Language Learning Strategies and Perceived Classroom Motivational Factors as Predictors of Perceived English Proficiency among Senior High School Students

***Kissy Kyle S. Lozarito[1], James L. Paglinawan[2]**

[1]Master Teacher I, Dagatkidavao Integrated School, Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines,

[2]Associate Professor IV, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Maramag, Bukidnon, Philippines,

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.101100069

Received: 30 October 2026; Accepted: 04 November 2026; Published: 20 November 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined language learning strategies and perceived classroom motivational factors as predictors of perceived English proficiency among Senior High School students at Apyao National High School in Quezon, Bukidnon. Using a quantitative, descriptive-correlational design, the study involved 261 Grade 11 and Grade 12 students during School Year 2026–2027. Three adapted instruments, which underwent expert content validation and reliability testing, showed high internal consistency (Cronbach's α = .915–.957). Data were analyzed using means, standard deviations, Pearson correlations, and simultaneous multiple regression with heteroscedasticity-consistent (HC3) standard errors and Holm-adjusted p values. Before the regression coefficients were interpreted, multicollinearity was evaluated through predictor intercorrelations, tolerance, and variance inflation factors (VIF).

Students reported a high overall extent of language learning strategy use (M = 3.528), with listening strategies highest (M = 3.618). Perceived classroom motivational factors averaged 3.942, with the teacher dimension rated highest (M = 4.021). Perceived English proficiency averaged 3.599, with listening as the highest-rated skill (M = 3.636). Perceived English proficiency correlated strongly and positively with language learning strategies ($r = .756$, $p < .001$) and perceived classroom motivational factors ($r = .731$, $p < .001$). Multicollinearity was not severe (tolerance = .214–.311; VIF = 3.219–4.672). The nine-domain model explained 66.0% of the variance in perceived English proficiency ($R^2 = .660$, adjusted $R^2 = .648$). Assessment was the only significant predictor after Holm adjustment ($\beta = .349$, $p = .004$, Holm-adjusted $p = .033$), whereas writing strategies showed a positive association ($\beta = .235$, $p = .016$) that did not remain significant after adjustment. The findings concern perceived, not actual, English proficiency and are associative and specific to one school. The study proposes formative assessment with descriptive feedback and clear rubrics and process-based writing instruction for implementation and evaluation, and recommends research that triangulates self-assessments with grades or tests.

Keywords: Language Learning Strategies, Perceived Classroom Motivational Factors, Perceived English Proficiency, Senior High School Students.

INTRODUCTION

In many countries where English is not the first language, English proficiency has become a condition for academic progress: English is increasingly the medium of instruction in higher education, and selection based on English proficiency at the transition from secondary to tertiary education may limit some students' opportunities (Macaro et al., 2018). Learners' judgments of their own English ability have also received considerable attention. A meta-analysis of 67 studies found that such self-assessments correspond only moderately with measured performance (M. Li & Zhang, 2021), and self-assessment can support learning when it is formative and guided by clear criteria (Andrade, 2019). The learner and classroom factors associated with these judgments are therefore relevant to English teaching.

In the Philippines, Filipino and English are intended to become the primary languages of instruction at the secondary level (Republic Act No. 10533, 2013), yet national and international assessments point to persistent difficulties. In the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2025, Filipino 15-year-old students obtained a mean reading score of 367, and only 31% reached at least the minimum level of proficiency (Level 2), compared with an average of 69% across the countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD); almost no Filipino students reached Level 5 or higher, compared with an OECD average of 6% (OECD, 2026). Because PISA measures reading literacy rather than English proficiency as such, and its participants are mostly in Grade 9 or Grade 10, these results describe the reading skills with which many learners enter Senior High School.

At the end of Senior High School, national assessment data cited by the Second Congressional Commission on Education (2026) showed that only 0.40% of Grade 12 learners reached the proficient or highly proficient level in the Grade 12 National Achievement Test when the results of all tested subjects were combined, a figure that reflects overall academic proficiency rather than English alone. These data suggest that many learners finish Senior High School below expected proficiency levels, which makes the factors associated with their English proficiency a practical concern for English teachers.

Language learning strategies (LLS) are one learner factor that has repeatedly been linked with English proficiency. Oxford (2017) describes strategies as deliberate thoughts and actions through which learners regulate their own language learning in specific contexts. Internationally, Habók and Magyar (2018) found that the strategy use of 868 Hungarian lower secondary students, particularly their use of metacognitive strategies, was related to their foreign language marks, and Teng et al. (2022) found that self-regulatory writing strategies predicted the writing performance of Chinese junior secondary students.

Philippine studies report similar relationships: Soliman and Gorospe (2024) and Yecyec et al. (2024) found positive relationships between strategy use and the English proficiency of Senior High School and Grade 11 students, respectively, and Quinatac-an (2026) found a positive correlation between strategy use and the self-reported English proficiency of Grade 10 students ($r = .523$, $p < .001$). Mebrano (2026) further found that language learning strategies and motivation in learning English together predicted the perceived English proficiency of 212 Grade 9 students in Davao City, explaining 70% of its variance.

Students' motivation and learning also depend on the classroom in which English is taught. Renandya (2014) identified five classroom sources of motivation, known as the 5Ts: teacher, teaching methodology, text, task, and test. Tran and Nguyen (2022) operationalized this framework as classroom-specific motivational factors and found that Vietnamese English as a foreign language (EFL) learners rated the teacher as the most important factor, although teaching materials were the strongest predictor of their motivation. Students' perceptions of the classroom have also been linked with achievement.

Yılmaz Bodur et al. (2023) found that Turkish sixth-grade students' perceptions of their instructional environment were related to their English achievement, partly through their engagement, and X. Li et al. (2023) found that perceived EFL teacher support predicted the achievement of Chinese Senior High School students indirectly through their academic buoyancy. Among Filipino Senior High School students, Corsino et al. (2022) found that teachers' constructivist learning environment management skills and creativity-fostering behaviors predicted English learning motivation, and Bucay and Rosil (2024) found that academic motivation and cognitive abilities predicted English proficiency.

These studies establish that strategy use and perceptions of the classroom are both related to English learning outcomes, but differences in how the variables were defined and measured leave important questions open. First, strategies have mostly been classified by psychological function, such as cognitive, metacognitive, social, and affective strategies (Habók & Magyar, 2018; Oxford, 2017; Quinatac-an, 2026; Soliman & Gorospe, 2024). Skill-based classifications (Amir, 2018; Cohen et al., 2002) correspond more directly to the listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills taught in English classes, yet studies using them have mainly described learners' strategy use (Amir, 2018; Noor et al., 2025) or focused on a single skill (Teng et al., 2022).

Second, classroom factors have usually been examined as predictors of motivation or engagement rather than proficiency (Corsino et al., 2022; Tran & Nguyen, 2022; Zhang & Hu, 2025); studies linking them with achievement examined the instructional environment or teacher support rather than the five 5Ts dimensions (X. Li et al., 2023; Yılmaz Bodur et al., 2023), and Philippine research on English proficiency has measured motivation as a learner characteristic (Bucay & Rosil, 2024; Mebrano, 2026). Third, proficiency has been measured through tests or school marks (Habók & Magyar, 2018; Soliman & Gorospe, 2024) or through self-report (Piamsai, 2023; Quinatac-an, 2026), and because the two correspond only moderately (M. Li & Zhang, 2021), findings for one cannot simply be assumed for the other.

The most important gap is that the studies reviewed here examined learner strategies and classroom factors in separate analyses, so less is known about how each strategy domain and each classroom domain relates to proficiency when the other domains are taken into account. This is particularly true for Filipino Senior High School students, whose strategy use and motivation have been examined in separate studies (Bucay & Rosil, 2024; Corsino et al., 2022; Soliman & Gorospe, 2024; Yecyec et al., 2024). The closest recent study, Mebrano (2026), examined strategies and motivation together, but among Grade 9 students, with motivation measured as students' motivation in learning English rather than as their perceptions of classroom conditions, and with each variable entered as a single composite predictor. The present study extends this line of work to Senior High School students and to nine predictor domains: four skill-based strategy domains and five classroom motivational domains.

A simultaneous examination is needed for two reasons. Students who use strategies more often may also view their English classes more favorably, so an analysis of either set alone may attribute their shared variance to that set. The factor that students rate most favorably is also not necessarily the one most strongly associated with an outcome (Tran & Nguyen, 2022). Examining the four skill-based strategy domains and the five classroom motivational domains together can therefore show which domains have unique associations with students' judgments of their English ability and where instructional attention may be most useful.

The present study addressed this gap by examining language learning strategies and perceived classroom motivational factors as predictors of perceived English proficiency among Grade 11 and Grade 12 students of Apyao National High School in Quezon, Bukidnon, during School Year 2026–2027, using a quantitative, descriptive-correlational design. In this study, LLS refer to students' reported strategies in listening, speaking, reading, and writing; perceived classroom motivational factors (PCMF) refer to students' perceptions of five classroom dimensions adapted from the 5Ts framework, namely the teacher, teaching methodology, teaching materials, learning tasks, and assessment; and perceived English proficiency (PEP) refers to students' self-assessed ability in the four skills, analyzed as a single composite. Because PEP reflects students' judgments rather than measured performance, the study examined statistical associations with these judgments, not causal effects on proficiency. The study contributes evidence on skill-based strategies and classroom-specific motivational factors examined together, with self-assessed proficiency as the outcome, among Filipino Senior High School students. Identifying the domains uniquely associated with students' judgments of their English ability can help English teachers decide which classroom practices to prioritize and which to evaluate further through performance-based measures, and it gives Apyao National High School school-specific evidence for instructional planning, although findings from one school cannot be generalized automatically to other settings. The first three objectives below describe students' strategy use, perceptions of the classroom, and perceived proficiency, and the last two examine the relationships among these variables and the unique association of each domain with PEP.

Objectives

Specifically, this study aimed to:

Determine the extent of language learning strategy use among Senior High School students in terms of:

- listening strategies,

- speaking strategies,
- reading strategies, and
- writing strategies;

Assess students' perceptions of classroom motivational factors in terms of:

- teacher,
- teaching methodology,
- teaching materials,
- learning tasks, and
- assessment;

Gauge the level of perceived English proficiency among Senior High School students in terms of:

- listening,
- speaking,
- reading,
- and writing;

Determine whether there are significant relationships between:

- language learning strategies and perceived English proficiency, and
- perceived classroom motivational factors and perceived English proficiency; and
- identify the language learning strategy domains and perceived classroom motivational factor domains that significantly predict perceived English proficiency.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested at the .05 level of significance.

H_{01}a: There is no significant relationship between language learning strategies and perceived English proficiency among Senior High School students.

H_{01}b: There is no significant relationship between perceived classroom motivational factors and perceived English proficiency among Senior High School students.

H_{02}: None of the nine domains of language learning strategies and perceived classroom motivational factors is significantly associated with perceived English proficiency after accounting for the other domains.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative, non-experimental research design utilizing a descriptive-correlational approach to examine language learning strategies and perceived classroom motivational factors as predictors of perceived English proficiency among Senior High School students. This design was appropriate as it

allowed for the systematic investigation of naturally occurring relationships and the predictive contributions of language learning strategies and perceived classroom motivational factors to students' perceived English proficiency.

The respondents were 261 Senior High School students from Apyao National High School in Quezon, Bukidnon. during School Year 2026–2027: 131 Grade 11 students (50.2%) and 130 Grade 12 students (49.8%). Data were collected from October 17 to 24, 2026. An a priori power analysis for an omnibus regression test with nine predictors, a medium effect ($f^2 = .15$), $\alpha = .05$, and power = .95 indicated a minimum sample of 166 cases (Faul et al., 2009); the analytic sample exceeded this estimate.

Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire of 107 items composed of three adapted parts. The Language Learning Strategies (LLS) section (40 items; 10 each for listening, speaking, reading, and writing) was adapted from Amir (2018), drawing on Cohen et al. (2002). The Perceived Classroom Motivational Factors (PCMF) section (27 items) was adapted from Tran and Nguyen (2022), who operationalized Renandya's (2014) 5Ts framework through five classroom-related dimensions: teacher (5 items), teaching methodology (5), teaching materials (5), learning tasks (6), and assessment (6). The Perceived English Proficiency (PEP) section (40 items; 10 each for listening, speaking, reading, and writing) employed self-assessment statements based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and adapted from Piamsai (2023). LLS items were rated from 1 (never) to 5 (always), while PCMF and PEP items were rated from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The three adapted instruments underwent expert content validation and reliability testing. Content validation was carried out by three validators (two Master Teachers and one School Principal IV) and is documented in signed evaluation forms and a validation certificate. The questionnaire was then pilot-tested with 30 students at Dagatkidavao Integrated School. Pilot Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from .922 to .946 for LLS, .904 to .955 for PCMF, and .934 to .956 for PEP. For the main study (N = 261), alpha ranged from .925 to .935 for LLS, .915 to .936 for PCMF, and .942 to .957 for PEP. Corrected item–total correlations ranged from .577 to .868, and deleting any item increased a subscale's alpha by no more than .001. Mean inter-item correlations ranged from .554 to .746. These procedures provided evidence of content relevance and internal consistency; however, the factor structures of the instruments were not independently examined, so construct validity was not established.

Permission to conduct the study and ethical clearance were both granted by the School Principal of Apyao National High School, as the school had no separate research ethics committee; the study was therefore not reviewed by an institutional ethics review board. The questionnaire's cover letter informed students that participation was voluntary, that they could skip any item or withdraw without penalty, that participation would not affect their grades, and that their responses would be kept confidential. All 261 respondents indicated their agreement to participate before answering, and written parent or guardian consent and student assent were obtained for participants younger than 18 years. The questionnaire was administered through printed copies and Google Forms. Respondents' identities are not reported, and the data were handled in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173).

Means and standard deviations described the four learning-strategy domains, five classroom-motivational domains, and four perceived-proficiency domains. Domain scores were calculated as the mean of their constituent items, and each overall construct score was calculated as the unweighted mean of its domain scores. Means were interpreted as follows: 4.51–5.00 (always or strongly agree; very high), 3.51–4.50 (often or agree; high), 2.51–3.50 (sometimes or neutral; moderate), 1.51–2.50 (rarely or disagree; low), and 1.00–1.50 (never or strongly disagree; very low), with the first rating applying to LLS and the second to PCMF and PEP; means were rounded to two decimal places before classification. Pearson product–moment correlations assessed the relationships of the overall LLS and PCMF constructs with overall PEP, and 95% confidence intervals were calculated using Fisher's z transformation.

Simultaneous multiple linear regression using the Enter method examined the adjusted associations of the four strategy domains and five classroom-motivational domains with overall PEP. Model fit was summarized using

R, R^2, adjusted R^2, and Cohen's f^2. To help interpret the strongest predictor, an exploratory item-level analysis examined the correlation of each classroom motivational item with overall PEP.

Because the nine domains were expected to be related, multicollinearity was evaluated before the coefficients were interpreted, in three ways: (a) the zero-order correlations among the nine predictors were inspected; (b) each predictor was regressed on the other eight to obtain its tolerance ($1 - R^2$); and (c) the corresponding variance inflation factor (VIF = 1/tolerance) was computed. Because rules of thumb for the VIF vary, commonly from 10 down to 4 (O'Brien, 2007), a stricter criterion of VIF below 5 (tolerance above .20) was adopted as indicating no severe multicollinearity.

The tolerance and VIF values of each of the nine predictors are reported in Table VI. Residual normality was examined using the Shapiro–Wilk and Jarque–Bera tests, and heteroscedasticity was assessed using the Breusch–Pagan and White tests. Because these tests indicated heteroscedasticity, HC3 heteroscedasticity-consistent standard errors and a robust Wald test were used for regression inference (Long & Ervin, 2000), and Holm-adjusted p values were calculated across the nine predictor tests (Holm, 1979). Statistical significance was evaluated at $\alpha = .05$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table I. Senior High School students' extent of language learning strategy use.

INDICATORS	Mean	SD	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Listening strategies	3.618	0.829	Often	High extent of use
Reading strategies	3.516	0.817	Often	High extent of use
Writing strategies	3.502	0.811	Sometimes	Moderate extent of use
Speaking strategies	3.479	0.859	Sometimes	Moderate extent of use
Overall Language Learning Strategy Use	3.528	0.750	Often	High extent of use

Note. N = 261. Descriptive ratings are based on means rounded to two decimal places. The mean for writing strategies (3.502) rounds to 3.50 and therefore falls within the 2.51–3.50 (Sometimes) range, whereas the mean for reading strategies (3.516) rounds to 3.52 and falls within the 3.51–4.50 (Often) range.

Table I indicates that the students report a high overall extent of language learning strategy use (M = 3.528, SD = 0.750), corresponding to "Often." Among the domains, listening strategies emerged as the most frequently used (M = 3.618, SD = 0.829), followed by reading strategies (M = 3.516, SD = 0.817). In contrast, speaking strategies registered the lowest mean (M = 3.479, SD = 0.859) and, together with writing strategies (M = 3.502, SD = 0.811), were rated "Sometimes" because both fell just below the lower limit of the "Often" range (3.51) after rounding, so the differences among the four domains were small.

These results suggest that students regularly use strategies across the four skills but rely somewhat more on listening and reading strategies than on speaking and writing strategies. This is partly consistent with Amir (2018), whose skill-based instrument was adapted for this study and who found that Indonesian junior high school learners used reading strategies most and speaking strategies least, although those learners, who were beginners in English, were only moderate strategy users overall. Noor et al. (2025) similarly described

Indonesian Grade 12 learners practicing listening through songs, films, and digital tools, which may help explain why listening strategies were used most.

However, the relatively lower use of speaking and writing strategies indicates that English teachers may provide more structured opportunities to plan, practice, and monitor oral and written output, keeping in mind that the results describe reported strategy use rather than demonstrated performance.

In the Philippine context, similar patterns have been observed. A high extent of strategy use has been reported among Senior High School students (Soliman & Gorospe, 2024), including high use of listening strategies among Grade 11 learners (Yecyec et al., 2024), while Quinatac-an (2026) found extensive strategy use among Grade 10 learners (M = 3.45), with metacognitive strategies highest.

These findings indicate that the students' strategy use is high but stronger in the receptive than in the productive skills. Consistent with Oxford's (2017) view of strategies as context-sensitive self-regulation, these studies suggest that strategy preferences vary with learners' proficiency, the classification framework, and the learning context.

Table II. Senior High School students' perceptions of classroom motivational factors.

INDICATORS	Mean	SD	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Teacher	4.021	0.920	Agree	High level of perceived motivation
Learning tasks	3.971	0.794	Agree	High level of perceived motivation
Teaching methodology	3.956	0.829	Agree	High level of perceived motivation
Assessment	3.895	0.822	Agree	High level of perceived motivation
Teaching materials	3.867	0.858	Agree	High level of perceived motivation
Overall Perceived Classroom Motivational Factors	3.942	0.770	Agree	High level of perceived motivation

Table II shows that the students rated the classroom motivational factors favorably (M = 3.942, SD = 0.770), corresponding to "Agree." The teacher dimension obtained the highest mean (M = 4.021, SD = 0.920), indicating that students most strongly endorsed teacher-related classroom conditions as sources of motivation in learning English, followed by learning tasks (M = 3.971, SD = 0.794) and teaching methodology (M = 3.956, SD = 0.829). In contrast, teaching materials registered the lowest mean (M = 3.867, SD = 0.858), slightly below assessment (M = 3.895, SD = 0.822), although all five dimensions remained within the same descriptive category.

This finding reflects students' perceived motivational preferences rather than a direct evaluation of their teachers' actual instructional practices. It aligns with Tran and Nguyen (2022), whose 5Ts questionnaire was adapted for this study and who likewise found the teacher to be the highest-rated motivational factor among Vietnamese EFL learners, although teaching materials emerged as the most influential variable in their regression model, which suggests that the most favorably rated factor is not necessarily the strongest correlate. Zhang and Hu (2025) also found that perceived teacher support was linked to the engagement of Chinese EFL undergraduates.

However, the comparatively lower rating for teaching materials indicates that students found the materials used in their English classes somewhat less motivating than the other classroom conditions, so the accessibility, variety, and contextual relevance of these resources may deserve closer attention. Nguyen (2024)

similarly found that Vietnamese English majors ranked the teacher first and the text last, paralleling the low rating of teaching materials in the present study.

In the Philippine context, Corsino et al. (2022) found that teachers' constructivist learning environment management skills and creativity-fostering behaviors significantly predicted the English learning motivation of Senior High School students in Davao del Sur.

These findings imply that, from the students' perspective, teacher-related conditions are the most motivating aspect of their English classes. These are instructional considerations drawn from students' perceptions rather than evidence that particular practices improve proficiency.

Table III. Senior High School students' level of perceived English proficiency.

INDICATORS	Mean	SD	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Listening	3.636	0.805	Agree	High level of perceived English proficiency
Reading	3.618	0.754	Agree	High level of perceived English proficiency
Writing	3.577	0.784	Agree	High level of perceived English proficiency
Speaking	3.566	0.753	Agree	High level of perceived English proficiency
Overall Perceived English Proficiency	3.599	0.713	Agree	High level of perceived English proficiency

Table III indicates that the students report a high overall level of perceived English proficiency (M = 3.599, SD = 0.713), corresponding to "Agree." Among the skills, listening emerged as the highest rated (M = 3.636, SD = 0.805), followed by reading (M = 3.618, SD = 0.754) and writing (M = 3.577, SD = 0.784). In contrast, speaking registered the lowest mean (M = 3.566, SD = 0.753), although all four skills fell within the same descriptive category and the differences among them were small.

This pattern suggests that students rate themselves as more capable of understanding spoken and written English than of expressing their ideas orally, which parallels their lower use of speaking strategies in Table I. A similar receptive-over-productive pattern was reported by Piamsai (2023), whose Thai university learners rated their receptive skills more favorably than their productive skills on a CEFR-based self-assessment that correlated moderately with their proficiency test scores. M. Li and Zhang (2021), in a meta-analysis of 67 studies, likewise found a moderate relationship between language self-assessment and measured performance (r = .466), supporting the interpretation of the present ratings as students' judgments of their abilities.

However, because the measure was a self-assessment, the lower rating for speaking indicates lower self-assessed ability rather than a demonstrated deficiency, and such self-assessments are best used together with performance-based assessment.

In the Philippine context, Quinatac-an (2026) found that Filipino Grade 10 learners rated their English proficiency as extensive (M = 3.43), with the quality of spoken performance rated lowest (M = 3.26), which

is consistent with speaking being the lowest-rated skill in the present study, although writing was rated highest in that study.

These findings imply that teachers may provide more opportunities for structured discussions, oral presentations, and guided writing with feedback.

Table IV. Correlation of language learning strategies and perceived classroom motivational factors with perceived English proficiency.

Independent variable	r	r^2	95% CI for r	p
Language learning strategies	.756	.571	[.699, .804]	< .001
Perceived classroom motivational factors	.731	.534	[.669, .783]	< .001

Note. N = 261. Coefficients of determination (r^2) were computed from the unrounded correlation coefficients (r = .75598 and r = .73100) and rounded to three decimal places; squaring the rounded value .756 would give .572.

Table IV presents the relationships of language learning strategies and perceived classroom motivational factors with perceived English proficiency. The results reveal strong, positive, and significant correlations for language learning strategies (r = .756, p < .001, 95% CI [.699, .804]) and perceived classroom motivational factors (r = .731, p < .001, 95% CI [.669, .783]), with coefficients of determination of .571 and .534, respectively. Students who reported more frequent strategy use and who rated their classroom conditions as more motivating thus also tended to rate their English ability more highly. Null hypotheses $H_{01}a$ and $H_{01}b$ were therefore rejected.

Although language learning strategies showed the numerically higher correlation, the difference between the two correlations was not formally tested and should not be read as evidence that one relationship is stronger than the other.

These findings are consistent with Oxford's (2017) view that strategies support learners' self-regulation of language learning and with Habók and Magyar (2018), who found that strategy use, particularly of metacognitive strategies, was related to the foreign language marks of 868 Hungarian lower secondary students. For the classroom factors, Yılmaz Bodur et al. (2023) found that Turkish sixth-grade students' perceptions of their instructional environment were related to their English achievement, partly through their engagement.

In the Philippine context, positive relationships between strategy use and English proficiency have been reported among Senior High School students (Soliman & Gorospe, 2024; Yecyec et al., 2024), Quinatac-an (2026) found a significant correlation between strategy use and self-reported English proficiency among Grade 10 learners (r = .523, p < .001), Mebrano (2026) found strong correlations of language learning strategies (r = .732) and motivation in learning English (r = .778) with the perceived English proficiency of Grade 9 students, and Bucay and Rosil (2024) linked academic motivation with the English proficiency of Filipino Senior High School students. Differences in participants, instruments, and proficiency measures, however, limit direct comparisons of correlation strength.

The strong correlations observed in this study suggest that combining explicit strategy instruction with motivating classroom conditions is worth examining in intervention studies. Because all variables were self-reported at a single point in time, however, shared response tendencies may have contributed to the associations, which do not establish cause and effect.

Table V. Intercorrelations of the nine predictor domains and perceived English proficiency.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Listening strategies	—								
2. Speaking strategies	.786	—							
3. Reading strategies	.785	.766	—						
4. Writing strategies	.692	.710	.812	—					
5. Teacher	.640	.595	.685	.704	—				
6. Teaching methodology	.631	.597	.665	.626	.786	—			
7. Teaching materials	.588	.551	.651	.645	.781	.756	—		
8. Learning tasks	.577	.560	.636	.624	.756	.803	.821	—	
9. Assessment	.676	.626	.714	.671	.774	.806	.795	.819	—
10. PEP	.651	.660	.721	.706	.626	.678	.638	.653	.742

Table V presents the intercorrelations among the nine predictor domains and PEP, which were examined before the regression analysis. All correlations were positive and significant ($p < .001$). The domains correlated with PEP from $r = .626$ (teacher) to $r = .742$ (assessment) and with one another from $r = .551$ to $r = .821$, indicating considerable shared variance that was considered in interpreting their unique contributions in the regression model.

Table VI. HC3-robust regression analysis of perceived English proficiency.

Predictor	B	HC3 SE	β	t	p	95% CI for B	Holm p	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	.646	.144	—	4.468	< .001	[.361, .930]	—	—	—
Language learning strategies									
Listening strategies	.009	.065	.010	.134	.893	[−.119, .136]	1.000	.284	3.523
Speaking strategies	.103	.066	.124	1.547	.123	[−.028, .234]	.861	.311	3.219
Reading strategies	.132	.095	.151	1.383	.168	[−.056, .319]	.861	.220	4.547
Writing strategies	.206	.085	.235	2.433	.016	[.039, .373]	.126	.285	3.514
Perceived classroom motivational factors									
Teacher	−.107	.071	−.138	−1.501	.135	[−.247, .033]	.861	.259	3.866
Teaching methodology	.127	.101	.148	1.261	.208	[−.071, .325]	.861	.249	4.018
Teaching materials	.011	.077	.014	.147	.883	[−.140, .163]	1.000	.248	4.037
Learning tasks	.022	.091	.024	.237	.813	[−.158, .202]	1.000	.223	4.490
Assessment	.302	.103	.349	2.930	.004	[.099, .506]	.033	.214	4.672

Table VI presents the results of the HC3-robust multiple regression analysis identifying the predictors of perceived English proficiency. The nine domains jointly explained 66.0% of the variance in perceived English proficiency ($R = .812$, $R^2 = .660$, adjusted $R^2 = .648$, standard error of the estimate = .423), a large effect (Cohen's $f^2 = 1.94$). Because the residuals were heteroscedastic, inference used HC3 robust standard errors, and the robust omnibus test was significant, $F(9, 251) = 57.114$, $p < .001$.

Assessment was the strongest and the only predictor that remained significant after Holm adjustment ($B = .302$, $\beta = .349$, HC3 SE = .103, $t = 2.930$, $p = .004$, 95% CI [.099, .506], Holm-adjusted $p = .033$). Writing strategies showed a positive nominal association ($B = .206$, $\beta = .235$, $p = .016$, 95% CI [.039, .373]) that did not remain significant after adjustment (Holm-adjusted $p = .126$), and teaching methodology, significant only in the conventional ordinary least squares (OLS) analysis ($p = .046$), was not significant under HC3 inference ($B = .127$, $\beta = .148$, $p = .208$). The remaining six domains were not significant ($p = .123$ to .893). The null hypothesis H_{02} was therefore rejected. Using the unstandardized coefficients, the regression equation for predicting perceived English proficiency is:

$$\hat{Y} = .646 + .009X_1 + .103X_2 + .132X_3 + .206X_4 - .107X_5 + .127X_6 + .011X_7 + .022X_8 + .302X_9$$

Where:

$\hat{Y}$ = predicted perceived English proficiency
X_1 = Listening strategies
X_2 = Speaking strategies
X_3 = Reading strategies
X_4 = Writing strategies
X_5 = Teacher
X_6 = Teaching methodology
X_7 = Teaching materials
X_8 = Learning tasks
X_9 = Assessment

Table VII. Exploratory item-level analysis: means, standard deviations, and correlations of the assessment items with perceived English proficiency.

Assessment item	Mean	SD	r with PEP
I enjoy learning English when my teacher is open to assessment activities other than traditional tests.	3.950	0.929	.662
I feel motivated when my English performance is assessed throughout the grading period, not only in one examination.	3.755	0.941	.656
I feel motivated when my English teacher uses different ways to assess what we have learned.	3.900	0.964	.653
I enjoy learning English when my teacher uses clear and fair scoring rubrics.	3.962	0.972	.629
I enjoy learning English when projects or other activities are used to assess us, not only written tests.	3.801	0.964	.626
I feel motivated when my English teacher regularly gives feedback that helps me improve.	4.004	0.947	.617

Table VII presents the results of an exploratory item-level analysis of assessment, which emerged as the strongest predictor and the clearest unique correlate of perceived English proficiency, contributing approximately 2.6% unique variance (squared semipartial correlation, $sr^2 = .026$), although it was one of the lower-rated classroom dimensions (M = 3.895). Of the 27 classroom motivational items, the five most strongly correlated with PEP were all assessment items (r = .626 to .662), and the sixth assessment item, on regular feedback, also correlated substantially (r = .617) despite having the highest mean among the assessment items (M = 4.004), whereas the items of the other four dimensions ranged from r = .487 to r = .618. The strongest items concerned the teacher's openness to assessment activities other than traditional tests (r = .662), assessment throughout the grading period rather than in a single examination (r = .656), and the use of different ways to assess learning (r = .653). Students who reported being motivated by continuous and varied assessment also tended to rate their English ability more highly. Because this analysis is exploratory and correlational, it shows which assessment conditions students most strongly associated with motivation, not the instructional mechanisms through which assessment operates.

Three considerations may explain why assessment stood out. First, assessment may be the classroom factor that most directly informs students about their own performance, as continuous and varied assessment can give students repeated evidence of what they can do; feedback has a medium effect on learning that grows with the information it conveys (Wisniewski et al., 2020); rubrics appear to offer more benefits than drawbacks when used formatively (Panadero & Jonsson, 2020); and self-assessment is most useful when it is formative and guided by criteria (Andrade, 2019). Such experiences may give students a clearer basis for judging their own skills. Second, the other classroom dimensions describe conditions that make English classes engaging. In earlier studies, such conditions were linked mainly with motivation and engagement (Tran & Nguyen, 2022; Zhang & Hu, 2025), and their association with achievement was partly or wholly indirect (X. Li et al., 2023; Yılmaz Bodur et al., 2023), so their relationship with students' judgments of their English ability may also be indirect or shared with other factors. Third, assessment had the highest zero-order correlation with PEP among the nine domains (r = .742; Table V), consistent with its adjusted association; as Tran and Nguyen (2022) observed, the most favorably rated factor is not necessarily the strongest correlate.

In the Philippine context, Saefurrohman and Balinas (2016) found that Filipino English teachers, like their Indonesian counterparts, used assessment mainly for learning and relied on written comments as feedback, and the revised classroom assessment guidelines of the Department of Education (DepEd) now embed formative assessment and timely, specific, and actionable feedback in daily instruction (Department of Education, 2026). Because some assessment items overlap with learning-task and teaching-methodology items and the coefficients were not formally compared, the result identifies the clearest adjusted correlate rather than a causal priority.

Writing strategies showed the second largest coefficient but only a suggestive association ($sr^2 = .016$), because the association did not survive Holm adjustment. The direction of this association is consistent with Teng et al. (2022), who found that self-regulatory writing strategies such as planning, monitoring, and evaluation predicted the writing performance of Chinese junior secondary school students, and with meta-analytic evidence that feedback on writing benefits first-, second-, and foreign-language learners (Scherer et al., 2024).

Teaching methodology was rated favorably (M = 3.956) but did not make a robust unique contribution, and the teacher domain had a negative adjusted coefficient ($\beta = -.138$) despite its positive zero-order correlation with PEP (r = .626, $p < .001$; Table V). This reflects the conditional nature of simultaneous regression with correlated predictors, such as suppression or shared variance, rather than a negative effect of teacher-related classroom conditions. A comparable pattern was reported by X. Li et al. (2023), who found that perceived EFL teacher support did not directly predict the achievement of Chinese Senior High School students but affected it indirectly through their academic buoyancy, which suggests that the teacher's influence may operate through other classroom and learner factors.

Regression diagnostics. Table VI also indicates that tolerance values ranged from .214 (assessment) to .311 (speaking strategies), and VIF values ranged from 3.219 (speaking strategies) to 4.672 (assessment). All nine

predictors therefore met the adopted criterion (VIF < 5; tolerance > .20), indicating no severe multicollinearity, although the predictors shared appreciable variance (r = .551 to .821; Table V).

The nine squared semipartial correlations summed to approximately .062, so most of the explained variance was shared among the correlated predictors. Residual normality was not rejected (Shapiro–Wilk W = .996, p = .741; Jarque–Bera χ^2 = 1.896, p = .388), whereas the Breusch–Pagan (LM = 45.777, p < .001) and White (LM = 131.939, p < .001) tests indicated heteroscedasticity, which justified HC3 robust inference. One case had an externally studentized residual above ±3 (3.75; maximum Cook's distance = .154); it contained valid, non-straight-lined responses and was retained, and a sensitivity analysis excluding it yielded the same conclusions (assessment: B = .318, HC3 p = .003, Holm-adjusted p = .023; writing strategies: p = .018, Holm-adjusted p = .148).

These regression results suggest that, in this school, students' perceptions of assessment practices as motivating are the most distinctive correlate of how they judge their English ability, while writing strategies are a promising focus for further evaluation. Strengthening feedback practices and the guided planning and revision of written work may therefore be worth implementing and evaluating. Because the design was cross-sectional and all variables were self-reported, the model does not establish causal effects on measured English proficiency.

SUMMARY

This study primarily aimed to examine language learning strategies (LLS) and perceived classroom motivational factors (PCMF) as predictors of the perceived English proficiency (PEP) of Senior High School students at Apyao National High School in Quezon, Bukidnon. Specifically, it sought to determine the extent of language learning strategy use, the students' perceptions of classroom motivational factors, and their level of perceived English proficiency; examine the relationships of these strategies and classroom factors with perceived English proficiency; and identify which strategy and classroom domains significantly predict perceived English proficiency.

The study employed a quantitative, non-experimental descriptive-correlational research design. A total of 261 Senior High School students, composed of 131 Grade 11 and 130 Grade 12 students, served as respondents during School Year 2026–2027. Data were gathered using three adapted instruments subjected to expert content validation and reliability testing, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from .915 to .957. Statistical tools used included means, standard deviations, Pearson correlations, and simultaneous multiple regression with HC3 robust standard errors and Holm-adjusted p values.

Findings revealed that the students reported a high overall extent of language learning strategy use (M = 3.528), using listening and reading strategies often and writing and speaking strategies sometimes. Classroom motivational factors were also favorably perceived (M = 3.942), with the teacher rated highest (M = 4.021) and teaching materials lowest (M = 3.867). Perceived English proficiency was likewise high (M = 3.599), with listening as the highest-rated skill (M = 3.636) and speaking as the lowest (M = 3.566).

Correlation analysis showed strong and positive relationships of language learning strategies (r = .756) and perceived classroom motivational factors (r = .731) with perceived English proficiency (p < .001). Multicollinearity among the nine domains was not severe (VIF = 3.219–4.672). Regression analysis further identified assessment as the only significant unique predictor after Holm adjustment (β = .349, Holm-adjusted p = .033), with the nine domains collectively explaining 66.0% of the variance in perceived English proficiency (adjusted R^2 = .648), most of it shared among the domains. The five classroom items most strongly correlated with perceived English proficiency were all assessment items (r = .626 to .662), whereas writing strategies showed a positive association (β = .235, p = .016) that did not remain significant after adjustment.

The study established that perceived English proficiency is strongly associated with both language learning strategies and perceived classroom motivational factors, with assessment emerging as the only significant unique predictor. These findings are associative and concern self-assessed rather than measured proficiency.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Several limitations should be considered. First, the outcome was students' perceived English proficiency rather than proficiency measured through a standardized test, a diagnostic assessment, or academic grades. Self-reported proficiency is susceptible to social desirability bias and to over- or underestimation of one's abilities, and self-assessments correspond only moderately with measured language performance (M. Li & Zhang, 2021). Because students' English grades and test scores were not collected in this study, the self-assessments could not be triangulated with objective measures; the PEP results should therefore be read as students' judgments of their abilities rather than as evidence of their actual proficiency.

Future studies can address this limitation by linking coded responses, with parental consent and student assent, to students' final English grades and to a CEFR-aligned proficiency test. Strategy use, classroom perceptions, and perceived proficiency were also all measured through self-report in a single administration, so shared method variance and response tendencies may have inflated the observed associations, and no causal or temporal ordering can be inferred.

Second, the study used a cross-sectional, non-experimental design in one public secondary school in Quezon, Bukidnon, so the findings may not generalize to other schools or to regional and national contexts. Class-section and teacher identifiers were not recorded, so possible within-class dependence could not be evaluated. Because no information was available on enrolled students who did not take part in the study, nonresponse bias could not be assessed.

Third, the nine predictors were intercorrelated (VIF up to 4.672), and some questionnaire items may overlap conceptually across subscales, particularly learning-task and assessment items. The classroom motivational questionnaire also asked about conditions that students find motivating, not about direct observations of individual teachers. Fourth, although internal consistency was high, the factor structure of the adapted instruments was not examined, and the very high alpha coefficients of some domains may partly reflect item redundancy. These characteristics limit the interpretation of the adjusted predictor coefficients. Finally, PEP was analyzed as a single composite of the four skills, so the study did not test whether each strategy domain is most strongly related to the matching skill, such as speaking strategies to perceived speaking proficiency.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the study concludes that the participating Senior High School students report a high extent of language learning strategy use and favorable perceptions of classroom motivational factors, both of which are strongly related to their high level of self-assessed English proficiency.

Reported language learning strategy use is high among the students, particularly in listening and reading strategies, indicating that their strategy use is stronger in the receptive than in the productive skills. However, writing and speaking strategies are used only sometimes.

Classroom motivational factors are favorably perceived across all five dimensions, with teacher-related conditions rated as the most motivating. All five dimensions fall within the same descriptive category, although teaching materials are rated lowest.

Self-assessed English proficiency is high in all four skills, particularly in listening. Speaking is rated relatively lower, although the differences among the skills are small. These ratings represent the students' self-assessments rather than their measured performance.

The relationships of language learning strategies and perceived classroom motivational factors with perceived English proficiency are strong, positive, and significant, indicating that students who report more frequent strategy use and more favorable perceptions of their English classes also rate their English proficiency more highly. $H_{01}a$ and $H_{01}b$ were therefore rejected. The nine domains also account for a large proportion of the variance in perceived English proficiency. Nevertheless, most of this variance is shared among the domains.

The study confirms that assessment is the only statistically significant unique predictor of perceived English proficiency after controlling for the other domains and applying Holm adjustment, so H_{02} was also rejected. Writing strategies demonstrated a positive association under HC3 robust inference but did not remain significant after adjustment, and the other seven domains, including the teacher domain that students rated most favorably, made no significant unique contribution. These findings reflect statistical associations with students' self-assessed English proficiency rather than causal effects on objectively measured language performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions drawn from this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

Use Formative Assessment Routines in Every English Lesson. English teachers may implement and evaluate formative assessment routines in every lesson, since assessment was the only domain uniquely associated with perceived English proficiency and its most strongly related items concerned assessment beyond traditional tests, assessment throughout the grading period, and varied ways of assessing learning. Teachers may state the learning target and share success criteria through a simple rubric and a sample output; use quick checks, such as exit slips, 3-2-1 reflections, short oral questions, or mini-quizzes; and give specific, timely feedback on what students did well, what to improve, and what to do next (Wisniewski et al., 2020), with time to revise. Students may also rate themselves using CEFR-based "can-do" checklists and assess a classmate's work using the same rubric, while assessment is spread across the grading period through written or oral works and performance tasks, such as oral presentations, role plays, and writing portfolios, following DepEd's revised classroom assessment guidelines (Department of Education, 2026). The effects of these routines on students' measured English performance should be evaluated.

Teach Writing Strategies Explicitly through a Process Approach. English teachers may model planning with an outline or graphic organizer, drafting, reviewing, and revising through think-alouds, then move students from guided to independent practice using revision checklists, peer review with a shared rubric, short teacher–student writing conferences, and reference tools. These practices may be organized as a weekly cycle in which students draft, receive rubric-based teacher and peer feedback, which benefits learners' writing (Scherer et al., 2024), and revise, with portfolios of successive drafts used to evaluate progress in their actual writing. Since writing strategies were used only sometimes and their positive association with perceived proficiency did not remain significant after adjustment, this practice is worth trying but needs to be evaluated.

Provide Structured Speaking Practice. English teachers may include short, structured speaking tasks in each week's lessons, such as guided conversations with sentence frames, think-pair-share discussions, role plays, and brief presentations, assessed with a simple speaking rubric and followed by feedback, since speaking strategies were the least used strategy domain and speaking was the lowest-rated skill. The value of this practice may be judged through students' performance on speaking tasks rather than through their self-ratings alone, as speaking strategies did not contribute uniquely in the regression model.

Review and Enrich Teaching Materials. School administrators and English teachers may review the available materials each grading period for accessibility, variety, and contextual relevance, add contextualized texts and digital resources suited to students' proficiency levels and interests, and ask students which materials help them learn, as teaching materials were the least favorably perceived classroom factor. This recommendation responds to students' perceptions, since teaching materials did not predict perceived proficiency uniquely.

Support Assessment and Writing Practices through Learning Action Cell Sessions. School administrators may support the implementation and evaluation of the proposed assessment and writing practices by scheduling regular Learning Action Cell sessions (Department of Education, 2016) in which English teachers develop shared rubrics, feedback routines, and performance tasks and review samples of student work, and may include varied and continuous assessment in classroom observation and instructional supervision. With parental consent, student assent, and compliance with data privacy requirements, administrators may also allow coded access to students' English grades for school-based research.

Triangulate Self-Assessments with Objective Measures. Future researchers may address the limitations of this study by assigning each respondent a code that is linked, with parental consent and student assent, to the student's final English grade and to a CEFR-aligned proficiency test, so that self-assessed and measured proficiency can be compared skill by skill, since proficiency in this study was self-reported and could not be triangulated.

Broaden the Research Design. Future studies may include several schools, record class sections and teachers for multilevel analysis, compare respondents with nonrespondents, and use longitudinal or quasi-experimental designs to test whether formative assessment routines and process-based writing instruction improve students' measured English performance, as the data came from one school at one point in time.

Strengthen the Measures and Models. Future researchers may test the adapted instruments through confirmatory factor analysis, revise items that overlap across the learning-task and assessment subscales, and test skill-matched models, such as speaking strategies predicting perceived speaking proficiency, since the factor structure of the instruments was not examined and PEP was analyzed as a composite.

REFERENCES

1. Amir, M. (2018). Language learning strategies used by junior high school EFL learners. LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching, 21(1), 94–103. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2018.210110
2. Andrade, H. L. (2019). A critical review of research on student self-assessment. Frontiers in Education, 4, Article 87. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00087
3. Bucay, P. B., & Rosil, C. B. (2024). Academic motivation and cognitive abilities as predictors of English language proficiency among senior high school students. Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 50(6), 336–347. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i61418
4. Cohen, A. D., Oxford, R. L., & Chi, J. C. (2002). Language strategy use survey [Survey instrument]. Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
5. Corsino, S. T., Lim, R. A., & Reyes, K. M. (2022). The correlates of language learning motivation of senior high school students. Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices, 4(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2022.4.1.1
6. Department of Education. (2016). The learning action cell as a K to 12 Basic Education Program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning (DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016). https://deped.gov.ph/?p=4892
7. Department of Education. (2026). Revised guidelines on classroom assessment, grading system, and awards and recognition for the K to 12 Basic Education Program (DepEd Order No. 015, s. 2026). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2026/06/04/june-4-2026-do-015-s-2026-revised-guidelines-on-classroom-assessment-grading-system-and-awards-and-recognition-for-the-k-to-12-basic-education-program/
8. Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. Behavior Research Methods, 41(4), 1149–1160. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149
9. Habók, A., & Magyar, A. (2018). The effect of language learning strategies on proficiency, attitudes and school achievement. Frontiers in Psychology, 8, Article 2358. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02358
10. Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, 6(2), 65–70.
11. Li, M., & Zhang, X. (2021). A meta-analysis of self-assessment and language performance in language testing and assessment. Language Testing, 38(2), 189–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532220932481
12. Li, X., Duan, S., & Liu, H. (2023). Unveiling the predictive effect of students' perceived EFL teacher support on academic achievement: The mediating role of academic buoyancy. Sustainability, 15(13), Article 10205. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151310205

13. Long, J. S., & Ervin, L. H. (2000). Using heteroscedasticity consistent standard errors in the linear regression model. The American Statistician, 54(3), 217–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2000.10474549
14. Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. Language Teaching, 51(1), 36–76. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350
15. Mebrano, A. (2026). Language learning strategy and motivation of learning English as predictors of student English proficiency of the Grade 9 students. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 10(26), 6201–6214. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0454
16. Nguyen, T. D. H. (2024). Vietnamese English majors' perspectives on teachers' motivational teaching at tertiary education. PASAA, 69, 277–303. https://doi.org/10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.69.9
17. Noor, N. N., Noni, N., & Weda, S. (2025). Exploring students' strategies in learning English at senior secondary school. International Journal of Language, Education, and Literature, 2(2), 205–210. https://journal.unm.ac.id/index.php/IJLEL/article/view/7675
18. O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. Quality & Quantity, 41(5), 673–690. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-006-9018-6
19. OECD. (2026). PISA 2025 results (Volume I): Philippines [Country note]. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2025-results-volume-i-country-notes_2d4ff9ea-en/philippines_3699b9d5-en.html
20. Oxford, R. L. (2017). Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context (2nd ed.). Routledge.
21. Panadero, E., & Jonsson, A. (2020). A critical review of the arguments against the use of rubrics. Educational Research Review, 30, Article 100329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100329
22. Piamsai, C. (2023). Development and use of CEFR based self-assessment in a Thai tertiary context. PASAA, 66, 81–126. https://doi.org/10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.66.1.3
23. Quinatac-an, Y. B. (2026). Language learning strategies and English proficiency of junior high school students. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 10(8), 11194–11205. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800759
24. Renandya, W. A. (2014). Motivation in the language classroom. TESOL Press.
25. Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533/
26. Saefurrohman, S., & Balinas, E. S. (2016). English teachers classroom assessment practices. International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 5(1), 82–92. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v5i1.4526
27. Scherer, S., Graham, S., & Busse, V. (2024). How effective is feedback for L1, L2, and FL learners' writing? A meta-analysis. Learning and Instruction, 93, Article 101961. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101961
28. Second Congressional Commission on Education. (2026). Turning point: A decade of necessary reform (2026–2035) [Final report]. https://edcom2.gov.ph/#report
29. Soliman, C. Q., & Gorospe, J. D. (2024). Learner autonomy, language learning strategies and English language proficiency of Filipino senior high school students. International Journal of Language and Literary Studies, 6(2), 330–359. https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v6i2.1645
30. Teng, M. F., Wang, C., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Assessing self-regulatory writing strategies and their predictive effects on young EFL learners' writing performance. Assessing Writing, 51, Article 100573. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100573
31. Tran, B. T., & Nguyen, T. M. N. (2022). EFL student learning motivation: A study of classroom-specific factors. International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies, 11(2), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.55493/5019.v11i2.4509
32. Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. Frontiers in Psychology, 10, Article 3087. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087
33. Yecyec, R. S., Bayani, E. J. F., Batoon, J. A. B., Cortado, J. D., Jr., Daraydo, C. B., Ingan, E. L., Lucas, N. G., Mondero, A. V., Pedrero, R., Sefuentes, S. C. J. D., Simbajon, K. A., Clamares, K. J. M., &

Pelandas, A. M. O. (2024). The influence of language strategy use to the English language proficiency of Grade 11 students: A correlational study. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8(4), 2749–2756. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.804260

34. Yılmaz Bodur, Z., Kılıç, A. F., & Aktan, S. (2023). Perceived instructional environment and English achievement: The mediating role of student engagement. The Journal of Educational Research, 116(2), 100–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2023.2203093

35. Zhang, W., & Hu, J. (2025). Effects of perceived English teacher support on student engagement among Chinese EFL undergraduates: L2 motivational self system as the mediator. Frontiers in Psychology, 16, Article 1607414. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1607414