Variations in the Motivation of Successful and Unsuccessful Turkish Learners of English

Thesis submitted to the
Institute of Social Sciences
in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English Language Teaching

by
John Richard Kennedy

Boğaziçi University

1996

The thesis of John Richard Kennedy

is approved by :

Prof. Dr. Cem Alptekin _____

(Committee Chairperson)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe Akyel _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kamışlı _____

June 1996

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor Prof. Dr. Cem Alptekin, for the time he has devoted in providing advice and guidance at all stages throughout the preparation of this thesis.

I also wish to thank Assist. Prof. Emine Erktin for her invaluable assistance in providing a framework for the statistical analysis of this study.

I am also indebted to Yakut Gazi-Demirci, for her considerable help in processing and interpreting the data.

This research study would also not have been possible were it not for considerable assistance from colleagues in the English Department of Gürsoy Özel Lisesi. Firstly, I would like to thank the Head of English, Belgin Öğrek, for permission to conduct this research and her enthusiastic support. I also owe many thanks to Fulya Erdemet for her assistance in translation at various stages of this study. And last, but not least, I am very grateful to the core teacher of the class researched, Ebru Çongar, and to the students themselves, without whose cooperation and frank expressions of opinion meaningful results could not have been obtained.

ABSTRACT

Variations in the Motivation of Successful and Unsuccessful Turkish Learners of English

by

John Richard Kennedy

This study investigated the relationship between attitudes and motivation and success for Turkish high school students learning English as a foreign language. The purpose was to determine which components of attitudes and motivation were the most relevant in this context. Furthermore, the study sought to establish what changes occured in this relationship over an academic year.

The subjects were thirty students, all from one class, following the intensive high school preparatory program in English at Gürsoy Özel Lisesi. A questionnaire, adapted from the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB), was administered in the middle of the first and second semesters. Shortly afterwards, one-to-one interviews were conducted with twelve of the subjects, selected to represent three different levels of the class. Scores on weekly achievement tests provided data on success.

As expected, attitudes and motivation did correlate highly

with achievement, but this was only consistent over time for the component of attitudes toward the learning situation. There was insufficient evidence for the existence of the other two components of the integrative motive, integrativeness and motivation, established in previous studies among learners of English as a second language.

Attitudes toward the learning situation significantly declined over time regardless of the level of success. Complaints included the repetitive nature of lessons and too great an emphasis on writing in the class. Less successful students were particularly concerned with their exam grades, and with the fact that their increased efforts throughout the year did not produce the desired results.

KISA ÖZET

Başarılı ve Başarısız İngilizce Öğrenen Türk Öğrencilerin Motivasyonlarındaki Varyasyonlar

John Richard Kennedy

Bu çalışma, İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen Türk lise öğrencilerinin yabancı dile karşı tutum ve motivasyonu ile yabancı dil başarısı arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemiştir. Çalışmanın amacı tutum ve motivasyonun hangi öğelerinin bu durumla bağlantılı olduğuna karar vermektir. Ayrıca, çalışma bir eğitim-öğretim yılı boyunca bu ilişkide oluşan değişiklikleri de belirlemek amacındadır.

Otuz deneğin hepsi aynı sınıftan olup Özel Gürsoy Lisesi'nde lise İngilizce hazırlık programına devam etmekteydi. Tutum ve Motivasyon Testi'nden (Attitude/ Motivation Test Battery) uyarlanan bir anket birinci ve ikinci yarıyılın ortasında deneklere verildi. Kısa bir süre sonra ise sınıfın üç farklı düzeyini yansıtan oniki öğrenci ile karşılıklı görüşmeler yapıldı. Başarı konusundaki veriyi haftalık başarı testlerinden elde edilen notlar oluşturdu.

Tahmin edildiği üzere tutum ve motivasyon ve başarı arasında yüksek bir korelasyon bulundu, fakat bu bulgu sadece öğrenme ortamına karşı tutum söz konusu olduğu zaman tutarlıydı. İkinci dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen öğrenciler üzerine yapılan daha önceki çalışmalarda ortaya çıkan birleştirici güdü, birleştiricilik ve güdüleme öğelerinin varlığı konusunda yeterli veri elde edinilmemiştir.

Öğrenme ortamına karşı tutum başarı düzeyine bağlı kalmadan zamanla anlamlı bir şekilde azaldı. Öğrencilerin şikayetleri arasında derslerin biribirini tekrar etmesi ve sınıfta yazmaya verilen fazla önem vardı. Daha az başarılı öğrencilerin özellikle ilgilendikleri nokta sınav notları ve sene boyunca artan çabalarına rağmen istedikleri sonucu alamamalarıydı.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

RESEARCH BACKGROUND

Theories of second language acquisition have often been concerned with describing the process of learning a language as a uniform phenomenon (Ellis 1985, p.4). Identification of factors that are relatively invariable and can be generalized across different learners and contexts has proved very valuable indeed, but learners do exhibit differences and, as such, variable factors also require investigation (Ellis 1985).

The different contexts in which learning takes place and the teaching methods used are two factors that can affect the SLA process. However, even where these are constant (e.g two learners in the same language classroom learning under much the same conditions), it is possible to observe marked differences between learners. As Ellis states, "To claim that individuals vary in the rate at which they learn or the level of competence they eventually attain is not controversial" (1985, p.99).

One area in which two learners may differ is in their use of language learning strategies. Oxford (1990) suggests that effective use of strategies is a pre-requisite for the development of communicative competence. Wenden (1991) believes that the development of effective learning strategies leads the way to greater learner autonomy and

thus more effective learning. However, although giving due importance to this increasingly popular area of investigation, Skehan (1989) sounds a note of caution in concluding that current evidence does not seem sufficient to support the claim that such strategies are trainable (p.139).

There are a number of other general factors that have been identified and researched in an attempt to explain individual learner differences. Age of learners, aptitude for learning a language, cognitive style and personality are important categories under which various empirical studies have been conducted (Ellis 1985; Skehan 1989).

One further source of individual differences that has received considerable attention is *motivation*: "Learner motivation and needs have always had a central place in theories of SLA" (Ellis 1985, p.11). In addition to its relevance within the research literature, the term motivation is familiar to most classroom teachers. As Ellis (1995) points out, "Language teachers readily acknowledge the importance of learners' *motivation*, not infrequently explaining their own sense of failure with reference to their students' lack of motivation" (p.508).

A. INSTRUMENTAL AND INTEGRATIVE ORIENTATIONS

Gardner and Lambert (1972) report the findings of their own research conducted over a period of more than ten years during which they endeavoured to answer the following question: "How is it that some people can learn a foreign language quickly and expertly while others, given the same opportunities to learn, are utter failures?" (p.1). While acknowledging the role of ability or aptitude, Gardner and Lambert believed that additional factors could be identified by considering the perspective of social psychology:

> Social psychologists would expect that success in mastering a foreign language would depend not only on intellectual capacity and language aptitude but also on the learner's perceptions of the other ethnolinguistic group involved, his attitudes towards representatives of that group, and his willingness to identify enough to adopt distinctive aspects of behavior, linguistic and nonlinguistic, that characterize that other group (p.132).

More specifically, Gardner and Lambert proposed two orientations that might define a student's attitude:

> The orientation is said to be *instrumental* in form if the purposes of language study reflect the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement, such as getting ahead in one's occupation. In contrast, the orientation is *integrative* if the student wishes to learn more about the other cultural community because he is interested in it in an open-minded way, to the point of eventually being accepted as a member of that other group (p.3).

Gardner and Lambert initially developed their theory and put it to the test in the bilingual setting of Montreal, conducting research amongst English-speaking high school students of French. In order to determine to what extent their findings could be generalized, they replicated their intial work at three research sites in the United States where they believed that the social factors at work were likely to be quite different. Their subjects were American high school students studying French. These three studies were conducted in Maine, Louisiana, and Connecticut and the three research locations differed from each other as follows:

(i) Maine - there was an active minority subculture of French-Americans.

(ii) Louisiana - the French influence was limited solely to culture, it didn't include language.

(iii) Connecticut - this was an entirely monolingual and monocultural setting.

One further study was conducted in the Phillipines. Again, the subjects were high school students, but the social context was expected to be radically different from that of the other studies, and a further difference was that the target language to be learned was English.

The main data collection techniques were similar across all these studies, with self-report questionnaires used to assess students' attitudes and thus provide a measure of their motivation, which was compared against scores on achievement tests.

Overall, the main findings were that motivation correlated significantly with achievement regardless of where the research was conducted, and that it did so independently of measures of language aptitude. When motivation was separated into instrumental and integrative orientations, an integrative orientation generally appeared to have the stronger relationship with achievement. An instrumental orientation took on most importance in the Phillipine study, though an integrative orientation was still found to be an important factor.

Thus Gardner and Lambert (1972) concluded in their review that motivation was a key variable in explaining

achievement in language learning in widely-differing contexts, and that the role it played did not depend on aptitude. They proposed that both instrumental and integrative orientations had a role to play in motivating students and that they were not necessarily mutually exclusive. However, in outlining an agenda for future research they stressed the likely importance of differing contexts in which language is learnt and warned against too great a generalization:

> It would be wrong to leave the impression that we have established the cross-cultural validity of the basic notions introduced in these investigations. That is certainly not the case. In fact what has been most impressive in this array of studies is the setting-to-setting contrasts that have emerged and the basic distinctiveness of each sociocultural context (p.142).

One such study conducted within a quite different context was that of Lukmani (1972), who investigated the nature of the motivation of Marathi-speaking high school students in India learning English. All subjects were female and from comparatively non-Westernized families in an average income-bracket. Data was collected through self-report questionnaires. Her main finding was that in this setting it was scores of instrumental motivation that correlated significantly with achievement.

Muchnick and Wolfe (1982) investigated American high school students, but this time the target language was Spanish. The researchers were particularly interested in analyzing the perceived lack of interest amongst such students in terms of their attitudes toward Hispanic-Americans, and also in extending the methodology of Gardner and Lambert to determine its suitability for an alternative target language group. The researchers concluded that a similar self-report measurement was indeed valid in the new context, and that both instrumental and integrative orientations played an important role. They recommended that due attention be paid to both orientations in any intervention to attempt to improve the attitudes of students.

One more important study was that of Clement and Kruidenier (1983), who set out to analyse different orientations across three factors - ethnicity (French vs. English), milieu (unicultural vs. multicultural) and target language (French or English vs. Spanish). Conducted on a large scale, 871 high school students were allocated to one of eight different groups formed from combinations of the above factors. Self-report questionnaires were once again used. It was found that orientation did vary across the three factors, although instrumental, friendship, travel and knowledge orientations were found to exist in all groups. The researchers concluded that all three factors could be

expected to cause major variations in student orientations and moreover that different orientations from those considered by Gardner and Lambert may exist: "Previous studies of the relative importance of orientations seem to have assumed, a priori, the universality and exhaustiveness of integrative and instrumental orientations" (p.289).

On the question of methodology, all the above-mentioned studies show a good deal of uniformity. Attitudes and motivation were measured by the use of self-report questionnaires. While the particular items used varied across studies, this would seem to have been necessary to some extent, given the widely differing situations in which research took place.

An example of a research study where methodology was called into question was conducted by Oller, Hudson & Liu (1977). The subjects were 44 Chinese graduate students of English in the United States, and the aim was to validate Gardner's construct of integrative motivation for this group. The difference this time was that the researchers chose to use two different types of self-report measures. They used what they termed a direct attitude measure following the methodology of Gardner and Lambert, and also an indirect measure where subjects were asked to give ratings for themselves, for how they would like to be, for Chinese people and for Americans. They reported that it

was the latter indirect scale that produced more meaningful variance, and while they found that integrative motivation was positively related to achievement, they claimed that the relationship was more complex than previously thought - one unexpected finding they cited was that desire to stay permanently in the U.S. correlated negatively with achievement, and one suggestion they put forward was that attitudes were dynamic and subject to change during the learning process.

However, another study which set out to compare direct and indirect measures of attitude produced a completely different result (Pierson, Fu & Lee 1980). The subjects were Chinese-speaking secondary school students of English in Hong Kong, and this time it was the direct measures that were found to correlate most significantly with achievement.

One further study conducted by Chihara and Oller (1978) found that neither indirect nor direct measures offered anything more than a rather weak correlation with achievement. This was intended as replication of the study by Oller et al (1977) in the EFL context - 123 Japanese adults studying English in Japan. The conclusion drawn was that both the direct and indirect measures of attitudes used were invalid. In an attempt to explain this further, Oller and Perkins (1978a) outlined three factors that could distort the findings of self-report

scales in a non-random way:

(i) The approval motive - subjects responding with what they believe to be the "right" answers, those that they imagine will be pleasing to the researcher.

(ii) Self-flattery - this is similar to the above with subjects supplying the "right" answers, but doing so in relation to their own personal value system.

(iii) Response set - the tendency to answer a series of questions in the same way (positively or negatively) regardless of true feelings.

The conclusion drawn was that serious threats to validity were present in all of the previous studies measuring attitude by means of self-report questionnaires, and it was proposed that the onus was on researchers to prove that the three factors identified above were not influencing their findings. Oller and Perkins (1978b) set out their thoughts clearly on this point - "Unless this claim is incorrect, all the other proposals are untestable" (p.423).

In a reply to these criticisms, Gardner and Gliksman (1982) discussed in detail the validity of their attitude

measurement scale, particularly considering the three key areas of predictive validity, content validity and construct validity. On predictive validity they pointed out that in the vast majority of research using their scale there was, as expected, a strong relationship between attitudes and motivation and achievement. In relation to content validity they cited regular testing showing high levels of internal consistency, and comparison with other existing self-report scales (though few in number) which showed significant correlations. As for construct validity, they claimed sufficient research evidence in favour of their basic model, in which both aptitude and motivation influence achievement, with motivation itself being influenced by attitudes (p.195).

In an attempt to further develop their theory, Gliksman, Gardner & Smythe (1982) set out to investigate what effect integrative motivation would have on actual classroom behaviour, hypothesizing that it would lead to greater classroom participation. This time they used classroom observations over a four month period of 149 secondary school students of French in Ontario, as well as initial self-report questionnaires. They found that integrative motivation did indeed correlate with rates of classroom participation and concluded that, "The integrative motive plays its major function in effecting achievement in a second language by orienting the student to capitalize on every opportunity possible to improve language

proficiency" (p.634). The clear implication is that not only is motivation significantly related to achievement, but also that it is motivation which causes success rather than the other way around.

However, this particular issue of causality has been the subject of some dispute. Results from research amongst Spanish-speaking kindergartners in a classroom in the U.S. suggest just the opposite (Strong 1984), that integrative motivation may be the result rather than the cause of a high level of achievement. This followed from observations of the children, who showed a much greater tendency to seek out contacts with the target language group at an advanced level of proficiency. In reviewing the research on the directionality of the relationship between motivation and achievement, Ellis (1985) concludes that in the light of contradictory findings it may be wise to assume that the relationship can work in both directions.

B. ATTITUDES AND MOTIVATION IN THE SOCIO-EDUCATIONAL MODEL

Gardner's work culminated in 1985 with the publication of the book entitled ***Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation.*** In this important volume Gardner explains and justifies the key

principles which lie behind his *socio-educational* model of second language learning. Within this model, four variables are considered as crucial for the explanation of individual differences - intelligence, language aptitude, motivation and situational anxiety. As suggested by the title of the book, attitudes and motivation are a central feature, and the writing of this book represents a major theoretical step towards a more comprehensive definition and explanation of the part played by attitudes and motivation in second language learning.

Gardner makes it clear that his theory includes different kinds of attitudes, and he proposes two dimensions along which these can be classified, one of these being specificity/generality (an example being attitudes toward learning French and interest in learning foreign languages, the former being more specific, the latter more general), the other being educational (for example attitudes toward a teacher or course) or social (attitudes toward the target language group) (pp.40-42). The point he makes is that all of these different kinds of attitudes are potentially of relevance and need to be considered.

Motivation is also considered by Gardner to be made up of different components - "In short, motivation involves four aspects, a goal, effortful behaviour, a desire to attain the goal and favourable attitudes toward the activity in question" (p.50). However, Gardner does not

consider the goal as something that can be measured, but rather as a reflection of a particular orientation to language study; and he stresses that motivation and orientation should be considered separately. He thus considers three measures as necessary in the assessment of motivation (p.54):

(i) motivational intensity
(ii) desire to learn the language
(iii) attitudes toward learning the language

In his discussion of orientation, Gardner once again refers to integrative and instrumental orientations but he takes care to point out that other orientations may exist and that much depends on context. Again though he seems to imply that an integrative orientation is likely to lead to greater motivation, he defines this orientation as "... that class of reasons that suggest that the individual is learning a second language in order to learn about, interact with, or become closer to, the second language community" (p.54).

The composite higher-order construct proposed by Gardner to take into account orientation, attitudes and motivation is termed the *integrative motive*, which he defines as "... motivation to learn a second language because of positive feelings toward the community that speaks that language" (pp.82-83). It is the integrative motive (a combination

of various attitudinal and motivational variables) rather than an integrative orientation that is the cornerstone of Gardner's theory, the orientation in itself not having much explanatory power:

> Only if this orientation is linked with effort expended to achieve this goal, a desire to learn the language, and favourable reactions to the language learning context can you meaningfully speak of an integrative motive. On its own the orientation reflects simply a goal which may lack motive power (pp.54-55).

Gardner's volume received a generally favourable review from Crookall and Oxford (1988), who felt that it had not been given the recognition it deserved by the second-language teaching community (p.136). This they suggest is due to the complexity of the theory, though they defend Gardner's view in asserting that reality is complex, as well as to the fact that with the social context of SLA at the core of the model, Gardner's proposals are set apart from other theories of SLA. They do criticize the lack of clear pedagogical recommendations, but this was not Gardner's main aim.

Au (1988) is much more critical in his appraisal of the model. His criticisms are very specific in nature and relate to five separate and important issues:

(i) He disputes the research evidence that the integrative motive is positively related to L2 achievement, at best he feels that it is rather inconclusive. In particular he expresses concern about studies where some components of the integrative motive correlate with achievement and others do not.

(ii) He claims that the theory is very vague in its explanation of how cultural setting affects the relationship between integrative motive and achievement, and suggests that the context of the research setting can be used to ignore disconfirming evidence on the validity of the model.

(iii) He states that the finding of Gliksman, Gardner & Smythe (1982) that integratively motivated learners achieve higher proficiency because they are active learners is subject to a serious methodological weakness (p.86), in that achievement is a confounding variable which could itself cause learners to be more active.

(iv) He finds no clear support from research findings for the claim that the integrative motive causes L2 achievement and believes that causality may be in the other direction.

(v) He concludes from available research that linguistic aptitude and integrative motive are not completely independent, and with this being the case, aptitude may be causing learners to be more integratively motivated.

These are serious criticisms of the main principles on which the socio-educational model is based. Each point was replied to separately by Gardner (1988):

(i) He points out that the integrative motive is a hypothetical variable, and that it is not expected or necessary that each component must always correlate with achievement.

(ii) Gardner counters that in fact clear examples of varying effects in different cultural settings have been given, and he cites Clement and Kruidenier (1983) as an illustration of a systematic analysis in this vein. Moreover, he states clearly once again his belief in contextual variations: "... that the role of attitudes and motivation should be consistent in many different contexts, and thus a universal in language learning, is just too simplistic" (p.112).

(iii) He claims that the findings of the study on active learners were intended to simply point out a tendency (perhaps a tacit admission that achievement may have had a confounding influence).

(iv) Gardner explains how difficult it is to conclusively prove causality in studies of a correlational nature. He acknowledges that results are open to different interpretations, but believes that the available evidence points in the direction of motivation causing achievement.

(v) Regarding language aptitude and the integrative motive, the important point according to Gardner is that they are "relatively" independent (p.117). He claims that there is enough empirical evidence to support this, and offers further the logical explanation that it ought to be so, with aptitude a cognitive component and motivational/attitudinal variables an affective component.

In his reply to Au's criticisms, Gardner further clarifies certain aspects of his theory regarding the role of attitudes and motivation, and at the same time points out

what remains to be investigated. He states clearly that the model requires further research and that it "... was never formulated as a final explanation of the processes underlying language learning" (p.120).

One empirical study compared motivation and cultural distance amongst students of differing national backgrounds (Svanes 1987). A questionnaire was administered to 167 university students from 27 different countries, all of whom were learning Norwegian in Norway. The students were classified into four groups by the researchers on the basis of nationality and expected cultural distance. The main finding was that Gardner's theory did not seem to be validated in this context with cultural distance proving a much better predictor of language proficiency than motivational factors. However, as the researchers themselves point out, the subjects were all university students and were expected to be well-motivated in such a context, whereas the sample displayed much greater variance in terms of cultural backgrounds. Gardner's research has focussed on an entirely different area - high school students with similar cultural backgrounds.

The socio-educational model and the construct of the integrative motive imply that it is an integrative orientation which generally carries greatest weight, even though Gardner acknowledges the existence and potential

importance of other orientations. This assumption was tested in the laboratory setting amongst 92 Canadian psychology students in an experiment in which they learned English/French vocabulary pairs (Gardner & MacIntyre 1991). All subjects had studied French before, but not for some time, and none of the vocabulary items were expected to be known to them. In addition to the usual questionnaire for assessing integrative motivation, instrumental motivation was tested by means of a 10 dollar reward for students who achieved a certain number of correct answers. The main finding was that both types of motivation were important, however when the financial reward was removed it was found that the corresponding instrumental motivation disappeared, leading the researchers to conclude that instrumental motivation is not so permanent and will cease to exist when a goal is achieved.

Gardner's model was empirically tested and found to be valid among Israeli high school students studying Arabic, a context differing greatly from any in which he himself had conducted research (Kraemer 1993). A questionnaire similar to Gardner's (though with some adaptations to fit the context) was administered to 484 students. The main tenets of the socio-educational model were shown to hold, though some context specific factors did emerge, one example being a National Security Orientation - obtaining Arabic language skills for use in the military or

intelligence services.

In more recent articles, further clarification is given on the roles of attitudes and motivation in second language learning, together with updated definitons of the key constructs (Gardner 1990; Gardner & MacIntyre 1993a). The following statement summarizes the relationship between attitudinal and motivational variables (Gardner 1990, pp.194-197):

> Integrativeness involves a complex of attitudes toward the other language group(s), a desire to learn the other language in order to interact with members of that group, and a general interest in other languages and other groups. Attitudes toward the learning situation refer to attitudes toward the language learning context, assessed primarily in terms of affective reactions toward the course and the teacher. Motivation, the third component, involves a three-part conceptualization of motivation reflecting a desire to learn the language, effort expended toward learning the language, and favorable attitudes toward learning the language. Each element of motivation, in and of itself, is not viewed as sufficient to characterize a motivated individual, whereas the totality of the three would seem to do so.

Gardner and MacIntyre (1993a) consider the relative predictive capacity of the three components of motivation, attitudes toward the learning situation and integrativeness. They conclude that the available research evidence points toward motivation, the most specific of the three, as having the strongest relationship with achievement. The three components taken together are considered to reflect *integrative motivation*. Although not explicitly stated, this term is presumably equivalent to the integrative motive.

The integrative motive is an important construct in the socio-educational model, encapsulating all the key attitudinal and motivational variables. In subsuming the component of integrativeness, it gives prime importance to an integrative orientation to language learning. However, the intention is not to deny that other motivational orientations influence achievement, rather it seems to reflect a majority of research findings, with the acknowledgement that different contexts will produce varying orientations: "This is not meant to imply that an integrative motive is the only motivational form that will promote the learning of another language. It is, however, one that has shown relationships to achievement in a foreign language fairly consistently" (Gardner 1990, p.204).

C. MEASUREMENT OF ATTITUDES AND MOTIVATION

With the exception of Strong (1984), all of the research studies reviewed so far have made use of self-report questionnaires to measure attitudes and motivation, and in the great majority of studies this has been the sole method for collecting data on these variables. Much of the research has been conducted by Gardner and his associates, and they have been concerned with comparability across studies. This led gradually to the development of the *Attitude/Motivation Test Battery* (or AMTB). The exact format used has changed over time, and also depended to some extent on the research context. What follows is a summary of the version (for French learners) given by Gardner (1985, pp.177-184):

Attitudes toward French Canadians	(10)
Interest in foreign languages	(10)
Attitudes toward European French people	(10)
Attitudes toward learning French	(10)
Integrative orientation	(4)
Instrumental orientation	(4)
French class anxiety	(5)
Parental encouragement	(10)

The figures in brackets refer to the number of items included in each section. All items in the eight

categories above were designed as Likert form items on seven-point scales.

Motivational intensity	(10)
Desire to learn French	(10)
Orientation index	(1)

All items in the three categories above were in multiple-choice format, and with the exception of the orientation index (four options), each item contained three options.

My French teacher	(25)
My French course	(25)

All items in the two categories above take the form of semantic differential assessments - opposing adjectives are given for each item, and the learner rates either his teacher or course on a corresponding seven-point scale.

The version used in a fairly recent study (Gardner, Day & MacIntyre 1992) shows some changes. All items were presented in Likert form and, apart from items assessing orientation, care was taken to guard against acquiescence response bias by incorporating equal numbers of positively and negatively worded items (p.201). A further difference was in the implementation, with subjects recording their responses to the items on computer, a procedure similar to that used by Gardner and MacIntyre (1991).

Most recently, Gardner and MacIntyre (1993a p.2) summarize the different sections of the AMTB, and define the various composite measures:

(i) Motivation (a sum of the three sections below)

Desire to learn the language
Motivational intensity
Attitudes toward learning the language

(ii) Integrativeness (a sum of the three sections below)

Attitudes toward the target language group
Interest in foreign languages
Integrative orientation

(iii) Attitudes toward the learning situation (a sum of the two sections below)

Evaluation of the language teacher
Evaluation of the language course

(iv) Language anxiety (a sum of the two sections below)

Language class anxiety
Language use anxiety

(v) Other attributes (depending on the research aims, one or more may be included - they are not added together)

Instrumental orientation
Parental encouragement
Orientation index

One aggregate that is commonly used is the integrative motivation score, which is simply a sum of categories (i), (ii) and (iii) above - in other words motivation plus integrativeness plus attitudes toward the learning situation.

Another aggregate score sometimes used is the Attitude/Motivation Index (or AMI). This takes the integrative motivation score as its basis, adds instrumental orientation and subtracts language anxiety.

Thus, to obtain aggregate measures, simple additive procedures are used. Skehan (1989) criticizes this as "... a disappointingly simple measurement technique, given the complexity and subtlety of the theorizing that lead up to it" (p.56). Au (1988) also questions the validity of this, and he points out the difficulty in interpreting research findings when different versions of the AMTB have been used in different studies by Gardner, and with other researchers making major adaptations or designing new

scales altogether, without establishing validity.

In reply, Gardner (1988) states that combining categories to obtain an integrative motive score is appropriate in some studies only. He stresses that the use of separate scores for each category may be called for at times, and that everything depends on the aims of the research being conducted. Thus it seems reasonable to conclude that he views the AMTB as an instrument offering the researcher a degree of flexibility. Which sections are included and the exact composite measure(s) to be derived will depend on the aims of a study.

The validity of the AMTB was investigated in the laboratory setting by Gardner, Lalonde & Moorcroft (1985), their main concern being to assess multitrait-multimethod validity by demonstrating that their scale showed significant correlations with other scales designed to measure the same attribute. The rate of learning French vocabulary was assessed amongst 170 volunteer psychology students. They compared eight attributes of the AMTB against self-ratings of the participants, who were asked to indicate how much effort they had put into learning the material, and also against single-item direct scales in a format previously used by Guilford. In addition, a scale of six items was used to assess each subject's tendency to give socially desirable answers. Little evidence of a correlation between measures of attitude and motivation

and social desirability was found. The multitrait-multimethod validity of the eight attributes investigated was found to have been substantiated.

In another more recent study with fairly similar aims, Gardner & MacIntyre (1993b), a multitrait-multimethod analysis again provided support for nine main attributes of the AMTB. An additional feature this time was a factor analysis, from which the researchers concluded there was sufficient empirical support for the four higher-order constructs of integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, anxiety and motivation.

One recent innovation is computer administration of the AMTB (Gardner & MacIntyre 1991), which was found not to detract from internal consistency reliability of the various subscales. Since data is available for individual response times to each item, the researchers propose that this may help to identify responses of a socially desirable nature.

The AMTB has emerged from a great deal of empirical work investigating the important components of attitudes and motivation. Gardner and his associates have constantly revised and updated their procedures, and have been particularly concerned with different aspects of validity. It is safe to say that there is no other scale on attitudes and motivation available in the field which has

been subjected to such intensive examination. Gardner makes the point clearly that research aims should be carefully considered before deciding exactly how to use the instrument.

D. MOTIVATION FROM AN EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

In reviewing Gardner's theory of attitudes and motivation in second language learning, Oxford and Shearin (1994) make the point that it is has been developed from the perspective of social psychology. They make the case for considering findings from other fields in order to develop a broader and possibly more useful perspective. They believe that the study of L2 learning motivation would benefit from a consideration of different aspects of psychology, including general, industrial, educational and cognitive developmental psychology (p.25). Crookes and Schmidt (1991) also recommend a wider perspective, and believe that consideration ought to be given to findings from mainstream educational research. Dörnyei (1994a) adopts a very similar position and outlines a new theoretical position on motivation in second language learning, with specific reference to various key aspects of the more general educational perspective. The implication that all these researchers make is that Gardner's theory is somewhat limited in its explanation of

classroom variables. While recognizing that Gardner's model and the AMTB contain a classroom component (attitudes toward the learning situation), this is considered insufficient in its scope: "... the data from this section do not provide a detailed enough description of the classroom dimension to be helpful in generating practical guidelines" (Dörnyei 1994a, p.273).

One distinction that has been repeatedly discussed in the education literature is that of *intrinsic/extrinsic* motivation. This is explained by Dörnyei (1994a, p.275) as follows:

> Extrinsically motivated behaviours are the ones that the individual performs to receive some extrinsic reward (e.g., good grades) or to avoid punishment. With intrinsically motivated behaviours the rewards are internal (e.g., the joy of doing a particular activity or satisfying one's curiosity).

Intrinsic motivation is linked with the closely related concept of continuing motivation - "... a tendency to return to and continue working on tasks away from the instructional context in which they were initially confronted" (Crooks 1988, p.463). It is proposed that both are very desirable outcomes of instruction, and that both are dependent on the material used in classrooms.

Stipek (1988) also considers intrinsic motivation to be of prime importance, though she believes that extrinsic rewards are necessary in some school situations. She proposes that intrinsic motivation can be increased when teachers give up some control and learners have more choice. The following conditions are seen as necessary to promote intrinsic motivation (p.73):

(i) The threat of external evaluation is not salient.
(ii) Attention is not focussed on extrinsic reasons for completing tasks.
(iii) Learners take responsibility for their own success.

However, some degree of extrinsic motivation is still considered to be of importance. In particular, it has not necessarily been proven that offering rewards in the classroom has a detrimental effect on intrinsic motivation, the conclusion of a review of 96 studies which addressed this question (Cameron and Pierce 1994).

Lens and Decruyenaere (1991), in discussing the results of their survey of 1824 students in secondary education, offer the following opinion in support of the role of extrinsic motivation: "Schooling is future-oriented. Well-motivated pupils study hard because it is important for their later life in general and for their professional life in particular" (p.157).

A further practical difficulty is pointed out by Symonds and Chase (1992), who conducted a treatment study amongst first language learners of English in six New York public schools, comparing the effects of traditional grammar practice against increased intrinsic motivation. It was traditional practice that was found to have the greater effect on success. The researchers conclude that it is unclear as to how real intrinsic motivation can be provided in a school setting: "The school cannot create a foreign-speaking community in which a foreign language can be acquired. Neither can it provide enough real situations involving algebra and geometry to provide for the learning of mathematics" (p.289).

Different viewpoints exist on the intrinsic/extrinsic distinction. They are not necessarily viewed as being in opposition. Generally intrinsic motivation would seem to be preferred, but there are practical questions as to how feasible it is for teachers to promote such motivation.

Another important issue that has been discussed in educational research is attribution theory (Dörnyei 1994a, p.276):

> The central theme in *attribution theory* is the study of how causal ascriptions of past failures and successes affect future goal expectancy. For example, failure that is ascribed to low ability or to the

> difficulty of a task decreases the expectation of future success more than failure that is ascribed to bad luck or to a lack of effort.

Crooks (1988) cites Weiner in stating that "... failure attributed to stable factors (lack of ability or task difficulty that is consistently too high) leads to hopelessness" (p.465). This hopelessness is surely something that all language teachers would want to avoid. With specific reference to language learning, Skehan (1989) makes the point that students will be less likely to persevere in their efforts to learn if they believe that ability or the inherent difficulty of language learning are important factors (p.52).

A further factor identified in educational research as affecting motivation is the *need for achievement*. Dörnyei (1994a, p.277) associates a high need for achievement with interest in excellence for its own sake, a tendency to initiate achievement activities, working with greater intensity at these tasks, and a persistence in the face of failure.

Initial evidence that these constructs may be important in language learning was obtained in an empirical study of adult Hungarian learners of English (Dörnyei 1990). An independent component of second language learning motivation, *attributions about past failures*, was

discovered with the claim that this is a reflection of the reality that very many students do indeed fail to learn in a foreign language learning context. Need for achievement also emerged from this research as playing an important role. This study is discussed in greater detail in the following section.

Classroom evaluation procedures are considered to have major effects on students' motivation (Crooks 1988), with insufficient attention having been given to this area. In particular, Crooks appeals for a careful consideration of evaluation standards: "Research has repeatedly demonstrated that students achieve most and gain most on key motivational variables when evaluation standards are high but attainable" (p.469). He points out that when all students in a class are required to meet the same standards this condition will inevitably remain unfulfilled. On a similar note, Lens and Decruyenaere (1991) warn against superficial comparisons between students: "Present outcomes must be compared with their previous results, and not with the present results of others in the class" (p.157). The results of a research study among English language learners at the University of Bahrain (Wigzell & Al-Ansari 1993), discussed in more detail in the following section, show an increase in motivation when traditional evaluation procedures are modified.

Educational research has also considered the question of age, and it has been claimed that at the onset of adolescence motivation becomes a particularly critical concern. Anderman and Maehr (1994) draw the conclusion in a review of recent research that "... during the middle grades, students often exhibit a disturbing downturn in motivation. Negative attitudes and behavioral patterns, which defeat any major investment in schooling, are common" (p.288). A similar statement of motivational problems in secondary education is made by Lens and Decruyenaere (1991), who believe that such problems lead directly to disruptive classroom behavior, underachievement and dropping out (p.145).

Dickinson (1995) suggests that there is a large body of evidence from educational research to justify the effectivess of learner autonomy in improving the motivation of language learners:

> ... learning success and enhanced motivation is conditional on learners taking responsibility for their own learning, being able to control their own learning and perceiving that their learning successes or failures are to be attributed to their own efforts and strategies rather than to factor outside their control. Each of these conditions is a characteristic of learner autonomy as it is described in applied linguistics (pp. 173-174).

This short review of educational research provides just a sample of some of the main findings and issues. However, those that have been identified may well be of relevance to language learning classrooms. In outlining an agenda for future research on motivation in language learning, Crookes and Schmidt (1991) propose that one aim ought to be to determine to what extent findings from education studies of motivation can be applied to second language learning (p.483).

E. NEW DIRECTIONS IN THEORY AND RESEARCH

Recently, a number of articles have appeared in the literature which question some of the theoretical assumptions made with regard to motivation in second language learning and the directions which the related research has followed. Problems in defining motivation have been raised (Crookes & Schmidt 1991; Oxford & Shearin 1994; Dörnyei 1994b), together with a call for greater consideration to be given to orientations which are neither instrumental nor integrative. The same writers have also proposed that more attention be given to linking motivation research with actual classroom practice. The methodology used to date in studies of motivation, which has primarily consisted of self-report questionnaires, has also been criticized as inadequate

(e.g Skehan 1991; Dörnyei 1994a; Ellis 1995). In short, the afore-mentioned writers have reached more or less similar conclusions in calling for a broader approach to researching motivation in language learning, to include factors they believe have been ignored. A full reply is given by Gardner and Tremblay (1994a, 1994b). The following sections deal with these various points in greater detail:

1. Problems in the definition of motivation.
2. Orientations which are neither instrumental nor integrative.
3. A focus on the language classroom.
4. Alternative research perspectives.
5. A response from Gardner and Tremblay.

1. Problems in the Definition of Motivation

Crookes and Schmidt (1991) consider that there is a mismatch between what classroom teachers understand by motivation and the way in which the term has been defined in second language learning. They believe that there may be more educational relevance in the teacher's understanding of a motivated student as being one who "... does study, or at least engage in teacher-desired behavior in the classroom and possibly outside it" (p.480).

The distinction made by Gardner between motivation and

motivational orientation is one, according to Oxford and Shearin (1994, p.14), that causes confusion when trying to apply research findings. Furthermore, they point out that orientations for learning a language frequently change over time, and they call for a broader theoretical framework to capture this more dynamic aspect of motivation.

The use of the term "integrative" to mean different things within Gardner's socio-educational model is criticized by Dörnyei (1994b), who points out that it is used at three different levels of the model, i.e. "integrative orientation" as one component of "integrativeness", which is in turn a component of the overall "integrative motive". In Dörnyei's view the use of such terminology is rather confusing. He also regards as confusing the use of the term "integrative motive" to be the higher-order construct, rather than "motivation" (which as defined by Gardner is only one component of the former).

2. Orientations which are neither Instrumental nor Integrative

Despite his criticisms of the terminology used by Gardner, Dörnyei (1994b) quotes his own recent research in Hungary (a context he describes as very different from those researched by Gardner), as evidence that the integrative motive is a valid construct. Amongst Hungarian learners

an integrative orientation was found to be meaningful. However, Dörnyei sees an instrumental orientation as important only "... *where it is relevant*, that is, where relatively short-term pragmatic, utilitarian benefits are actually available for the learners" (p.520). He goes on to suggest that with such benefits not usually available to school children, an instrumental orientation is not particularly relevant in this setting. While he acknowledges that Gardner has stated that there may be other orientations, he believes that the research design used (in particular the AMTB), has prioritized integrative and instrumental orientations and prevented the emergence of other potentially important orientations.

A similar point is made by Oxford and Shearin (1994), in whose own research amongst American high school students studying Japanese, various reasons emerged for studying the language which did not fit into either instrumental or integrative categories. The students were not prompted, and asked simply to write an essay explaining their reasons for learning Japanese. Some reasons that were given included the following (p.12):

> ... receiving intellectual stimulation, seeking personal challenge, enjoying the elitism of taking a difficult language, showing off to friends, developing greater cultural tolerance through language study, aiding world peace, satisfying curiosity about

cultural "secrets", pursuing a fascination with Japanese writing systems, and having a private code that parents would not know.

A more detailed research study, conducted by Ramage (1990), sought to determine reasons for studying foreign languages amongst 138 U.S. high school students of second-level French and Spanish. A distinction was made between continuing students, those who had opted to study for more than the compulsory period of two years, and discontinuing students. A more open-ended methodological approach was taken to allow for all possible orientations, with a self-report questionnaire being generated from a pilot study. The discontinuing students were found for the most part to be solely interested in fulfilling a college entrance requirement. Those who chose to continue language study, however, had developed an interest in language study for its own sake (p.212). Ramage concludes that language teachers in the U.S. must somehow attempt to instill intrinsic interest amongst their learners. As discussed previously in section D, this is far from an easy task. However, the results of this study are very interesting in that they provide evidence that the construct of intrinsic motivation (taken from educational research) may be more relevant to some groups of learners than the instrumental or integrative orientations traditionally considered in second language learning.

3. A Focus on the Language Classroom

In reviewing the motivational research in second language learning to date, Skehan (1989) concludes that there is a need for conducting studies in more varied situations. He cites the research of Clement and Kruidenier (1983) as illustrative of differences that were obtained merely by moving from one Canadian province to another. Dörnyei (1994a) adopts a similar point of view in stating that Gardner and Lambert as Canadians were "... particularly sensitive to the social dimension of L2 motivation" (p.274). He proposes that outside of North America different factors may be at work, and emphasizes the importance of context by concluding that "... the exact nature of the social and pragmatic dimensions of L2 motivation is always dependent on *who* learns *what* languages *where*" (p.275).

A specific distinction between *second language* and *foreign language* environments is considered relevant to the study of motivation by Oxford and Shearin (1994). They define a second language as "... one that is learned in a location where that language is typically used as the main vehicle of everyday communication for most people" and a foreign language as "... one that is learned in a place where that language is not typically used as the medium of ordinary communication" (p.14). They propose the following key difference as one that has considerable

implications on the motivation of learners:

> The learner of the second language is surrounded by stimulation, both visual and auditory, in the target language and thus has many motivational and instructional advantages. Foreign language learners are surrounded by their own native language and have to go out of their way to find stimulation and input in the target language (p.14).

Thus they believe that there can be very significant differences between the motivations of second and foreign language learners, and they claim that integrative motivation will be more meaningful for second language learners, for whom learning to live in the new culture and learning to communicate fluently in the target language is obligatory (p.15). In contrast, they see the task for foreign language learners, who they claim rarely surpass intermediate language proficiency, as more difficult. It is the foreign language learning context that they believe has so far been neglected in empirical research on motivation.

Dörnyei (1990) did conduct a study in such a situation. The subjects were 134 young adult learners of English in Hungary, "... a European environment that is believed to be typical of FLL in general" (p.49). All learners were expected to be reasonably motivated in that they had made

the decision themselves to invest both time and money in attending a fairly prestigious language institute. Two groups of approximately equal size were included, beginners and intermediate learners (p.50); otherwise all subjects were assumed to form a reasonably homogenous group. A self-report questionnaire was administered with 44 items (all in Likert-scale format) and 13 subscales (some of which contained only one item). Students were also asked to indicate their desired level of proficiency. A factor analysis was performed on the results with the aim of determining the important components of motivation in such a context.

Instrumental orientations were found to make a significant contribution to motivation in this context (p.67). Integrative orientations were also found to be important, but somewhat different in nature to those considered by Gardner. Dörnyei proposes that "Foreign language learners often have not had enough contact with the target language community to form attitudes about them" (p.69). Thus he concludes that it is more general attitudes and beliefs that are important, which he lists as follows (p.69):

(i) Interest in foreign languages, cultures, and people.

(ii) Desire to broaden one's view and avoid provincialism.

(iii) Desire for new stimuli and challenges.

(iv) Desire to integrate into a new community.

While an instrumental orientation appeared sufficient to take students to the intermediate level, those desiring to go beyond this level were found to be more likely to have a general integrative orientation. Need for achievement and attributions about past failures were two other components that were found to significantly affect motivation, Dörnyei suggests that these would be expected in any typical foreign language learning environment, where the classroom is of crucial importance.

Crookes and Schmidt (1991) make the point that these findings were to a certain extent determined by what was chosen for inclusion in the study in the first place. However, they are in agreement with the need for more research in foreign language situations, which they believe are very frequently characterized by failure to learn the language.

One such study was carried out at the University of Bahrain (Wigzell & Al-Ansari 1993). The aim was to determine how low achievers could be encouraged to persevere. Self-report questionnaires were administered to 55 students majoring in either Arabic or Islamic studies and taking an English language course; these students were generally among the poorest performers, with at best neutral attitudes toward the language and the

culture of English-speaking people. The questionnaire items were very specific in eliciting attitudes to the classroom, the language program and the students' perceptions of their own success or failure. Most students reported difficulty in understanding what the instructor was saying and expressed a preference for a bilingual instructor; the reading material was generally perceived as much too difficult; and students did not enjoy the role play activities which they saw as irrelevant to their own needs.

Thus, clear pedagogical implications were derived from this research. A subsequent treatment study by the same researchers found that when traditional methods of assessment were changed to give the low achievers a better chance of success, they became more motivated and their performance improved. This study would seem to suggest that what happens in the classroom can have a very critical effect on motivation, particularly for low achievers.

4. Alternative Research Perspectives

Dörnyei (1994a) considers that data obtained from the classroom section of the AMTB is insufficient in providing pedagogical guidelines that can be of use to the language teacher. In proposing a revised construct of motivation in language learning, he puts forward three components

that are of importance - the *Language Level*, the *Learner Level* and the *Learning Situation Level* (p.279). The Language Level he defines in terms of "... an *integrative* and an *instrumental motivational subsystem*", which is similar to the approach taken by Gardner in considering orientations. The Learner Level consists of "... a complex of affects and cognitions that form fairly stable personality traits." What is of most interest to classroom teachers in Dörnyei's view, since it is the component most open to outside influence, is the Learning Situation Level. This is where he suggests the main focus of future research should lie. He identifies three subcomponents of this construct (p.280):

(i) Course-specific motivational components
(ii) Teacher-specific motivational components
(iii) Group-specific motivational components

Greater attention to motivation at the classroom level is also advocated by Crookes and Schmidt (1991), who outline seven specific areas to which future research could be directed (pp. 487-492):

(i) Preliminaries - the effect of any remarks the instructor makes about forthcoming activities.
(ii) Activities - is the right level of challenge being provided, or are the activities leading to boredom or anxiety?

(iii) Groupwork - while this is often claimed to be motivating for students, there is no proof this is necessarily true. In particular, it may depend on cultural factors.

(iv) Maintaining Interest - to what extent does boredom develop and is it a result of using the same routine?

(v) Feedback - the effects of using extrinsic rewards in the classroom and the impact of praise or criticism given.

(vi) Concern for grades - the extent to which this may be too great and negatively affecting learning.

(vii) Materials - to what extent are they interesting and motivating?

Ellis (1995) also points out that the research conducted to date has been limited in that "... it takes no cognizance of the potential effect that learning experiences can have on learners' motivation, as opposed to the effect that motivation has on language learning" (p.513).

In terms of methodology, motivation studies to date have relied more or less entirely on self-report questionnaires (Ellis 1995). Crookes and Schmidt (1991) cite the lack of long-term studies as another limitation. Skehan (1991) recommends a more longitudinal approach, using open-ended and ethnographic techniques, with greater consideration to

be given as to how learners' motivation is affected by classroom events and how it varies over time.

One study (already reported on above), where the approach was more open-ended, was conducted by Ramage (1990) among high school language learners in the U.S. The questionnaire was developed from a pilot study and the main finding was that those students who continued language study, when it became optional, were much more likely to be intrinsically motivated. Pre-determined categories reflecting instrumental and integrative orientations would surely have disguised this important result.

An entirely qualitative method yielded very interesting findings, in research carried out amongst 24 learners of French in two Ontario secondary schools (Massey 1994). As in the above-mentioned study by Ramage, the focus was the decision to continue or discontinue the program when it became optional. All students were interviewed individually for about thirty minutes, and all factors relating to their decision to continue (or not) were investigated. The level of success that the students had achieved so far was an important factor in the decision (it was the unsuccessful students who were discontinuing), though the students were not always too concerned with their grades - those who felt they had achieved a reasonable level of communicative competence were likely

to continue. Dissatisfaction with some aspects of the learning environment was expressed, in particular many students complained that there had been too much emphasis on written language and grammar in the earlier grades.

A study which monitored a group of students over an academic year also produced interesting and important findings (Samimy & Tabuse 1992). Seventy learners in beginning Japanese classes at a U.S. university were investigated in order to determine reasons for high attrition rates. Data was collected through self-report questionnaires, administered in both the the autumn and spring quarters. The results showed that the students were significantly less motivated in the spring quarter, that their attitudes to the class were more negative and that the grades they received were significantly lower. In other words there was a deterioration over the year in attitudes, motivation and performance. The researchers conclude that it is critical to somehow enhance the attitudes and motivation of the students: "As language professionals, then, we have an obligation to respond not only to learners' linguistic needs, but also to their affective needs to produce more successful language learners" (p.393).

The three research studies above all used data collection techniques that have been relatively untried in research on attitudes and motivation in language learning. The

findings provide important pedagogical implications, though there are no conclusive answers as to how teachers may attempt to manipulate the attitudes and motivation of their students.

5. A Response from Gardner and Tremblay

One of the major criticisms made in the recent literature is that research on attitudes and motivation in language learning has somehow been insufficient in addressing issues of interest to the classroom teacher. It is important perhaps to consider the aim of Gardner and his colleagues in researching attitudes and motivation in language learning, and in their development of the socio-educational model. For as Gardner and Tremblay (1994a, p.359) state, "... their primary objective has been to understand individual differences in the motivation to learn a second language, not to proselytize on ways to teach or even learn languages".

The primacy of integrative motivation has also been questioned. In particular, a case has been made for considering orientations that are neither integrative nor instrumental, and that this may be all the more relevant outside of the contexts researched by Gardner and his colleagues. The existence of other orientations is not actually disputed by Gardner and Tremblay (1994a), who restate that in the socio-educational model

"... integrative motivation is seen as important. It is not seen as paramount, however" (p.361).

While complete generalizability of the socio-educational model is not being claimed, Gardner and Tremblay (1994a) point out that there is some research evidence to show validity of the main constructs in contexts quite different from those in which it was developed. They cite the research of Kraemer (1993) amongst Israelis learning Arabic as one such case, where the model was expanded to include some extra variables specific to the context, but was otherwise found to be valid.

Gardner and Tremblay (1994a) do not reject the proposals made by their critics; however, they make it quite clear that empirical research is called for (p.362):

> It seems quite reasonable to argue that the points raised in these reviews could well be valid in the area of second language acquisition. What is missing, however, is the research necessary to determine whether or not in fact this is true.

As an example of research integrating some of the new ideas suggested, Gardner and Tremblay (1995) chose to include several new constructs in their own latest research. Seventy-five students of French in a Northern Ontario secondary school were measured on the AMTB scale

as well as on self-report measures of goal-setting, causal attributions, attention, and persistence. The main finding was that the new variables were found to act as mediators in the relationship between attitudes and motivational behavior. The researchers conclude that this study "... provides initial support for the development of more elaborate motivational theories" (p.516).

F. OVERVIEW

A great deal of the empirical research on attitudes and motivation in second language learning has been carried out by Gardner and his colleagues. A comprehensive theory of second language learning, called the socio-educational model, has been developed, within which attitudes and motivation are considered to play an important role in explaining individual differences. Gardner has continued to update his propositions in the light of findings from empirical research. A detailed measurement scale, the AMTB, has also been developed and updated where necessary. In particular, Gardner and his colleagues have conducted extensive research to establish the validity of this scale.

Other researchers in the field have recently begun to question the assumptions on which much of the research has been based, the directions which it has taken and the

methodology used. However, the conclusion that most of these researchers reach is that the work of Gardner has been very valuable, and that it offers a sound basis upon which the scope of investigation can be broadened. The following tribute is typical: "Without doubt, Gardner's work on the place of motivation in language learning is unique, and certainly its positive qualities far outweigh the negative" (Skehan 1989, p.61). Gardner himself does not come out against a more extensive approach, believing that what is needed is pertinent empirical research (Gardner & Tremblay 1994a, p.366). There appears to be a consensus amongst all in the field that further research is now required. Oxford (1994) concludes with the following assessment: "We are at a key point in time regarding research on language learning motivation. Gardner and his colleagues originally brought us to the place we are. For this we can be grateful, no matter where we go from here" (p.514).

The importance of context in relation to motivation has been recognized by all. Dörnyei (1990) conducted a study among learners of English in Hungary (an EFL environment). Most other research, however, has focussed either on North-American students learning a language other than English, or on international students learning English in an English speaking country (an ESL environment). It has been proposed that many more studies are needed in EFL environments, and that the findings obtained may be quite

different.

In such environments, what happens in the language classroom is likely to take on highly significant importance, yet the main focus of research on attitudes and motivation to date has tended to de-emphasize classroom factors. Skehan (1991) makes the point that with regard to actual classroom practice, assumptions about motivation have been made where it is research that is required: "There has been relatively little research into the effects of different materials and teaching techniques on the motivation of students (although all manner of generalizations in this area are conveyed during teacher training courses)" (p.281). Insights gained from general educational research, concerning how attitudes and motivation are affected by what takes place in the classroom, have not usually been integrated into research in second language learning.

Methodology has been rather limited to date, with too much reliance on self-report questionnaires. A call has been made for the use of more qualitative techniques, in addition to a longitudinal approach which can identify possible changes in attitudes and motivation over time.

Thus the research to be undertaken will differ from many of the previous studies in the following three areas:

(i) It will be conducted among EFL students.

(ii) Greater emphasis will be given to classroom factors.

(iii) The methodology used will be partly qualitative, and will include a longitudinal component.

METHOD

A. PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study was to answer the following three questions:-

1. Are the attitudes and motivation of the subjects related to their scores on achievement tests?

2. Assuming that a positive relationship is determined from question one above, what subcomponents of attitudes and motivation best explain differences between "successful" and "unsuccessful" learners?

3. How does the relationship between attitudes and motivation and achievement scores change over time?

It was expected that in answer to the first question, a positive relationship would be found between attitudes and motivation and achievement scores. This would both confirm observations made by the researcher of groups of learners similar to those chosen as subjects for this study, and be in line with findings from most of the studies reviewed in the previous chapter.

It was less easy to predict the answer to the second question, but the data collection procedures (discussed in section C below) were designed such that detailed information could be obtained about the attitudes of subjects to the learning situation. It was hoped that should this component prove to be significant, then actionable pedagogical recommendations could be derived.

Finally, with reference to question three, previous observation of similar groups suggested a possible widening of the gap between "successful" and "unsuccessful" learners, due to a deterioration in attitudes and motivation of the latter.

The researcher was also a participant observer in this study, being the speaking and writing skills teacher of the class under investigation. The following profile of the subjects is based on the researcher's inside knowledge of this particular group.

B. SUBJECTS

The subjects were a complete class of Turkish learners of English at a high school in Istanbul - Gürsoy Özel Lisesi. There were 32 students in the class, though it was thought necessary to exclude two students from the research (one

was a foreign student from Turkmenistan, the other was much older than the rest of the students, and had a different educational background). Thus thirty subjects were left, all of whom were aged between 14 and 15 at the time of the research, 10 were male and 20 female. All students were newly enrolled at the school and were following the intensive high school English preparatory program, which consisted of twenty-seven hours of instruction per week. Twenty of these hours were taught by one Turkish teacher with the emphasis on structure, vocabulary and listening comprehension, while two native-speaking teachers focussed on the reading, speaking and writing skills in the remaining seven hours. The program adhered to the guidelines laid down by the Turkish Ministry of Education, and was similar in nature to the intensive program applied at a number of private and "fast-track" high schools throughout Turkey. Such schools and intensive programs are rapidly increasing in number.

All students had graduated from state junior schools, and this was their first learning experience at such a private school. It could be expected that most would be under pressure to succeed, since their parents had invested both time (following such a preparatory program means that students graduate one year later) and money when deciding to enrol their children. All students had in fact been exposed to some English at junior school (with the exception of one, who had attended a school where French

was taught), but their level on entry was low enough for them to be considered not very different from zero beginners, an assumption made while designing the program. It had been observed from past programs that any differences which do exist in pre-entry levels have usually all but disappeared by the end of the first month.

Therefore, the age of the subjects, their pre-entry level of English, previous educational background, the program followed and the teachers of this program were factors that were, as far as reasonably possible, controlled in this study.

One of the main aims of the research, stated in section A above, was to identify possible differences between "successful" and "unsuccessful" learners. Such a categorization of learners is of course relative. It was decided to base this upon an adequate number of scores from achievement tests (which the students take each week). The views of the other teachers of the class were elicited to confirm that this division, based on achievement scores, was also reflected in classroom performance.

C. DATA COLLECTION

1. Questionnaire adapted from the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB).

It was decided that the questionnaire ought to be as broad as possible so as to minimize the risk of missing important variables. This is in line with recent theoretical articles (Crookes and Schmidt 1991; Dörnyei 1994a; Oxford and Shearin 1994) which call for an extension of Gardner's work to include all possible factors which could influence motivation and recognize (as did Gardner himself) that different factors may be at work in different contexts.

While taking as wide a perspective as possible, there was a need to limit the number of items to those which could be tackled by students within one lesson. A further consideration was that if the questionnaire contained too many items, boredom might become a factor, with the consequence that students would not give each item sufficient attention. It was decided that care would need to be exercised on this point, since most of the subjects had probably not been exposed to such research questionnaires previously.

The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) (Gardner 1985 Gardner, Day & Macintyre 1992) formed the basis of much of the questionnaire. However, several sections were shortened in line with the above time constraints, some items were rewritten, and in others wording was changed slightly to be more meaningful for the context in which the students find themselves.

Integrativeness, motivation, and attitudes toward the learning situation were the three main subsections, and it was assumed that the total of these three sections would provide an overall measure of the integrative motive. While this approach was a replication of Gardner's methodology, the attitudes toward the learning situation section was rewritten to incorporate factors specific to the language program under consideration as well as some points raised in connection with the classroom in some of the recent research articles.[1] In addition, some new components were added to provide additonal data. Further specific explanations of the various subcomponents, together with references as to the source of each item, are all included in Appendix I.

All items were presented as Likert items on a 5-point scale (Kraemer 1993; Pierson, Fu & Lee 1980) from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". While Gardner has used 7-point scales in his work, the subjects were not expected to be particularly familiar with such

questionnaires and it seemed prudent to keep the format as simple as possible. Where possible (orientation sections are the main exception), equal numbers of positively and negatively worded items were included with the intention of minimizing socially desirable responses. The original version of the questionnaire is included in Appendix II.

The questionnaire was translated into Turkish by the researcher and a colleague working together. Particular care was taken at this stage to ensure that the Turkish wording would be as clear and unambiguous in meaning as possible to the students. The translated version was then passed to a research assistant in the Department of Translation and Interpretation of Boğaziçi University for independent verification by means of back-translation. A few minor adjustments were found to be needed; these were carried out and checked once more through back-translation. The finalized Turkish version was checked by two more teachers at the high school for any potential areas of misunderstanding. This final version used is included in Appendix III.

2. Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted among a whole class at the same school, in which most of the students had been at the preparatory level in the previous year. In addition to checking whether any problems remained with the individual

items, it was hoped also that the researcher could determine how the subjects were likely to react to such an inquiry, how much time was needed, and how understandable the format was. No significant problems were identified, though nearly all the subjects completed the questionnaire within 20 minutes, considerably quicker than had been expected. One subject, however, was observed to be simply circling numbers on the last page without appearing to read, in an effort, presumably, to finish quickly (the data from this subject obviously had to be discarded). Although time was available, it was decided not to increase the number of items, since this could lead to the risk of more subjects taking such an approach. It was also thought prudent to emphasize to the students that they could take just as much time as they needed.

One final trial was completed before administering the questionnaire to the chosen group. Two students, one who had obtained high grades and one who had obtained low grades, were selected from another of the previous year's classes. They answered the questionnaire while explaining their ideas and reactions directly to the researcher. No significant problems were identified from this procedure, and it was reasonably apparent that the students did not feel any of the items to be particularly sensitive, and thus did not appear to be attempting to provide socially desirable answers.

The AMTB has been subject to extensive tests over the years to establish its reliability and validity (Gardner and Gliksman 1982; Gardner, Lalonde & Moorcroft 1985; Gardner and MacIntyre 1993b). For the current research, Cronbach Alpha coefficients of internal reliability (Hatch and Faraday 1982) were calculated for all of the important subcategories. Because of the limited number of subjects, data from the sample group was combined with the pilot group while carrying out this procedure. Table 1 shows the results obtained for the three main subscales taken as a whole, together with the overall integrative motive measure.

Table 1. Reliability coefficients for the main components of the questionnaire.

Component	Cronbach Alpha
Integrativeness	0.57
Motivation	0.26
Attitudes toward the learning situation	0.72
Integrative Motive	0.72

Attitudes toward the learning situation consisted of twenty items specially written for the questionnaire, this being the largest section. It would seem that this section, together with the overall measure of integrative motive, is the most reliable measure. The coefficients

for Integrativeness and Motivation are a little lower than was expected, yet these scales were the most similar in design to those of Gardner. This may be due to the smaller number of items (twelve in each category), or it may result from contextual factors affecting the students. This point will be discussed in more detail later.

3. Student Interviews

Twelve subjects were interviewed by the researcher on a one-to-one basis. The main aim behind collecting data this way was to elicit points of relevance that may have been missed in the questionnaire, and to obtain possible further explantions of some of the numerical data, with students' attitudes toward the language program being of central interest. Therefore the emphasis at this stage was on an open-ended approach. The following five topics were explored initially:

(i) Expectations prior to commencing the preparatory program.
(ii) Extent to which expectations have been met.
(iii) Attitudes toward the classroom.
(iv) Attitudes toward homework / independent study.
(v) Exams.

Examples of questions asked under each topic are included in Appendix IV. It should be noted, however, that not all

the subjects were asked the same questions. Rather, attention was given to creating a relaxed atmosphere, in which subjects would talk about their true feelings with a minimum of prompting. The interviews were conducted in Turkish, tape-recorded, and then transcribed in full. All subjects were asked for their consent, and the purpose behind the research, together with the reasons for recording the interviews were carefully explained. Each interview lasted about fifteen minutes.

4. Achievement Tests

The class was given one test every week, written by one of the teachers, to assess progress. The tests lasted 40 minutes each and were conducted in the same class hour each Monday morning under similar conditions of supervision. Scores were given out of a total of 100 points, and accumulation of these test scores provided students with their official grades for each semester. These tests were of four types:

(i) Core (structure and vocabulary)
(ii) Listening / Video (comprehension skills)
(iii) Speaking and Writing skills
(iv) Reading skills

An intuitive observation of the complete set of test results for the first semester (which include four tests

of type (i) above and three tests for each of the other three categories, 13 test scores in all) suggested that student performance did not vary much across the different types of tests. To provide empirical evidence for this, Spearman rank-order correlation coefficients (Hatch and Faraday 1982) were computed comparing the four categories with each other. Table 2 shows the results obtained.

Table 2. Spearman rank-order correlation coefficients for the four categories of tests.

Test category		(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)
(i)	Core	****	0.92	0.93	0.92
(ii)	Listening / Video	0.92	****	0.89	0.78
(iii)	Speaking / Writing	0.93	0.89	****	0.86
(iv)	Reading	0.92	0.78	0.86	****

Though the tests were designed to measure achievement in different areas of the program, student scores did not vary greatly across these areas. It was thus decided that all test scores could be combined to produce one overall performance score for each student.

D. PROCEDURE

The questionnaire was administered to the subjects in the middle of the first semester and again in the middle of the second semester. The aims of the research were carefully explained, the students were assured of confidentiality, and they were asked not to write their names on the questionnaire. The two instructions that were particularly emphasized to the students were "tell the truth" and "take your time". The students were allowed to ask questions about any points they did not understand, but none chose to do so.

In the week immediately following the implementation of the questionnaire (in both semesters), and as soon as was practically possible, selected students were interviewed. They were not given prior notice so as to discourage any pre-prepared answers, and after the interview, they were encouraged not to discuss their ideas with any of their peers. Interviews took place during normal class time, with the permission of the class teacher, and only this teacher was aware of which students would be called when.

Sampling was conducted from aggregated achievement scores for the first half of the first semester, together with consultation with the other teachers of the class to predict which students were likely to be the most

successful and unsuccessful. The initial exam scores suggested that eight subjects were clearly ahead of the rest, and the teachers confirmed that this was also reflected in classroom performance. In the same way, six students were identified as potentially weaker than the rest. It was decided that these would form probable groups for data analysis, on the condition that later achievement scores did not vary much. To guard against possible effects of this, the four subjects with the highest grades, the four subjects with the lowest grades, and the four subjects clustered around the median were chosen for interview, to represent the top, bottom, and middle groups of students respectively.

The validity of this procedure was checked at the end of the first semester, by comparing achievement scores in the first half of the semester with those obtained in the second half. The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient for all the students was 0.95. When both the top and bottom groups were considered alone, a value of 0.97 was obtained for each group. This would appear to confirm that there are only slight variations in performance over time, and the movement that does occur is less likely to take place amongst the top or bottom groups.

E. PROCESSING THE DATA

Data from the questionnaires was entered into the SPSS program, together with average achievement scores. In this way there were two sets of data, one for each semester. Correlations of different components of motivation with achievement were calculated. Comparisons were also made of the data obtained from both semesters.

All interviews conducted were transcribed in full. Appendix V contains two examples. Following this, a coding frame was designed to cover all of the main points made by the subjects. According to this, all replies were coded, and tables were drawn up to differentiate the three groups of students.

[1] In particular, items were included to cover the seven points raised by Crookes and Schmidt (1991, pp. 487-492) - preliminaries, activities, groupwork, maintaining interest, feedback, concern for grades, and materials. These points are explained further on pages 46-47 of the first chapter.

RESULTS

A. SCORES ON ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

Aggregate scores on achievement tests in the first half of the first semester were compared with those in the first half of the second semester for all subjects. The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient obtained was 0.87. This high level of correlation would seem to indicate that relative student performance did not vary greatly. What was even more striking was the consistency within the top and bottom groups of students. When ranked according to grades, those students occupying the top seven positions in the first semester were also to be found in the top seven positions in the second semester, and likewise for the bottom five students. Achievement scores thus suggested the following three groups be used for analysis purposes:

(i) Top group - 7 students
(ii) Middle group - 18 students
(iii) Bottom group - 5 students

B. CORRELATIONS OF ATTITUDES AND MOTIVATION WITH ACHIEVEMENT

Table 3. Correlations with the main components of the integrative motive.

Component	First semester	Second semester
Integrativeness	0.48*	0.35
Motivation	0.62**	0.40
Classroom Attitudes	0.42*	0.68**
Integrative Motive	0.67**	0.67**

* denotes a one-tailed significance level of 0.01

** denotes a one-tailed significance level of 0.001

Classroom attitudes in the above table is an abbreviation for attitudes toward the learning situation.

The correlation between integrative motive and achievement scores is highly significant with a value of 0.67 for both semesters. Motivation, with a correlation of 0.62 appears to be the key component in the first semester. Integrativeness is also significantly correlated and classroom attitudes shows the weakest level of correlation although still significant. However, the picture changes radically in the second semester, with classroom attitudes increasing greatly in significance, and indeed proving to be the only significant component.

C. GROUP DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES AND MOTIVATION

Table 4. First semester scores for each group on the main components of attitudes and motivation.

Component	Bottom Group	Middle Group	Top Group	Total
Integrativeness	42.8	50.7	49.6	49.1
Motivation	49.6	53.2	55.3	53.1
Classroom Attitudes	73.0	76.8	79.4	76.8
Integrative Motive	165.4	180.6	184.3	178.9

Table 5. Second semester scores for each group on the main components of attitudes and motivation.

Component	Bottom Group	Middle Group	Top Group	Total
Integrativeness	45.0	47.4	51.1	47.9
Motivation	48.2	52.4	52.7	51.8
Classroom Attitudes	62.4	72.7	74.0	71.3
Integrative Motive	155.6	172.5	177.9	170.9

Both tables above show average scores for each component. Table 4 shows the scores for the first semester and table 5 for the second semester. The maximum possible score for

both integrativeness and motivation is 60, the minimum score is 12 (12 items each rated on a scale of one to five). Classroom attitudes has maximum and minimum scores of 100 and 20 respectively (20 items), and the integrative motive, being the total of the three components, has a maximum score of 220 and a minimum score of 44.

On the integrative motive and on all three subcomponents of it, in both tables, scores for the top group are higher than for the middle group, the scores for which are in turn higher than those of the bottom group (there is just one exception to this, in the first semester, with the middle group scoring slightly higher than the top group on integrativeness). This would seem to confirm what was expected and it backs up the correlational data in table three. An analysis of variance between the three groups was conducted to check which of these differences were significant, and those that were found to be significant at the .05 level are shown in table 6 below:

Table 6. Significant differences between groups.

Component	First semester	Second semester
Integrativeness	BOT/MID	NONE
Motivation	BOT/TOP	NONE
Classroom Attitudes	NONE	BOT/MID BOT/TOP
Integrative Motive	BOT/MID BOT/TOP	BOT/MID BOT/TOP

None of the differences between the middle and top groups were found to be significant. All significant differences identified involved the bottom group. On the overall measure of the integrative motive, the bottom group had a significantly lower average score than both the top and middle groups. These differences were significant for both the first and second semesters. However, looking at the three components that make up the integrative motive, a clear difference emerges between the first and second semesters. In the first semester the bottom group was significantly lower than the middle group on the measure of integrativeness, and significantly lower than the top group on the measure of motivation, but no group differences were found to be significant on these components in the second semester. Average scores on classroom attitudes on the other hand, which had shown no significant differences between groups in the first semester, were significantly lower in the second semester for the bottom group than for both the middle and top groups.

This analysis, backed up by the correlational data in table 3, would seem to suggest two key findings. Firstly, it is the bottom group that is the most different in relation to the other two groups, and secondly, the relationship between success and classroom attitudes becomes more important over time, with a corresponding decline in the relationship between success and the other

two components of integrativeness and motivation.

D. CHANGES IN ATTITUDES AND MOTIVATION OVER TIME

A comparison of tables 4 and 5 above shows that, for all 30 subjects, the average scores on the integrative motive, and on all three subcomponents of it, decreased in the second semester. For the integrative motive and for the two subcomponents of motivation and classroom attitudes this decrease was reflected across all three groups. However, for the component of integrativeness, average scores of both the top and bottom groups increased slightly. Paired t-tests were conducted to determine the significance of these changes between first and second semesters:

Table 7. Results of paired t-tests on first and second semester scores for the three groups.

Component	Bottom Group	Middle Group	Top Group	Total
Integrativeness	0.41	0.03*	0.18	0.25
Motivation	0.39	0.46	0.00*	0.07
Classroom Attitudes	0.02*	0.01*	0.02*	0.00*
Integrative Motive	0.03*	0.01*	0.04*	0.00*

Table 7 above shows the two-tailed probabilities obtained. Changes that were significant at the .05 level are denoted by (*), and all of these significant changes reflected decreases in average scores.

Thus there was a general and significant decline over time for all groups on average scores of the integrative motive. On examination of the subcomponents, it can be seen that a significant decline also occured for all three groups on classroom attitudes. The average score on integrativeness decreased significantly for the middle group, and on motivation for the strong group, but these findings were not reflected across any other groups or in the total.

Thus it appears that most of the significant differences occuring between groups and over time do so on the variable of classroom attitudes. This component was therefore analyzed in greater detail, to determine what specific factors are particularly relevant in explaining differences in classroom attitudes.

E. IMPORTANT CLASSROOM FACTORS

Twenty items were included on the questionnaire to measure attitudes toward the learning situation. An item by item

analysis was conducted to determine which items were rated negatively by the students, and which items changed significantly across groups or over time. It is worthwhile stating at this point that with such a detailed breakdown, and a small number of subjects, the findings in this section ought to be treated with some degree of caution. In section G (to follow) these findings are compared, where possible, with the results obtained from the student interviews. In table 8 below, those items from the classroom attitudes section of the questionnaire

Table 8. First semester negative ratings for individual items related to classroom attitudes.

No.	Individual questionnaire item	Bot grp	Mid grp	Top grp	Total
25	Teachers don't explain reasons for tasks sufficiently.	2.4	2.3	(3.3)	2.6
31	Teachers put too much importance on exam results.	2.6	(3.1)	(3.4)	(3.1)
36	Feeling unhappy when exam results announced.	2.6	(3.3)	(3.1)	(3.1)
41	More advice wanted as to how to study.	1.6*	1.6	2.9	1.9

* denotes that a t-test showed this rating for the bottom group to be significantly lower than the top group.

which elicited negative average ratings from at least one of the three groups are shown.

Negative ratings in the above table were defined as average ratings that were less than 3.0, which was taken as the neutral point on a scale of one to five. All of the above items were negatively worded on the questionnaire, so it was *agreement* with these items which led to the negative ratings shown. Where ratings for certain groups or the total did not turn out to be negative, these are shown in brackets.

Not surprisingly, it was the bottom group which gave the highest number of negative ratings, four items in total. In contrast, the top group only expressed dissatisfaction in calling for more advice on how to study, and at 2.9, this rating was only just negative, and was significantly higher in any case than the average rating given to this item by the bottom group.

One more item, not shown in the above table as it elicited positive ratings from all groups, also produced a significant difference between the top and bottom groups on a t-test. With a rating of 4.9, the top group were strongly against the idea that the teacher should correct grammar mistakes less often, a proposal slightly more appealing to the bottom group which gave it a score of 4.0.

Table 9. Second semester negative ratings for individual items related to classroom attitudes.

No.	Individual questionnaire item	Bot grp	Mid grp	Top grp	Total
25	Teachers don't explain reasons for tasks sufficiently.	1.8	2.0	2.7	2.1
28	Lessons are too repetitive.	2.8	(3.6)	(3.3)	(3.4)
31	Teachers put too much importance on exam results.	(3.0)	2.9	(3.4)	(3.0)
35	Teachers should speak more Turkish in class.	2.8	(3.6)	(3.6)	(3.4)
36	Feeling unhappy when exam results announced.	1.8	(3.0)	(3.1)	2.8
38	Twenty-seven hours of English a week is too much.	2.4*	(4.2)	(4.6)	(4.0)
39	Teachers don't understand me and don't know how to help me.	2.6	(3.5)	(3.4)	(3.3)
41	More advice wanted as to how to study.	1.8	2.0	2.9	2.2
42	Teachers put too much emphasis on grammar.	(3.0)	2.9	2.7	2.9
43	Insufficient opportunities to participate in class.	2.4*	(4.1)	(4.4)	(3.9)

Table 9 shows the results of a similar analysis on the data obtained in the second semester. It can be immediately seen that many more items are involved this time, with ten out of the twenty items related to classroom attitudes eliciting negative ratings from one or more groups. Once again though, it is the bottom group that gives the highest number of negative ratings - eight in all.

Two of the differences between the bottom and top groups were found to be significant, shown by (*) in the table. In addition it was found there was a significant difference in the rating given to the usefulness of groupwork (item 27) between the top and bottom groups, but that this time the rating was *higher* for the bottom group (4.4 for the bottom group, 3.3 for the top group).

Summarizing the results of the above two tables, it seems reasonable to state that all students would prefer more explanations from the teacher as to why they do certain tasks, and they would also prefer more advice on how to study. In the second semester, the middle and top groups feel that there is too great an emphasis on grammar.

Several more problems are identified by the bottom group. Initially in the first semester, they believe that there is too much emphasis on exam results, and they are unhappy when hearing the results of these exams. In the second

semester they express dissatisfaction with the repetitiveness of lessons, with the intensity of the program, and with the lack of opportunities to participate. Moreover, they complain that the teacher is unable to understand and help them, and that they would prefer the teacher to use more Turkish in the classroom. However, they put greater value on group activities in the class than do the top group.

Table 10. Changes in ratings on individual items of classroom attitudes over time.

No.	Questionnaire item	Bottom group	Middle group	Top group	Total
28	Lessons are too repetitive.	0.02*	0.05*	0.05*	0.00*
33	Weekly exams help me learn English.	0.43	0.00*	0.60	0.01*
38	Twenty-seven hours a week of English is too much.	0.05*	0.42	0.17	0.03*
43	Insufficient opportunity to participate in class.	0.02*	0.56	0.46	0.47
44	Happy with the general atmosphere among students	0.21	0.19	0.60	0.05*

One further analysis was carried out for all three groups. Paired t-tests for the first and second semesters were conducted for each of the twenty items in the classroom attitudes section to identify changes over time. The significant two-tailed probabilities (denoted by (*)) are shown in table 10 above. All of these changes represented a decrease in ratings.

Thus it can be seen that as time went on, all students had a tendency to view their lessons as more repetitive. The bottom group increasingly felt that twenty-seven hours a week of English was too intensive, and that they did not have enough opportunities to participate. The middle group became less sure of the usefulness of taking exams every week. There was also a fall in the rating of general classroom atmosphere for the total group of students, though individual group changes were not significant.

F. OTHER RESULTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

In addition to the integrative motive and its three main subcomponents, a number of other variables were included in the questionnaire to determine other factors that may be correlated with success. The main results for these variables are shown in table 11 below:

Table 11. First and second semester average scores and correlations with achievement for all subjects.

Variable	Average scores		Correlations	
	1st sem	2nd sem	1st sem	2nd sem
Anxiety	14.5	12.9*	0.19	0.49*
Instrumental orientn.	16.8	16.5	-0.15	0.14
Parental encouragmnt.	16.0	15.3*	0.17	0.02
Need for achievement	16.4	16.6	0.28	0.33
Attributions	12.9	12.5	0.13	0.36

Each of these variables was measured by four questionnaire items and had a maximum possible score of 20 and a minimum of 4. A positive score reflects a positive attitude, thus the decrease in scores on the variable of anxiety (from 14.5 to 12.9) was a result of *increasing* anxiety. A paired t-test showed that this increase in anxiety was significant (the two-tailed probability obtained was 0.01). The decrease in parental encouragement was also found to be significant (with a two-tailed probability of 0.05). These differences were significant only for the total group of subjects, and not for any of the three subgroups.

The only significant correlation obtained between these variables and achievement scores was for anxiety in the second semester (a one-tailed significance of 0.01).

Six orientations other than the instrumental and integrative ones traditionally investigated were also included in the questionnaire (items 65-70). Average ratings for each item, for both the first and second semesters are shown in table 12 below:

Table 12. Average ratings for other orientations for total group of subjects.

No	Individual questionnaire item	1st sem	2nd sem
65	Desire to study or live abroad.	4.0	3.7*
66	A general interest in culture.	3.8	3.5
67	Use of English for foreign travel.	4.6	4.8
68	To better understand Turkish.	2.8	2.6
69	To learn about myself.	3.7	3.5
70	Everyone should learn English.	4.4	4.4

The orientation that received the most positive rating was that of learning English in order to use it while travelling abroad. The statement "Everyone in Turkey should learn English" also elicited a very positive response. An intention to study or live in a foreign culture became less popular in the second semester and this decrease was significant (with a two-tailed probability of 0.04). The idea that learning English would improve the student's command of his/her native

language received a negative rating. Significant differences between the top and bottom groups occured on only one item, a general interest in culture, and only in the second semester (a two-tailed probability of 0.03 was obtained) - the top group gave a higher rating of 4.1 compared with 3.0 for the bottom group.

G. STUDENT INTERVIEWS

Twelve students were interviewed in total, four each from the bottom, the top and the middle groups. The same students were interviewed in both the first and second semesters. Further details on the questions asked are given in Appendix IV.

The main findings from these interviews are presented below. Where differences between groups are not specifically mentioned, it should be assumed that the findings do not vary across groups. Where appropriate, certain figures have been expressed in tables. As the sample sizes involved are rather small, the numerical findings should be taken as suggestive only, and ought to be considered in conjunction with the findings from the questionnaire.

All students had attended a state Junior school prior to

their enrolment in the language program under investigation. All had studied English for about three to four hours per week, except for one student from the bottom group who had studied French. However, half of the students stated that it was difficult to learn effectively in a state school environment, three of these students were from the bottom group, and moreover these three stated that they had been unsuccessful in learning any English in such an environment. Two students from the top group mentioned having attended a private English course for a short period. The great majority of respondents, ten in total, including all four subjects from the top group, said that they were initially nervous about starting at their new school and afraid that the program might prove too difficult.

Eight of the students stated reasons for learning English that could be categorized as broadly instrumental - such as "useful for my future", "important in my life", "will help me to get a job" or "necessary". Interestingly, just four students mentioned that they liked learning English, three of whom were from the top group. Nine students, including all four from the bottom group, stated that "my family wanted me to learn English", six students said that they themselves had wanted to learn. Also worthy of note is the fact that one student in the bottom group said that she had not initially wanted to learn, and had not expected to be successful.

The main factors in the choice of school appeared to be a personal recommendation (by relative, friend or neighbour), or generally having heard that it was a good school, each of these factors being mentioned by six subjects.

On their initial reaction to the school and language program, all respondents without exception had something positive to say, generally making very favourable comparisons with their previous state school environment. The much smaller class size, the methodology used in the classroom and the teachers were all commented on in a positive way. In addition, all students expressed satisfaction with the general atmosphere among students in the class, though three students added that they were sometimes distracted by a friend, and one student complained that a few students in the class did not respect those who had learning difficulties.

In the second semester all respondents were asked to compare their general feelings about the class with what they had thought initially in the the first semester. Four students (three of them from the top group) said that there was no real change and that they were still satisfied with everything. Four students (two from the top group) said that they felt they had learnt something or improved their English. The second semester was

considered to be generally more difficult by four students, two each from the bottom and middle groups. Two of these students said that they hadn't expected this to be the case, one of them had. Three students said that they had generally begun to get bored (two from the middle group and one from the bottom group), in contrast, three students specifically claimed to have maintained the same level of interest (all three from the top group). One student from the middle group felt that the level of English he had reached was sufficient; in contrast, one student in the top group expressed some disappointment in that she said she had expected to have learnt more.

Eleven of the twelve subjects expressed general satisfaction with the classroom atmosphere, and three of these said that they felt the atmosphere was better in the second semester, with noone feeling that it had got worse. It is worth pointing out that this finding runs contrary to the seeming decline in satisfaction expressed in questionnaire responses. The possible reasons for this will be discussed later.

In both the first and second semesters, all respondents were asked to give the average number of hours that they spent studying outside class in a normal week. The averages for the three groups are shown in table 13 below:

Table 13. Average number of hours per week spent studying English outside the classroom.

	Bottom	Middle	Top	Total
First semester	11	14	12	12
Second semester	17	14	13	15

There appears to be little difference between the three groups in the first semester. However, there is a clear increase in the second semester for the bottom group, from eleven to seventeen hours. Even allowing for possible inaccuracies in the self-reporting of such data, this increase would appear to be significant. Overall, the figures for the middle and top groups do not seem to vary across the two semesters.

In both the first and second semesters, all respondents were asked for details of the classroom activities they particularly enjoyed, and for what they would like to do more of. The results obtained are shown in table 14 below; the figures in parentheses refer to the first semester, those outside parentheses to the second semester. Activities that had not yet become a part of the program when the initial data was collected, midway through the first semester, are indicated by the symbol (-):

Table 14. Activities that students enjoy doing in class or would like to do more of.

Classroom Activities	Bottom	Middle	Top	Total
Listening (general)	1 (0)	3 (1)	3 (2)	7 (3)
Listening to music	1 (-)	3 (-)	3 (-)	7 (-)
Grammar	2 (4)	2 (3)	2 (3)	6 (10)
Class discussions	1 (-)	3 (-)	0 (-)	4 (-)
Activities using video	1 (2)	1 (0)	2 (1)	4 (3)
Reading activities	0 (0)	1 (3)	0 (1)	1 (4)

It can be seen that listening activities, including listening to pop songs in English, became particularly popular in the second semester. This popularity was evident for the middle and top groups but did not extend to the bottom group. Grammar activities declined in popularity for all three groups in the second semester. Few students appeared to enjoy reading activities particularly in the second semester.

All respondents were also asked to indicate what they did not enjoy or what they would like to do less of. While they did not usually give specific activities in answer to this question, the following points were mentioned by more than one respondent: not understanding something (sometimes or often), copying down from the board or doing

repeated examples in their notebooks, reading a text aloud in class with students taking turns, repetition of topics already known to the student, lessons late in the day (usually the seventh or eighth class hours), doing speaking activities in pairs or groups. Data is presented in table 15 below; once again figures in parentheses refer to the first semester, the other figures to the second semester:

Table 15. Aspects of the class that students are dissatisfied with.

Aspects of Classroom	Bottom	Middle	Top	Total
Not Understanding	3 (1)	3 (1)	0 (1)	6 (3)
Writing in notebooks	1 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	6 (0)
Reading in class	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)
Repeating known topics	0 (0)	2 (1)	2 (2)	4 (3)
Lessons late in day	1 (3)	0 (1)	0 (0)	1 (4)
Groupwork or pairwork	0 (0)	1 (1)	1 (2)	2 (3)

Inability to understand was a greater problem in the second semester, though it was confined to the bottom and middle groups. Dissatisfaction with too much writing in notebooks occured in the second semester and would also appear to be a significant problem, being mentioned by half of the students, two of whom went on to say that they

would prefer examples to be done orally. Reading aloud in class, which was not identified as a problem area in the first semester, and repeating known topics, a problem only for the middle and top groups, were each identified by four students. Losing concentration in lessons later in the day appeared to be less of a problem in the second semester, being identified by only one student, perhaps a result of the class getting more used to their timetable. Dissatisfaction with group and pair work was confined to the middle and top groups.

In terms of homework assigned, seven students in the second semester (an increase from five in the first semester) said that they found the worksheet given every weekend, as a detailed revision of the previous week's material, to be valuable. All four students from the bottom group subscribed to this. At the same time however, eight students (up from six students in the first semester) complained that this worksheet was too long. Six students said that they preferred the shorter handouts given on particular grammatical points. Eight students found the composition assignments in the program (second semester only) to be useful. On the general subject of parental encouragement, five students (including all four from the bottom group) reported that their parents encouraged them to spend more time on homework.

In the second semester, five students (including all four

from the bottom group) said that they would appreciate more advice from their teachers on how to study. Five thought that it was unnecessary. In the first semester, only two students said that they would like such advice.

Apart from assigned homework and general revision, all respondents were asked what strategies they employed outside class to improve their English. The results obtained are shown in table 16 below; the figures in parentheses once again refer to the first semester:

Table 16. Strategies students use to improve their English outside of assigned homework.

Strategies used	Bottom	Middle	Top	Total
Watching TV	4 (1)	1 (0)	2 (1)	7 (2)
Reading	2 (2)	1 (2)	4 (3)	7 (7)
Listening-cassette/music	2 (1)	2 (0)	1 (0)	5 (1)
Speaking-family/friend	0 (1)	1 (2)	0 (1)	1 (4)

Reading books outside of those assigned in the program was a strategy employed by seven students in both semesters; in the second semester though it was more popular with students in the top group. Watching English language TV channels became popular (particularly with the bottom group) in the second semester, perhaps it was at this stage that the students felt they could understand

something. Listening to a cassette or to English music also emerged in the second semester, being mentioned by five students. In contrast, those students (four in total) who had initially practised their speaking with a family member or friend did not report doing the same thing in the second semester, perhaps because of the higher level reached or maybe the novelty had worn off.

In the first semester, six students reported being generally satisfied with their exam grades and five students expressed dissatisfaction. There was not much change in the second semester with five students satisfied and six dissatisfied. Not surprisingly those students dissatisfied were predominantly from the bottom group (three) with the satisfied students all being from the middle and top groups.

In both the first and second semesters, eight students reported studying specially for exams and four students (all from the bottom group) stated that they were encouraged to do so by their families. All except one subject said that they were always anxious before exams and there appeared to be no reduction in this anxiety in the second semester. Three subjects (all from the bottom group) claimed that they often forgot things because of nerves.

Students were asked in the second semester how they

intended to improve their grades in the future. A total of nine students (including all those from the bottom and middle groups) stated that they intended to do so by working harder. However, three of the students in the bottom group expressed the reservation that they were already working harder but not getting improved grades. Two students from the bottom group were taking private lessons. One student, also from the bottom group, expressed frustration in saying that she could speak and understand English but was not successful in exams.

DISCUSSION

In answer to the first research question, a positive relationship was found to exist between the attitudes and motivation of the subjects and their scores on achievement tests. The subcomponent of attitudes and motivation that was found to best explain differences between successful and unsuccessful learners was that of attitudes toward the learning situation. Attitudes and motivation were found to decrease over time, with this decrease apparent for all learners.

The integrative motive (as defined by Gardner, 1985) was found to show highly significant correlations with achievement scores for both periods during which data was collected. During the first semester all three subcomponents of the integrative motive, integrativeness, motivation and attitudes to the learning situation, were found to significantly correlate with achievement scores, and it was the component of motivation that had the most significant correlation. This picture changed over time however, and in the second semester neither integrativeness nor motivation showed significant correlations, whereas the correlation for attitudes toward the learning situation was found to have greatly increased in significance. These findings would appear to add support for the position adopted by both Oxford and

Shearin (1994) and Dörnyei (1994a), that in a foreign language learning environment attitudes toward the language program take on increasing importance. It is possible that the reduced significance of these attitudes in the first semester can be attributed to the fact that students had not yet developed strong attitudes.

Further evidence for the importance of attitudes toward the learning situation was obtained by analyzing the differences between three groups of students, a top, a middle and a bottom group, determined on the basis of achievement scores. The composition of these groups was identical in both the first and second semesters, with the only variations in student performance taking place within groups. The greatest number of significant differences between groups were found on the component of attitudes toward the learning situation. The bottom group scored significantly lower on this component than both the middle and top groups, and this finding was valid for both the first and second semesters.

Dörnyei (1994a) terms this component the learning situation level in his proposed new model of language learning motivation. He believes that this component is of most interest to the classroom teacher in that it can provide firm pedagogical implications.

A more detailed examination of the findings related to

these classroom attitudes provides some points that need to be considered in any possible intervention to improve attitudes. As early as the first semester, unsuccessful students (those in the bottom group) expressed dissatisfaction with the emphasis placed on exams and reported being unhappy with the results of these exams. Thus it would seem that they are already under a threat of external evaluation, an undesirable state of affairs (Stipek 1988; Crookes and Schmidt 1991). This position was maintained in the second semester, and despite the fact that unsuccessful students reported an increase in the number of hours devoted to private study, no corresponding improvement in grades was attained. This point will be discussed further below.

There were a number of other areas where the unsuccessful students expressed dissatisfaction, particularly in the second semester. They felt that the program was too intensive with 27 hours of lessons a week, that the lessons were repetitive, and that there were insufficient opportunities to participate in class. Also, they felt that the teachers ought to use more Turkish in the classroom, and they thought that the teachers did not understand or were unable to help them. Moreover, they reported being unable to understand at times and required more advice on how to study. One aspect of the class that they preferred (when compared with successful learners) was doing speaking activities in groups, this perhaps

being the only chance they felt they had to participate.

The research study conducted by Wigzell and Al-Ansari (1993) also identified a difficulty in understanding as being a key factor in reduced motivation among less successful learners. However, continual repetition of topics already known to students was a cause of dissatisfaction among successful learners, thus it would appear that there are no easy answers for the classroom teacher on this point. However, opportunities for weaker students to participate more in class could perhaps be created, and maybe this could be achieved through greater use of pairwork and groupwork. A compromise needs to be maintained on this point however, for other than the unsuccessful students, high ratings for such student controlled activies were not obtained in this research. As suggested by Crookes and Schmidt (1991) this could be a result of cultural factors. The Turkish educational system does not encourage such activities, and classroom observation of the students seemed to confirm that they did not find it easy to adapt to working in this way.

Complaints about the repetitiveness of lessons were not confined to the unsuccessful learners but were elicited from all levels of the class. This seems to confirm the proposition made by Crookes and Schmidt (1991) that motivation will improve if teachers can somehow maintain interest. One possibility, suggested by this study, is

that less emphasis ought to be put on students writing in their notebooks, where this is mechanical in nature.

Reading activities also gave the students cause for some complaint, and it would seem that reading aloud in class is not a popular activity. Teachers could perhaps require that students read at home and come to class prepared for some alternative activities based on what they have read. Indeed while the weekend worksheet was generally perceived as useful in revising the subjects learned each week, it attracted a lot of criticism as being too long, criticism that increased as the year went on. Perhaps a shorter worksheet would make way for the assignment of different homework (for example reading). The positive reaction to the written composition tasks given in the second semester would seem to indicate that as time passes students prefer some variety in homework assignments. In any case, quite a number of students (particularly the more successful students) reported reading on their own initiative anyway outside class. Furthermore, there seems no reason at all why different homework could not be assigned to different groups of students.

One more finding relevant to the classroom teacher is that interest in studying grammar appears to decline over time, especially for the more successful students. The program under consideration was based on a grammatical syllabus, a requirement of the Turkish Ministry of Education in all

such schools. However, some more flexibility could and perhaps ought to be shown in the second semester. In this way also, students will perhaps perceive their classes as being less repetitive.

It is the points above, mentioned by all three groups of students, which most likely explain the significant decline in atttitudes toward the learning situation which occured between the first and second semesters. Such a finding, also determined in the longitudinal study by Samimy and Tabuse (1992), is perhaps not a real surprise. Since Turkish students tend to be so excited and enthusiastic when embarking upon a new course of learning, a change in attitudes is almost inevitable when the novelty value wears off. Nevertheless, it is surely in the teacher's interests to keep such a decline to a minimum, by considering the causes for it.

So far it has been the negative points only that have been considered in relation to classroom attitudes. It ought not to be considered that this is indicative of a dissatisfied class, full of unmotivated learners, for generally it was the opposite that was true. The teachers of this class expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the efforts and attitudes of their students throughout the year, and were unanimous in comparing them very favourably with classes from previous years. The students themselves generally expressed a high level of satisfaction with the

school and the language program, and in particular with the atmosphere amongst the students in their class. These evaluations were perhaps all the more favourable in that the students had previously attended state schools, where overcrowding, lack of facilities, and lack of trained English teachers are all serious problems in Turkey.

Other than those points mentioned above which elicited negative ratings from students, attitudes were generally positive. Listening activities seemed to be particularly valued by the students, and specifically listening to pop songs in English was a very popular activity. Such an activity probably appeals to students due to its realistic nature and close relation with their own interests. Teachers perhaps ought to take note and incorporate such songs wherever possible.

Probably the area which must be cause for the most serious concern is the attitudes toward exam results identified among the unsuccessful learners. Crooks (1988) sounds a warning note in stating that failure which is attributed to task difficulty leads to hopelessness, and he points out that evaluation standards must be high but attainable. Lens and Decruyenaere (1991) warn against making superficial comparisons between students. It would seem that these views are pertinent to a consideration of the unsuccessful learners investigated in this study. All

four of those interviewed reported studying more in the second semester to improve their grades and also reported that their parents encouraged them to do so. Three of them complained that in spite of studying harder they were not improving their grades. It is worth noting that this does not mean that their English had not improved, but was more a reflection of the standards set by the school, and all such similar schools in Turkey, which evaluate all students, strong or weak, on the same basis.

In view of the fact that the unsuccessful students expressed a desire for more advice on how to study, it may be tempting to propose this as a possible solution. In reality however, such advice was provided by the teachers from the outset of the school year and at regular intervals, particularly with a view to helping the less successful students.

In the treatment study conducted by Wigzell and Al-Ansari (1993), an improvement in motivation was the result of low achievers being given a better chance of success by changing the system of evaluation. Serious consideration ought perhaps to be given to such a change. Massey (1994) found that unsuccessful students were likely to discontinue language studies. Unsuccessful students may continue their enrolment at school and compulsory attendance at English classes, but it is likely that if their efforts produce no external reward then sooner or

later they will give up these efforts.

The problem is perhaps best summarized in the words of one of the students participating in this study. About one month after the final data was collected, a further questionnaire was administered to the group to collect data on language anxiety for a separate study being conducted at Boğaziçi University. The following extract is from an unsolicited note this student wrote on her questionnaire, entitled "My problem":

> ... I get very nervous in exams, I'm afraid when I read the questions and I feel under pressure. I'm working and working but it's still going badly... Help me. I'm not at all happy about this situation and I can't stop thinking about it... I think that I work hard enough. I do my homework everyday, I always revise, I put my hand up when I know the answer. I'm not afraid to speak. I believe in myself. But my exams are bad.

Neither instrumental nor integrative orientations were found to produce significant correlations with achievement. When interviewed and asked their reasons for studying English, most students gave reasons that were apparently instrumental in talking of a future job requirement, or more vaguely considering that English would be important for them in the future. Dörnyei (1994b) considers that instrumental reasons are perhaps

not directly relevant for school children, and this would seem to be borne out in the present study, where the learners are likely to spend three more years in high school education.

As in the research of Clement and Kruidenier (1983), a travel orientation was found to be particularly relevant. Additionally, the students gave strong support to the notion that everyone in Turkey should learn English, a social attitude that perhaps reflects the great importance given these days to learning English in Turkey.

Need for achievement and attributions about past failures, two components that emerged from the study conducted by Dörnyei (1990), did not show significant correlations with achievement. However, with regard to attributions, it was interesting to note that nearly all subjects reported being initially fearful that they would be unable to cope with such an intensive English program, and it seems that previous state school experiences played a role in this. It is important for teachers to be aware that students from similar backgrounds are initially likely to lack confidence, and to grade activities at the beginning of the program accordingly.

Parental encouragement, while not correlating with achievement, was seen to decline significantly over time. This was perhaps to be expected since initially parents

would be likely to be closely interested in their child's progress at a new school, particularly in view of the financial investment made. There is evidence to suggest however, that parents of unsuccessful students show increasing concern, and react by urging their children to study harder and in some cases by arranging private lessons. However, it does not appear that either measure leads to an improvement in exam grades, and parents perhaps need to be warned against expecting too much. An increase in pressure put on their children is unlikely to result in an improved attitude to learning English.

One additional variable that did show a significant correlation with achievement, in the second semester at least, was anxiety. Moreover, anxiety was found to increase significantly over time. This was perhaps rather unexpected, and it is not easy to explain. One possibility is that students are required to communicate more in the second semester as their level of English improves, and that they find this a stressful experience. However, further research, such as the above-mentioned study now being conducted at Boğaziçi University, ought to shed further light on this question.

While the major aim of this research was not to test the socio-educational model as defined by Gardner (1985), it is worth noting that there is little evidence from this

research to suggest that the model is appropriate in explaining the attitudes and motivation of Turkish high school students who are learning English as a foreign language. It is important to reiterate that Gardner has made it clear on a number of occasions (e.g. Gardner, 1988) that he does not claim that the model will necessarily have explanatory power in all contexts. The results of this research tend to suggest that while *educational* attitudes correlate with success for Turkish high school students, there is a lack of evidence that *social* attitudes also do so. The integrative motive, defined by Gardner as the sum of integrativeness, motivation and attitudes toward the learning situation, was not found to correlate more strongly with achievement than attitudes toward the learning situation considered alone, at least for the data collected in the second semester.

Initially, however, there was some evidence for the existence of the other two components. Motivation correlated strongly with achievement in the first semester, seeming to confirm the proposition made by Gardner and MacIntyre (1993a) that it is motivation that usually shows the most direct relationship. However, an examination of the data on reliability (contained in Appendix VI) offers a possible explanation. Motivation is itself a sum of three subcomponents; attitudes toward learning English, desire to learn English, and

motivational intensity. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of internal reliability obtained for the overall total of motivation was less than that for each of the three subcomponents. Thus, there must be some considerable doubt that these three subcomponents combined effectively in an additive manner. Motivation as measured by the AMTB may not be an appropriate measure in the context of this research study.

Integrativeness would appear to be a more reliable measure, and it correlated significantly with achievement in the first semester, although not in the second semester. It may be that at the outset of such a language program, students' social attitudes are related to their initial success, the importance of these atttiudes perhaps diminishing in time as they form more definite attitudes in relation to the learning situation.

The general conclusion on the use of the AMTB (Gardner 1985; Gardner, Day & MacIntyre 1992) must be that its reliability when administered to Turkish high school students is open to question, particularly on the component of motivation. The highest Cronbach Alpha coefficient was obtained for the component of attitudes toward the learning situation, and it was this section of the questionnaire that was written from scratch for this research project.

In an observational study on rates of participation in class, Gardner and Smythe (1982) found a significant correlation with the integrative motive. They proposed that it was integrative motivation that *caused* students to participate more frequently. Ellis (1985), in reviewing the results of numerous studies, considers that it is necessary to treat causality as possibly working in both directions. The data from this study provides clear evidence for a correlational relationship only, between achievement and attitudes toward the learning situation. However, the picture that emerges among unsuccessful students of increased effort, no improvement in grades, not understanding sometimes in class, a lack of perceived opportunity to participate, and a negative feeling toward exams, do suggest that it could be their lower level of achievement that is instrumental in producing increasingly negative attitudes toward the learning situation.

CONCLUSION

In this study it was the component of attitudes toward the learning situation that showed the most consistent correlation with achievement scores. The significance of this correlation increased in time. There was a corresponding reduction in the levels of correlation found for the other two components of the integrative motive, which were statistically significant only at the early stages of the language program under investigation.

Scores on the measure of attitudes toward the learning situation declined significantly over time, and this decline was evident for both successful and unsuccessful learners. In general, students expressed dissatisfaction with the repetitive nature of lessons, they began to lose their initial enthusiasm for grammar lessons, and they considered some homework exercises to be much too long.

Many more points were a cause for concern among less successful learners. In particular, they were unhappy with the exam results they obtained. As time went on their scores did not improve in spite of a reported greater intensity in effort. Indeed achievement scores for all students did not vary greatly over the year. This

perhaps indicates a need for a review of assessment procedures, and consideration of methods which do not evaluate all students according to the same criteria.

One obvious limitation of the current study is the small number of subjects and the fact that just one class was considered, though in compensation for the low sample size a certain depth of information was obtained. Some of the results may well reflect specific characteristics of this class, and may not be found among other groups of students. It would seem advisable to replicate this study among other groups of Turkish learners following a similar program, in order to determine the extent to which these results can be generalized. One feature of this class commented upon by all the teachers was the extent to which those students with low grades persisted in their efforts. This perhaps makes the finding that they did not exhibit a corresponding improvement in achievement scores, and the recommendation that consideration be given to evaluation procedures, all the more pertinent.

There is also an element of risk in relying on self-report measures to draw conclusions, with a danger that students will answer according to an approval motive (Oller and Perkins 1978a), telling the researcher what they think he/she wants to hear. However, it was mostly apparent in the current research that the students did not consider the questions asked to be of a particularly sensitive

nature. Moreover, they seemed to appreciate being asked for their opinions (it was clearly apparent that they had not participated in such a study before) and did so with a great deal of enthusiasm. The use of both a questionnaire and interviews, in addition to collecting data at two different time periods, helped in eliminating inconsistencies. It was generally pleasing that such inconsistencies were very few indeed.

However this does not remove the need for replication of this study to test the validity of the results obtained. Now that evidence has been obtained for the relevance of various aspects of attitudes toward the learning situation, this particular section of the questionnaire could be expanded in any future study. More detailed information would thus be obtained on particular aspects of classroom atttiudes.

In addition to this it would be interesting to investigate anxiety in more depth, to determine further how it is related with achievement and classroom attitudes and what role it plays. It might also be interesting to follow the progress of the same group of students next year, particularly the unsuccessful learners, to determine what further changes take place over time. It has generally been observed among teachers of Turkish students that levels of motivation drop sharply after the preparatory year, and that the gap between successful and unsuccessful

learners widens, both in achievement and in their attitudes. Research is needed to explore the validity of this claim.

Finally, if any changes are to be made in evaluation procedures, a treatment study would be required to determine whether or not such changes are capable of inducing improved attitudes among less successful learners.

REFERENCES

Anderman, E. M. & Maehr, M. L. (1994). Motivation and schooling in the middle grades. Review of Educational Research 64 (2). 287-309.

Au, S. Y. (1988). A critical appraisal of Gardner's social-psychological theory of second language (L2) learning. Language Learning 38 (1). 75-100.

Cameron, J. & Pierce, W. D. (1994). Reinforcement, reward and intrinsic motivation: a meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research 64 (3). 363-423.

Chihara, T. & Oller, J. W. (1978). Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: a sociolinguistic study of adult Japanese speakers. Language Learning 28 (1). 55-68.

Clement, R. & Kruidenier, B. G. (1983). Orientations in second language acquisition: I. The effects of ethnicity, milieu, and target language on their emergence. Language Learning 33 (3). 273-291.

Crookall, D. & Oxford, R. (1988). Review essay: *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation* by R. C. Gardner. Language Learning 38 (1). 127-140.

Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: reopening the research agenda. Language Learning 41 (4). 469-512.

Crooks, T. J. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. Review of Educational Research 58 (4). 438-481.

Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation: a literature review. System 23 (2). 165-174.

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. Language Learning 40 (1). 45-78.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994a). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. Modern Language Journal 78 (iii). 273-284.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994b). Understanding L2 motivation: on with the challenge! Modern Language Journal 78 (iv). 515-523.

Ellis, R. (1985). Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1995). The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. (1988). The socio-educational model of second-language learning: assumptions, findings, and issues. Language Learning 38 (1). 101-126.

Gardner, R. C. (1990). Attitudes, motivation, and personality as predictors of success in foreign language learning. In T. S. Parry & C. H. Stansfield (Eds), Language Aptitude Reconsidered. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall.

Gardner, R. C., Day, J. B. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1992). Integrative motivation, induced anxiety, and language learning in a controlled environment. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 14 (2). 197-214.

Gardner, R. C. & Gliksman, L. (1982). On "Gardner on affect": a discussion of validity as it relates to the attitude/motivation test battery: a response from Gardner. Language Learning 32 (1). 191-200.

Gardner, R. C., Lalonde, R. N. & Moorcroft, R. (1985). The role of attitudes and motivation in second language learning: correlational and experimental considerations. Language Learning 35 (2). 207-227.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1972). Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1991). An instrumental motivation in language study: who says it isn't effective? Studies in Second Language Acquisition 13 (1). 57-72.

Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993a). A student's contributions to second-language learning. Part II: affective variables. Language Teaching 26 (1). 1-11.

Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993b). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. Language Learning 43 (2). 157-194.

Gardner, R. C. & Tremblay, P. F. (1994a). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks. Modern Language Journal 78 (iii). 359-368.

Gardner, R. C. & Tremblay, P. F. (1994b). On motivation: measurement and conceptual considerations. Modern Language Journal 78 (iv). 524-527.

Gardner, R. C. & Tremblay, P. F. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. Modern Language Journal 79 (iv). 505-518.

Gliksman, L., Gardner, R. C. & Smythe, P. C. (1982). The role of the integrative motive on students' participation in the French classroom. Canadian Modern Language Review 38 (4). 625-647.

Hatch, E. & Faraday, H. (1982). Research Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics. Cambridge, Mass: Newbury House.

Kraemer, R. (1993). Social psychological factors related to the study of Arabic among Israeli high school students. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 15 (1). 83-105.

Lens, W. & Decruyenaere, M. (1991). Motivation and de-motivation in secondary education: student characteristics. Learning and Instruction 1 (2). 145-159.

Lukmani, Y. M. (1972). Motivation to learn and language proficiency. Language Learning 22 (2). 261-273.

Massey, D. A. (1994). Why choose French? Secondary school students' accounts of their decision to leave or enrol in the Ontario regular FSL programme. Canadian Modern Language Review 50 (4). 714-735.

Muchnick, A. G. & Wolfe, D. E. (1982). Attitudes and motivations of American students of Spanish. Canadian Modern Language Review 38 (2). 262-281.

Oller, J. W., Hudson, A. J. & Liu, P. F. (1977). Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: a sociolinguistic study of native speakers of Chinese in the United States. Language Learning 27 (1). 1-23.

Oller, J. W. & Perkins, K. (1978a). Intelligence and language proficiency as sources of variance in self-reported affective variables. Language Learning 28 (1). 85-97.

Oller, J. W. & Perkins, K. (1978b). A further comment on language proficiency as a source of variance in certain affective measures. Language Learning 28 (2). 417-423.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Oxford, R. L. (1994). Where are we regarding language learning motivation? Modern Language Journal 78 (iv). 512-514.

Oxford, R. L. & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: expanding the theoretical framework. Modern Language Journal 78 (i). 12-28.

Pierson, H. D., Fu, G. S. & Lee, S. (1980). An analysis of the relationship between language attitudes and English attainment of secondary students in Hong Kong. Language Learning 30 (2). 289-316.

Ramage, K. (1990). Motivational factors and persistence in foreign language study. Language Learning 40 (2). 189-219.

Samimy, K. K. & Tabuse, M. (1992). Affective variables and a less commonly taught language: a study in beginning Japanese classes. Language Learning 42 (3). 377-398.

Skehan, P. (1989). Individual Differences in Second-Language Learning. London: Edward Arnold.

Skehan, P. (1991). Individual differences in second language learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 13 (2). 275-298.

Stipek, D. J. (1988). Motivation to Learn: From Theory to Practice. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Strong, M. (1984). Integrative motivation: cause or result of successful second language acquisition? Language Learning 34 (3). 1-14.

Svanes, B. (1987). Motivation and cultural distance in second-language acquisition. Language Learning 37 (3). 341-359.

Symonds, P. M. & Harter Chase, D. (1992). Practice vs. motivation. Journal of Educational Psychology 84 (3). 282-289.

Wenden, A. (1991). Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy. New York: Prentice Hall.

Wigzell, R. & Al-Ansari, S. (1993). The pedagogical needs of low achievers. Canadian Modern Language Review 49 (2). 302-315.

APPENDIX I

Notes on Questionnaire Design

(Items 1-4) Attitudes toward the Anglo-Saxon world: Taken from Dörnyei (1990) with some slight changes in wording. It was felt that the items in the AMTB would have little meaning for the students. Items two and three are negatively worded.

(Items 5-8) Interest in foreign languages: Items 5 and 6 (Gardner, Day & MacIntyre 1992) and item 7 (Gardner 1985) are from the AMTB. Item 8 (Dörnyei 1990) has been reversed and is negatively worded along with item 5.

(Items 9-12) Integrative orientation: Following the suggestion of Gardner, Day & MacIntyre (1992) all items are positively worded (the same principle is also followed in the other two orientation sections below). Items 9 and 10 are from Clement and Kruidenier (1983), item 11 is from Gardner (1985) and item 12 is from Dörnyei (1990).

Note: It is intended that the sum of the twelve items above should provide a reasonable measure of integrativeness of the students as defined by Gardner.

(Units 13-16) Attitudes toward learning English: Item 13 is taken from Gardner, Day & MacIntyre (1992), item 14

from Kraemer (1993), but made more specific in its reference to the junior school attended by the student. Items 15 (also made more specific) and 16 are from Gardner (1985). Items 13 and 15 are negatively worded.

(Items 17-20) Desire to learn English: Items 17 and 20 are from Gardner, Day & MacIntyre (1992), item 18 is from Gardner (1985). Item 19 was designed specifically for the research study and based on a previously made observation that students entering this program sometimes feel no real sense of urgency to learn. Items 19 and 20 are negatively worded.

(Items 21-24) Motivational intensity: Item 24 is from Kraemer (1993), but again is made more specific; the others are from Gardner (1985). Items 21 and 22 are negatively worded.

Note: It is intended that the sum of the twelve items above should provide a reasonable measure of motivation as defined by Gardner.

(Units 25-44) Attitudes toward the learning situation: The twenty items contained in the questionnaire under this category have been written specially for the purposes of this research study. Items 25 to 32 are based on pedagogical points raised by Crookes and Schmidt (1991, pp.487-492); the remainder have been written with the

specific language program the students follow firmly in mind, and also considering classroom issues raised by Dörnyei (1994, pp.281-282) - there is some overlap since both articles refer to many of the same points, which in turn are particularly relevant in the classroom situation under investigation. This is not in conflict with the work of Gardner, who advocates researchers adapting this part of the AMTB to evaluate whatever is of concern in a language program. Thirteen of the twenty items are negatively worded (items 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, and 43); this imbalance is deliberate with the hope that it will lead the respondents away from responses of a socially desirable nature.

(Items 45-48) English class anxiety: All taken from Gardner (1985) except for item 47 (Gardner, Day & MacIntyre 1992). Items 46 and 47 are negatively worded (in that they are not manifestations of anxiety - which is a negative component of motivation).

(Items 49-52) Instrumental orientation: All items are from Gardner (1985). All are positively worded as explained above.

(Items 53-56) Parental encouragement: All are from Gardner (1985) except for item 54, which is a specific problem students have complained about in the past; they usually resent such negative comparisons. Items 53 and 54

are negatively worded.

(Items 57-60) Need for achievement: This section is not a part of the AMTB and is adapted entirely from Dörnyei (1990). Items 57 and 58 are negatively worded. Item 59 in Dörnyei's study related to a Hungarian state examination which was optional for the students. All students in the current research study will be encouraged to consider entering one of the Cambridge exams at a later date.

(Items 61-64) Attributions about past failures: Again all items are from Dörnyei (1990). Item 62 was altered to refer specifically to the junior school experience of the students. Items 61 and 64 are negative (in relation to the concept of attributions, which has a proposed negative influence on motivation).

(Items 65-70) Other orientations: Again this section is unrelated with the AMTB; it is included with a view to establishing orientations the students may have other than purely integrative/instrumental ones. Items have been included from a number of studies conducted in different contexts as follows:

Items 65-66: Ramage (1990)

Item 67: Samimy and Tabuse (1992)

Items 68-69: Clement and Kruidenier (1983)

Item 70: Dörnyei (1990)

APPENDIX II

Questionnaire - English version

The questionnaire you are going to be given is part of a research project that is concerned with students' ideas about learning English. It is hoped that the information you provide will allow us to improve the language program in this school and in other schools throughout Turkey. It is particularly important that you answer the questions truthfully and give *your own ideas.*

The questionnaire consists of 70 statements. For each statement you should circle a number from one to five as follows:

1 You agree completely or very strongly
2 You agree, but with some reservations
3 You are undecided - you neither agree nor disagree
4 You disagree, but with some reservations
5 You disagree completely or very strongly

Two examples are given below. Do these examples now. Circle the numbers which correspond most closely to your own ideas:

I like football very much	1	2	3	4	5
Reading books is boring	1	2	3	4	5

There are no right or wrong responses to any of the statements in the questionnaire. It is very important that you *respond truthfully* to each statement. You are not required to write your name on the questionnaire. All answers will be treated in the strictest confidence.

There is no time limit for completing this questionnaire. You should read each item carefully and take just as much time as you need.

Do not speak to the other students while you are working and do not look at another student's paper. If there is anything that you don't understand, please raise your hand and the teacher will come and explain.

It is most important that you do read each statement carefully and do not hurry, and also that you answer truthfully and give your own ideas. As new students at this school, your thoughts and opinions are particularly important for us.

Thank you very much for taking part in this research project. You may start now.

Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	2	3	4	5

1. The more I learn about the British/Americans, the more I like them.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Most of my favourite artists (e.g. actors, musicians) are Turkish rather than British or American.	1	2	3	4	5
3. British/American culture is not so important in the world nowadays.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Britain and America are exciting countries for me.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Studying a foreign language is not a pleasant experience for me.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I wish I could speak another language fluently.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I would like to learn a lot of foreign languages.	1	2	3	4	5
8. After I finish learning English I will not want to learn another language.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Studying English is important for me because it will help me understand how British/ American people live.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Studying English is important for me because I will be able to make some friends with British/American people.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Studying English is important for me because it will allow me to understand and appreciate British/American art and literature.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Studying English is important for me because it will allow me to become familiar with a number of different cultures and peoples.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I think studying English is boring.	1	2	3	4	5
14. English is more interesting for me than the other subjects I studied in my junior school.	1	2	3	4	5
15. In prep class I would like to study other subjects as well as English.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Learning English is really enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I wish I were fluent in English.	1	2	3	4	5
18. If the opportunity arose and I knew enough English, I would often watch English television programmes.	1	2	3	4	5

Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	2	3	4	5

19. Learning English is not so urgent for me now, I have got a few years to do so.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I wish I had never studied English.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I don't spend much time doing English homework.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I do just enough work to pass my English class.	1	2	3	4	5
23. In my English lessons I try to volunteer answers as much as possible.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I spend more time doing homework now that I am learning English, than I did in my junior school.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Our teachers do not spend enough time explaining why we are doing certain tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I get bored in English classes because the tasks are too easy.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I think that working in a group helps me to learn.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Our lessons are often repetitive and so I lose concentration easily.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I would prefer our teachers to correct our grammar mistakes less frequently.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I do not get enough praise when I do something correctly.	1	2	3	4	5
31. The teachers put too much importance on the results of our exams.	1	2	3	4	5
32. The English books we are using are interesting and attractive.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Doing exams every week helps me to learn English.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I think the weekend worksheet helps me to remember the points we learned in class.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I would prefer our teachers to use more Turkish in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I often feel unhappy when exam results are announced.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I think we are given about the right amount of homework.	1	2	3	4	5

Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	2	3	4	5

38. I think that a total of 27 hours of English a week is too much.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I feel that the teachers don't understand me and don't know how to help me.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I enjoy lessons in which the video is used.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I think our teachers should spend more time advising us on how to study.	1	2	3	4	5
42. Our teachers spend too much time talking about grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
43. I don't usually get enough opportunities to participate in lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I am happy with the general atmosphere among the students in our class.	1	2	3	4	5
45. I am embarassed to volunteer answers during English lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
46. I usually feel quite confident when speaking in our English classes.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I don't understand why some of the students are nervous when speaking in English lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I feel that the other students in the class speak better English than I do.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Studying English is important for me because I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job.	1	2	3	4	5
50. Studying English is important for me because it will make me a more knowledgeable person.	1	2	3	4	5
51. Studying English is important for me because I'll need it for my future career.	1	2	3	4	5
52. Studying English is important for me because other people will respect me if I have knowledge of a foreign language.	1	2	3	4	5
53. My parents don't usually help me with my English.	1	2	3	4	5
54. My parents compare my grades with those of family, friends or neighbours.	1	2	3	4	5
55. My parents have stressed the importance English will have for me when I leave school.	1	2	3	4	5
56. My parents think I should spend more time studying English.	1	2	3	4	5

Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	2	3	4	5

57. It is not necessary for me to have perfect pronunciation in English, so long as people understand me.	1	2	3	4	5
58. It does not matter if I make mistakes in English so long as I can express my thoughts.	1	2	3	4	5
59. I would like to take one of the international Cambridge exams in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
60. At present, learning English is one of the most important things in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
61. I think I have a good sense for languages.	1	2	3	4	5
62. My experiences of learning English in my junior school were discouraging.	1	2	3	4	5
63. I am the kind of student who will lose interest if the teacher is bad.	1	2	3	4	5
64. Language learning is easier for me than the average student.	1	2	3	4	5
65. Studying English is important for me because I hope to study or live in a foreign country.	1	2	3	4	5
66. Studying English is important for me because I am interested in culture - the way different people in the world think and live.	1	2	3	4	5
67. Studying English is important for me because I want to use English when I travel to other countries.	1	2	3	4	5
68. Studying English is important for me because it will help me understand Turkish better.	1	2	3	4	5
69. Studying English is important for me because it will help me learn about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
70. Studying English is important for me because I think everyone in Turkey should learn English.	1	2	3	4	5

Gender (girl/boy)

Name of junior school attended: _____

Date of birth (please give day, month and year) : ___/___/___

Age : _____

THANK YOU

APPENDIX III

Anket - Türkçe çevirme

Size verilecek olan bu anket, öğrencilerin İngilizce öğrenimi hakkındaki görüşleri ile ilgili bir araştırma projesinin parçasıdır. Ankette bize vereceğiniz cevapların okulunuzda ve Türkiye'deki diğer okullardaki yabancı dil eğitim programının gelişmesini sağlayacağını umarız. Soruları içtenlikle cevaplamanız ve *kendi düşüncelerinizi* belirtmeniz anketin geçerliliği açısından önemlidir.

Ankette 70 soru vardır. Her soru için aşağıda belirtildiği gibi 1'den 5'e kadar bir sayı işaretleyin:

1 Tamamen aynı fikirdesiniz veya büyük ölçüde bu fikre katılıyorsunuz
2 Aynı fikirdesiniz fakat bazı tereddütleriniz var
3 Kararsızsınız. Ne aynı fikirdesiniz ne de bu fikrin karşısındasınız
4 Aynı fikirde değilsiniz fakat bazı tereddütleriniz var
5 Kesinlikle aynı fikirde değilsiniz veya büyük ölçüde bu fikre katılmıyorsunuz

Aşağıda iki örnek verilmiştir. Şimdi örnekleri yapınız. Sizin düşüncenizi en yakın bir şekilde ifade eden sayıyı yuvarlak içine alarak işaretleyin:

Futbol oynamayı çok severim	1	2	3	4	5
Kitap okumak çok sıkıcıdır	1	2	3	4	5

Anketteki hiçbir soru için doğru veya yanlış diye bir cevap yoktur. Önemli olan her soruyu *içtenlikle doğru olarak cevaplandırmanızdır.* Anketi cevaplarken adınızı belirtmeniz gerekmez. Cevaplar kesinlikle gizli tutulacaktır.

Anketin cevaplandırılması için zaman sınırlaması verilmemiştir. Her soruyu dikkatle okumalı ve ihtiyaç duyduğunuz kadar düşünerek cevaplamalısınız.

Anketi cevaplarken arkadaşınızla konuşmayın ve onun kağıdına bakmayın. Anlamadığınız birşey olursa, lütfen parmak kaldırın, öğretmeniniz gelip gerekli açıklamayı yapacaktır.

Her soruyu dikkatle okumanız ve acele etmeden cevaplamanız çok önemlidir. Ayrıca soruları içtenlikle ve kendi düşünceleriniz doğrultusunda cevaplamanız da çok önemlidir. Bu okulda yeni gelen öğrenciler olarak sizin düşünceleriniz ve fikirleriniz bizim için önemlidir.

Bu araştırma projesine katıldığınız için teşekkür ederiz. Şimdi başlayabilirsiniz.

Tamamen aynı fikirdeyim	Aynı fikirdeyim	Ne aynı fikirdeyim ne değilim	Aynı fikirde değilim	Kesinlikle aynı fikirde değilim
1	2	3	4	5

1. İngilizler ve Amerikalılar hakkında ne kadar çok şey öğrenirsem, onları o kadar severim.	1	2	3	4	5
2. İngiliz ve Amerikalı sanatçılardan (şarkıcılar aktörler) çok Türk sanatçıları beğeniyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Günümüzde Amerikan ve İngiliz kültürü dünyada önemli bir yer tutmuyor.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Benim için İngiltere ve Amerika heyecan uyandıran ülkelerdir.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Yabancı dil öğrenmek benim için hoş bir şey değil.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Yabancı bir dili akıcı bir şekilde konuşabilmeyi çok isterdim.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Birçok yabancı dil öğrenmek isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
8. İngilizce öğrendikten sonra başka bir yabancı dil öğrenmek istemem.	1	2	3	4	5
9. İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü Amerikalı ve İngilizlerin yaşam biçimlerini öğrenmemi sağlayacak.	1	2	3	4	5
10. İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü Amerikalı ve İngiliz arkadaşlar edinmemi sağlayacak.	1	2	3	4	5
11. İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü İngiliz/Amerikan sanat ve edebiyatını anlayıp beğenmemi sağlayacak.	1	2	3	4	5
12. İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü Değişik kültür ve insanları daha iyi tanımamı sağlayacak.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Bence İngilizce öğrenmek sıkıcı.	1	2	3	4	5
14. İngilizce ortaokulda okuduğum diğer derslerden daha ilginç.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Hazırlık sınıfında sadece İngilizce değil, diğer dersleri de görmek istiyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
16. İngilizce öğrenmek çok zevkli.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Keşke İngilizce'yi akıcı bir şekilde konuşabilsem.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Eğer hem İngilizcem yeterli hem de imkanım olsa, sık sık İngilizce televizyon programlarını izlerim.	1	2	3	4	5

Tamamen aynı fikirdeyim	Aynı fikirdeyim	Ne aynı fikirdeyim ne değilim	Aynı fikirde değilim	Kesinlikle aynı fikirde değilim
1	2	3	4	5

19. Şu anda İngilizce öğrenmek benim için o kadar acil değil çünkü ileriki yıllarda öğrenebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Keşke İngilizce hiç *öğrenmeseydim.*	1	2	3	4	5
21. İngilizce ödevlerime çok fazla zaman *ayırmıyorum.*	1	2	3	4	5
22. Sadece sınıf geçmek için gereken çabayı gösteriyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
23. İngilizce derslerinde öğretmen soru sorduğunda mümkün olduğu kadar parmak kaldırıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Bu sene (hazırlık sınıfında) ödev yapmak için ortaokulda harcadığım zamandan daha fazla zaman harcıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Öğretmenlerimiz neyi-niçin yaptığımızı daha çok açıklasalar daha iyi olur.	1	2	3	4	5
26. İngilizce derslerinde sıkılıyorum çünkü alıştırmalar ve aktiviteler çok basit.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Bence grup çalışmaları İngilizce öğrenmek için yararlı.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Derslerde hergün aynı tip şeyleri yapıyoruz, bu da benim konsantrasyonumu azaltıyor.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Öğretmenler sınıf içinde gramer hatalarımızı daha az düzeltseler daha iyi olur.	1	2	3	4	5
30. İngilizce'yi doğru bir şekilde kullandığımda, öğretmenler beni takdir *etmiyor.*	1	2	3	4	5
31. Öğretmenler sınav sonuçlarına çok fazla önem veriyorlar.	1	2	3	4	5
32. İngilizce kitaplarımız ilginç ve cazip.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Bence her hafta sınav yapılması İngilizce öğrenmem için yararlı.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Hafta sonu ödevleri (Weekend worksheet) hafta içinde öğrendiğim konuları hatırlamamı sağlıyor.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Öğretmenlerin derste daha çok Türkçe konuşmasını tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Sınav sonuçları açıklandığında çoğunlukla kendimi kötü hissediyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Bence uygun miktarda (ne çok, ne de az) ödev veriliyor.	1	2	3	4	5

Tamamen aynı fikirdeyim	Aynı fikirdeyim	Ne aynı fikirdeyim ne değilim	Aynı fikirde değilim	Kesinlikle aynı fikirde değilim
1	2	3	4	5

38.	Bence haftada toplam 27 saat İngilizce dersi çok fazla.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	Öğretmenlerimin beni *anlamadıklarını* ve bana nasıl yardım edeceklerini *bilmediklerini* düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Video kullanılan dersleri beğeniyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Bence öğretmenler bize nasıl ders çalışmamız gerektiği konusunda bilgi verirlerse daha iyi olur.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Öğretmenlerimiz dilbilgisi üzerinde fazla duruyorlar.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	Genellikle derse katılmak için yeterli fırsatım *olmuyor*.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Sınıf ortamından ve arkadaşlık ilişkilerinden memnunum.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	İngilizce derslerinde öğretmenin sorduğu sorulara cevap vermeye çekiniyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
46.	İngilizce derslerinde söz aldığımda kendimi rahat hissediyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	Bazı öğrencilerin İngilizce konuşurken neden heyecanlandıklarını *anlamıyorum*.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	Sanırım sınıftaki diğer öğrenciler benden daha iyi İngilizce konuşuyor.	1	2	3	4	5
49.	İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü ilerde bana iyi bir iş olanağı sağlayacak.	1	2	3	4	5
50.	İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü daha bilgili bir insan olmamı sağlayacak.	1	2	3	4	5
51.	İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü gelecekteki kariyerim için gerekli olacak.	1	2	3	4	5
52.	İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü eğer bir yabancı dil bilirsem, insanlar bana saygı duyacaklar.	1	2	3	4	5
53.	Annem-babam genellikle İngilizce konusunda yardım *etmiyorlar*.	1	2	3	4	5
54.	Annem-babam aldığım notları komşu çocuklarının arkadaşlarımın ya da akraba çocuklarının notları ile karşılaştırıyorlar.	1	2	3	4	5
55.	Annem-babam mezun olduktan sonra gelecekte İngilizce bilmemin önemini vurguluyorlar.	1	2	3	4	5
56.	Annem-babam İngilizce çalışmaya daha fazla zaman ayırmam gerektiğini düşünüyorlar.	1	2	3	4	5

Tamamen aynı fikirdeyim	Aynı fikirdeyim	Ne aynı fikirdeyim ne değilim	Aynı fikirde değilim	Kesinlikle aynı fikirde değilim
1	2	3	4	5

57. İnsanlar beni anladığı sürece mükemmel telaffuza sahip olmam gerekli *değil*.	1	2	3	4	5
58. İngilizce olarak düşüncelerimi ifade edebildiğim sürece hata yapmak benim için sorun *değil*.	1	2	3	4	5
59. İlerde uluslararası Cambridge sınavlarından birine girip, sertifika almak istiyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
60. Şu anda İngilizce öğrenmek hayatımdaki en önemli şeylerden biri.	1	2	3	4	5
61. Yabancı dil öğrenmek için yeteneğim var.	1	2	3	4	5
62. Eski okulumdaki İngilizce eğitim sistemi beni İngilizceden soğuttu.	1	2	3	4	5
63. Eğer öğretmen kötü ise derse ilgisini kaybeden bir öğrenciyim.	1	2	3	4	5
64. Benim için dil öğrenimi ortalama bir öğrencininkinden daha kolay.	1	2	3	4	5
65. İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü yabancı bir ülkede yaşamak veya eğitimime orada devam etmek istiyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
66. İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü dünyanın değişik yerlerinde yaşayan insanların düşünce ve yaşam biçimleri, kısacası kültürleri ile ilgileniyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
67. İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü yurtdışına gittiğimde İngilizcemi kullanmak istiyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
68. İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü Türkçe'yi daha iyi anlamama yardım edecek.	1	2	3	4	5
69. İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü kendimi tanımamı ve geliştirmemi sağlayacak.	1	2	3	4	5
70. İngilizce öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü bence Türkiye'de yaşayan herkes İngilizce öğrenmeli.	1	2	3	4	5

Cinsiyetiniz (kız/erkek)

Bitirdiğiniz ortaokulun adı : _____

Doğum tarihiniz (gün, ay ve yılını belirtiniz) : ___/___/___

Yaşınız : _____

TEŞEKKÜR EDERIM

APPENDIX IV

Topics for Student Interviews

1. Expectations prior to commencing the prep program

   Had you any previous experience of language learning?
   Were you nervous /excited /eager to begin?
   Why did you (your parents) want (you) to learn English?
   What were your (your parents') reasons for choosing this school?

2. Extent to which expectations have been met

   What do you think now that you have been studying English for half a semester (one and a half semesters)?
   What things have surprised you ?
   What have you been happy / unhappy with over the last two months (seven months)?
   Do you think that learning English is easy?
   Why / Why not?

3. Attitudes toward the classroom

   What classroom activities do you particularly enjoy and what would you like to do more of? grammar exercises? speaking practice? reading /writing /listening /video?
   What activities do you not enjoy so much?
   When are you most interested in the lessons?

When do you find yourself getting bored?

How do you feel about the atmosphere among students?

4. Attitudes toward homework / independent study

Which homework exercises do you prefer?

About how many hours a week do you study outside class? (Tell the truth please!)

Apart from homework given by your teachers, what else do you do to improve your English?

What advice do your parents give you on this subject?

Would you like your teachers to give you more or different kinds of homework?

Would you like your teachers to give you more advice about *how* to study? Why / Why not?

5. Exams

Are you satisfied with your exam grades so far?

How do you feel before / after an exam?

Would you prefer to have more / fewer exams?

How do you study for exams? What advice / help does your family give?

Are they interested in your grades? What do they say?

How will you try to improve your grades?

Note: In the second semester, section one above was omitted, and in section two, students were encouraged to compare their general attitudes and feelings with those they had held during the first semester.

APPENDIX V

Example Transcripts of Student Interviews

1. Interview recorded with a student from the top group (first semester).

What were your feelings before starting at this school? I was a bit afraid because it was a new school, but I really liked it when I came. I was worried that it could be bad, that my English level would be too low, and that I would have difficulties. But it wasn't like this.

What did your family and friends say? My family wanted it but at first I didn't because I was afraid I wouldn't be able to cope. My friends told me "you can do it". My family especially wanted it. Now it's very easy.

Why did your family choose this type of school? For a better education and to learn English.

Why English? Because it's important. It will help me in my life. And it gives a good cultural background.

Why this school? We saw a lot of schools and were impressed with the success in the Cambridge exams. We investigated a lot as to which was the best school.

What do you think now? Anything that you didn't expect? Now it's much better than I expected and I have no fears. I'm sure I'll be successful.

Any surprises? It's turned out much better, I thought it would be worse.

What do you mean worse? I don't know. Maybe I thought the teachers would be bad, but everything's completely the reverse.

Is there anything you're not happy with? Your friends? My friends are excellent. I'm very happy.

Is learning English easy? No, difficult. *Why?* Grammar is very difficult. Sometimes you can't translate, you get confused. I don't know.

What activities do you particularly enjoy in the classroom? I like listening a lot and reading is very important. I like the other lessons, but these are the best. *Why?* Because when you listen your ear gets attuned.

Anything you don't like or get bored with? Sometimes yes, maybe. But nothing comes to mind now.

Classroom atmosphere? the other students? I'm very happy. They're excellent. Everyone is very friendly. There's no problem at all.

What kind of homework do you find most useful? Things that will be put on the wall. For example, things you do yourself. I like them because you use your brain rather than following something else. And the weekend homework is a good revision. *Worksheet?* Yes worksheet.

How many hours do you work in a week? Approximately, truthfully! I suppose as many as seven or eight hours.

Apart from homework, do you do anything else? No, I used to go to a course, English Fast. Ah, now I read books, from the library. *Anything else?* No. *Do you like reading?* Yes. *How many books have you read so far?* Two.

Do your family advise you on how to study? Yes, they tell me that I ought to read a lot in order to improve my vocabulary. They want me to focus on words I don't know.
Do you want more homework or less? No. On average now it's just right.
Would you prefer the teachers to give you more advice on how to study? Yes it would be helpful to know where to start, sometimes it's very difficult. We don't know what to do at home for learning words.
Are you satisfied with your exam grades? Yes I'm very satisfied. *How do you feel before an exam?* I'm very nervous. I'm always afraid that I'll get one in the exam.
And afterwards when you find out your grade? Then I'm very happy.
Do you think there should be more or fewer exams? No, one a week is very appropriate.
And do you prepare especially? Yes I study.
What do you do? I look over what we've learned. Especially vocabulary. And I rewrite the words I don't know separately. *Do your family recommend anything?* They say "work harder!" and "read more books".

2. Interview recorded with a student from the bottom group (second semester).

In general how would you compare your feelings about the first and second semesters? In the first term I couldn't speak, I couldn't put to use the words I knew and my

grammar was bad. In the second term, I've got better I think. Because time's passed and I think I'll be even better at the end of the year. Now it's good, much better than the first term. But in the first term I never got bored at all, now I've started to get bored, particularly in the last lessons, eighth lesson. Probably because it's winter. I don't know. That's all. I like English very much.

Anything that has surprised you or that you didn't expect? No, I knew how it would be, very good like the first term. Maths and science have made things a little more difficult, we've got more lessons now and they're both tricky subjects.

Because you learn them through English? It can be a bit difficult sometimes because I don't know some words. But I revise. It's good.

Is learning English easy? It's easy compared with French. But not that easy. If you want you can do it.

What lessons or activities do you particularly enjoy? When we talk and give our ideas about a subject. I like that. I like everything. Sometimes I get bored though, I think everyone's the same.

Would you like to do more or less grammar exercises? Enough actually. Not too much or too little.

Speaking practice? There should be lots of it.

Reading? There's enough anyhow.

Compositions or writing in class? Usually we speak don't we? That's good. Normal. It should be this way.

Listening? Very good. It would be good if there was more, because sometimes we confuse words. It helps us to understand. *Video?* Enough.

Is there anything that you don't like? When there are words I don't understand I don't like it and I get bored. Nothing else, everything is good. But there are more lessons now in the second term, and in the first term it was more fun and I never got bored. Now I get bored in the seventh and eighth lessons.

When are you most interested in the lessons? When I want to understand I listen. *And when do you get bored?* Sometimes we talk a lot and there are words I don't understand. And when we write a lot. That's all.

How do you feel about the classroom atmosphere? Very good. It's better now because we didn't know each other well at first.

What kind of homework activities do you prefer? Handouts. Reading and writing. *The worksheet?* At the weekends it's sometimes boring. But it's good especially for revision.

Sometimes boring? It's sometimes very boring, especially when there are a lot of pages, and when there are things I don't understand.

How many hours a week do you study? Tell the truth please! I revise for one hour or less each day before starting homework, our guidance teacher told me to do this. I spend between one and one and a half hours on homework. So perhaps three hours a day. At the weekend it varies greatly. For exams, for example core, I do the

worksheet and then revise the topics the teacher told us to. I use my note book. That's all.

Are you studying more than in the first term? Yes.

What else do you do to improve your English? I listen to music and watch TV, number one on fridays and saturdays. We don't have any other foreign channels.

What advice do your family give you? They support me and do what they can. They tell me to study and I'm doing what I can.

Would you like your teachers to give you more advice about how to study? Yes, before exams they could tell us what we should study. We want example questions and to know how we can study.

Are you satisfied with your exam grades? No, I'm not happy at all.

How would you compare the first and second semesters? The first term was worse. But I can speak, I can speak English. I can use what I've learned, but it doesn't work out in the exams. But normally I can speak to an English person. If I don't understand something I can ask them. When I have a problem I can explain it. My grades are low in the core lesson because my grammar is not very good.

How do you feel before exams? I'm extremely nervous. It's very bad. And also when getting results. I'm afraid my marks are going to be bad.

Do your family ask about your marks? Of course.

What do they say? If you work harder you'll be more successful. *Do they put pressure on you?* No it all

depends on me. But they tell me to work.

What will you do to try and improve your grades? I'll listen and speak more in the lessons. And by doing my homework. I've got to improve my grammar. But even if my exam grades are bad, I don't feel bad. Because I can speak English.

APPENDIX VI

Cronbach Alpha Coefficients of Internal Reliability

Items	Component	Cronbach Alpha
1-4	Attitudes toward the Anglo-Saxon world	-0.05
5-8	Interest in foreign languages	0.07
9-12	Integrative orientation	0.69
1-12	Integrativeness	0.57
13-16	Attitudes toward learning English	0.38
17-20	Desire to learn English	0.28
21-24	Motivational intensity	0.40
13-24	Motivation	0.26
25-44	Attitudes toward the learning situation	0.72
1-44	Integrative motive	0.72
45-48	English class anxiety	0.61
49-52	Instrumental orientation	0.48
53-56	Parental encouragement	0.28
57-60	Need for achievement	0.46
61-64	Attributions about past failures	0.35
65-70	Other orientations	0.36