

## Views on Language Acquisition, General Achievement in Language Acquisition, and Socioeconomic Status: A Correlational Study

Anita Candra Dewi<sup>1</sup>, Andi Asrifan<sup>2</sup>, Enkeleda Lulaj<sup>3</sup>, Sheik Mohamed<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Management in Tourism, Hospitality and Environment, University "Haxhi Zeka" Peja-State of Kosovo

<sup>4</sup> Department of Electronic media, St. Thomas College of Arts and Science, India

Corresponding Email: [anitacandradewi@unm.ac.id](mailto:anitacandradewi@unm.ac.id)

**Abstract.** This research aims to better understand the interplay between Indonesian students' socioeconomic background, their views on the efficacy of language instruction, and the overall results of their language classes. This study aimed to achieve that goal by including 350 undergraduate students from Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang who were taking English-language courses. Based on their socioeconomic status, they were categorized. In response to a questionnaire, they shared their views on the best ways to acquire a second language in various linguistic settings. To ensure that all participants were on the same page in terms of their overall level of proficiency or the results of their language study, they were also given a practice test of the TOEFL exam. Descriptive statistics, factor analysis, and other parametric statistical tests were applied to the quantitative data. The results showed that the students' socioeconomic position had a positive correlation with the overall language learning outcome. In addition, the results showed that the participants' ideas about language learning had a significant impact on their language learning outcomes. The results suggest that both the rate of language acquisition and the likelihood of measurement errors can be improved provided language instructors have the information they need to help their students overcome negative beliefs.

**Keywords:** language acquisition, general achievement, and socioeconomic status

### Introduction

Teachers and scholars have long studied socioeconomic status and academic performance. Motivation, beliefs, and parental participation affect pupils' academic success across circumstances. This paper investigates how socioeconomic position affects language learning outcomes, notably among Indonesian undergraduates. The study examines students' language learning beliefs and acquisition to understand the complex dynamics that support language education achievement. (Horwitz, 1988; Jernigan, 2001; Kern, 1995; Miele, 1982; Rifkin, 2000; Strevens, 1978) Several studies have shown that students' attitudes toward learning a foreign language impact whether or not they can become proficient in that language. According to the main results of the studies described earlier, people's success in learning a foreign language is positively or negatively affected by their attitudes and views about the process. For instance, according to Mantle-Bromley (1995), a trusting relationship between instructors and students, among other factors, creates an ideal learning environment that aids in acquiring foreign languages. How students choose to study a foreign language is influenced by their views about the process, according to Horwitz (1987). Students' socioeconomic situation has a marginally significant impact on their learning outcomes, as Mirza (2001) discovered in a study on the relationship between the two. The most ubiquitous aspect of educational sociology, according to Sirin (2005), is the examination of students' socioeconomic features in order to understand their learning outcomes. Mattheoudakis and Alexiou (2009) realized that students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds have certain advantages over pupils from more privileged backgrounds. While students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds often struggle due to a lack of resources, those from higher socioeconomic

Article info:

<https://doi.org/10.52760/ijerd.v4i1.55>

Received 24<sup>th</sup> December 2023; Received in revised form 20<sup>th</sup> January 2024; Accepted 20<sup>th</sup> February 2024

Published by Corolla Education Centre Foundation on behalf of International Journal of Education Research and Development. This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license

backgrounds typically have more access to the open possibilities that help them learn faster (Akhtar & Niazi, 2011). Research by Knapp and Shields (1990) and Reed and Sautter (1990) found that pupils from higher socioeconomic status groups outperformed those from lower socioeconomic status groups regarding academic performance. Combining students' income, occupation, and degree of education is the most common way to determine their socioeconomic position (Jeynes, 2002). Hamid (2011) examined how socioeconomic status affected academic achievement. Student English language learning performance was consistently correlated with socioeconomic level. Students from wealthier backgrounds scored higher on English tests. Babikkoi and Binti Abdul Razak (2014) say learners' socioeconomic status affects English language acquisition. Their motivation to learn may help. Low-income students lack the incentive to learn. Thus, this is different. Researching students' ideas in connection to their diverse characteristics, such as socioeconomic status, and how these factors impact their learning results is, thus, essential for educational progress. Because each student brings a unique set of experiences, perspectives, and strengths to the classroom, educators must consider their students' socioeconomic background and beliefs about language acquisition to foster academic growth. Students are more likely to work together toward a common objective if their values are acknowledged. Educators can develop more equitable and impactful teaching methods by gaining insight into students' viewpoints on language acquisition. Educators can enhance their teaching and classroom environments by better understanding students' cultural identities and worldviews.

The training of students is influenced by society, education, and the economy, according to Ogunshola and Adewale (2012), because these three factors are interrelated. Results in school are related to one's socioeconomic status and degree of education. During the 1970s and 1980s, researchers relied heavily on student opinions to establish and clarify important ideas. Future research was able to build upon this foundation. Gardner's (1985) study of the belief-dependent socio-economic model of language acquisition and learners' attitudes and Bartley's (1970) work on belief and attrition emphasized the need to use the target construct, build a survey from its essential parts, and validate it. The Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory (BALLI), the Foreign Language Attitude Scale (FLAS) (Bartley, 1970), and the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) (Gardner, 1985) were utilized in this research. Using these metrics, Spolsky and Skehan (1989) found recurring themes in the texts of their diverse student bodies. Some evidence shows a weak but significant correlation between one's socioeconomic status and academic performance. According to studies, academic performance is worse among children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Barry, 2005; Ewijk & Slegers, 2010; Sirin, 2005). According to Jeynes (2002), most students' socioeconomic position is dictated by their income, occupation, and level of education. According to several studies (Baharudin & Luster, 1998; Eamon, 2000; Jeynes, 2002; Majoribanks, 1996; Mecneal, 2001; Seyfried, 1998), students' socioeconomic background impacts their outcomes. The descriptive level has been used in other trait/student orientation research. Graham (2006) and Csizér and Dörnyei (2005) used structural equation modeling and qualitative interviews to understand motivation and self-efficacy. Rad (2010) and Dörnyei (2005) argue that improving language teaching should center on how students think and feel about learning a foreign language. Knowing English opens doors to higher social status and more job opportunities, according to Altan (2012), making it crucial for career and personal progress. The severe socioeconomic difference in education may be explained by the increased link between motivating factors, learners' beliefs, and socio-economic position (Lamb, 2012).

This study compares Indonesian students' socioeconomic level, language learning beliefs, and program outcomes. Effective educational programs must consider students' aspirations, self-beliefs, and self-regulation (Kormos, & Kiddle, 2013). Social class affects language learning, motivation, self-regulation, and self-image (Fan, 2011). Vellymalay (2012) argues socioeconomic and sociocultural factors most impact student learning.

Motivating and assisting pupils to have better educational chances and conditions are social elements as well. This research looks at the assumptions made regarding the relationship

between Indonesian students' socioeconomic level, their views on language learning, and the overall results of their language classes. In relation to the points indicated, the following are the research questions created for this study:

1. Does the socio-economic situation of Indonesian students have any impact on their overall language learning outcomes?
2. Is there a correlation between the socio-economic level of Indonesian students and their general language learning outcomes?

The following parts cover the methodology and results used to investigate the research questions.

## **Material and Method**

### **Participants**

Three hundred and fifty Indonesian management Undergraduate students enrolled in English language programs at Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang were the subjects of this research. They were between the ages of 23 and 45, with men making up 58.28% of the group and females 41.72%. Five different socioeconomic categories were used to allocate the participants. Of the student body, 30.86% were from the middle class, and 30% were from the lower middle class. A 20% upper-middle-class student body, 12% lower-class, and 7.14 percent upper-class student body comprised the total. The actual numbers were as follows: 24.8 percent of students were jobless, and 75.1 percent had jobs.

### **Instrument**

There were two phases to the instrument's development. Several parts of the initial stage were borrowed from other existing instruments, such as Horwitz's Belief Inventory (BALLI, 1988). In the second stage, participants were asked to fill out a Socioeconomic level (SES) Questionnaire that would give us a better picture of their socioeconomic level. Indeed, it was constructed with the help of numerous experts from various domains, including languages, sociology, and psychology.

### **The Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory (BALLI)**

For this study, the Horwitz (1987) Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) was used, which consists of 35 items. They were given 33 statements to agree or disagree with using a Likert scale from 1 to 5. Different scales and answers are used for the two items. Items 4 and 15 assess the difficulty of learning English and the time required to do so, respectively. Language learning beliefs were used to assess the assertions. Items 1-4 on the Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) evaluate respondents' confidence in their own language-learning abilities; items 9-14 on their strategies for learning and communicating in that language; items 8-12 on their experiences with language acquisition; and items 27-28 on their difficulties with learning. Bahasa Indonesia was used as the translation language for the BALLI questionnaire to ensure clarity. Researchers in the fields of psychology and language evaluated the content and readability of the BALLI and socioeconomic status questionnaires before to administration. Forty students participated in a pilot study that gathered feedback through the BALLI questionnaire.

### **SES Questionnaire**

The "Socio-economic Status Scale (SES) Questionnaire") was utilized to ascertain the socio-economic status of the individuals. Language, sociology, and psychology experts reviewed it and provided feedback on improving it. The instruments were fine-tuned based on the input of the specialists. The Third Item: The TOFEL Exam  
The TOEFL, a broad measure of English proficiency, was administered to all participants to ensure uniformity. For this study, we specifically sought out students who had achieved an intermediate level of proficiency. Since only 350 out of 500 people had scores within one

standard deviation of the mean, we can say that only 350 people were considered for the study. Roughly forty students served as a pilot group to test and improve the goods. The reliability study yielded an acceptable and high overall Alpha Cronbach's rating of 817.

### Procedure

To remove any possible misunderstandings, the BALLI questionnaire was translated into the participants' native Bahasa Indonesia. Some psychology and language professors reviewed the BALLI and SES questionnaires before the actual administrations. They provided helpful comments on the questionnaire's content and items' clarity. The items were further refined after BALLI piloted them on a group of around 40 students. In addition, in order to standardize the participants' language skills, they were all given a general language competency test, which is essentially a practice version of the TOEFL exam. The participants were only given the reading, grammar, and written expression portions of the test because of logistical issues. To find out how socio-economic status relates to views on language acquisition, a one-way ANOVA was conducted.

### Data Analysis

Among the statistical techniques applied in the study were a one-way analysis of variance, principal component analysis, descriptive statistics, and Cronbach's alpha formula.

### Results and Discussion

#### Results

The current study investigated how socio-economic status, language learning outcomes, and language learning attitudes are connected. The current data show that socioeconomic class is a substantial predictor of student outcomes and language learning beliefs. The relationship between these parameters was examined using statistical methods.

#### *Latent Variables Explored by the BALLI*

Data was analyzed using principal component analysis to improve dependability. This study's principal component analysis and Horwitz's (1987) five themes are summarized in Table 4.1.

**Table 1**  
Horwitz's (1987) Separation of Items

	Beliefs	Loading
Factor 1. Proficiency in a foreign language (Cronbach's alpha = .80)		
1	Foreign language learning is easier for kids than adults.	0.63
2	Foreign language learning is gifted in some persons.	0.62
5	I am confident I will master English.	0.59
6	My people are skilled in other languages.	0.57
10	Speaking a foreign language makes learning another easier.	0.57
30	Multilingual people are smart.	0.55
33	Everyone can learn another language.	0.55
35	Language acquisition requires memorizing.	0.49
11	Scientists and mathematicians struggle with foreign languages.	0.49
16	Foreign language learning is my forte.	0.47
19	Women learn foreign languages better than men.	0.46
Factor 2: The challenge of learning a language (Cronbach's alpha = .86)		
3	Some languages are simpler to learn.	0.62
4	English is hard/easy.	0.60
15	How long would it take someone to speak a language well after one hour a	0.59

	day?	
25	Speaking is easier than understanding a foreign language.	0.58
34	English is simpler to read and write than to speak and understand.	0.57
Factor 3: Character of language acquisition (Cronbach's alpha = .84)		
8	Speaking English requires knowledge of English-speaking cultures.	0.65
12	English is best learned in an English-speaking country.	0.63
17	The most crucial component of learning a new language is vocabulary.	0.59
23	The most crucial component of learning a new language is grammar.	0.57
27	Foreign language acquisition is different from academic courses.	0.56
28	Learning to translate from my original language to English or vice versa is the most significant component of learning English.	0.55
Factor 4: Learning and communication strategies (Cronbach's alpha = .90)		
18	Repetition and practice are key.	0.77
7	Speaking English with good pronunciation is crucial.	0.76
13	I like practising English with native speakers.	0.75
22	If beginning English learners can make mistakes, they will struggle to communicate appropriately.	0.74
26	Practice with cassettes or tapes.	0.70
14	If you don't know an English word, guess.	0.64
9	Say nothing in English unless you can say it right.	0.62
21	Speaking English with others makes me nervous.	0.59
Factor 5 : Motivation and expectations (Cronbach's alpha = .87)		
20	In my country, speaking English is vital.	0.67
24	I want to learn English to understand native speakers and their cultures.	0.62
29	I can get a better job if I learn English effectively.	0.61
31	I wish to speak English well.	0.59
32	I want natural English-speaking pals.	0.59

The foreign language aptitude factor measures students' language aptitude beliefs with 11 items. Items 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, and 33 concern student language learning attitudes. Foreign language learning conflicts are addressed under items 35, 11, 16, and 19. Five items in the second component represent students' perceptions on language learning's simplicity or complexity. Nature of language learning, the third component, comprises six parts that reflect students' views on English-speaking cultures and translation. Items 8, 12, and 28 stress non-translation and foreign culture. The fourth category, learning and communication techniques, has eight questions about students' English language practice views. This criteria encourages practice and error avoidance. Five elements address higher prospects in the fifth aspect, motivation and expectations.

### **Comparison of Factors**

PCA discovered five components related to Horwitz's (1988) themes. Table 4.2 summarizes five language learning beliefs factor results.

**Table 2**

Selected Factors of BALLI Questionnaire and Descriptive Statistics

Item	Mean	SD
------	------	----



Factor 4: Approaches to learning and communicating	4.12	0.51
Factor 5 : Reasoning and anticipations	3.78	0.55
Factor 2: Challenges in acquiring a new language	3.43	0.50
Factor 3: Learning a new language: its essence	3.34	0.57
Factor 1: Foreign language aptitude	3.14	0.60

Factor 4 had the greatest mean average, the study found. All participants said language practice and learning strategies were useful. Students were also very motivated. They believe motivation aids language learning. Factors 2 and 3 show pupils like language learning complexity and nature. It means pupils find target language moderately difficult. Also, gender does not matter in language learning, according to factor 1.

**Socioeconomic Status and Perceptions of Language Learning in Relationship**

Socioeconomic status and language learning views were examined using a one-way ANOVA. Results demonstrated that learners' socioeconomic status affects their beliefs. One-way ANOVA shows how socioeconomic status affects students' language learning beliefs in Table 4.3.

**Table 3**

One-way ANOVA for Students' Beliefs about Language Learning at Different Socio-economic Status Levels

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	dF	Mean Sq	F	P Value
Between Groups	3017.16	2	1511.020	10.012	.000
Within Groups	26880.65	189	136.008		
Total	29897.81	191			

Table 3 shows that  $F_2 = 10.012$ ,  $p = .000$ , the mean scores of learners' opinions about language acquisition differ significantly by socioeconomic position.

**Socio-Economic Status Score**

All criteria were scored, and cumulative scores determined classes. Socioeconomic status questionnaire scores varied from 5 to 51 for students. The scores suggest 25% student unemployment, with lower classes having the highest rate. Table 4.4 indicates employment and social class.

**Table 4**

Relation between Social Class and Employment

Class	No	Unemployed
Upper Class	25	0
Upper-Middle Class	70	2
Middle Class	108	30
Lower-Middle Class	105	25
Lower Class	42	30

Based on the data in Table 4, we can see that 25 pupils fall into the upper class, 70 into the upper middle class, 108 into the medium class, 108 into the lower middle class, and 42 into the lower class. The majority of the student body is middle class or lower class. According to the data, a quarter of the jobless student population lives in poverty. Students' socioeconomic status and the distribution of outcomes were examined using means and standard deviations.

Socioeconomic status and student learning were both studied using the Pearson Coefficient Correlation, which was a great tool. Socioeconomic data is provided in Table 4.5.

**Table 5**  
Descriptive Statistics of SES

SD	Mean	Social Class
5.304715	43.16	Upper Class
2.8204	7.954658	Upper Middle Class
2.665287	22.28704	Middle Class
2.766294	13.29524	Lower Middle Class
1.37169	6.857143	Lower Class

Table 5 shows a substantial standard deviation, indicating socioeconomic status was well distributed. Table 4.6 displays the socioeconomic class distribution and average.

**Table 6**  
The Distribution of the Participants in Socio-economic Classes Based on SES

Class	No	
Upper Class	25	78.76
Upper Middle Class	70	70.65714
Middle Class	108	59.23148
Lower Middle Class	105	51.44762
Lower Class	42	50.52381

Higher scores were recorded by the upper and upper middle classes compared to the lower and lower middle classes (Table 6). Means and standard deviations were used to assess for spread in the results. The descriptive statistics of student learning are shown in Table 4.7.

**Table 7**  
Descriptive Statistics of Students' Learning Outcomes

Class	Mean	SD
Upper Class	78.76	8.074032
Upper Middle Class	70.65714	6.484956
Middle Class	59.23148	7.341607
Lower Middle Class	51.44762	8.994636
Lower Class	50.52381	9.386649

The table reveals pupils' learning results were well-spaced. Pearson coefficient correlation is used to examine socioeconomic status and student outcomes. Results are in Table 4.8.

**Table 8**  
Correlation Coefficients between Students' Socio-economic Status and Learning Outcomes

Class	No s	Pearson Coefficient r	Critical Value
All	350	-0.1	.24
Upper Class	25	0.1	.195
Upper Middle Class	70	0.05	.35
Middle Class	108	0.03	.23
Lower Middle Class	105	0.01	.20
Lower Class	42	-0.01	.2

The way children think, feel, and do academically is influenced by their socioeconomic status. Several intriguing outcomes are displayed in the table. Results in table 4.8 indicate that students from more privileged backgrounds do better. Seemingly ready to learn are upper-

middle class folks. When compared to the wealthy, those in the lower middle and lower classes show less enthusiasm for education. Because of this, it is clear that children from privileged backgrounds are eager to learn. According to the numbers, upperclassmen have the highest rate of learning. Students' lack of motivation in learning suggests that social and economic classes have a greater impact on their academic performance.

### ***Relation between Socioeconomic Status and Learning Outcome***

The second research topic concerns social economic position and learning outcomes. Table 4.8 shows a strong association between socioeconomic position and student outcomes. Lower class scored lowest and upper class highest. Upper class kids were more eager to learn than lower class pupils, according to social economic status and outcome studies. So learning and social standing are linked. Upper middle-class pupils like language learning and education. Lower middle class pupils performed poorly, while lower class students performed worst. Student language achievement is strongly influenced by socioeconomic status.

### **Discussion**

The intricate relationship between socio-economic status and academic achievement has been extensively documented, highlighting the multifaceted nature of educational success. Recent studies underscore the significance of understanding how socio-economic factors intertwine with students' beliefs and attitudes towards learning, particularly in the context of language acquisition. The belief that socio-economic status can influence educational outcomes is not new; however, the mechanisms through which this influence manifests are complex and multifaceted. For instance, socio-economic status has been shown to impact students' access to resources, their learning environments, and the level of support they receive at home, all of which can significantly affect their academic performance.

Through the views About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI), students' views about language learning reveal how they view their talents and language acquisition. These ideas, established by personal and socioeconomic circumstances, can help or hinder language learning. Students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds may have more exposure to the target language through travel, educational resources, and practice, which may boost their confidence in their language learning abilities.

Moreover, the motivation to learn a foreign language often correlates with socio-economic status, where learners from more affluent backgrounds may view language learning as a valuable skill that can open doors to further educational and career opportunities. This motivational aspect is critical, as it directly influences the effort and resources students are willing to invest in language learning. Altan (2012) emphasizes the importance of English proficiency in advancing one's career and personal life, suggesting that motivation to learn is closely linked to perceived benefits that transcend academic achievement.

In light of these findings, it becomes evident that addressing the educational needs of students from diverse socio-economic backgrounds requires a comprehensive understanding of how socio-economic factors, beliefs about language learning, and motivation interact. By acknowledging and addressing these interrelated components, educators can develop more effective and inclusive pedagogical strategies that cater to the diverse needs of their students, ultimately fostering a more equitable educational environment.

Building on the findings from the aforementioned study, it is crucial to delve into the theoretical underpinnings that explain the observed phenomena. Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory provides a valuable lens through which to understand the impact of socio-economic status on language learning. According to Vygotsky, social interactions play a fundamental role in the development of cognition (Vygotsky, 1978). This perspective suggests that students from higher socio-economic backgrounds may benefit from more enriched social interactions that support language learning, both in formal educational settings and through informal learning opportunities (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).



Moreover, Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory (SDT) emphasizes the role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in learning outcomes (Deci & Ryan, 1985). The theory posits that students who are intrinsically motivated to learn a language are more likely to achieve higher proficiency levels. This intrinsic motivation can be influenced by socio-economic factors, as students from more affluent backgrounds may have access to resources and opportunities that foster a love for learning and a sense of autonomy in their educational pursuits (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

The intersection of socio-economic status, motivation, and language learning outcomes underscores the need for educational interventions that address these factors. Tailoring language instruction to meet the diverse needs of students, considering their socio-economic backgrounds and motivational profiles, can enhance language learning outcomes. Providing equitable access to resources, fostering a supportive learning environment, and encouraging positive beliefs about language learning are essential steps in this direction (Norton, 2000; Dörnyei, 2005).

## Conclusion

Finding out what Indonesian Undergraduate students think about language acquisition was the main goal of this research. There was also a comparison made between these views and the impact of socioeconomic position on schooling. This study found that participants' socioeconomic position was the most important factor in explaining why they studied a foreign language. Students from higher and medium-class backgrounds are more likely to fall into this pattern; their drive to learn a new language, as well as their success in doing so, are heavily impacted by their social class. A student's socioeconomic position is a common and powerful indicator of their academic performance. Understanding language learners actually involves delving into several pieces of information related to their language acquisition. There are two things that can encourage people to learn a new language: their financial situation and their interest in linguistics in general. Discouragement of learning a foreign language and poor performance in that endeavor are likely associated with dwindling attitudes about things like social and economic standing, interests, and drive. Pupils' ideas and attitudes may change over time, but teachers still have a responsibility to help their pupils develop more optimistic outlooks. There is a vast array of potential elements that could impact the process of learning a new language. This study's examination of the role of socioeconomic variables in second language acquisition is among the most crucial considerations. Results show that students' socioeconomic position significantly affects their attitudes toward and performance in language classes.

## Acknowledgment

We extend our heartfelt gratitude to the faculty and students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang for their invaluable participation in this study. Special thanks to the English Department for facilitating the research process and providing essential resources. We also acknowledge the contributions of our research team, whose dedication and expertise were instrumental in conducting this study. Additionally, we are grateful for the insightful feedback from peer reviewers, which significantly enhanced the quality of our work. This research would not have been possible without the collaborative effort and support of all involved.

## References

- Akhtar, Z., & Niazi, H. K. (2011). The Relationship between socio-economic status and learning achievement of students at secondary level. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3 (2).
- Babikkoi, M.A. & Binti Abdul Razak. N. Z. (2014). Implications of parents' socio-economic status

- in the choice of English language learning strategies among Nigeria's secondary school students. *English Language Teaching*, 7 (8).
- Baharudin, R& Luster, T.(1998).Factors related to the qualities of the environment and children's achievement. *Journal of Family Issue*. 19(4).375-403. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/019251398019004002>
- Barry, J. (2005). *The effect of socio-economic status on academic achievement*. Department of Sociology, Wichita KS: Wichita State University.
- Bartley, D. E. (1970). The importance of the attitude factor in language dropout: A preliminary investigation of group and sex differences. *Foreign Language Annals*, 3(3), 383-39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1970.tb01292.x>
- Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Language learners' motivational profiles and their motivated learning behavior. *Language Learning*, 55 (4), 623-669. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0023-8333.2005.00319.x>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*: Lawrence N. J. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Eamon, M. K. (2005). Social-demographic, school, neighborhood, and parenting influences on academic achievement of Latino young adolescent. *Journal of youth and adolescence*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-005-3214-x>
- Ewijk & Slegers (2010). The effect of peer SES on students Achievement: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Research Review*. 5 (2). 134-150.7.
- Fan, W. (2011). Social influences, school motivation and gender differences: An application of the expectancy-value theory. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* 31,155-157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2010.536525>
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology aspects of second language learning: The role of attitudes a motivation*. London: Arnold.
- Goleman, D. (2009). What makes a leader? In D. Demers (Ed.), *AHSC 230: Interpersonal communication and relationships* (pp. 47-56). Montreal, Canada: Concordia University Bookstore. (Reprinted from *Harvard Business Review*, 76 (6), pp. 93-102, 1998).
- Graham, S. J. (2006). A study of students' metacognitive beliefs about foreign language study and their impact on learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 296-309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2006.tb02267.x>
- Hamid, M. O. (2011). Socio-economic characteristics and English language achievement in Rural Bangladesh. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*, 8 (2), 31-51.
- Horwitz, E.K. (1987). Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp.119-129). London: Prentice-Hall.
- Horwitz, E.K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *Modern Language Journal*, 72, 283-293. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1988.tb04190.x>
- Jennes.W.H. (2002). Examing the effects of parental absence on the academic achievement of adolescent: The challenge of controlling for family income. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*.23 (2).
- Jernigan, C.G. (2001). The role of beliefs, attributions, and perceived goal attainment in students' motivation. In G. Bräuer (Ed.), *Pedagogy of language learning in higher education* (pp. 23-45). Westport, CT: Ablex
- Kern, R.G. (1995). Students' beliefs and teachers' beliefs about language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28, 71-92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1995.tb00770.x>
- Knapp, M. S., & Shields, P. M. (1990). Reconceiving Academic Institution for the Children of Poverty. *Kappan*, 71(10), 753-758.
- Kormos, J., & Kiddle, T. (2013). The role of socio-economic factors in motivation to learn English

- as a foreign language: The case of Chile. *System*, 41, 399-412.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.03.006>
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.
- Majoribanks, K. (1996). Family learning environments and students outcomes: A review. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 27 (2), 373 – 394.
- Mattheoudakis, M., & Alexiou, T. (2009). Early foreign language instruction in Greece: Socioeconomic factors and their effect on young learners' language development. In M. Nikolov (Ed.), K Gruyter. Nikolov\_10\_Ch10. Times NRMT 1120 Jiang (SOLA).<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110218282.227>
- Matthew, I. A. (2013). Provision of secondary education in Nigeria: Challenges and way forward. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 5(1), 1-9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5897/JASD11.058>
- MCneal, R. B. (2001) Differential effects of parental involvement on cognitive and behavioral outcomes by socioeconomic status. *Economics*, 30(2), 171-179. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-5357\(00\)00100-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-5357(00)00100-1)
- Miele, P. (1982). *Suggestopedia: Easier learning the natural way*. Sandy Spring, MD: Utopia Unlimited.
- Mirza, M. Sh. (2001). Relationship of Socio-economic Stats with Achievement. *Journal Elementary Education*, 1(4), 18-24.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Longman.
- Ogunshola, F. & Adewale, A. M. (2012). The Effects of Parental Socio-Economic Status on Academic Performance of Students in Selected Schools in EduLga of Kwara State Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(7).
- Rad, N. (2010). Evaluation of English Students' Beliefs about Learning English as Foreign Language: A Case of Kerman Azad University. *Proceedings of ICT for Language Learning Conference 3rd Edition*, Simonelli Editore.
- Reed, S., & Sautter, C. S. (1990). Children of poverty: The Status of 12 Million Young Americans. *Phi Delta Kappan*: 71(10), K1-K12.
- Rifkin, B. (2000). Revisiting beliefs about foreign language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33, 394-420. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2000.tb00621.x>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
- Seyfried, Sh. F. (1998). Academic achievement of African American Preadolescent: The influence of teacher perception. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26 (3). 381-402. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1022107120472>
- Sirin. S. R. (2005). SES and academic Achievement: A meta-Analytical review of Research. *Review of Educational Research*. 75 (31). 417-453.13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543075003417>
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning*. New York: Edward Arnold
- Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for second language learning: Introduction to a general theory*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Stevens, P. (1978). The nature of language teaching. In R.C. Richards (Ed.), *Understanding second and foreign language learning: Issues and approaches* (pp. 179-203). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Vellymalay, S. (2012). Parental Involvement at Home: Analyzing the Influence of Parents' Socioeconomic Status. *Studies in Sociology of Science*, 3 (1), 1-6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.sss.1923018420120301.2048>
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.



**Empty Page**