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LANGUAGE LEARNING ATTITUDES AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY OF FIRST YEAR QUR'ANIC STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY AT KUIM

ABSTRACT

Language learning attitude is one of the factors that affects language learning. This study attempts to identify language learning attitude and its relationship with English Language proficiency amongst second language learners of English in KUIM. Survey method is employed through the administration of questionnaire to each individual group. The findings indicate that the subjects have less favourable language learning attitudes as portrayed by the inclination of personality traits towards the less favourable attitude zones. This shows that language learning attitude does influence the subjects' performance in their English Language Examination as pointed out by their final English Examination results at the end of the first semester of their freshman year. Cooperative Learning strategies are recommended in the English Language activities conducted in the classroom as to improve the students' language learning attitude. The implementation of these strategies in all four skills is in the aim to improve students' language learning attitude, which will contribute to the enhancement of their performance in the English Language Examination.
ABSTRAK

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The issue of language attitude has been discussed widely for decades. "Language attitudes in the learner, the peer group, the school, the neighbourhood, and society at large can have an enormous effect on the second language learning process, both positive and negative" (Walqui, 2000). Due to its role in language acquisition, attitudes are thus part of the primary ingredients, which compose and nurture a beautiful language growth. On the other hand, attitudes can also play a major role in causing language decay. A language becomes important to a particular group of people or to a society depending on the adopted or learnt attitudes.

1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There have been assumptions that Quranic and Sunnah Studies students of KUIM, coming from the Islamic Studies background as having less desirable attitudes towards learning English as a second language. According to PMIUM President, Mohd Izwan Md Yusof (2002), the serious problem of unemployment among
Islamic Studies students is the lack of competency in the English Language. English is actually the third learnt language. In other words, English is a foreign language to them. Due to the Arabic language employed in the Quran and hadiths, the students, thus, focus more on learning Arabic as the second language instead of English in mastering their field of study. The stress on learning English as the second language during their secondary education could be said as rather minimal. This is concluded based on their performance in the Arabic (refer to Appendix A) and English exams results (refer to Appendix B). Their results for Arabic exams are always better than their results for English exams.

In this study, by identifying the students’ language learning attitudes (LLA) and correlating them with their proficiency, it is hoped that solution could be derived as to design new method of teaching and learning in the aims of making substantial improvement in the English Language acquisition among the Quranic students in particular and KUIM community at large.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study is to find out the existing language learning attitudes among first year Quranic students as well as the relationship between their present LLA and their proficiency as indicated by their English Language (UB1021) results in their first semester final exam in KUIM (refer to Appendix B).

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions will be addressed in this study:

1. What are the existing LLA of first year Quranic students at KUIM? (Measured by a LLA questionnaire-refer to Appendix C).
2. Is there any relationship between the samples’ learning attitudes and their English Language proficiency? (Comparison between learning attitudes and English results).

1.4 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

The following research hypothesis is formulated based on the research questions stated above.

‘Language learning attitudes (LLA) and English Language proficiency level of first year Quranic students in KUIM are correlated.’

The students’ performance in their first semester final exam is hypothesized as indicators of their level of proficiency, which is affected by their LLA.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

English is one of the mediums of instructions at KUIM. In order for the students to perform in their overall exams throughout their study, they have to be well-versed in the institution’s medium of instruction. This is for them to fully understand lectures, take down notes correctly and efficiently and simultaneously able to proficiently write answers during exams. In order to achieve the level of proficiency required to meet the mentioned needs, therefore the students have to acquire the language without choice.

However, the language cannot be acquired if the students have unfavourable attitudes towards the language. This kind of LLA will lead to the resistance of input intake throughout the learning process. Even though Chomsky (1965)
hypothesized that all people are born with a cognitive readiness to acquire a language, but this readiness might diminish due to negative cognitive reinforcement, which appears in terms of attitudes against the second language.

Therefore, it is important to address this LLA issue among the Quranic students as to find ways to mend the less desirable attitudes, if any, in the effort to enhance the rate of English Language acquisition among Quranic students in particular and other KUIM students in general.

Should the hypothesis proven true, the researchers would like to recommend a new perspective in designing the university English Course syllabus. This will be done through the employment of adapted version of the many existing collaborative learning strategies, which is hoped to maximize the degree of effective learning as to materialize acquisition of the target language. Cooperative learning represents valuable strategies in helping students attain high academic standards (Kagan, 1993c; Cohen, 1994).

After nearly fifty years of research and scores of studies, there is strong agreement among researchers that cooperative methods can and usually do have positive effects on students’ achievement (Dumas, 2004). Oxford (1989a) stated that, “language learning styles and strategies appear to be among the most important variables influencing performance in a second language”. Through cooperative learning, students are able to build positive inter-peers learning attitudes throughout the learning process. Some studies (Gunderson & Johnson, 1980; Jacob & Mattson, 1987) indicated that when language students have been taught cooperative skills, however, they showed positive results in both language skill and altruism.
1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The findings of this research should not be generalised as representative data of Quranic and Sunnah students in other higher learning institutions. This is as the study involves a specified language learning contexts, and specified language-attitudinal variables that might not occur in other institution and not applicable to students in other academic settings.

The delimitation of this study is that it involves only the first year Quranic and Sunnah students of KUIM. This is done due to the needs of providing a more specified accurate representation of data, which will act as a springboard for future research.

1.7 WORKING DEFINITION

1.7.1 Language Learning Attitudes (L.L.A)

Language attitudes may refer to attitudes toward the language itself (Hobenthal, 2003), which in this study is the English Language. A broader definition would engulf all kinds of behavior concerning language to be treated (Fasold, 1984).

In this study, LLA are measured based on the students' personality traits such as self-image, degree of inhibition, risk-taking, ego permeability, and tolerance for ambiguity in relation to the English Language learning.

1.7.2 English Language Proficiency

Students’ English Language proficiency refers to the students’ final exam results (refer to Appendix B). The final result of each student is the total of their scores of test/examination for each of the four main skills in the English Language (listening, speaking, reading and writing). Therefore, the final
results are considered to be the suitable indicators of the samples' proficiency level.

1.7.3 Learning Styles
Learning styles refer to individual’s preferred learning modes. Some would acquire language better with numerous number of ways; by seeing and hearing, reflecting and acting, reasoning logically and intuitively, memorizing and visualizing, doing and building (Ramlee Mustapha, 2000).

Cognitive, affective and physiological traits have been identified as relatively stable indicators as to how learners' perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment (Keele, 1991). In relation to this study, a variety of communicative and interactive teaching pedagogy such as Cooperative Learning has been recommended so as to cater each learner’s learning styles.

1.7.4 Personality Traits

1.7.4.1 Self-image
Learners’ with positive self-image are confident, enthusiastic, and have optimistic nature toward learning a language. This positive attitude allows you to respond constructively. Individuals with strong self-efficacy are less likely to give up than those who are paralyzed with doubt about their capabilities (Alderman, 1999).

Nevertheless, learners who carry negative self-image normally have low self-esteem and gradually feel demotivated in the language learning process. Such “negative attitudes and inappropriate behaviours” toward language learning are usually linked with underachievers (Felton & Briggs, 1977). This study intends to look at the extent of the learners’ positive self-image and how it can be fully utilized towards a better language acquisition.
1.7.4.2 Inhibition

According to the *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics* (1985), inhibition is defined as a feeling of embarrassment or worry that prevents an individual from saying or doing what they are required to do. In the context of learning a language, inhibition is linked with negative attitudes that prevent learners from learning another language due to the belief that they are incapable of performing well in any language practice.

As far as this study is concerned, a series of questions have been addressed to the subjects as means of finding out their level of inhibition. Their ability to overcome their “deep-seated fear of inadequacy and deficiency” (Oxford, 1989a), with the help of their teachers’ role in lessening the level of anxiety through the application of Cooperative Learning Strategies is vital in ensuring a more favourable attitude and greater proficiency toward the target language.

1.7.4.3 Risk-taking

Another personality trait that is closely related to learners’ inhibition and ambiguity tolerance is risk-taking. These learners do not hesitate taking the risk of providing an answer to the teacher’s questions or engaging in conversation even if they are not sure about the success of their attempt (Pavli, 1997). In relation to learning performance, risk-takers, as categorized by McDonough (1995), are usually extroverts due to their willingness to talk, to risk failure and to assert themselves in any academic and social settings. These risk-takers usually have increased their self-consciousness, overcome their feelings of vulnerability (inhibition) and have no more fear of “exposing themselves” in front of others by taking part in classroom activities (Singleton, 1989; Duy, Burt and Krashen, 1982).
1.7.4.4  

**Ego Permeability**

Usually associated with the 'language ego' (Guirao, 1983c) that is a more or less permeable structure in enhancing or impeding learning processes. It involves the willingness of an individual to allow others to perceive the self as a speaker of the target language. If a speaker is anxious, not very motivated and has high ego permeability, these all act as a barrier between input and the linguistic system. Leiman (1993) agrees by claiming, "the higher the self-ego, the thicker the filter". This will hinder the process of maximizing learning input. Thin ego boundaries are linked to a higher tolerance of ambiguity.

1.7.4.5  

**Tolerance for Ambiguity**

According to foreign and second languages theoreticians, the concept of ambiguity in the context of learning styles does refer to a situation whereby some learners get turned off when they are confronted with too much ambiguity in their understanding of lexical, syntactical and semantical items (Empson, 1947). Hence, foreign language learners as well as the subjects of this study, constantly find themselves in such confusing and unfavourable situations (Chapelle, 1983; Naiman et al., 1978). The higher the tolerance for the unfavourable environment, the stronger the learners' persistence level towards language learning.

As the subjects of this study may have "a different psychological profile from students in other disciplines" (Ettwistle, 1972; Evans, 1988; Mood, 1988), they are directly exposed to the criteria (ego permeability). Only through the development of language awareness of the importance the acquiring the target language (Domnilt, 1985; Hawkins, 1984), the learners are able to open their mind-set of accepting other than their own cultures and social circle and gradually give in to the new learning environment.
1.7.5 Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is a powerful educational approach for helping all students attain content standards and develop the interpersonal skills needed for succeeding in a multicultural world (Durnas, 2004).

Cooperative learning can be carried out in many forms and has a wide range of definitions. According to Durnas (2004), the most common cooperative approaches involve small, heterogeneous teams, usually of four or five members, working together toward a group task in which each member is individually accountable for part of an outcome that cannot be completed unless the members work together.

Cooperative learning involves tremendous amount of peer inter-dependency. Therefore, in order to achieve certain goals or to complete certain tasks, there must be positive inter-dependent among members of the group.

Studies have shown that cooperative learning is often used as a learning strategy as to improve learning attitudes. Through cooperative learning, students are able to actively practice communication in L2. Academic and language learning requires that students have opportunities to comprehend what they hear and read as well as express themselves in meaningful tasks (McGroarty, 1993).

Cooperative groups increase opportunities for students to produce and comprehend language and to obtain modeling and feedback from their peers (Durnas, 2004). Other than maximizing opportunities, the process of learning becomes more authentic and meaningful through variety of interactive experiences, which assimilate real situation in meeting the tasks. By stimulating language input and output, cooperative strategies provide English learners with natural settings in which they can derive and express meaning from academic content (McGroarty, 1992; Swain, 1985).
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The word 'attitude' is derived from a Latin root, 'aptus' meaning fitted, suitable, appropriate, or the quality of being apt for a specific purpose. Beginning from early 19th century the meaning of attitudes shifted from the physiological to the psychological associated with habits of behavior representative of emotion and belief (Musgrove, 1998). This is in line with the definition carries by Macmillan English Dictionary (2002), that attitude means 'someone’s opinions or feelings about something, especially as shown by their behaviour'. In relation, Fasold (1984) also defines language attitudes as all kinds of behaviour toward language. In the same defining manner, Baker (1992) perceives attitudes as some abstracts involving both positive and negative feelings such as feelings toward a language situation.

2.1 LLA IN THE SECOND LANGUAGE CONTEXT

As 'attitude' refers to one's mental and neutral state of readiness, organised through experience and exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon individuals' response to all objects and situations to which it is related (Allport,
language attitude, on the other hand, covers all the values, beliefs and emotional aspects in relation to the target language (Penafosa, 1981).

Based on previous research conducted by Gardner (1965a) and Larsen-Freeman (1991), it is found that one's social-psychological factors (attitude and motivation) do have an important role in ensuring the success of learning a second language. Similarly, Spolsky (1969) also agrees that one of the most important attitudinal factors of second language learning is the attitude of the learner to the language and its speakers. With the intention of looking at the relationship between attitudes and attained proficiency in English among a population of Chinese subjects in the United States, Oller, Hudson and Liu (1977) have conducted a convincing study by revealing that such positive attitudes toward self and toward members of the native language group do result in higher scores on the English proficiency test.

Walqui (2000) specifies that the factors contribute to learning perception: as linguistic distance between languages spoken, students' level of proficiency in the native language and second language; the dialect of the native language spoken by the learners; the relative status of the students' language in the community; and finally the societal attitudes toward the students' native language. In a nutshell, attitude engendering learning attitude is an internal organization in an individual that is inter-related to the societal context it breeds in. This in turn defines or promotes certain learning behaviours.

To exemplify is the status of English in Malaysia, and to what extent does it have been perceived. Gill (1994) postulated that earlier divergent language policies and implementation had retarded the steady growth of English proficiency in Malaysia. Whereupon, national policies emphasizing the national language for the sake of national unity (Report of the Education Committee: 1956) and gradual attitudinal change toward English and the need to adhere to British RP (Gill: 1994), had decreased the production of internationally intelligible English.
Furthermore, the earlier prestige and primary function of English as the main medium of instruction had been lost. Consequently, the motivation to use English has lessened with its decreasing meaningful role of the national level (Asiah in Abdullah Hassan: 1994).

Fishman and Aggrey (1970) proposed two viewpoints concerning language attitudes. The first is the mentalist view who suggests that attitudes are a mental and neutral state of readiness, which cannot be observed directly, but must be inferred from the subject's introspection. A cognitive view of language was proposed by Edward Tolman (1948) during the fervour of behaviourist theories. However, as time passed, there grow gaps of knowledge that the Behaviorist theorists could not explain. These gaps of knowledge were related to the cognitive processes involved in learning. In addition, the rapid recognition of the cognitive school of thought was attributed to the acceptance of individuals as "active", individuals compared to animals. Furthermore, in the aspect of affective development individuals were gradually accepted as influenced by achievement motivation. Initially, in the cognitive theory, the human memory was described as a 'multistage bin processor'. This concept was proposed by Donald Broadbent (1958) in:

a. Sensory register
b. Short term memory
c. Long term memory

On the other hand, the behaviourist school of thought perceives attitudes as a dependent variable that can be statistically determined by observing actual behaviour in social situations. Advocates of the behaviorist school of thought include names like Pavlov, Skinner, Thorndike and Watson (Graham, 2002). In general, behaviorist theorist discussed human behavior and capability based on comparisons of experiment conducted on animals. The experiments observe the role of motives and rewards as a form of stimuli. Skinner, though, revealed a growing transition from a behaviorist school of thought to that of a cognitive
school of thought. He asserted the relation between cognition and reflex. Whereupon, response to stimuli was based on meaningful reflexes and fulfilled needs (Walker, Colvin & Ramsey, 1994). Hence, behaviour could not be completely conditioned to fulfill needs. Furthermore, Dittrich (1976) argues the extent of attitudes to be defined entirely in terms of observable data. However, contemporary theorists have revealed a growing eclectic model of perspective toward language learning. The eclectic model of perspective emphasizes the interaction between behavior, mental processes and environment. The advocates of this school of thought include Gagne, Piaget, Bandura and Weiner. Gardner (1982b) proposes a socio-educational model language learning. In the socio-educational model second language acquisition is inter-related to four features of second language acquisition, namely: socio and cultural, individual learner differences and the learning context. These four features influence learning motivation and perception.

Despite the variety of opinions on the issue of language attitudes, Gardner and Lambert (1959) highlighted that attitudes do play a significant role in second language acquisition. Walqui (2000) expressed the same agreement of the role of attitude in second language learning. According to Walqui (2000), 'language attitudes in the learners, the peer group, the school, the neighbourhood, and society at large can have such enormous effect on the second language learning process, both positive and negative'. The effects of attitude on language learning were also found in several other studies (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Goodwin, 1996; Gillette; Graham; & Pennington, 1994).

2.2 THE EFFECT OF LLA ON EFFECTIVE SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

Due to its role in language acquisition, attitudes are thus part of the primary ingredients, which compose and nurture a beautiful language growth. On the other hand, attitudes can also play a major role in causing language decay. Adopted or
learnt attitudes are a crucial determiner of the importance of a language to a particular group of people or to a society.

Studies on attitudes have never shown that attitudes are never inherited. However, they have the tendency to remain intact in an individual's psychological construct. Nevertheless, those persisted attitudes might change upon newly learned predispositions, which cause either minor or major alteration of the existing attitudes. These alterations might transform into certain actions. As stated by Kenneth Burke (1969), in *A Grammar of Motives*, attitudes are ambiguous because they can both substitute for an action or lead to action. The intricacy of attitudes transformation due to the intervention of other affecting elements indicates the possibility of transforming bad language learning attitudes into the good ones by imposing certain stimulants.

In the recent decades, many studies (Weaver 1996; Camp, 1992; Rosenblatt, 1995; Standards, 1996) suggest explicit attention on students' attitudes. This generally proposes the importance of studying the attitudes of learners in ensuring effective learning. As stated earlier, considering attitude is a psychological construct, which affects emotion and belief; hence, without proper shaping of the attitudes, learning might not take place. Richards (1925) looked at attitudes as the tendency toward learning. According to him, this sense of attitude as a tendency toward reading and writing should be better prepared as the ground for learning in the English classroom. In line of this view, Musgrove (1998) commented that before teachers could ask their students to compose lists of their reading and writing goals, teachers should first identify the students' predispositions toward reading and writing or in other words have a needs analysis of the students' language needs and wants in relation to the learning environment.
2.2.1 Environment Affective Factors (Learning Conditions)

External factor, such as the classroom climate, does contribute to the enhancement of positive learning attitudes. Hence, the classroom must be a safe and supportive environment in which students feel respected, able to take risks and free to experiment with language (Changing College Classrooms, 30 May 1994).

Being aware of the learners’ needs contains a myriad of definition such as ‘objective and subjective needs’ (Brindley, 1988: 65); ‘perceived and felt needs’ (Berwick, 1989: 55), necessities, wants and lacks (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987: 55); and finally Target Situation analysis (TSA), researchers such as Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998) have unanimously agreed on the idea of conducting Learning Situation analysis (LSA) and Present Situation Analysis (PSA) as preliminary attempts to stimulating learning interest in ESL classrooms. As such, teachers are expected to gather certain related information from their students based on the framework of Needs Analysis (ibid, 1998). The framework of Needs Analysis consists of the environment situation that is inclusive of:

i. personal information of the learner
ii. language information of the target situation
iii. learners’ lacks
iv. learners’ needs from the needs of the course
v. language learning needs
vi. how to communicate in the target situation
vii. professional information about the learners

This environmental analysis is also similar to Holliday & Cooke (1982) Means Analysis. Consequently, it observes two key factors, classroom culture and the management of infrastructure and culture. Consequently, with regards
to learning perception and motivation, teachers are able to help their students revise and improve their attitudes to enhance motivation for learning.


Gagne et al (1992) classified attitudes as one of the types of learning. Learning involves attitudes as they modify the learner’s choice of action (Gagne, Briggs, & Wager, 1992). Gagne’s (1985) had introduced an information processing theory, namely the Task-Cognition theory. His theory contains influences from the Pavlovian model, the Stimulus-Response association and the theory of Chainlike skills (see Graham, 2002). However, it is further developed on the premise of the general nature of human learning and the learning process that:

a. Learning is the causal factor of individual development
b. Intellectual development deals with the construction of structure and learnt skills.
c. No single set of characteristics can be applied to all types of learning.
d. The human capacity for learning enables an almost infinite variety of behavioural patterns or capabilities.

e. Capabilities are attained through the interaction between simulation and cognitive processes.

f. Learning is the set of cognition process that changes stimulation from the learning environment into several phases of information processing in the acquisition of a new capability.

When observed closely, Gagne’s Theory of Task-Cognition contains the influence of Skinner’s behaviorist Direct Learning Model (ibid, 2002). Nonetheless, at the same time, it differs as Gagne’s theory is less autocratic and prescriptive as the behaviorist learning models. Gagne’s learning theory encourages learner autonomy and discovery; however, control of information is still more in hands of the teacher. This is to prevent the danger of distortion of learning when the total learning process is left to the learner. In short, Gagne views learning as shaping cognitive development. However, since the process of learning does not only involve cognitive operations but also behavioral formation, thus, having the right attitude toward learning is imperative (Foley, 2004). This leads to a stronger reason to study the learning attitudes among students.

As to explore further the issue of LLA, various studies were conducted as to find out the relationship between learning attitudes and proficiency. Krashen (1981a) claimed that the attitude and proficiency in second language would be strongest when learners have sufficient intake for acquisition and when monitor-free measures of proficiency are used. This indicates the conditions, which results in the extent to which attitude will predict proficiency. Saville-Troike (1988) found, in one study, that students who had active and competitive coping styles, and a more positive attitude toward learning English achieved better in school.
2.2.2 Individual Affective Factors (Personality Traits)

Apart from proficiency, learners' personality traits whether positive or negative are believed to have formed the type of learning effort displayed by these learners. Learners who have personality traits such as being risk-takers, possess high tolerance for ambiguity, less inhibited, carry positive self-image, and have a lower degree of ego permeability, would most probably form more positive learning attitudes. Nevertheless, like motivation, these traits are extremely difficult to study, and it is difficult to prove their specific effects on language learning success or failure (Thomson, 2000). Maslow (1970) posited that the success of achieving cognitive and aesthetic goals among L2 learners could not be realized unless the human physiological needs like, the need for safety and security, the need for belonging, and the need for self-esteem had not been met. Therefore, having a positive self-image is one of the vital elements that is needed in assuring greater acquisition.

2.2.2.1 Self-Image

The personality trait that correlates positively with the success of learning a target language (L2) is self-image. Learners' self-image is closely linked to the self-esteem concepts. "Self-esteem is a personal judgement of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes that the individual holds towards himself" (Coopersmith, 1967). According to Breen & Mann (1997), if the learner has a 'robust sense of self', his relationship to himself as a learner is unlikely to be marred by any negative assessments by the teacher. In a study involving ESL performers at the University of Michigan (Heyde, 1977), she discovered a high correlation between global self-esteem (the individual's evaluation of his own worth) and teacher ratings of oral production. Other related study was conducted by Oller, Hudson, and Liu in 1977; they discovered that subjects with positive self-perceptions as being democratic, broad-minded, and calm tended to do
better on the Cloze test. Since these traits were found to be positively valued by the subjects, Oller et al. (1977) and Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, & Tolesco (1978) concluded that “the more positive a subject’s self-concept, the higher the subject’s achievement in ESL.” Lacking of self-esteem however, is likely to lead to negative attitudes towards one’s capability as a learner, and to a deterioration in cognitive performance” (Diener and Dweck, 1978).

Learners who come from families who display inconsistent discipline, or over-severe discipline and disapproval of their children produce people who have a low self-image and little confidence in themselves. On the contrary, learners who come from homes where parents are strongly approving of their children, and of their friends, who join in many activities with them, are more confident. One study on the relationship between self-confidence and ESL was carried out by Clement (1986) who investigated 293 Francophone students at the University of Ottawa, who were learning English. The integrative orientation had no effect on language outcomes – the best predictor was self-confidence. Thus, learners who have a good self-image may do better than those who have a poor self-image.

A strong sense of identity and a positive self-image is fundamental to the emotional, physical, as well as language and cognitive development (Long and Crookes, 1992) of a learner. Individual identity is the internal model that allows each learner to have a perception of themselves as an individual and social being. Being members of numerous social groupings (relatives, villagers, classmates), each learner is also distinct in his/her own individuality from any other member of the group to which he/she belongs to. This is because each learner’s interaction between other ESL learners, his or her family members, and others within several social contexts will be processed into a learner’s experience. These sets of
individual experiences contribute toward the development of a certain kind of attitude (background knowledge) toward language acquisition.

2.2.2.2 Inhibition

Despite being closely related to self-image, self-esteem is also associated with learners' inhibition; the weaker the self-esteem, the stronger the inhibition to protect the weak ego (Andres, 2003). Learners with high inhibition cannot understand the learning style of making mistakes as the norm of learning. They have too much fear of making mistakes (inhibition), and strangely, to them such verdict is non-comprehensible. Often, students who had reported that they were shy and embarrassed, and that they were afraid to speak out in class and were afraid of people laughing at them, and being ridiculed for their answers failed to score at par with the other extrovert classmates (Naiman et al., 1978) Thus, inhibited learners do not receive the practice necessary to reach linguistic fluency.

Relatively, Ehrman (1993) concludes that students with thick, perfectionist boundaries find language learning more difficult than those learners with thin boundaries who favour attitudes of openness and the tolerance of ambiguity. As second language learning is a highly demanding task, it is very likely to raise anxiety in the learner. Anxiety can be considered a negative factor in language learning. As noted by Brown (1994), language learning implies a great deal of self-exposure as it necessarily involves making mistakes. Due to the defense mechanisms outlined above, these mistakes can be experienced as threats to the self. It can be argued that the students arrive at the classroom with those defenses already built and that little can be done to remove them. Hence, one of the teaching strategies to overcome inhibition would be by focusing on learners' strengths rather than their weaknesses. Even worse, since they do not have the same
control over the target language (ESL) as over their native language (L1), gradually, they would become inhibited about using the target language.

2.2.2.3 Risk-Takers

Learners who are risk-takers usually show active participation in class as well as social maladjustment (Lavery, Siegel, Cousins, & Rubovits, 1993). They should be more willing to open his or her mouth and try to communicate, even when the road to the end of the sentence is not clear (Thomson, 2000). Only those who are frequently engaged in high-risk behaviours had higher scores on affiliation, desirability, dominance, exhibition ... venturesomeness, and impulsiveness (Jackson et al., 1983; Moore & Rosenthal, 1993). In contrast, inhibited learners who normally practice 'perfectionism' might display an opposite type of language attitudes. Learners of this attitude resist from using the language because of the consciousness that their speech is far from perfect.

A research on language learners conducted by Young (1991) has presented that teachers who used humour and created a friendly, supportive, and relaxed classroom atmosphere that encouraged risk-taking were most helpful in alleviating L2 learners' anxiety and facilitating learning. Lortie (1975) further suggested that the best way to encourage oral participation is by creating an environment that allows learners to explore the different purposes for speech.

2.2.2.4 Ego Permeability

Another collection of personality traits that intervenes between input and the unconscious system for acquiring linguistic knowledge is the extent of a person’s ego permeability. That is, willingness to allow one's perception of the self to extend to being a speaker of the language of a foreign
culture. If a speaker is anxious, not very motivated and has low ego permeability, these all act as a barrier between input and the linguistic system (the filter is high). If a speaker is not anxious, has high motivation and high ego permeability, the input will get through to the linguistic system (the filter is low) (Department of Language & Linguistics, 17 November 2004).

The ‘language ego’, according to Gärtner (1981b), is a more or less permeable structure and belongs to the category of general ego boundaries. Individuals who have ‘thin’ rather than ‘thick’ psychological boundaries between mental, interpersonal and external experience tend to make better language learners (Ehrman & Oxford, 1995). Thin ego boundaries are linked to a global (as opposed to analytic) learning style, to a (self-reported) interest in abstractions, to tolerance of ambiguity, and to a preference for flexibility and fuzziness over neatness and sharp, cut-and-dried definition (Language Teaching, 9 August 1997).

As the acquisition of L1 is central to any ESL learners as a feature of the learners’ individual and group identity, the particular language, will help them to define themselves, and others to define the learners in relation to their roots and ethnicity. Apart from enabling learners the ability to communicate, L1 also helps a learner to access and be accessed by groups of people who share the same language, and to reinforce the learner’s sense of their own cultural group identity. Based on the findings gathered by Dosanjh and Ghuman (1998), it turned out that the mothers of ESL & EFL learners were keen to maintain their religious rites and customs. Family nurturing and total exposure to ‘mother-tongue’ languages at home has contributed to learners’ L1 acquisition. Despite the demand of acquiring the target language in school and higher institutions, family and social background have also affected the degree of self-esteem, motivation and level of anxiety among these learners. Learners have been implanted
with the notion that it is vital for them to uphold their family languages at home and in schools. As a result, learners have little or no opportunity to practise and develop their L2.

As such, these learners' is said to have high ego permeability, where they have high defensiveness and low receptivity to outside influences. A person with a low self-conviction however, is said to have low defensiveness and high receptivity to outside influences, i.e. the ESL classroom.

2.2.2.5 Tolerance for Ambiguity

Tolerance for ambiguity is another style dimension of language learning. Ambiguity tolerance is an acceptance of confusing situations without clear demarcation lines (Ely, 1989a), situations in which foreign language learners constantly find themselves in. The factor is linked to persistence at language learning (Chapelle, 1983; Naiman et al., 1978) and to risk-taking behaviour, an essential for language progress, since its opposites (anxiety, inhibition, anticipated criticism from others or oneself) restrict language practice.

As learning a language can be a difficult and at times ambiguous endeavour, learners should keep in mind of a more tolerant and outgoing approach to the target language. Only those who are ready of such doings often show the best language learning performance (see Chapelle & Roberts, 1986; Naiman et al, 1978). A person with high tolerance for ambiguity could make predictable, near-accurate contextual guess without having to identify and understand every last detail of a sentence he/she hears in the target language.
Relatively, both Bandura (1977) and Wenden (1987) agreed with the idea that each individual learner has the strength or confidence of his sense of self (self-efficacy). This fact, as Wenden (1987) puts it, integrates well with the definition of attitudes as ‘learned motivations, valued beliefs, evaluations, what one believes is acceptable, or responses oriented towards approaching or avoiding. Inevitably, these two kinds of attitudes are crucial: attitudes learners hold about their role in the learning process, and their capability as learners (Wenden & Rubin, 1987). At any rate, ‘learner beliefs about their role and capability as learners will be shaped and maintained…by other beliefs they hold about themselves as learners’ (Wenden & Rubin, 1987).

Language learning styles and strategies appear to be among the most important variables influencing performance in a second language. They are often-conscious steps or behaviours used by language learners to enhance the acquisition, storage, retention, recall, and use of new information (Rigney, 1978; Oxford, 1990b). Research and investigations with language learners (see reviews by Skehan, 1989; Oxford 1989a; Oxford & Crookall, 1989) frequently show that the most successful learners tend to use learning strategies that are appropriate to the material, to the task, and to their own goals, needs, and stage of learning. As for the teachers, they can help their students by designing instruction that meets the needs of individuals with different stylistic preferences such as emphasizing not only on linguistic competency but also on communicative competency.

### 2.3 COOPERATIVE LEARNING

One of the effective methods that can be used to nurture good attitudes as to enhance learning and acquisition is through the implementation of collaborative learning strategy. Adult Education in ESL demands a new philosophy, new assessment tools and teaching approaches (Chuprina, 1998). According to Ross (1989), if lessons are based on the students’ prior knowledge and interests, their desire to learn to read is greatly enhanced. This does not only true for reading but
in sharpening other skills as well as to improve students' overall proficiency. So, through collaborative learning strategy, Chuprina (1998) emphasized on providing the students with tasks that are related to students' personal interests and prior knowledge, in order to build the language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing on them.

Freed (1994) investigated the effect of cooperative learning on students' attitudes through an experimental study. Even though both the experimental and control groups showed positive attitudes, but samples in the experimental group claimed enhanced enjoyment and motivation. Cooperative learning is an instructional strategy that provides the social structure for learners to work cooperatively in groups. Due to the various natures of interactions involving different individuals in the process of completing certain tasks, cooperative learning has been found to be effective for creating language awareness that further promotes the academic achievement, language acquisition, and social development of English language learners (Calderon & Slavin, 1999; Ovando & Collier, 1998). Language awareness enhances motivation and positive attitudes to language and language learning (Leo van Lier, 2001).

Apart from that, some studies (Brooks et al. 1997, Doughty & Varela, 1998) suggested that collaborative works could successfully help learners focus on formal aspects of language. This type of learning also encourages learners to actively interact with the other members of the group in order to materialize the same goal. Indirectly, learners' attitudes toward participating in the target language gradually change. Interactions can be maximized by providing learners with situations, which they must negotiate language with partners or group members to complete a task (See Bell, 1988). When students work in cooperative teams which "all work for one" and "one works for all," team members receive the emotional and academic support that helps them persevere the many obstacles they face (Dumas, 2004) throughout the learning process.
A number of studies (Griggs & Dunn 1984; Smith & Renzulli 1984; Brown 1978; Charkins et al. 1985; Oxford et al. 1991; Wallace & Oxford 1992) show that matching teaching styles to learning styles can significantly enhance academic achievement, students' attitudes, and students' behaviour at all learning institutions level (primary, secondary and tertiary). Learning process with suitable ingredients for each individual learner helps form desirable learning attitudes.

As suggested by (Hymes, 1981), forms of classroom activities such as role-playing, simulations, and real-life interactions should be used to provide as much practice as possible for students to develop communicative competence while practicing linguistic competence. In order for our students to develop their inherent potential to learn, the affective variables such as anxiety, motivation, self-esteem and inhibition can no longer be denied, the inner needs of the learners can no longer be neglected (Andres, 2003).
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 INTRODUCTION

Survey method was employed in this research. The samples learning attitudes were described in relation to their proficiency level. The variables involved are subjects' learning attitudes as the independent variable and the students' proficiency as the dependent variable. This study aims to seek answers of how language attitudes can be used as a tool to improve proficiency by enhancing rate of learning and acquisition.

3.1 SUBJECTS OF THE STUDY

The subjects for this study are first year Quranic students who obtained a grade in the 'C' range (C+, C or C-) for their English Course (UB1012) at the end of their first semester in KUIM. Their final grade is the total marks of the tests/exam, which they have scored throughout the semester including the final exam score. The students are tested on all the four language skills namely listening, speaking, reading and writing.
Quranic students come from various Islamic studies schools around Malaysia. Quranic students are chosen because English is actually the third learnt language after Malay and Arabic. The emphasis on language learning is more on Arabic compared to English. The due reason is their option as Quranic and Sunnah major requires them to be well versed in Arabic instead of English. This is because the general language used in the Holy Quran and Haditha is Arabic. As a consequence, the Quranic and Sunnah students tend to perceive English as of secondary importance. This, in part, reflects their LLA.

3.2 PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION

Data on Quranic students’ proficiency was obtained from the Academic Division of Islamic University College of Malaysia (KUITM). Subjects’ proficiency was indicated by their first semester final exam results for their English Course (UB 1012 – See Appendix B). Upon receiving the results list, the researchers identified those Quranic students who obtained a grade in the 'C' range (C+, C or C−).

The reason why the 'C' range students were selected as the samples for this study was because the researchers’ basis of assumptions that those who obtain a grade in the ‘A’ and ‘B’ range have better LLA as indicated by their English examination grade. On the other hand, those who obtain a grade in the ‘D’ range and less are assumed to have less favorable LLA.

Therefore students in the 'C' range are considered as having mediocre performance and thus their LLA is still undetermined. Since these students are in the 'ambiguous' zone of LLA, thus the researchers attempt to identify their LLA as well as to find out whether or not there is a correlation between their LLA and their proficiency level.
In order to obtain data on the samples' LLA, a set of questionnaire (refer to Appendix C) was administered to the identified samples. The administration of the questionnaire involved six sessions. The same researcher conducted all six sessions by going through each item in the questionnaire and explaining the questionnaire item by item.

The reason why the same researcher carried out all the sessions was to ensure that homogeneous instructions and explanation was given to all subjects from the same individual. The same explanation and examples were used for the items in the questionnaire for all the questionnaire administration session. This is to ensure the homogeneity exposure in terms of explanation and examples, as if the questionnaire administration session is carried out in a single session for all samples. The participants were allowed to ask for clarifications for any item should any ambiguity arise.

For each session, between 17 and 20 samples were gathered. The reason of having a small number of students in each session was to ensure that every sample fully understands each item in the questionnaire, so as to maximize the reliability of the participants' response. All sessions were carried out in the morning as to avoid the contaminating effect related to condition of timing if the sessions were carried out at a different time of the day.

3.3 INSTRUMENT

The data on language learning attitudes (LLA) was obtained from the LLA questionnaire (See Appendix C). The questionnaire comprises 27 statements. The statements are posed in such a way as to identify the type of samples' personality traits, which reflect the type of samples' learning attitudes. For each statement, five options are given as indicated below:

SA - Strongly Agree
The items were grouped into five types of personality traits namely 'self-image', 'inhibition', 'risk-taking', 'ego-permeability' and 'ambiguity' (refer to questionnaire scoring manual) - refer to Appendix D.

The lower the score in self-image and risk-taking, the more the samples tend to exhibit these traits, indicating less positive learning attitudes. The higher the score in these two groups portrays otherwise. The lower the score in inhibition, risk-taking and ego permeability, the less the samples tend to exhibit these traits, indicating more positive learning attitudes and vice versa. However, the lower the score for tolerance for ambiguity, the higher the samples tend to exhibit this trait, indicating favorable language learning attitudes (LLA) and vice versa.

3.4 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

Each answer option carries the following weightage:

- SA - Strongly Agree - 8
- A - Agree - 6
The score under each personality traits will be totaled up. The total score for each personality trait will be ranked in terms of the degree of each personality as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>&quot;HIGH&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>&quot;ABOVE AVERAGE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot;AVERAGE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;LOW&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean for each personality trait was calculated as to find out the average degree of each personality among the samples whether toward the lower end or the higher end of the scale. This enabled the researchers to describe the type of learning attitudes among the subjects. Using the type of traits the subjects have, the extent to which the subjects' learning attitudes reflect their proficiency was then analyzed.

In analyzing the personality traits in indicating the subjects' attitudes, a bar chart, a pie chart and a graph for each personality trait were produced. The bar charts and the pie chart were generated based on the abovementioned ranks. The graphs were derived from the grouping of the ranks into two zones, namely the low and high zones. Based on the charts and graphs, the researchers determined the sequence of the traits according to their degree of dominancy.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

4.0 INTRODUCTION

This study attempts to answer the following research question:

a) What are the English LLA of Quranic and Sunnah students who obtained an average English Language Examination result within C grade range (refer to Chapter III)?

b) Is there any relationship between English LLA of Quranic and Sunnah students and their English Language proficiency (refer to Appendix B)?

The findings in this study would be focused on subjects' English LLA as well as the relationship of the found attitude with their English Language proficiency as indicated by their final first semester English Language examination results (refer to appendix B).

This chapter presents only the findings of the study whereas the discussion of these findings would be further elaborated in the subsequent chapter (refer to Chapter V). Following the research question, the first part of this chapter would deal with the subjects' LLA represented by five types of language learning personality namely self-
image, inhibition, risk-taking, ego permeability and tolerance for ambiguity (refer to Appendix C).

4.1 SECTION A

Principle of Traits Interrelation

The five personality traits will be analyzed based on the underlying principle of traits interrelations as presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Traits Interrelation Principle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favours Language Learning Attitude</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Image</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibition</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Permeability</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity*</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tolerance for Ambiguity

↑ = High  ↓ = Low

Language Learning Attitude (LLA) can either be favourable or less favourable. Favourable LLA is considered to be positive whereas, less favourable LLA is perceived to be a less stimulating attitude toward language learning.
Self-Image
A subject who possesses a high self-image usually displays a favourable LLA. On the contrary, subjects with a low self-image tend to exhibit a less favourable LLA.

Inhibition
When an individual has a high degree of inhibition, he or she is perceived to have a less favourable LLA. However, those with a low degree of inhibition are categorized as a good language learner (Rubin, 1975). These learners thus fall under the favourable LLA.

Risk-taking
Risk-takers are those who normally have favourable LLA because their risk-taking trait is more prominent. On the other hand, the risk-averse frequently choose to take the least risk possible and therefore, they are often in the less favourable LLA group.

Ego Permeability
Low ego permeability is considered as a good personality trait or a favourable LLA, as it very much contributes to the making of better language learners (Ehrman & Oxford, 1995). In contrast, learners with a high degree of ego permeability are grouped in the less favourable LLA zone.

Tolerance for Ambiguity
As it is with self-image and risk-taking traits, a high tolerance for ambiguity makes one has a favourable LLA. The lower tolerance for ambiguity, the higher the tendency for one to have a less favourable LLA.
4.2 SECTION B

Frequency Data

The data obtained on the five types of learning personality were analyzed using straightforward percentages through frequency counts as illustrated in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Tabulation of frequency counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>0-15 (LOW)</th>
<th>16-35 (AVERAGE)</th>
<th>36-47 (ABOVE AVERAGE)</th>
<th>48-64 (HIGH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF-IMAGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INHIBITION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISK-TAKING</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGO PERMEABILITY</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBIGUITY*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TOLERANCE FOR AMBIGUITY

Table 2 shows that as many as 50 participants' scores for self-image fall mostly in the 16-35 range, which is the 'average' category. 31 subjects are in the 'above average' category. However, none of the participants' self-image falls in the 'low' and the 'high' category.
The next personality trait, which is ‘inhibition’ indicates that 3 subjects exhibit low trait of inhibition, 44 subjects fall in the ‘average’ category while 28 subjects exhibit ‘above average’ degree of inhibition. 5 subjects show high degree of inhibition.

16 subjects are obviously low risk takers while 53 subjects are in the ‘average’ risk-taking category and 12 in the ‘above average’ category. None of the subjects seems to be a high risk-taker.

39 subjects exhibit low ego permeability traits. The same number of subjects possesses an average degree of ego permeability. A relatively small number of subjects (not more than 3) fall in the above average category. None of the subjects has high ego permeability.

None of the subjects has low tolerance of ambiguity. 18 subjects are categorized as in the ‘average’ range. 51 subjects fall in the ‘above average’ group and as many as 12 subjects have high degree of tolerance for ambiguity.

The raw scores are translated into bar charts as to see the overall impression of the participants’ general finding on their LLA as illustrated in Chart A, B, C, D and E.
Chart A indicates that majority of the participants have an average self-image. Nevertheless, more than half of the majority has above average self-image. None of the participants regards themselves as having either low or high self-image.
Chart B indicates that majority of the participants have an average degree of inhibition. More than half of the majority have an above average degree of inhibition. Nevertheless, the chart shows that there are quite a number of the participants who have a high degree of inhibition.
Chart C indicates that majority of the participants are average risk-takers. The number of participants who are categorized as low risk-takers is slightly higher than the number of participants who are categorized as above average risk-takers. None of the participants regards themselves as being a high risk-taker.
Chart D indicates that the number of participants who have a low degree and an average degree of ego permeability is the same. A considerably small number of participants have an above average degree of ego permeability. None of the participants has a high degree of ego permeability.
Chart E indicates that majority of the participants have an above average tolerance for ambiguity. Nevertheless, more than half of the majority have above average self-image. None of the participants regards themselves as having either low or high self-image. The raw scores are converted into straightforward percentages as to see the actual representation of each raw score in each category for each personality trait.
### 4.3 SECTION C

Percentage Data

**TABLE 3**

Tabulation of Percentage Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>0-15 (LOW)</th>
<th>16-35 (AVERAGE)</th>
<th>36-47 (ABOVE AVERAGE)</th>
<th>48-64 (HIGH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-IMAGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INHIBITION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISK-TAKING</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGO PERMEABILITY</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBIGUITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TOLERANCE FOR AMBIGUITY

Chart F, G, H, I and J are further generated from the percentages tabulated in Table 3 as to see the percentages that represent each category in all five personality traits.
Chart F illustrates that, in terms of percentage, 62% of the participants have an average self-image. The pie chart clearly depicts that the bigger portion of the chart goes for the 16-35 scorers range. 38% of the participants carry with them an above average self-image. This figure is almost half of the percentage belongs to the average self-image group.
Chart G illustrates that 36% of the participants have an above average degree of inhibition. The pie chart shows that the bigger portion (57%) of the chart is allocated for the 36-47 scorers range. 6% of the participants are highly inhibited. Only 1% of the participants have a rather low degree of inhibition.
Chart H illustrates that 20% of the participants are low risk-takers. The pie chart shows that the bigger portion of the chart, as much as 65%, is allocated for the 16-35 scorers range, which is the average category. 15% of the participants are above average risk-takers. Nonetheless, none of the participants is a risk-taker.
Chart I illustrates an equal percentage of 48% for both the participants in low and average category. The pie chart shows that only as much as 4% is allocated for the 36-47 scorers range, which is the above average category. None of the participants has high ego permeability.
Chart J illustrates that 63% of the participants have an above average tolerance for ambiguity. The pie chart shows that 15% of the participants have a high tolerance for ambiguity while 22% have average tolerance for ambiguity. None of the participants has a high tolerance for ambiguity.

The data obtained from the questionnaire for each personality is then narrowed down to two categories, which are charted into two zones namely low zone and high zone. Graphs K, L, M, N and O are then generated from Table 4.
4.4 SECTION D
Zones of Traits Inclination

TABLE 4

Traits Inclination Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAITS</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF-IMAGE</td>
<td>↑ (62%)</td>
<td>↓ (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INHIBITION</td>
<td>↑ (58%)</td>
<td>↓ (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISK-TAKING</td>
<td>↑ (85%)</td>
<td>↓ (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGO PERMEABILITY</td>
<td>↑ (96%)</td>
<td>↓ (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBIGUITY *</td>
<td>↓ (22%)</td>
<td>↑ (78%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TOLERANCE FOR AMBIGUITY
↑ = HIGHER    ↓ = LOWER
The graph in Chart K indicates that the participants' pattern of self-image moves in an ascending manner from high self-image to low self-image among the participants. A line of intercept will cross the graph at a point slightly lower than 40.0 unit in the low zone and at about 30.0 unit in the high zone thus resulting in a bigger area of low zone in comparison to the high zone.
The graph in Chart L indicates that a higher number of participants are in the low inhibition zone compared to the high inhibition zone. The line of intercept for this trait crosses the graph at unit 45.0 in the low zone and approximately at 33.0 in the high zone. This leads to a conclusion that the low inhibition zone is more domineering compared to the high inhibition zone.
The graph in Chart M indicates that the number of participants in the low zone is more than the number of participants in the high zone. The line of intercept meets the line of the trait at unit 85.0 approximately in the low zone and 15.0 in the high zone thus suggesting a bigger area for the low zone in comparison to the high zone.
The graph in Chart N indicates that the number of participants in the high zone is more than the number of participants in the low zone. The line of intercept crosses the graph at less than 39.0 unit in the low zone and 42.0 unit in the high zone, thus, displaying the picture that the high zone is more dominating than the low zone.
The graph in Chart O indicates that the number of participants in the high zone is higher than the number of participants in the low zone. The line of intercept meets the tolerance for ambiguity axis at unit 22.0 unit in the low zone approximately and at 78.0 unit in the high zone. This suggests a bigger area for the high zone and a comparatively smaller area for the low zone.
CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

5.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter analyses the findings presented in Chapter IV. It is the objective of this study to identify the subjects' Language Learning Attitude (LLA) in terms of their personality traits and the correlation of their LLA with their English Language proficiency. The findings in this study shall be analyzed in details in this chapter as to what extent the five personality traits affect the subjects LLA. Subsequently following the discussion (Section A & B), in Section C, a number of Cooperative Learning Models will be highlighted in providing teachers with insights on some alternatives to enhance effective language learning in the classrooms. As part of the effort to remedy the less favourable LLA among language learners in KUIM, further elaboration on the implementation of Cooperative Learning Models through classroom activities as well as its implications will be presented in Section D, E, F & G.
5.1 SECTION A

PERSONALITY TRAITS AND LLA

As presented in Table 1 (refer to Chapter IV, p.33), the analysis of the findings will focus on the interrelations of the five personality traits namely self-image, inhibition, risk-taking, ego permeability and tolerance for ambiguity. These interrelations will exhibit either favourable LLA or less favourable LLA.

Favourable LLA exists if the subjects have a high self-image, of the risk-takers type and have a high tolerance for ambiguity. As the principle of these traits employed in this study goes, when the subjects have favourable LLA, they normally have a low degree of inhibition, if any, as well as a low degree of ego permeability.

On the other hand, less favourable LLA will be exhibited when subjects have a low self-image, are the risk-averse type and have a low degree of tolerance for ambiguity. Subjects with less favourable LLA normally have a high degree of inhibition as well as a high degree of ego permeability.

5.1.1 Self-Image

The subjects' self-image as indicated by the frequency counts with 50 subjects in the average category and 31 subjects in the above average category show that majority of the participants have an average perception of their self-image. This reflects that where language learning is concerned, the subjects do not regard themselves highly. In other words, 50 subjects do not think that they are a pretty good language learner. It could be that these subjects hold "inflated, unstable, or tentative beliefs in the self's superiority" and are most likely easily and frequently threatened by negative feedback from others (Baumeister, Smart & Boden, 1996).
This above average category is obtained by adding the score for item 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10 and 22 in the questionnaire (refer to Appendix C). Even though these subjects do believe that learning a language is important to their goals but they also carry with them the idea that learning a language is not an activity that they enjoy. Learners, as concluded by Prodromou (1994), are people who have feelings, and these feelings can either lower or raise their barrier to language learning.

In addition, these subjects do not consider that they possess a good language learning aptitude. Other than that, they also do not have a clear picture on how to go about learning a language. They also feel that, even if they put their mind to learning a language in the right circumstances, they will still probably unable to learn the language well. This is due to the feeling of resistance from within themselves especially when they attempt to function in the language they learn even though they have practiced very hard. Alderman (1999) has categorized these learners as the ones with weaker self-efficacy and always being doubtful about their own capabilities.

These 50 subjects represent 62% of the total sample in this study. As illustrated by Chart K in Chapter IV (p.49), majority of the subjects are in the low self-image zone compared to the high self-image zone. Low self-image leads to low self-confidence. In order to learn a language, each individual learner needs to have a good amount of self-confidence, which normally emerges from an established self-image within oneself. Learners with low self-image as found in this study often feel that others are better language learners compared to them. Having such negative LLA traits these learners further into underestimating their own capabilities and refraining from participating in any classroom activities (Littlerjohn, 2000).

In contrast, 37 subjects represent 38% of the total sample are in the above average category for self-image personality trait. These subjects exhibit a better
self-image in respect to language learning. They regard themselves higher than those in the average category. As research has shown that a student who feels good about himself is more likely to succeed, these subjects have a better self-confidence in learning a language (Holly, 1987).

Nevertheless, the fact that the samples in this study fall in the average and above average category suggest that in general the samples can be grouped as having a comparatively low self-image. Unless the difference in the category involves two obvious categories such as low and high or low and above average or average and high, thus it can be concluded that the subjects in this study have a rather low self-image. This is due to the close reading of findings from the average and above average category. As agreed by Dierick and Dweck (1978), these learners who are lacking in self-esteem will gradually enter the phase of "deterioration in cognitive performance".

5.1.2 Inhibition

Table 2 (refer to Chapter IV, p.35) shows that only 1 participant has low degree of inhibition whereas the rest of them are in the average, above average and high category. To be a language learner with favourable LLA, the participants are expected to have as low score as possible in this personality trait. This is due to the fact that inhibited learners with thick, perfectionist boundaries find language learning more difficult than those learners with thin boundaries who favour attitudes of openness and the tolerance for ambiguity (Ehrman, 1993). As mentioned in Chapter III (refer to p.31), the lower the score for this trait, the less the participants tend to exhibit this trait and vice versa.

However, as presented in Table 3 (refer to Chapter IV, p.42), 99% of the participants does not belong to the low category of inhibition trait. This indicates that the participants possess a significant amount of inhibition, which contributes to a less favourable LLA in Table 1 (refer to Chapter IV, p.33).
This is very much in line with Pavli’s (1997) hypothesis that the defensiveness associated with inhibition would later discourage the risk-taking, which is necessary for rapid progression in language learning.

The degree of inhibition trait is obtained by summing up the score for items, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 16 in the questionnaire (refer to Appendix C). Based on the questionnaire, the participants in this study do not have the belief that learning a language is important in achieving their goals. They also admit that to them learning a language is a rather confused activity because they have less than the slightest idea of how about to learn it effectively.

As stated by Rubin (1975), a good language learner is the one who is less inhibited. On the contrary, the participants in this study being highly inhibited as indicated in Chapter IV by Chart B (p.38), G (p.44), and L (p.50) thus cannot be considered as good language learners. The significant degree of inhibition deprives the learners from many language learning opportunities. This is partly because these learners are afraid to attempt the language in light of avoiding mistakes. Inhibited individuals often employ evasive language learning strategy because they are very concerned with the reaction from individuals around them.

The stronger side of the inhibition trait of the subjects in this study erodes their self-confidence. Quite often inhibition in participating in classroom activities or in communicating in a foreign language derives from feelings of learners’ anxiety about how well they can perform. These learners, according to Littlejohn (2000), avoid participation in the activities that they cannot do well. This is due to their beliefs that they are unable to perform in the target language should they be asked to do so in front of others. This highly corresponds with the subjects’ agreement with especially items 7, 8, 9 and 10 in the questionnaire, which contributes to a higher score for inhibition.
5.1.3 Risk-Taking

Table 2 (refer to Chapter IV, p.35) illustrates that 53 participants of this study falls into the category of average, 16 in low and 12 in the above average category. None of the participants is found in the high category. This result shows that the subjects are primarily averse to risks concerning language learning. It seems that almost all of the subjects prefer to sit passively during class and therefore are not favorable language learner. The subjects felt that their situation as a student in a local institution does not necessitate learning a foreign language that is not a priority to their course (item 5, refer to Appendix C). This, as according to Pavli (1997), is due to the learners’ lack of confidence and fear of committing a mistake in front of their fellow friends.

As shown by Chart M, tabulation of percentage 65% in the average category of risk-takers, 20% in low and 15% in the above average. Even though the findings have shown some efforts of these participants in tackling the designated questions in relation to risk-taking, still the degree of this personality trait is obtained most at the average level. The participants are not overly interested in people from other countries, and make no effort in getting to know them or their homeland. From Table 4 (refer to Chapter IV, p.48) we can see that the subjects’ inclination for risk-taking is actually low (85%) compared to 15% for the high risk-takers. Due to insufficient confidence, they often employ risk-averse strategy as to avoid embarrassment of not being competent (Pimsleur, Mosberg & Morrison, 1962). As such, in a multiracial gathering, the subjects prefer to stick to their own nationality, not bothering to expand their social knowledge and awareness with others.

The degree of the participants’ risk-taking mode is obtained by summing up the score for items 5, 11-13, 21, 24, 25 and 27 in the questionnaire (refer to Appendix C). The subjects are obviously unwilling to speak up or participate in class activities if there’s a slight chance that their answer is incorrect. They will
not discuss their ideas or opinions with others even from the same group for fear of being ridiculed. As such, these obstacles (subjects’ anxiety and inhibition over anticipated criticism from others) have very much influenced their risk-taking behaviour and further restrict any language practices (Chapelle, 1983; Naiman et al., 1978).

This passive and risk-averse attitude causes the subjects to be rather small minded, less willing to explore other avenues besides their primary education. They are not aware of the bigger world out there that consists of other societies and cultures. This is shown by their scores in items 11-13 in the questionnaire, where the subjects do not realize the significance of communication with locals of another country. Hence, in ensuring the success of language learning processes, it is vital for teachers to instill their learners with positive disposition towards learning (Chi, 1988; Pressley et al., 1987). These dispositions include traits like high motivation, risk-taking attitudes, mindfulness or attentiveness, and a sense of responsibility for learning (Salomon & Perkins, 1988; Pea, 1988).

Skehan (1989) believes that risk-taking plays an important role in the actual use of a target language. These subjects however, as Krashen (1981a) claims, are overpowered by their self-consciousness and greater inhibition. Thus, it discourages the risk-taking, which is necessary for rapid progression in a target language. Evidently from the findings, the subjects appear to refrain from participating in any language learning activities, due to their fear of making mistakes and being the classroom laughingstock. Their egocentrism leads to unwillingness of understanding that making mistakes are actually part of the learning process, where comparisons can be made and thus result in better understanding of the language (Krashen, 1981a).
5.1.4 Ego Permeability

Based on the findings, it has been found that 48% (39 participants) is in the category of having low and average ego permeability. Only 4% (3 participants) falls in the above average category. The subjects know that they are neither genius nor are they good language learners. As a result, they are content with their moderate level of LLA. Only a number of participants fall in the category of above average ego permeability. They do not think they could learn any second language, unless they are fully supported by their learning environment; i.e., having the chance to practice using the target language with the native and other ESL speakers. None of the participants has a high degree of ego permeability. Without certain degree of ego strength, these learners are afraid to make necessary mistakes involved in language learning, as it definitely would threat their ego (Brown, 1977).

By summing up items 1, 3, 5, 14, 15 and 21-23 in the questionnaire (refer Appendix C), the degree of ego permeability is obtained. Interestingly enough, equal numbers of participants are found in the low and average category. The participants are not overly excited in the idea of learning English even in another country. However, they realize that the inability to talk to the local citizens can cause problems and communication breakdown. The subjects have a lower degree of ego permeability. They can imagine being "in the other shoes" and feel the necessity of language learning. This suggests that in spite of their anxiety, the subjects are willing to put aside their ego to make way for language learning (Schaumann, 1975).

Only 3 participants are found to be in the above average category. They don’t really have a high degree of ego, and so they are more likely to respond favorably to a change of attitude. The subjects are aware of the importance of language learning to be in another country, as shown in item 14 and 15. They have “the ability to move back and forth between languages and the
"personalities' that seem to come with them" (Guiora, 1979a). Still, the idea of learning another language is deemed a chore: a task that has to be done due to necessity, and not pleasurable to them. This, as observed by Guiora (1979a), is related to the common observation that one 'feels like a different person' when speaking a second language and often indeed acts differently as well.

Almost half of the participants are in the average category. They see themselves as ordinary individuals, lacking the need to stand out from the crowd. Conforming to the masses provide a safe haven, where a person does not have to exert himself needlessly. By having permeable ego boundaries entails them to have a well-defined, secure, integrated ego or sense of self in the first place (ibid, 1979a). This barrier, albeit a thin one, still stops the subjects from fully utilizing their potential for language learning.

5.1.5 Tolerance for Ambiguity

In Table 2 (refer to Chapter IV, p.35), majority of the participants (63% of them) have an above average score when measuring their tolerance for ambiguity. They do not want to be burdened by the extra time to delve into ambiguousness, and prefer things to be explained clearly and succinctly. A small number of participants, (22%) and (13%), falls in the category of average and high scoring consecutively. None of the participants has low score in this segment. They do not have any idea about how to go about learning a language (according to its syntax, lexical & semantic), and they do not care to exert themselves to find out how. Therefore, Littlewood (2000) believes that if learners can tolerate uncertainty without feeling insecure or confused they are less likely to feel overwhelmed by the large amounts of strange material they must face when learning a target language.

In contrast to the other personality traits, a high score does not indicate high tolerance. The subjects strongly agree in most of the items in the questionnaire
pertaining to tolerance for ambiguity, such as “It annoys me when people don’t give me a clear-cut answer” (item 18, refer to Appendix C). As already stated in Chapter III (refer to p. 30), the lower the score for tolerance for ambiguity, the higher the subjects tend to exhibit this trait, indicating favorable learning attitudes and vice versa. Therefore, subjects that strongly agree to most of the questions in the study actually have low tolerance for ambiguity. An example would be in item 19 (refer to Appendix C) where the subjects concur with the statement: “You should say ‘yes’ if you mean yes and ‘no’ if you mean no”.

Items 4, 16-20, 26 and 27 reveal the trait of most of the subjects to be that they have average tolerance for ambiguity. According to Pavli (1997), learners who are intolerant of ambiguity perceive confusion and difficulty as sources of threat. They do not like to be in such ambiguous situations (facing syntactical, lexical & semantical ambiguity), yet they do not actively search for solutions to clarify the matter. They know they are lacking in knowledge where the language is concerned, but they do not have any idea about how to deal with the ambiguity.

Since their tolerance for ambiguity is at the average level, the subjects have the tendency to solely rely on their teachers, automatically refuse to have any forms of thinking ‘outside the norm’ and even worse, avoid making contextual guesses whenever possible. They are anxious to understand every last detail before committing to a decision. Even then, they tend to wait for others to answer or decide for them. They have less favourable LLA since they do not stand out and rectify their deficiencies.

15% of the subjects have high score in the questionnaire, and thus have low tolerance for ambiguity. As they expect others to be clear, the participants also prefer to take time to have everything worked out in their own head before answering any questions (item 26, Appendix C). This leads them to having such negative attitudes toward language learning.
5.2 SECTION B

LLA AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

As concluded by Colin Baker in *Attitudes and Language* (1992), learners vary in their language acquisition, not solely depending on their attitudes but also other factors. They are namely, age, gender, social, politic, economy and personality factors. Nevertheless, a lot of studies have proven that the personality factors have played so many roles in influencing learners' capability of acquiring the language.

Findings have revealed that those learners with favourable LLA will usually enjoy and gradually master the target language. Those with less favourable LLA will usually end up being demotivated and having difficulties in acquiring the language. In his book, *Frames of Mind*, Gardner (1983) has pointed out that learners' attitude are the main factor that contributes to the success of acquiring a language.

Overall, the participants of this study have average self-image, average inhibition and are average risk-takers. They have low to average degree of ego permeability and their tolerance for ambiguity is also average. Being that the subjects are in the C range Examination grade, it is not surprising that their attitude toward language learning, namely English, cannot be considered as the favourable LLA.

The subjects are passive language learners, as shown by their average self-image and risk-taking trait. This leads to a potential assumption that the subjects are most probably less participative or not participating at all in class discussions or activities unless they are instructed to do so. They are easily satisfied by their examination results that are merely passing grade. As far as self-image is concerned, these subjects would rather risk a poor grade than a poor image (Veroff, McClelland, and Marquis, 1991; Grabe, 1993).
No further effort is made to improve their mastery of the language. When learning process is not voluntary, it will be difficult for learning to take place. This will gradually create passive learners who will only attempt the language out of a forced situation (OMSLF, 8 March 2003). To them, learning the target language is only for educational purposes, and not to be utilized beyond the classroom. Previous educational and social backgrounds contribute toward negative preconceptions regarding English. The language is deemed unimportant for their field of study and thought to be of little use beyond the classroom. This debilitating high-anxiety state causes the learner to flee from the learning task in order to avoid the source of anxiety (Scovel, 1978).

While not highly inhibited, there still exist thin barriers among the subjects that prevent them from becoming positive language learners. As suggested by Ehrman (1993), those students with thick, perfectionist boundaries find language learning more difficult than those learners with thin boundaries who favour attitudes of openness and the tolerance of ambiguity.

Since the subjects are feeling insecure about their own learning capabilities, their built-in defence mechanism and weaker self-esteem have caused them to experience learning blocks (Rao Zhenhui, 1999). Hence, these subjects’ lack of confidence prevent the language learners from taking steps towards better understanding of the language. When the time comes to evaluate their performance in the final exam, it has already been too late to have a better result.

The subjects are a contradiction to themselves when it comes to what they feel about themselves and what they expect from others. They have average tolerance for ambiguity. They expect others to be clear in their statements, yet they themselves are unwilling to help clarify or discuss the matter. This causes lots of problems in answering examination questions that require context understanding rather than explicit meaning. Thus, they lose out on better marks in their final paper.
Combination of all these low and average personality traits in the participants causes them to have average grade in their final exam. Therefore, there exist a relationship between the subjects’ learning attitudes and their English Language proficiency. If they have favourable LLA, their proficiency will be higher, and vice versa. Since the subjects have average learning attitudes, their proficiency is therefore merely average.

5.3 SECTION C

RECOMMENDATIONS

According to McClelland (1985) & Alschuler (1980), students who score in the target language are those who have positive attitudes toward the language. In achieving this, Kassim Shaaban (2001) has pointed out the needs of decreasing learners’ level of anxiety on achieving linguistic accuracy and increasing learners’ comfort zone by introducing interactive and communicative English lessons, i.e., through Cooperative Learning.

Cooperative Learning as described by Olsen and Kagan (1992), is one of the examples of an organized pedagogical technique where learning is dependent on the social structured exchange of information between learners in groups. Hence, such technique would increase the sense of Positive Interdependency among students in order to maximize their learning outcomes. Apart from Positive Interdependency, Oxford (1996d), and other educationists like Kagan (1989a) and Johnson et al. (1984) have also advocated other key principles like Individual Accountability, where learners collaborate in Heterogeneous Grouping (sex, past achievement, ethnicity and diligence) and are held accountable for their own learning. The success of such collaboration shall be recorded and further used as means of improvising their ability to learn together.
In conducting this technique, language learners, regardless of their sex, should first be grouped among peers of the same grade level to reduce their performance anxieties. Among meaningful activities that can be conducted in liaison with Cooperative Learning are Poetry Readings, Plays, Role-plays, Dramatizations, and Interviews (Kassim Shaaban, 2001). Other activities as suggested by ESOL programmes (Department of Multicultural Education, December 2004) are Jigsaw, Numbered Heads, Corners, Information Gap, Games, Think-Pair-Share, Debates, Reciprocal Teaching, and Group Projects. These “teaching methods and techniques do help learners acquire the language in an anxiety-reduced environment” (Stevick 1976; Krashen, 1988b; Asher, 1977).

Another benefit of Cooperative Learning is through the interaction that takes place in groups. This will definitely facilitate learning. Since an individual’s cognitive system is a result of communication in social groups and cannot be separated from social life, it is believed that when learners work cooperatively with others in groups, they will be able to share ideas, responsibility and gain feedback from their peers (Vygotsky, 1962). Through collaboration, learners’ attitude towards learning the target language becomes more receptive and in no time, they will be confident risk-takers.

Students should be made aware of the importance of the target language in real life and in their future career choices. Educators could introduce situations that relate to them personally, such as wanting to explain the teachings of the Holy Quran to a foreign student; or doing a field study that requires research in foreign journals or news articles.

Cooperative learning is said to be more effective in promoting intrinsic motivation and task achievement, generating higher order thinking skills, improving attitudes towards subject, developing academic peer norms, heightening self-esteem, increasing time on task, creating caring and altruistic relationships and lowering anxiety and prejudice (Oxford, 1996d). As such, these subjects who are directly involved with professional careers like Syariah Lawyer, Islamic Banking Officer and
others may find English Language handy most of the time. For instance, a Syariah lawyer may need to defend an abused western defendant in court, or an Ustaz may want to look for relevant teaching materials on the Internet.

Broadening the students’ views on the usage of the language learnt can help change their perception towards it. By instilling the principle of “Not afraid to be a Fool” (Hinchey, 1997) in them could encourage risk taking trait in communication, particularly in spoken discourse. As indicated by Gulera (1981b), pronunciation is an accurate measure of ego permeability, hence, subjects should treat the language not as chores but as something enjoyable instead. Eventually their style of learning will shift from being passive to a more integrative and proactive learning for their own self-satisfaction.

The term ‘enjoyable’ does not necessarily mean something bad. Students from a strict or reserved religious background may cringe at the thought of learning a language that has been associated with the Colonial Masters or the one that has no Islamic values. Based on the findings collected from certain personality traits like ego permeability and tolerance for ambiguity, it is not surprising that the subjects are lacking in positive attitudes towards the English Language. Parilah Shah & Nadzrah Abu Bakar (2000) conclude “the subjects might feel that the English culture contradicts to their own way of life and so knowing about the target language culture is not necessary”. As means of rectifying and enhancing fatigue learning processes, there is a need for educators to expose their students with the culture of the target language. Hence, there is no harm in being well-versed in the target language as long as one does not emulate the elements of second language culture that are in conflict to one’s own culture (ibid, 2000).

Other new ways of teaching can be introduced to language learners to increase their learning interests. As teachers are able to understand their own students, they should allow their students to become aware of their learning strengths and weaknesses
(Reid, 1995a). Hence, they should adjust their teaching pedagogy to suit learners’ attitude and aptitude accordingly.

When analyzing students’ examination results, their learning attitudes should be taken into account. Students who have positive attitude toward a subject tend to do better when tested, and vice versa. This is in line with Rubin (1975) suggestion that good L2 learners are willing and accurate guessers; have a strong drive to communicate; are often uninhibited; are willing to make mistakes; focus on form by looking for patterns and analyzing; take advantage of all practice opportunities; monitor their speech as well as that of others; and pay attention to meaning.

Attitudes and beliefs (perception towards language), as reported by Oxford (1994c), do have a profound effect on the strategies learners choose, be it positive or negative attitudes. Such degree can only be determined by detecting and analyzing learners’ personality traits. In language learning, most affecting traits are self-image, degree of inhibition, risk-taking, ego permeability, and tolerance for ambiguity.

Findings of this study reveal that students with average grade in their final English exam have average attitude toward the language. The subjects are very aware that they are learning a second language and have a low confidence that they can master the language. The participants do not think that English is of as much importance as Arabic (refer to Appendix A & B). They feel that this language is only another subject that has to be taken as part of their course requirement, and no further effort should be taken to really understand, let alone excel in it. As a result, most of them have low self-image and are lacking in self-confidence.

Since our self-image determines how or if we do certain things, one who has negative attitude towards learning, may expect to do poorly or to even fail in their examinations (Bailey, 1983). This is frustrating to the language learners themselves, as they know that they are not good enough, yet they cannot change themselves to do better. They feel inhibited by their preconditioning as quiet and unassuming students
that now they are unwilling to take the necessary risks that might invite scorn and ridicule. However, their lack of self-ego allows them to adapt to new situations, if needed. Only that low ego makes them receptive to new approaches of language learning.

5.4 SECTION D

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Pavi (1997) and other researchers agree that learning can only be successful if teaching conditions are favourable. Unfavourable conditions will only produce incompetent learners that are haunted by negative attitudes towards languages, cultures and people. Hence, it is hoped that this study will serve as a framework or backdrop for preparing the essential conditions in the learning environment as well as introducing the ideal teaching pedagogy.

Educators must always bear in mind that it is vital for these learners to feel comfortable and at ease with their learning environment first. Only then are they able to work cooperatively on the interactive language activities given to them. Like the famous American Revolution motto, “Together we stand, divided we fall”, do instill in them the importance of working together in achieving their goals rather than just keeping everything to themselves (cited from Johnson & Johnson, 1998).

Several Cooperative Learning strategies featured in this study can also be adopted and used as tickets to effective learning processes. Through Dixon (1996) “learner-centered approach”, teachers can also adopt and adapt most language topics and activities into one that encourages learners to be more responsible to utilizing and setting their own learning-styles/pace. Furthermore, teachers are also responsible for “creating and fostering an environment that encourages and accommodates diversity” (ibid, 1996).
5.5 SECTION E

COOPERATIVE LEARNING MODEL

Oxford (1994c) agrees with the fact that students who are cognitively exposed to better learning strategies would show greater improvement in their language performance. From the affective domain, the effectiveness of this collaborative strategy would further stimulate learners' socialization process (Jordan & Le Matais, 1997; Shachar & Sharan, 1994).

As learning a language cannot be done in isolation, Slavin (1995d) as cited in Mohd Arif & Rosnaini (2000), has framed out 5 main strategies of Cooperative Learning to be incorporated with the 4 language skills, namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. The 5 main strategies are:

a) Student Teams – Achievement Divisions (STAD)

Students of heterogeneous group (different background and level of proficiency) will collaborate together in delegated class activities. They will be tested (quizzes, oral presentation) individually based on each acquired skill. The total marks, however, is obtained from adding all the individual’s scores. To ensure winning, each member must work actively and cooperatively to achieve the most out of the assigned task.

b) Team-Games-Tournament (TGT)

It follows the same concept as STAD. Nevertheless, instead of making the learning into an exam-oriented or task-based, these students are exposed to games and tournament as means of scoring points to each team.

c) Jigsaw II

Teams are developed according to the STAD and TGT format. Each member of a team is assigned with different expertise. For instance, one student who is
in charged of a discussion topic on Sound Pollution, another on Air Pollution, so on and so forth, is expected to gather detailed information on it. In doing so, each member of each team has to form a new team consists of members of the same expertise. After a thorough discussion and going through an exchange of ideas session on similar topic, these students will present their findings to their own team members. Each team can either be assessed using the format of STAD or TGT.

d) Teams Accelerated Instruction (TAI)

This strategy is catered for problem-solution type of lesson, Mathematics & Physics subjects, etc. Educators of ETEMS (English for the Teaching of Mathematics & Science) may find this strategy very useful. In one way, the implementation of this strategy follows the format of Jigsaw II. The difference just lies in the active participation of the class teachers to guide one pilot team with their assigned task. After gathering sufficient input on such tasks, members of this team will then join their original team and facilitate their friends' group activity.

e) Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC)

This strategy is designed specifically for the teaching of reading and writing. In their teams, students are expected to read and analyze an excerpt, or to write book reviews, or to complete guided essays. The best thing about this strategy is that these students will not be tested until all the other members have totally grasped the required skills and successfully completed the assigned tasks. On-going discussion to stimulate the understanding of each given task is being held regularly as means to accelerate the learning process. The format of such discussion will be based on the Jigsaw II model.

Apart from the above-mentioned strategies, the followings are the integrated classroom activities obtained from the suggestions of Johnson & Johnson (2001), Howard Community College's Teaching Resources (15 October 2001), and Kagan
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(2001d), which can also be implemented appropriately in the English Language classroom:

a) Jigsaw
Groups with five students are set up. Each group member is assigned some unique material to learn and then to teach to his group members. As means to assist the learning students across the class working on the same sub-section get together to decide what is important and how to teach it. After practicing in these "expert" groups the original groups reform and students teach each other. Tests or assessment follows (Wood, 1987).

b) Think-Pair-Share
From its name, we know that it involves a three step cooperative structure. During the first step, individuals think silently about a question posed by the instructor. Individuals pair up during the second step and exchange thoughts. In the third step, the pairs share their responses with other pairs, other teams, or the entire group.

c) Three-Step Interview
Each member of a team chooses another member to be a partner. During the first step individuals interview their partners by asking clarifying questions. During the second step partners reverse the roles. For the final step, members share their partner's response with the team.

d) Round Robin Brainstorming
Class is divided into small groups (4 to 6) with one person appointed as the recorder. A question is posed with many answers and students are given time to think about answers. After the "think time," members of the team share responses with one another round robin style. The recorder writes down the answers of the group members. The person next to the recorder starts and each person in the group in order give an answer until time is called.
e) Three-minute review
Teachers stop any time during a lecture or discussion and give teams three minutes to review what has been said, ask clarifying questions or answer questions.

f) Numbered Heads
A team of four is established. Each member is given numbers of 1, 2, 3, 4. Questions are asked of the group. Groups work together to answer the question so that all can verbally answer the question. Teacher calls out a number (two) and each two is asked to give the answer.

g) Team Pair Solo
Students do problems first as a team, then with a partner, and finally on their own. It is designed to motivate students to tackle and succeed at problems which initially are beyond their ability. It is based on a simple notion of mediated learning. Students can do more things with help (mediation) than they can do alone. By allowing them to work on problems they could not do alone, first as a team and then with a partner, they progress to a point they can do alone that which at first they could do only with help.

h) Circle the Sage
First the teacher pulls the class to see which students have a special knowledge to share. For example the teacher may ask who in the class was able to solve a difficult math homework question, who had visited Mexico, who knows the chemical reactions involved in how salting the streets help dissipate snow. Those students (the sages) stand and spread out in the room. The teacher then has the rest of the classmates each surround a sage, with no two members of the same team going to the same sage. The sage explains what they know while the classmates listen, ask questions, and take notes. All students then return to their teams. Each in turn, explains what they learned. Because each one has gone to a different sage, they compare notes. If there is
disagreement, they stand up as a team. Finally, the disagreements are aired and resolved.

i) Partners
The class is divided into teams of four. Partners move to one side of the room. Half of each team is given an assignment to master to be able to teach the other half. Partners work to learn and can consult with other partners working on the same material. Teams go back together with each set of partners teaching the other set. Partners quiz and tutor teammates. Team reviews how well they learned and taught and how they might improve the process.

The cooperative learning models proposed in this study are among the tangible strategies for second language learners. Nevertheless, other models might be found useful depending on the learners and the academic setting. Language instructors are the best determiners in deciding the suitable model for their learners. Therefore, the models suggested above can serve as some guidelines when embarking on the incorporation of cooperative learning strategies with the classroom language activities.

5.6 SECTION F
HOW COOPERATIVE LEARNING CAN HELP IMPROVE LLA

This study focuses on the five personality traits namely self-image, inhibition, risk-taking, ego permeability and tolerance for ambiguity, as indicators of the Quranic and Sunnah students’ LLA.

Since it was found that these samples have low self-image, high degree of inhibition, are risk-averse, high self-ego pertaining language learning and low tolerance for ambiguity, thus suggestions should be made on how to improve these personalities to be more favourable toward language learning.
Cooperative learning has been highly promoted to be embedded in classroom activities as suggested by the University of Minnesota, Learning Center:

Over 122 studies conducted between 1924 and 1981 provide clear evidence that cooperative learning experiences promote higher achievement than their competitive or individualistic counterparts. Cooperative activities also tend to promote the development of higher-order levels of thinking, essential communication skills, improved motivation, positive self-esteem, social awareness, and tolerance for individual differences. Specifically, recent research links regular cooperative experience in the classroom with gains in the following areas:

- Student achievement
- Critical and creative thinking
- Positive attitudes toward subject and school
- Group interaction and social skills
- Self-esteem and mutual respect

(Johnson & Johnson, 2001)

A cooperative group is defined as two to five students who are tied together by a common purpose (Hirst & Slavik, 1990). Studies (Aaronson, 1978; De Vries, Edwards & Slavin, 1978; Dishon & O'Leary, 1984; Johnson et al., 1984; Slavin, 1978a; 1980b, 1986c) have shown that cooperative learning has lent a significant contribution towards improvement in language performance. Cooperative learning situations, compared to competitive or individualistic ones, promote greater achievement motivation, more intrinsic motivation, more persistence in completing the tasks, and greater continuing motivation to learn. Cooperative learning experiences also result in more positive attitudes (Hirst & Slavik, 1990). It is also highly learner-centered. According to New Horizons for Learning, 2 February 2005.

Cooperative Learning is one of the best researched of all teaching strategies. The results show that students who have opportunities to work collaboratively, learn faster and more efficiently, have greater retention, and feel more positive about the learning experience. Needless to say, this is not to say that students can just be put into a group and assigned a
Considering this contribution, therefore, cooperative learning is thus strongly recommended in the effort to improve the five personality traits mentioned above.

5.6.1 How Can Cooperative Learning Help Improve Self-Image

An individual with a low self-image often has little self-confidence. When a person is not confident, the tendency of being introvert is likely high. When a language learner is far from being an extrovert, he or she is unlikely to attempt the language even when opportunity arises.

The nature of cooperative learning is the one that is not individual in nature. Group or pair work is often the feature of this concept. In cooperative learning implementation, individual differences are acknowledged in a positive manner. This is because members of the group are encouraged to help one another to meet the objective of the activity. In cooperative learning groups, responsibility for learning is shared with other group members expected to provide help and encouragement to each other (Cooperative Learning Strategies, 4 February 2005). Therefore, even though some of the group members are less proficient compared to the others, but the gap in proficiency level does not hinder each individual involvement in achieving the objectives of the task.

Even though some researchers, such as Mills & Durden (1992), state that high proficiency students are at a disadvantage when grouped with weaker students but many researchers advocate diversity in small groups. Radenich & McKay (1995) come to a conclusion that grouping by ability does not usually benefit overall achievement and can lead to inequalities of achievement. With good arguments on both sides, most teachers make choices based on their objectives when grouping their students in the language classroom.
It is one of the features of cooperative learning strategy that each member is assigned with an exclusive part, which is one of the components to complete the task. When each member’s contribution, if without, will lead to the failure of completing the task, a sense of being as important as other group members will gradually help to build self-confidence. Subtly, the member with a low self-image is somehow given a ‘no choice’ situation but to take part in the discussion. When one’s contribution is appreciated, it will boost the person’s confidence to continuously participate in future activities. Cooperative learning experiences also result in higher levels of self-esteem, healthier processes for deriving conclusions about one’s self-worth, and greater psychological health than do competitive and individualistic learning experiences (Johnson & Johnson, 1983).

As this condition goes on, over time the individual’s self-image will improve and so will his or her proficiency level. Cooperative learning strategies can work well and enhance learning for all students; however, the language interactions they produce make them especially effective for limited English proficient students (Kagan, 1993c).

5.6.2 How Can Cooperative Learning Help Inhibited Learners

Low self-image normally leads to inhibition. Learners who are inhibited often intentionally let others manipulate the learning situation. This is because they are often afraid to let themselves go and try out things. In language learning, participation is essential. Without participation, learning does not take place. The reason being, language is acquired through constant practice. When individual learning strategy is exercised in language classroom, the dominant language learners will advantage the most from their own self-willingness to attempt the language while the inhibited learners remain where they are. Good Language Learners actively involve themselves in the language learning task (Naiman et al. 1978).
However, when cooperative strategies are exercised instead, those inhibited learners have to cooperate with the active learners in conducting their individual task in the group. This implicit help-seeking session gradually pushes inhibited learners to communicate and actively participate in order to carry out their responsibility as a group member. Cooperative learning develops oral communication skill (Panitz, 2000). During small-group interactions, they find many opportunities to reflect upon and reply to the diverse responses fellow learners bring to the questions raised (What Are the Benefits of Cooperative and Collaborative Learning, 4 February 2005). When this is practiced over time, inhibition will slowly be eradicated. When inhibition problem is substantially solved, it will be easier for language teachers to polish the students' proficiency toward better improvement.

5.6.3 How Can Cooperative Learning Help Learners to be Risk-Takers

When a learner has to work with another person, a sense of accountability to carry out the assigned duty will implicitly be created. This is especially when learners are working in group. Even though members of the group are working towards the same goal, but a competition among group members to complete their individual task is inevitable.

This competition is somehow a healthy one because each member tries to show that they can complete their individual task, not just with the expected product but they will compete in terms of efficiency in carrying out the individual task. The significance of this competition will depend on the frequency of the implementation of the cooperative learning strategy in classroom activities.

When learners are competing with each other, they are more willing to take risk in order to be the prominent contributor in the group. This might not take place at the first few group activities but as they go along, the risk-averse learners will gradually adopt the risk-taker personality trait. The cooperative learning
strategy thus becomes a useful tool to polish sense of competition in human nature in a very healthy way. Johnson & Johnson (1991) stress on positive interdependence, individual accountability and personal responsibility as essential components of an effective cooperative learning strategy.

5.6.4 How Can Cooperative Learning Help to Reduce the Degree of Ego Permeability

It is natural for any individual to have self-ego. However, in language learning, to a certain extent it can be damaging to learning process. When a language learner permits ego to surpass their language goal, his or her degree of language ego permeability will thicken. Unfortunately, very often learners are not aware of this negative process. This is especially when language learning is not learners’ priority. In this situation, when individual learning strategy is practiced, learners will continue with the language learning culture of their own. This is the point where cooperative learning strategy can step in to mend the situation.

As mentioned earlier, students can be grouped either according to their ability or diversely in terms of proficiency. When good students are mixed with the weaker ones, a lot of learning styles from different individual can be adopted by one another. When students with high ego permeability see that other students of approximately the same proficiency level or perhaps lower make effort to attempt the language, most of the time with difficulty, it will bring a realization that they should also attempt the language without having to fear that they will be looked down on. This is a part of experiential learning that can help learners to focus less on their language deficiency but instead start catching up with the language opportunities that they have been missing. Trust building is part of the advantage of cooperative learning strategy (Salmon River - GLC Eisenhower Project, 4 February 2005).
5.6.5 How Can Cooperative Learning Help to Increase Tolerance for Ambiguity

Not many language learners have sufficient amount of tolerance for ambiguity. Individual learning does not provide room for learners to help one another especially when encountering language ambiguities. On the contrary, when learners are put in group-activities, they can share and clarify these ambiguities. Each learner has different knowledge of the language. Some might be better in syntax while others might have more knowledge in vocabulary. Perhaps, some others are better at deriving meaning from the language. The culminating activity allows individual sharing team members to demonstrate their knowledge of all topics identified in the unit (Kagan, 1993c).

Therefore, cooperative learning strategy will enable these learners to share their expertise and benefit from each other. Each individual learner has his or her own unique proficiency level. There are no two learners of precisely the same proficiency level. Due to this, at any time cooperative learning strategy is exercised, it will naturally benefit the participants towards language improvement.

5.7 SECTION G

COOPERATIVE LEARNING MODEL AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS

As it is now, the existing syllabus for UBE 1012 in KUIM does not emphasize on the employment of cooperative learning in classroom activities. It is entirely up to the language instructors to employ any learning strategy in their classroom. Considering that Quranic & Sunnah students are the subjects of this study, in particular, therefore the following suggestions of cooperative learning models might be especially applicable to the Quranic & Sunnah students. Nevertheless, these recommendations
might also be found workable and useful as well for other students learning English as a second language in KUIM.

As one of the focuses of this study, proficiency is an element that involves the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing). Based on the cooperative learning strategies, integrated classroom cooperative learning activities have been derived as to suit the academic needs and the setting in KUIM.

5.7.1 Proposed Integrated Classroom Cooperative Learning Activities

5.7.1.1 Listening

The Conventional way of conducting a listening activity in the classroom is normally by merely listening to the tape and doing either a pre-, while-, and post listening activity. It is very common that listening activity task being carried out individually. Since Malaysian educational system is very much exam-oriented, thus, this format is often practiced as to familiarize students with the same nature of task during the actual examination.

Nevertheless, unlike school-level assessment system, which is rather rigidly formatted, ample rooms for changes and transformation for the form of evaluation at college level enable tremendous creativity in enriching listening activity in a language classroom.

Even though it is undeniable that at the end of the day students still have to face examination but colouring their classroom activities that can help improve their proficiency is always a fruitful effort.

Moving away from the conventional method can in fact boost students interest for it breaks a long repetitive, homogenous, monotonous activity. The
followings are among the possible effective listening activities that can be utilized in achieving any listening objective:

a) Pre-Listening

A listening text is often focusing on certain issues. A pre-listening activity may include not just teacher-student discussion but student-student interaction. At this stage, the actual narrowed down issue as presented by the actual listening text is still an element of surprise.

A brief introduction by the teacher followed by perhaps a pair work to discuss what they know about the issue can actually help to trigger interest toward the listening text that follows. Besides helping each other by sharing their general knowledge of the issue, the pair work helps to increase exposure to one another in terms of related syntax and vocabulary. This will contribute to the improvement of proficiency level.

b) While-listening

Each learner is assigned an individual task such as text completion. It is a common feature to have certain individual task, when necessary, in cooperative learning strategies.

c) Post-listening

Teacher could assign various issues related to the topic of the listening text. Argumentative genre for the group discussion task will enable the students to practise vocabulary and related syntax in a repetitive manner. This will strengthen the registration and extend the retention rate of the newly acquired language item for a longer period. Since the four language skills are interrelated, it is thus impossible to separate them. Therefore, the post-listening activity will involve a lot of
speaking activities. Nonetheless, as much as speaking takes place, listening activity occurs as much as well.

5.7.1.2 Speaking

Even though group or pair discussion has been conducted in the language classroom since long time ago but the extent to which its effectiveness contributes to the improvement of learners' proficiency is still questionable. This is because very often, participative students take an active role in the discussion while inhibited students sit and listen. The product of the discussion is often actually the outcome of the work of a few students.

On the contrary, when cooperative learning strategies are exercised in classroom activities, the task assigned to each member of the group requires each individual to take an equal part to achieve the goal. Based on this principle, language instructors can move to giving speaking task, which is fragmented, to each individual so as to ensure that none of the members of the group could escape from participating in the discussion. Should any of the members refuses to participate, the group's goal will not be achieved because a fragment of the task is missing.

In implementing cooperative learning strategies for speaking activities, the nature of the task given to students is a crucial feature. This is the element that differentiates cooperative learning strategy of discussion with the conventional method of discussion. Task could be set as problem-based at the very beginning of cooperative learning implementation. As the learners become more actively involved in the group discussion, teachers could move to a more challenging genre such as argumentative nature of speaking task.
5.7.1.3 Reading

In ESL reading programs, teachers have traditionally used reading texts that emphasize intensive or close reading, where the focus is on accuracy, on comprehension, and on specific strategies and skills (Crandall, 1995). Individual learners are usually bombarded with reading techniques like 'top-down', 'bottom-up' approach, skimming and scanning as tools for getting answers in the comprehension sections.

As means to improve learners' fluency in a target language, it is vital for teachers to incorporate both intensive and extensive reading skills together with some suitable cooperative learning strategies. For example, in groups, learners are given a set of jumbled-up strips of dialogues from a short story. The names of the persons who uttered the dialogues have been omitted. With the CIRC strategy, each group is expected to read and analyze those loose scripts by looking for clues that may lead them to further logical rearrangement of plot and identification of characters processes.

Furthermore, CIRC also allows learners to tackle increasingly complex material, build their vocabulary and gain confidence and independence in reading (Calderon & Slavin, 1999). By figuring out 'Who is who?', 'Who says what?' and 'What makes that person to say this?' in a given script actually prepares learners to (syntax, lexical, semantic) ambiguity tolerance. Such in-groups activity spells higher tolerance for ambiguity rather than working alone.

This activity encourages learners to be more active and questioning readers through co-operation in interdependent learning. On-going discussion to stimulate the understanding and the completion of each given task is being held regularly as means to accelerate the learning process (Slavin, 1995d). For
the beginners, let them explore with just two characters. As the lesson progresses, teachers can assign them with far more complicated scripts that contain more than just two characters, as well as expose them to a variety of roles (major, minor, & round characters).

It is important to note that this small peer-group activity could serve as a non-constraining platform for inhibited learners. Alas, in any classroom setting, learners are expected to be able to overcome their "deep-seated fear of inadequacy and deficiency" (Oxford, 1989a).

5.7.1.4 Writing

The traditional method of teaching writing is the one that requires learners to write about the given topic and later submit the composition to the teacher for assessment. This is a type of self-learning without any intervention from other parties except the learners’ own effort. Inhibited learners remain where they are at the point where their writing proficiency could reach a stagnant stage.

As pointed by Vygotsky (1962), "...writing should be incorporated into a task that is necessary and relevant for life. Only then can we be certain that it will develop not as a matter of hand and finger habits but as a really new and complex form of speech." Hence, introducing cooperative learning into writing activities could help learners to build a sense of interdependence and gain the most out of the whole process. Teachers as usual still have to assign a topic to the class and employ the traditional method of essay writing. Once the students have already written their essay, teachers will collect the essay and redistribute the essay to a different student.

The next step is to introduce a virtual scheme of essay assessment, which is laid out in detail and user-friendly in nature, to the students. Based on the assessment, the student will evaluate their friends’ composition in terms of
language, content, format, coherence and cohesion. The students will then be instructed to rationalize each decision they make in evaluating their friends' work. Each student will give a score to the essay they mark.

Next, students have to return their essay to the owners for them to study their strengths and weaknesses based on the examiner’s comments. The examiners, in return have to write a summary based on the essay that they check. The summary is then assessed by the writers themselves and returned to the respective individuals with the comments and score.

Students are then instructed to sit with their examiner and have a question and answer session regarding the comments made by their friends for the essay and summary and discuss on how they can further improve their writing skill. They are also allowed to intellectually argue their friends' scoring decision.

This way, a sense of cooperation and responsibility to help one another is created among learners. Simultaneously, substantial room is developed to nurture open-minded, extrovert and risk-taker type of second language learners.

**Remark**

Apart from the fact that all the activities in English Language classrooms are never conclusive, teachers must also bear in mind that "accommodating learners' needs and preferences is vital in designing a learner-centred curriculum (Nunan, 1989). Research indicates that highly successful students often have multistyle preferences, and some research suggests that students adapt their learning styles with experimentation and practice (Reid, 1998b). Hence, it is entirely up to the teachers' creativity to make use of the above strategies to suit their learners' needs, capabilities, potentials, and preferences in any classroom setting.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

6.0 INTRODUCTION

In this section, a conclusion of the study will be provided. The conclusion will be based on the research question formulated in Chapter 1. Subsequently following the conclusion is some suggestions that can be considered for further research. The following are the research questions of this study:

1. What are the existing LLA of the first year Quranic students at KUIM?

2. Is there any relationship between the samples’ learning attitudes and their English Proficiency?

6.1 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

Based on the findings of this study, the following variables had been identified as the language attitude of the first year Quranic students at KUIM: namely low self-image, high inhibition, low risk-taking, high ego permeability and low tolerance for ambiguity. Firstly, the image of being a Muslim and emphasis on Islamic values has affected these students’ perception and action towards the English language. This is as the English language is related to the language of the Christian colonizers. Due to
that, the tendency to assume the notions, ideologies and philosophies posed in the use of the language are assumed as polluting or contradictory to Islamic values. Hence, the students’ high ego permeability has somehow hindered the self from being in total control of “a new language, a new culture, a new way of thinking, feeling, and acting” (Brown, 1994). Another trait, tolerance of ambiguity as gathered by Ausburn & Aushburn (1978) (as cited in Thanaawas, 2004), refers to one’s willingness to adapt to apparently ambiguous situations or ideas. Since, these students have to decipher the truth of the holy Quranic words by mastering Arabic, no other language is deemed important. Thus, the state of ambiguity only serves as a catalyst of confusion. Therefore, ambiguity tolerance in the use of English is low.

Secondly, the students regard English as less important than the Arabic language – the language of the Quran (Refer to the comparison of Appendix A & B). Due to that, the motivation to improve their English language proficiency is less compared to the students’ effort to master the Arabic language. With a weak command of the English language and insufficient effort to improve mastery in the English language, the students have lesser motivation to use English. This is as it involves their self-image, inhibition and fear of making mistakes when using English – the language of the colonial master. In other words, ego permeability towards English is high, so much so that the improvement of the students’ proficiency level in the English language is affected.

Therefore, there is a correlation between the students’ LLA and English language proficiency. Whereupon, the higher the students’ self image is, the higher level of scrutiny is placed on the use of English. Positively, this would encourage usage of English that involves critical thinking and intellectual growth. However, if the self-image is juxtaposed with strung negative images and assumptions of English Language, the affective filter towards the use of English becomes high. Henceforth, this will cause a rise in the learners’ ego permeability, inhibition and their fear of taking risks. This will further lead to the declining of the language acquisition process.
Hence, the use of classroom activities and materials through cooperative learning strategies should be employed. Gradually, it is hoped that all these cooperative learning strategies will not only cater to the students' language needs, but also acts as a catalyst in widening the mindset of the students' perception of other things outside the Islamic perspectives. Soon the students will be able to understand the link between their daily routine in language classrooms as well as their Quranic and Sunnah syllabus.

6.2 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study has not been able to look at the relationship between the personality traits of the higher achievers and their LLA. Thus, further study of a similar kind could be carried out onto those students as well as those from the other existing faculties in KUIIM, namely, Faculty of Science & Technology, Faculty of Economy & Muamalah, Faculty of Syariah & Law and Faculty of Leadership & Management.

As "the objective of teaching English in present days is to make the language the most important language for the purpose of knowledge and science" (Asmah, 1992:55), hence, favourable learning attitudes are needed not only in learning the English Language, but also when learning other languages and content subjects. Further experimental research could also be conducted with the aim of looking at the success and the effectiveness of implementing cooperative learning strategies toward improving second language learners LLA. Nowadays, most higher learning institutions in the West such as University of Minnesota, University of Concordia, Canada and many others in the United States of America have already set up their own Cooperative Learning Center. Such centers conduct research pertaining to cooperative learning strategies which can be implemented not only in the English Language classrooms (including ESP) but also in other content subjects' classroom activities (Science, Mathematics, Management, etc.).
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## APPENDIX A

**PROGRAM :** EK1133C  
**K/URAT :** 1  
**KOLEJ UNIVERSITI ISLAM MALAYSIA**  
**ANALISA BILANGAN CALON MENGikut ORED**  
**SESJI :** 2003/2004  
**SEMESTER :** 1  

### FAKULTI PENGAJIAN QURAN DAN SUNNAH  
**UKURAN :** UBA1012  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Diagram:**

- **BIL:**
  - A: 9
  - A-: 19
  - B+: 46
  - B: 31
  - B-: 21
  - C+: 2
  - C: 1

- **GRED:**
  - A: 46
  - A-: 31
  - B+: 21
  - B: 2
  - C+: 1
## APPENDIX B

KOLEJ UNIVERSITI ISLAM MALAYSIA  
ANALISA BILANGAN CALON MENGIKUT GRED  
Sesi: 2003/2004  
Semester: 1

FAKULTI PENGAJIAN QURAN DAN SUNNAH  
KURSUS: UB1012 - BAHASA INGGERIS I  
JML CALON: 134

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 134 | 100.0 | 100.0 |          |

![Graph showing distribution of grades]
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

Fill out the following questionnaire. Tick (/) the option which best describes whether you agree or disagree with each statement according to the given scale. Please answer as honestly as you can.

SA - strongly agree, A - agree, N - neither agree nor disagree, D - disagree, SD - disagree

1. I think I'm a pretty good language learner.
2. Learning a language maybe important to my goals, but I don't expect it to be much fun.
3. My language learning aptitude is probably pretty high.
4. I don't have any idea about how to go about learning a language.
5. I think I could learn pretty much any language I really put my mind to, given the right circumstances.
6. I worry a lot about making mistakes.
7. I'm afraid people will laugh at me if I don't say things right.
8. I end up trembling and practically in a cold sweat when I have to talk in front of people.
9. I find it hard to make conversation even with people who speak my own language.
10. I feel a resistance from within when I try to speak in a foreign language, even if I’ve practiced.

11. It is a mark of respect to people to learn their language if you’re living in their country.

12. I like getting to know people from other countries, in general.

13. Speaking the language of the community where I’ll be living will let me help people more than I could do otherwise.

14. I don’t like the idea of relying on speaking English in another country.

15. I think the people of the country where I’ll be living would like me to learn their language.

16. I won’t really be able to get to know people well if I don’t speak their language.

17. There is a right and wrong way to do almost everything, and I think it’s my duty to figure out which is which and do it right.

18. It annoys me when people don’t give me a clear-cut answer, but just beat around the bush.

19. You should say ‘yes’ if you mean yes and ‘no’ if you mean no.

20. You have to understand people’s culture and value system before you can be sure whether some things are right or wrong.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I like to mimic other accents. And people say I do it well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I can do impersonations of famous people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I find it easy to &quot;put myself in other people's shoes&quot; and imagine how they feel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>In school, if I didn't know an answer for sure, I'd sometimes answer out loud in class anyway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I often think out loud, trying out my ideas on other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I want to have everything worked out in my own head before I answer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I'd call myself a risk taker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE OPERATING MANUAL

Instructions:

Each answer option carries the following point value:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine the type of personality of the subjects, each personality will be operationalised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Self-image</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Inhibiting</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Risk-taking</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Type-personality</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Ambiguity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The point value of each question will be placed in the box next to its corresponding question number. The score in each personality column will be added and analysed according to the rank stated in Method of Analysis Section.

KEY:

Q – question number
T – total score

(Taken from "Language Learning Attitudes Questionnaire": January 2003)
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Permohonan Keputusan Peperiksaan
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