ‘it provides the primary impetus to initiate L2 learning and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process; indeed… …without sufficient motivation, even individuals with the most remarkable abilities cannot accomplish long-term goals, and neither are appropriate curricula and good teaching enough on their own to ensure student achievement’.

Moving on now to consider the process of language learning within the CALL environments itself. A number of authors have reported analyses of trends in the activities of language learning through the use of computer and internet in particular. In this paper, the term that will be used to describe this phenomenon is Online Informal Learning of English (OILE). According to Sockett (2014), in OILE activities, both internet and English are being the two main points in the practice; as in the online activities the chance to learn English is likely to be present. Also, the ‘informal’ part is to be considered prominent since the term refers to a process of language learning that happens incidentally, without the intention to learn. One study by Kabilan et al. (2010) examined the trend in using Facebook (FB) as a facility to learn English. They found that FB was the most popular platform for online social networking among university students, and believed that teachers have to integrate FB as an educational project with outcome for the language learning to be meaningful. Three years later, Tan (2013) reported the project which investigate the use of YouTube in the classroom. The result showed that YouTube video contents supported informal peer learning, as the nature of online learning is not only of education but also of entertainment. In 2019, Jurkovič published a paper in which she investigated the use of smartphone for the online informal learning of English among undergraduate students in Slovenia. Overall, these studies highlighted the need for more exploration in the field of OILE.

A report by Lamb & Arisandy (2019) has investigated the relationship between the practice of CALL in an informal context and the motivation to learn English. The project was to measure the amount of online activities that include English language usage and then to analyze its correlation with the self-reported motivation state. The results suggested that those who occupied English online activities more showed a high level of motivation for learning English. One point to be noted is that the subjects of their research were college students of a prestigious academy in Jakarta, a metropolitan city, that could lead to a different result if this point is removed, because in current study the research is going to be conducted in a boarding
school, where the access to internet is limited, according to the caretakers. The writer would conduct the study in Pondok Pesantren Daarul Ukhuwwah Malang.

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between the online English usage and the motivation to learn, but with a different variable of the subject. Due to practical constraints, this study cannot provide a comprehensive review of the technology preferably used by the subjects, as the research in the field of CALL is developing and growing a term called MALL (Mobile-Assisted Language Learning). A more detailed discussion on this topic could be found in other studies with an appropriate theme, e.g. CALL journal, Euro CALL, etc. Therefore, despite the technical matter, all activities with internet usage whether from mobile devices or desktop computers, will be counted as online activities. Also, to avoid getting too far from the main goal of research, that is to measure the amount of online activities in English done by students, the common question whether the teachers implement online teaching and so on will be considered as part of another discussions.

What sort of OILE activities done by the students?

In general, the students show a moderately low score in English usage in online activities (Mean (M) = 2.77, Standard Deviation (SD) = 1.39) (from scale 1 – 6) (M shows the distribution of data, SD shows the variability of data). The most and least popular activities are shown in the table below.

| Most popular                                      | M   | SD   | Least popular                        | M   | SD   |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----|------|--------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Listening to English songs                        | 4.40| 1.37 | Following tweets in English          | 1.62| 1.11 |
| Playing games in English                          | 4.22| 1.46 | Writing blog in English              | 1.69| 0.10 |
| Using Google Translate to translate English words or phrases | 4.18| 1.53 | Recording video in English           | 1.91| 1.26 |
| Reading English song lyrics on internet           | 3.87| 1.56 | Using Wikipedia in English           | 1.95| 1.08 |
| Using English as social media interface           | 3.45| 1.70 | Reading articles related to study in English | 2.05| 1.24 |

Not all the students added comments in the open question about another activities involving English (only 45 from 55), and some of these are not even involving the use of internet in the activities (such as public speaking, singing in toilet, joking with friends). Two
What is the relationship between the online use of English and motivation to learn?

After obtaining the data of online use of English and motivation to learn it from the questionnaire, Pearson’s correlation analysis is performed to further obtain the relationship between them. The analysis is done using IBM SPSS 25 and Microsoft Excel. The correlation coefficient is symbolized as $r$. The result is:

$$r = 0.48$$

Following are the summary of the data and the process of correlational analysis:

| Student | X  | Y  | XY | X²   | Y²   |
|---------|----|----|----|------|------|
| 401     | 1.02| 0.44| 0.45| 1.03 | 0.20 |
| 402     | 1.50| 0.93| 1.39| 2.24 | 0.86 |
| 403     | -0.76| 0.07| -0.06| 0.58 | 0.01 |
| 404     | 0.72| 0.18| 0.13| 0.52 | 0.03 |
| 405     | -1.21| 0.07| -0.09| 1.45 | 0.01 |
| 406     | 0.28| 0.26| 0.07| 0.08 | 0.07 |
| 407     | 0.61| 0.74| 0.45| 0.37 | 0.55 |
| 408     | 1.02| 0.89| 0.90| 1.03 | 0.79 |
| 409     | 0.20| 0.00| 0.00| 0.04 | 0.00 |
| 410     | 2.05| 0.44| 0.91| 4.22 | 0.20 |
| 411     | 1.50| 0.74| 1.11| 2.24 | 0.55 |
| 412     | -1.09| -0.19| 0.20| 1.20 | 0.03 |
| 413     | 0.02| 0.11| 0.00| 0.00 | 0.01 |
| 414     | 0.61| 0.59| 0.36| 0.37 | 0.35 |
| 415     | 1.94| 0.41| 0.79| 3.77 | 0.17 |
| 416     | -0.17| 0.67| -0.11| 0.03 | 0.44 |
| 417     | 0.16| 0.18| 0.03| 0.03 | 0.03 |
| 418     | -0.80| 0.41| -0.32| 0.64 | 0.17 |
| 419     | -0.47| 0.41| -0.19| 0.22 | 0.17 |
| 420     | -0.09| 0.11| -0.01| 0.01 | 0.01 |
| 421     | 0.53| -0.04| -0.02| 0.29 | 0.00 |
| 422     | 0.39| 0.33| 0.13| 0.15 | 0.11 |
| 423     | -0.84| 0.26| -0.22| 0.70 | 0.07 |
| 424     | -0.13| 0.89| -0.12| 0.02 | 0.79 |
| 501     | -0.02| 0.55| -0.01| 0.00 | 0.31 |
| 502     | -0.58| -0.37| 0.21| 0.33 | 0.14 |
| 503     | 1.39| -0.07| -0.10| 1.92 | 0.01 |
| 504     | -0.09| 0.07| -0.01| 0.01 | 0.01 |
| 505     | 0.61| -0.48| -0.29| 0.37 | 0.23 |
| 506     | 0.94| 0.04| 0.03| 0.89 | 0.00 |
| 507     | -0.50| -0.30| 0.15| 0.25 | 0.09 |
| 508     | -0.61| 0.74| -0.45| 0.38 | 0.55 |
| 509     | -1.09| -0.37| 0.41| 1.20 | 0.14 |
| 510     | 0.72| -0.22| -0.16| 0.52 | 0.05 |
| 511     | -1.43| -0.89| 1.27| 2.04 | 0.79 |
The data above then is analysed to get the correlation coefficient using this formula:

\[ r_{xy} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i - \bar{x})^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \bar{y})^2}} \]

where:

- \( r_{xy} \) is the correlation coefficient of the linear relationship between the variables x and y
- \( x_i \) is the values of the x-variable in a sample
- \( \bar{x} \) is the mean of the values of the x-variable
- \( y_i \) is the values of the y-variable in a sample
- \( \bar{y} \) is the mean of the values of the y-variable

\[ r_{xy} = \frac{11,56}{\sqrt{37,90 \times 15,22}} \]

\[ r_{xy} = \frac{11,56}{24,02} \]

\[ r_{xy} = 0,48 \]

*Table 3 Simple Interpretation of Correlation*
From the calculation above, the writer got the result \( r = 0.48 \). From the table above, the correlation between the \( x \) variable (online use of English) and \( y \) variable (motivation) is moderate. The positive coefficient means that the higher one variable would likely to result on the other variable being high, and vice versa.

The validity and reliability check of questionnaire is used to examine the usability of questionnaire and to know that the data gathered is reliable. Below are tables of validity and reliability check for both questionnaires:

*Table 4 Validity and Reliability Check of Questionnaire A (about online use of English)*

| Question | Correlation | Criteria | Question | Correlation | Criteria |
|----------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|
| b1       | 0.501       | Valid    | b15      | 0.580       | Valid    |
| b2       | 0.516       | Valid    | b16      | 0.455       | Valid    |
| b3       | 0.687       | Valid    | b17      | 0.696       | Valid    |
| b4       | 0.605       | Valid    | b18      | 0.540       | Valid    |
| b5       | 0.688       | Valid    | b19      | 0.460       | Valid    |
| b6       | 0.650       | Valid    | b20      | 0.663       | Valid    |
| b7       | 0.690       | Valid    | b21      | 0.405       | Valid    |
| b8       | 0.659       | Valid    | b22      | 0.622       | Valid    |
| b9       | 0.581       | Valid    | b23      | 0.494       | Valid    |
| b10      | 0.555       | Valid    | b24      | 0.437       | Valid    |
| b11      | 0.637       | Valid    | b25      | 0.271       | Invalid  |
| b12      | 0.552       | Valid    | b26      | 0.580       | Valid    |
| b13      | 0.088       | Invalid  | b27      | 0.576       | Valid    |
| b14      | 0.560       | Valid    |          |             |          |

**Reliability Check**

| Cronbach’s Alpha score | Criteria |
|------------------------|----------|
Questionnaire A has two questions that were marked invalid. An invalid question means that it needs to be revised in order to measure the variable accurately. The invalid questions were ignored by writer since the purpose of this study is only to know the correlation between all variables roughly. Detailed review and analysis will need another study to be conducted. The reliability check of questionnaire A is 0.927, means that it is very reliable to be used in order to measure the online use of English among the subjects.

Table 5 Validity and Reliability Check of Questionnaire B (about motivation)

| Question | Correlation | Criteria | Question | Correlation | Criteria |
|----------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|
| c1       | 0.449       | Valid    | c15      | 0.386       | Valid    |
| c2       | 0.497       | Valid    | c16      | 0.454       | Valid    |
| c3       | 0.583       | Valid    | c17      | 0.509       | Valid    |
| c4       | 0.573       | Valid    | c18      | 0.488       | Valid    |
| c5       | 0.322       | Valid    | c19      | 0.248       | Invalid  |
| c6       | 0.410       | Valid    | c20      | 0.530       | Valid    |
| c7       | 0.343       | Valid    | c21      | -0.238      | Invalid  |
| c8       | 0.627       | Valid    | c22      | 0.310       | Valid    |
| c9       | -0.089      | Invalid  | c23      | 0.365       | Valid    |
| c10      | 0.445       | Valid    | c24      | 0.624       | Valid    |
| c11      | 0.541       | Valid    | c25      | 0.675       | Valid    |
| c12      | 0.387       | Valid    | c26      | 0.466       | Valid    |
| c13      | 0.515       | Valid    | c27      | 0.573       | Valid    |
| c14      | 0.646       | Valid    |          |             |          |
Cronbach’s Alpha score | Criteria  
---|---  
0.866 | Very high

Questionnaire B has three questions that were marked invalid. An invalid question means that it needs to be revised in order to measure the variable accurately. The invalid questions were ignored by writer since the purpose of this study is only to know the correlation between all variables roughly. Detailed review and analysis will need another study to be conducted. The reliability check of questionnaire B is 0.866, means that it is very reliable to be used in order to measure the motivation condition of the subjects.

**Data analysis**

The data analysis was divided into two parts; according to the research questions. According to the table above, two most common activates done by the students are listening to English songs and playing games using English. This is understandable since English songs and games are two activities taking place between the youth in their leisure time. The exposure to English music from various media has possibly created the unstated rule that students must listen to it in order to be accepted in the society. In playing games, players often must interact actively with other players in order to finish the challenge, which requires good communication and language mastery. The urge to do so corresponds to the ought-to self-part of the L2MSS theory, as to meet the expectations and to avoid negative outcomes from friends and others. Following the songs and games are using Google translate, reading song’s lyrics, and using social media in English.

On the other side, the lowest score of online activities represented by the activity of following tweets in English. This is most likely because of students in boarding schools do not rely much on Twitter, despite it is the common media to get information used by youth. Following that is the activity of writing blog in English. The reason behind this is probably because of the students are unaccustomed to write in a blog. The explanation of this is presumably because of the poor score in literacy, which this explanation will help to justify the following arguments. Next, are recording videos, using Wikipedia, and reading articles that relate to their study in English. These activities represent the point of ideal self from L2MSS theory. The low score in these activities may result from the insufficient motive to learn English from the students.
Moving to the second question, the correlation coefficient mentioned before showed that there is a moderate positive correlation between the use of English in online activities and motivation to learn English. The data showed that the average online usage of English demonstrated by the subjects was low (M = 2.77, SD = 1.39) and their self-motivation to learn English is rather high (M = 4.32, SD = 1.15), thus resulting in a moderate positive correlation coefficient.

DISCUSSION

The finding showed that students in boarding schools were motivated to learn English, despite of their lack of its usage. One explanation for this was, from the interview done with students, they are more into practicing Arabic language than English so they seem practicing English less. The students were ordered to speak Arabic mostly in the boarding schools since it would help them in studying religious subjects at school. The principal also limit the students to not bring their own phones or laptop so they can focus on learning, which also reduces the possibility to access the internet. This condition contrasted with previous research by Lamb & Arisandy (2019) where the subjects had no such rule. One weakness from current study is that the inability of providing the evidence whether students practice little English in online activities because of lack of access to internet or other reasons. This gap could be overcome by doing more intense interview, which could not be done due to limited chance.

The aforementioned condition has a concern with the theory of L2 Motivational Self System point three; L2 Learning Experiences. The L2 Learning Experiences focuses on self-attitude and learning environment condition, which also includes teachers’ attitude in teaching, the curriculum, and other things related to the learning progress. Al-Hoorie (2018) stated that very little attention has been paid to this point in a number of studies in L2MSS, rather than the other two since most researchers were interested in inner and outer motivation. Based on some informal talks with the English teacher and students, the class was fairly interesting. The teacher has the experience of studying abroad, giving assumption that he has a good proficiency in English, and speaks English mostly all the time. In some occasions he also played videos from internet in teaching, giving the role model to students on how to use internet to learn English. This state eliminates the teacher’s attitude factor from the ‘barrier’ in
L2 learning Experiences, leaving the other factors as the challenge for students to practice more English. The most likely possibility is the official order from the boarding school that put more attention into Arabic than English language has caused the small frequency of English practice.

In the research field, current study helps to expand the discussion in psychological field in education, especially motivation of learning. Although it did not cover the whole subject, the present study provides a different practice of researching motivation in a boarding school in Indonesia. The result of this study could be generalized and criticized to help improving the quality of both the research and the school. As analyzed before, the most possibility of lack in English practice in boarding school is the regulation. This can be overcome by whether to adjust the language usage rule, more into English perhaps, or to increase the access to internet in boarding school.

CONCLUSION
The conclusion would be delivered in two parts; based on the research questions. It can be concluded that the students in the boarding school where writer gathered the data from were not much into practicing English in online activities. The correlation coefficient r = 0.48 indicates that there is moderate positive correlation which means higher English use in online activities is associated with higher motivation in learning English.
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