



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

The Nature of Motivational Factors
Related to Achievement of
English as a Foreign Language
in Turkey

Iffet E. Özkut

Thesis Presented to the School of Graduate Studies
of the University of Ottawa
as Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-75096-0

Canada



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Lionel Desjarlais and Dr. Ian Dow, both of the Faculty of Education, for their initial and continuing direction in providing me the opportunity to pursue my studies and research.

I am eternally indebted to Dr. Richard Clément of the School of Psychology, without whose guidance this study would not have been possible. I had the privilege of working with him and his assistant, Kimberley Noels, after the collection of the data, at the analysis stage. Ms. Noels' invaluable skill in analyses carried out in the study, her patience and her encouragement will never be forgotten.

I would also like to thank Dr. Jean-Paul Dionne of the Faculty of Education and Vishwanath C. Hassan, M.A.Sc. in Mechanical Engineering, both of whom provided their expertise in developing and sequencing the various statistical tables and appendices.

I am especially grateful to Dr. Joshua Bear of the Faculty of Education at the Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara, Turkey. He provided updated material and research done in Turkey, including his own. Dr. Bear's constant support throughout my graduate studies and his willingness to share information have been a great source of encouragement.

I would like to thank the professors in Hacettepe

University and METU in Ankara for their assistance in administering the tests for the data collection.

Ronald Crelinsten, my life companion, was very supportive and performed several roles throughout this research. He has been strong in sharing the load and will certainly be happy to share the outcome with me.

ABSTRACT

The motivational dimension of second/foreign language learning has received considerable emphasis in the literature as a means of better predicting language achievement and understanding the factors that influence language learning. The present study is an attempt to analyze the nature of orientations towards learning English as a foreign language, and to test whether they are related to other constructs, such as motivation and proficiency, in a context not hitherto explored. To this end, four instruments were administered to a random sample of approximately 200 male and female university students in Humanities and Science in Turkey. These students were enrolled in intensive English language programs at the time of testing. The instruments consisted of 1) a cloze test to measure language proficiency; 2) a questionnaire to assess Ss' reasons for studying L₂; 3) a Motivational Intensity Scale to assess the students' effort in studying L₂; and 4) a Desire to Learn L₂ Scale to assess the degree to which Ss want to learn L₂.

The data was subjected to factor analyses and seven orientations to learn English were found to be common to all groups studied. Results of correlational analyses showed that there was a relationship between motivation and proficiency for females in the sample. There was no significant relationship between proficiency and any of the

seven orientations for either sex. Results based on MANOVA to determine the main effects for sex and field of study revealed significant effects for sex but not for field. A second factor analysis was done to assess the relationships between the seven orientations and motivation and proficiency for males and females separately. Four factors for females and three factors for males were obtained. A detailed description was given of the cultural, historical and educational context where English as a Foreign Language (EFL) takes place, where there is almost no contact with native speakers of English outside the classroom. This study contributes to those already conducted to test the most recent models of language learning in contexts both outside and within North America.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iv
List of tables	vii
List of appendices	viii
Introduction	1
Chapter One	
Motivation and second/foreign language learning	2
Gardner's model	7
Clément's model	23
Chapter Two	
Foreign language learning in Turkey	45
Turkey's educational system	46
History of foreign language teaching/learning	
in Turkey	50
The social and cultural context in Turkey	55
Foreign language teaching/learning -	
university level	57
The present status of English and the	
organization of foreign language programs ...	63
Research on foreign language learning	
in Turkey	69
Chapter Three	
Methodology	78
Subjects	78
Instruments	80
Procedure	94
Analyses	95
Chapter Four	
Results	104
Correlations among dependent variables	104
MANOVA for sex and field effects	110
Factor analysis II	114
Chapter Five	
Conclusions	124
References	132

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Choice of foreign language study in Turkey, based on student enrollment figures	52
Table 2.	Students enrolled in foreign language and literature departments where the medium of instruction is L ₂ in Turkey	60
Table 3.	The numbers of departments where the medium of instruction is a foreign language in Turkey	61
Table 4.	Students enrolled in English-medium universities in Turkey	62
Table 5.	Subjects	78
Table 6.	Reasons for Learning English Questionnaire ...	81
Table 7.	Motivational Intensity and Desire to Learn English Questionnaire	86
Table 8.	Varimax rotated factor matrix	98
Table 9.	Relative importance of factors after varimax rotation	99
Table 10.	Pearson correlation coefficients for male and female students	105
Table 11.	Multivariate and univariate tests for sex and field	112
Table 12.	Descriptive statistics for male and female students in the sample	113
Table 13.	Varimax rotated factor matrices: females and males	115
Table 14.	Relative importance of factors after varimax rotation: females and males	116

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1.	Framework for foreign language programs	140
Appendix 2.	Reasons for learning	143
Appendix 3.	Items	148
Appendix 4.	Reliability analysis for the motivation as a combination of the motivational intensity and desire to learn scales	151
Appendix 5.	Reliability analysis for the motivational intensity scale	152
Appendix 6.	Reliability analysis for the desire to learn scale	153
Appendix 7.	Cloze test	154
Appendix 8.	Varimax rotated factor matrix	156
Appendix 9.	Descriptive statistics for science and humanities students in the sample	157

INTRODUCTION

Trying to uncover and understand the factors that influence foreign language learning has been the concern of psychologists, linguists and educators for many years. The motivational dimension, among others, has been extensively researched to arrive at a better understanding of the factors underlying achievement in second language learning. It is this dimension that will be the focus of this study. In particular, this study looks at the nature of student motivations related to achievement in a foreign language in Turkey, a unilingual country with a strong national culture and identity. The specific foreign language concerned is English, which is the language of instruction in some of the Turkish universities.

In the first chapter, a review of the literature dealing with motivational aspects of second/foreign language learning will be presented. In Chapter Two, the Turkish context will be described in detail. Chapter Three will describe the various instruments and analyses used in the present study, while Chapter Four will present the main findings of the study. Chapter Five will draw some conclusions and point towards future directions for research.

CHAPTER ONE

MOTIVATION AND SECOND/FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING

The importance of aptitude, attitudes and motivation, individual differences and environmental variables in the process of learning a second language has generated a considerable body of research literature. The motivational aspect of L₂ (second language) learning has been studied by Gardner and his associates (Gardner and Lambert, 1972; Gardner, Smythe, Clément and Glikzman, 1976). The largest part of research in this area has focused on aptitude, and the attitudinal and motivational construct proposed by Gardner and Lambert (1959). Their study was one of the initial studies on the relation of attitudinal and motivational variables to second language achievement. The researchers factor-analyzed several measures that were administered to a sample of English-speaking high school Ss studying French in Montreal. One of the factors obtained had an influence on the students' language achievement, and was defined by the authors (Ibid.) as "social-motivation". The loading of this factor suggested, that students who had a favourable attitude toward French Canadians, who wanted to learn French for integrative purposes, and who worked hard to learn this language, would be successful. Other studies which demonstrated relationships between L₂ proficiency, and attitudes/motivation dimension involve many regions and languages.

Gardner and Lambert (1959) originally defined two major

goals in second language learning, namely "instrumental" and "integrative". If a learner's purposes for L₂ learning reflect the more utilitarian value of language achievement, such as career advancement, his/her orientation would be "instrumental", whereas if the language learner is oriented to learn more about the other cultural community, then it would be "integrative". Orientations are stated to represent long range goals that support a student's motivation to learn a language together with his/her attitudes toward the learning process (Gardner 1979, 1981; Gardner, Glikzman and Smythe, 1978).

Concerning the different contexts of L₂ learning, Gardner and Smythe (1974) stated earlier, that in a bilingual community, for instance, the Ss may develop some competency in some aspects of the L₂, whereas in a unilingual community only a few Ss may prove to be successful in those aspects. It is noted (Ibid.) that in a bilingual community, the language program may focus on communicational skills, whereas in a unilingual community, the program may be oriented towards "a knowledge of the language", rather than the "ability to use" the language (authors' emphasis, Ibid.).

Different functions are carried out in different languages in many contexts in the world. The status accorded to the languages in contact should be considered in analyzing these functions. Language competence of one particular type may lead to more economic and social

advancement than another. This usually leads to planning the promotion of a specific language for the socioeconomic activity in a nation, such as English and French in Canada. A discussion of language in education should not be limited to the medium of instruction in the classroom alone. The teaching of specific languages as subjects in the curriculum and the effect it has on cultural awareness has been a concern for many researchers (Alptekin 1981; 1982; Kachru 1976; England, 1982). The studies in this area show that

in many countries where more than one language is spoken by important segments of the population, there is often an unequal distribution of power (social, economic, etc.) among the various ethnolinguistic groups. It is often the case that minority groups are involved in a struggle for cultural and linguistic survival in the face of threatened assimilation by more dominant groups. In such situations, it is quite conceivable that, for some individuals, anticipated rewards of learning a second language do not balance out the perceived costs in terms of loss to ethnic or cultural identity. (Taylor, Meynard, and Rheault, 1977, p. 103)

Thinking along these lines, Lambert and his associates made a distinction between a "subtractive" and an "additive" form of bilingualism as follows (Lambert 1979, p. 422; Taylor, Meynard and Rheault, 1977):

a) subtractive bilingualism: an ethnolinguistic minority group, in attempting to master a prestigious national or international language, may actually set aside or "subtract out" for good the home language;

b) additive bilingualism: members of a high prestige linguistic community can easily, and with no fear of jeopardizing home language competence, "add" one or more

other languages to their repertoire of skills, reaping benefits of various sorts from their bilinguality.

Gardner (1979, p. 197) states that

This is a distinction in terms of the social implications of developing bilingual skills in which bilingualism is viewed as contributing to an individual's growth by offering him access to other cultural communities (additive) or as contributing to his feelings of loss of identity by orienting him away from his own cultural background towards another (imposed) one (subtractive). Obviously, this distinction depends not on the development of two language codes in the individual, but rather his belief and, quite likely, those of his immediate community concerning the implications of second language acquisition.

Gardner (1979: 200-201) emphasizes the role that the social context might play in second language acquisition. The author states that "communities obviously differ in a number of ways, and one which seems particularly relevant is the extent to which the other language group is an active part of the community" (Gardner, 1979, p. 201). The author refers to Giles, Bourhis and Taylor's (1977) schema for assessing "ethnolinguistic vitality" which causes a group to behave distinctively and act as a collectivity. This concept was originally introduced as a description of the language status of ethnic groups and it was proposed that most of the structural variables influencing ethnolinguistic vitality could be derived from the following three factors (Hogg and Abrams, 1988, p. 197):

1. Status: If an ethnolinguistic group has economic control over its destiny, consensually high self-esteem, pride in its past, and a respected language of international repute,

then it can be considered to have high status. This confers vitality which secures its survival as a distinct entity with a future.

2. Demography: This refers to the sheer number and distribution of group members. Demographic factors which favor enhanced vitality include large numbers concentrated in an ancestral homeland, favorable ingroup-outgroup numerical proportions, low emigration and high birth rates, and a low incidence of mixed ingroup-outgroup marriages.

3. The degree of institutional support: This refers to the representation that the language enjoys in the institutions (e.g. government, church, school, media) of the nation or territory. Institutional support enhances vitality. Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977) argued that the more an ethnic group is represented in these aspects, the more vitality it is said to have and accordingly, these three factors, namely status, demography and institutional support, would have a direct impact on the maintenance of a language within a community. Gardner (1979, p. 201) states that consideration of Giles, Bourhis and Taylor's (1977) system would facilitate the classification of communities as either bilingual or monolingual, largely on the basis of public information. Gardner and Clément (1990) state that the ethnolinguistic vitality construct includes both demographic and political aspects together with socioeconomic status, and that results applied to second language acquisition and use mostly originate from the education literature.

In the following section, related research results demonstrating the outcomes of second language acquisition in bilingual education and in inter-ethnic contexts will be described pertaining to the most recent and important social psychological models of second language acquisition.

Gardner's (1979) and Clément's (1980) models focus on the relationship between motivation and proficiency in second language learning influenced by the status of L_2 , the social environment, individual differences and the contextual characteristics of second language acquisition.

GARDNER'S MODEL

Gardner (1979, p. 193) states that

"second languages", unlike virtually any other curriculum topic, must be viewed as a central social psychological phenomenon. The rationale underlying this view is that most other school subjects involve learning elements of the student's own cultural heritage ... the acquisition of knowledge or habits which are already part of the makeup of the culture with which the student identifies. Such is not the case with second languages, however.

Gardner (1979, p. 193) describes second language acquisition as "acquiring symbolic elements of a different ethnolinguistic community", the characteristics of which are vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and other structural features of a language. Making these elements part of his/her own language reservoir, the student is said to have elements of another culture imposed into his/her own lifespace.

As a result the student's harmony with his own cultural community and his willingness or ability to identify with other cultural communities become

important considerations in the process (Gardner, 1979, p. 194).

Thus, second language acquisition "not only involves individuals and groups, but also language, culture, and intergroup interaction" (Ibid.).

Gardner's model consists of four distinct components: social milieu, individual differences, second language acquisition contexts and outcomes. Gardner (1979, p. 195) describes the model as "a social psychological one which focuses its major attention on individual difference variables as they relate to the achievement of outcomes of second language acquisition".

The socio-educational model of second language learning was originally proposed by Gardner and Smythe (1975), which was an elaborate version of Lambert's (1963; 1967; 1974) theoretical formulations and aspects of a model proposed by Carroll (1962). The major elements mentioned above are described as follows (Gardner, 1979, pp. 195-200):

1. Social Milieu: Second language learning process must be considered in the larger context in which the individual and the second language program exists. The major process variable here is "Cultural Beliefs".

If a student resides in a community where speakers of the other language are not valued, or where debate exists concerning the value of that language or the reasons for teaching it, the beliefs he takes with him into the language learning situation will differ from those he would hold if he were resident of an area where opposing cultural beliefs exist (Gardner, 1979, p. 195).

This social context is discussed in terms of bilingualism

(additive/subtractive) and unilingualism, and developing different language skills as required in each milieu.

2. Individual Differences: This category of the model refers to "characteristics of the student which will influence his/her approach to the second language acquisition process" (Gardner, 1979, p. 197). Gardner describes four major variables: intelligence, language aptitude, motivation and situational anxiety.

Intelligence refers to a general class of abilities which account for individual differences in the extent to which students understand the nature of any task to be learned. Language aptitude refers specifically to the capacity to learn languages and is typically assessed in terms of students' verbal abilities... Motivation refers to those affective characteristics which orient the student to try to acquire elements of the second language, and includes the desire the student has for achieving a goal, and the amount of effort he expends in this direction... Situational anxiety refers to those anxiety reactions aroused in specific situations involving second language; examples would be French classroom anxiety or French use anxiety. Situational anxiety should not be confused with general anxiety (Gardner, 1979, pp. 197-198).

3. Second Language Acquisition Contexts: This category refers to the formal and informal contexts of second language acquisition. The four individual variables, described previously, would seem particularly important in the school setting. Gardner (1979, p. 198) states that motivation, for instance,

would be expected to play a direct role in the formal language training situation because it would serve to keep the student in the program, influence his perceptions of the training situation, and serve as the basis for many reinforcements which might be obtained in the classroom.

4. Outcomes: As indicated in the model, both formal language training and informal language experience are shown as having direct effects on both linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes. Linguistic outcomes refer to second language knowledge of such structural aspects of the language as vocabulary, grammar, etc., and specific second language skills, such as reading, writing, understanding and speaking. Non-linguistic outcomes refer to extra-language attributes which might develop as a function of second language training and experience. Examples of such non-linguistic outcomes are favorable attitudes towards the other cultural community, a general appreciation of other cultures, interest in further language study, etc. Listening to radio broadcasts, for example, may improve aural comprehension and promote an appreciation of the other community, while having a pen pal could improve writing skills and foster favorable attitudes towards some members of the community. In short, depending on the nature of the particular formal language training or informal language experience, it is possible that different linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes would develop.

This socio-educational model considers second language acquisition to be a function of two major classes of variables, motivation and language aptitude (Gardner, 1979; 1981; 1982). Gardner's model proposes that

the cultural milieu, reflected in beliefs held in the community about second language learning and bilingualism, will influence individuals' attitudes and beliefs about a number of factors

associated with second language learning. These factors could include the implications of bilingualism to the individual (i.e. additive or subtractive), or any other factor involved with language acquisition; hence, the model is completely general to all contexts (Gardner, 1982, p. 144).

The conceptualization of motivation is a complex of three aspects; effort (Motivational Intensity), desire, and affect (Attitudes toward Learning French). Effort refers to the student's drive to learn the language, desire refers to the extent to which the student wishes to learn the language, and affect refers to the student's emotional reactions toward the language learning experience (Gardner, 1982, pp. 144-146).

Clément (1979) compared immersion program students who were enrolled in intensive language training with exchange program students who visited students in the other community. His findings indicated that both situations improved attitudes toward French Canadians and lowered French classroom anxiety. However, it was shown that the exchange program had more influence on the attitudes whereas the immersion program appeared to be more effective in reducing anxiety. The students in the intensive language program had the opportunity to use L₂ in the classroom which led to decreased anxiety. On the other hand, students in the exchange program had the opportunity to meet French Canadians to socialize. This promoted their attitude change.

In Gardner's earlier work (1966), "integrative motive"

has been described as containing a number of attitudinal and motivational components. These include attitudes toward the L₂ group and toward the language learning task, motivational intensity, desire to learn the language and the integrative orientation. Gardner (1977; 1980) demonstrated that the integrative motive was a significant predictor of L₂ proficiency. However, for some researchers, the distinction between the integrative motive and its components did not seem to be clear. Spolsky (1969a), for instance, calculated the integrative motive from indirect measures and found that the resulting measure correlated higher with L₂ proficiency measures than what he called Gardner and Lambert's "direct" measures of motivation. The subjects in this study had a variety of first languages and were all learning English in the United States. Spolsky's scheme will be described later in this section.

The studies relating the integrative motive to second language achievement were done using various scales to elicit integrative motive. The most frequently used direct questions were those of the "Attitude and Motivation Test Battery" (AMTB) (Gardner, Clément, Smythe and Smythe, 1979). The three composite measures were: 1. motivation, that is the individual's total drive to learn L₂ and that reflects a combination of effort, desire and affective reactions toward learning L₂; 2. integrativeness, that refers to a positive and accepting orientation toward the target language (TL) group and other groups in general; 3. attitudes toward the

learning situation, that is the sum of the learner's evaluation of both the L₂ teacher and the L₂ course.

Scores of all the scales were added together to find a single integrative motive score. These measures were later elaborated on by Gardner and Smythe (1981) and were assumed to reflect the three different aspects of an important attitudinal complex mentioned above, that is, an Integrative Motive involved in second language learning (Gardner, 1979). Earlier studies (Gardner 1960; 1966) emphasized the integrative, versus the instrumental, orientation in L₂ learning. However, Anisfeld and Lambert (1961), for instance, investigated both these orientations and their role in the language learning process. Their study will be discussed later on.

The development of the AMTB followed "more than twenty years of research, much of which has been directed to the investigation of English-speaking students learning French as a second language" (Gardner, 1985, p. 1). Other studies were done using modified versions of these items or similar ones to study the learning of English in various contexts. These studies will be described in more detail further on. Seldom have all the scales been used in one study. The use of adapted scales from the AMTB and the totally new scales without estimates of reliability and validity makes it difficult to determine the appropriateness of these measures.

The second method to calculate the measure of the

integrative motive is Spolsky's (1969a) scheme. It is an indirect measure of the learner's attitudes toward his/her own group and toward the second language group. The subject is asked to rate himself/herself, his/her ideal self, the first language group, and the second language group on the same list of adjectives. Instead of measuring orientations or motivation, Spolsky's measures focus on learner's attitudes toward cultural groups. Therefore, while including an important aspect of the integrative orientation, which is the positive attitude toward the L₂ group, Spolsky's measures appear to have excluded the learner's desire to identify with valued members of the L₂ group, the second aspect of the integrative orientation (Ervin-Tripp, 1973).

In Gardner and Lambert's (1959, p. 207) original work, the integrative orientation to learn a second language indicated reasons such as "to learn more about the language group, or to meet more and different people". Thus, in Gardner's (1960) study, the students' reasons for learning L₂, such as to get to know the L₂ group better or to become more friendly with them, were categorized as indicating an integrative orientation. Later, Gardner and Lambert (1972, p. 14) stated that "the acquisition of a new language involves much more than mere acquisition of a new set of verbal habits. The language student must be willing to adopt appropriate features of behavior which characterize members of another linguistic community". The authors

described an instrumental orientation as "characterized by a desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages through knowledge of a foreign language. The perspective in this instance is more self-oriented in the sense that a person prepares to learn a new code in order to derive benefits of a noninterpersonal sort" (Ibid.). Thus, contrasting the two forms of orientation, Gardner and Lambert (1972, pp. 14-15) draw attention to "an integratively oriented learner who in considering the learning task is oriented principally towards representatives of a novel and interesting ethnolinguistic community, people with whom he would like to develop personal ties" and an "instrumentally oriented ... learner ... interested mainly in using the cultural group and their language as an instrument of personal satisfaction, with few signs of an interest in the other people per se".

The question of whether language learners were integratively or instrumentally motivated has led to conflicting research results. The instrumental reasons for language learning described in Gardner and Lambert's work appeared to be integrative reasons for the subjects in Anisfeld and Lambert's (1961) study. To get a job or to choose a career that requires L₂ (Hebrew in this case) indicated that the student would be getting a job in the Jewish community, thus integrating into their culture and participating in their traditions. The subjects in this study were Canadian Jewish children. Contrary to their

expectations, the authors found that instrumentally motivated students performed better on Hebrew tests.

Variants of Spolsky's scheme were used to assess language learning motivation. In Lukmani's (1972) study, the subjects were sixty Marathi-speaking girls graduating from a high school in India, who had studied English as a second language for seven years. Marathi was the medium of instruction in this school. Both direct and indirect questionnaires were used in this study as well as a cloze test to measure English proficiency. The results showed that the students were instrumentally motivated to learn English and that instrumental motivation scores correlated significantly with English proficiency scores. The higher their motivation to use English as a means of career advancement, the better their English language scores. The traits on which English was marked high related to modernity and better standards of living, which the students could acquire without becoming Westernized. For the subjects, Westernization implied a clear rejection of the norms of Marathi society, therefore it was quite unacceptable. The students showed little desire to identify with English-speaking natives in India. The role of cultural milieu was emphasized in the interpretation of the differences in the nature of students' motivation to learn L₂ in different contexts.

Other studies used Spolsky's (1969a) indirect method to investigate the relationship between attained proficiency in

English as a Second Language (ESL) and attitudes toward the TL group. Oller, Baca and Vigil (1977) studied Mexican-American women between ages 16 and 23. The authors found that the relationship between attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL was strong, and that the indirect scales concerning students' attitudes toward themselves, their native language group and TL group seemed to be more informative than the direct questionnaires asking about their reasons for learning ESL or for traveling to the United States. The ratings for the direct questionnaire were factor analyzed and seven factors were identified. One of these factors, labeled Instrumental Orientation, was found to be negatively related to L₂ achievement. Similarly, Oller, Hudson and Liu (1977) studied university students in the United States, whose L₁ was Chinese. The students who rated Americans high in traits like successful and helpful and low in traits like sensitive and happy had high English proficiency. Results from the direct questionnaire indicated that there was a significant negative correlation between desire to stay in the United States and attained ESL proficiency. The students who obtained low proficiency scores had a tendency to stay permanently in the United States, to think that there were better job opportunities and had long planned to come to the United States. In general, attitudes toward self and the L₁ group, as well as attitudes toward the TL group, were positively correlated with ESL proficiency.

In the study done by Chihara and Oller (1978), the methodology used was similar to those of the two previous studies. In this study, the subjects were Japanese adults learning English as a foreign language in Japan. The results indicated that there was evidence for significant relationships between attitudes and proficiency in EFL which were not easily explained or closely parallel to those obtained by Oller, Hudson and Liu (1977). The authors raised the possibility that this was due to the differences in context in both studies, such as subjects learning English as a second language versus as a foreign language. The relationship between attitudes and proficiency was much weaker than that of Oller, Hudson and Liu (1977). Chihara and Oller (1978) concluded that there was no clear difference between the utility of indirect and direct questions as techniques for eliciting information on attitudes.

Other researchers also stated that the relationship between attitudes and achievement varies from one cultural context to another. Teitelbaum, Edwards and Hudson (1975) suggested that it was important to take into account extralinguistic considerations, such as the prestige of the TL locally, nationally or internationally, and the pragmatic consequences of acquiring a particular L_2 . The authors investigated specific motivational and attitudinal variables that could be used as predictors of Spanish proficiency. Their results indicated that a positive orientation toward

the local Chicano community might have been more of a hindrance than a help in the acquisition of Spanish as a second language. The authors concluded that the concepts of integrative and instrumental motivation have failed to produce replicable results with regard to the prediction of language proficiency, and that these concepts have to be further investigated.

One of the major critical analyses of Gardner's (1980) socio-educational model has been done by Au (1988). Au (1988, p. 85) criticized Gardner for "explicitly pointing out contextual considerations as one of the three major considerations [the other two being conceptual and statistical] that must be taken into account in evaluating evidence". He suggests that the cultural beliefs proposition in Gardner's model has been used "to rescue the major assumption of the theory, namely that integrative motive facilitates L₂ achievement, when evidence to the contrary is discerned" (Ibid.). Au describes contextual considerations as vague, and goes on to question the weight that should be given to contexts, the manner in which they should be classified, and whether or not they should be applied to negative evidence only.

Gardner (1988, p. 121) however, in his response to Au's criticism, states:

Despite Au's observation that the role of the cultural context is difficult to investigate, there is a need to determine its effect on the relation of aptitude and attitudes and motivation to proficiency in a second language. It is not unreasonable to expect that situational factors

could influence such relationships.

He also refers to suggestions that "attitudinal/motivational variables may play a greater role in learning French in Canada, because of the official status of French as a second language, than they might play with learning other languages in other contexts" (Gardner, 1988, p. 121). Gardner states that although this might be a possible explanation, the great diversity in people's needs in relation to the French language across Canada has been ignored. In referring to findings in other cultures on the relationship between attitudinal/motivational variables and achievement, Gardner (1988, p. 121) concludes that "until more research has been conducted using measures of demonstrated reliability and validity, and controlling for various extraneous factors ... the role of contextual factors cannot be ruled out".

In Gardner's (1979) model, the major operative construct is motivation. It has been suggested that the cultural milieu in which language learning takes place will influence attitudinal variables that serve as basic supports for this motivation (Gardner and Lalonde, 1985). The results of an earlier study conducted by Gardner, Smythe and Clément (1979) indicated that the differences between the two groups of subjects studied were attributable to socio-cultural factors.

In this study, the samples investigated were Canadian and American adult students participating in an intensive French language program. The subjects were tested before

and after the program on a series of attitudinal, motivational and French achievement measures. The Canadian students, who entered the program with positive attitudes toward learning French for purposes of integrating with the TL group, were found to be much more successful in developing oral skills, and perceived the course as more rewarding than the American students who were not similarly motivated. There was clear evidence of an Integrative Motive in data obtained from the American students, which, the authors claimed, was not as clearly articulated as with the Canadian sample. The American students did not have much prior training in French, and came from a milieu in which there were no French Canadians as a major social group. The authors concluded that this was one of the most important factors for the American sample to demonstrate decreased appreciation of the French Canadian community in the context of a demanding French language program. On the other hand, these students indicated an increased desire to learn French after the program. Both groups were reported to have evidenced decreases in anxiety about L₂ and in attitudinal reactions toward bilingualism, and an increase in French proficiency. The authors stated that the results reflected the important role that an individual's socio-cultural background can have on the nature of attitudinal/motivational characteristics in L₂ learning.

The results of the studies relating affective variables and L₂ achievement conducted in the Canadian context, the

majority of them employing Canadians as subjects, vastly differed from those conducted in other contexts. This was primarily due to sociocultural differences. In the Canadian context, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, the students learn one of the two official languages in Canada - that is, their own country. Gardner and Lambert (1959) studied Anglophone high school students in Canada. This study included linguistic aptitude measures. The results of their factor analysis showed that achievement loaded highly on the linguistic aptitude and the motivation factors. In a similar study, Gardner (1960) employed Anglophone high school students learning French as a second language. The results obtained showed that L₂ achievement loaded with the linguistic aptitude and the integrative motive. Gardner, Smythe and Brunet (1977) studied Canadian students during a five-week, residential summer program. The instruments used included a battery of attitude and motivation tests, oral proficiency (pre- and post-) tests, teacher ratings, and self-ratings of French language skills. The results indicated that the course had been effective in increasing the students' motivation to learn French and had helped to improve oral/aural skills. Changes in attitudes were also observed. The students had become significantly more ethnocentric, similar to the results obtained by Gardner, Smythe and Clément (1979), as described earlier.

Francophone students in the Canadian context were studied by Clément and his colleagues (Clément, 1978;

Clément, Gardner and Smythe, 1977; Clément, Major, Gardner and Smythe, 1977; Clément, Gardner and Smythe, 1980). These studies have addressed the relative status of two ethnolinguistic groups and related the learner's L₂ acquisition to the social/structural characteristics of the community he/she lived in. Accordingly, the relative dominance/subordinance of the learner's own group and the TL group would influence the intergroup relations and determine the learner's motivation to learn or to avoid to learn L₂. In the following section, a description of "the bases of a framework designed to encompass the theoretical formulations related to social/structural individual and collective aspects of interethnic communication" will be presented (Clément, 1980, p. 148).

CLEMENT'S MODEL

Clément's model (1980; 1984; Clément and Kruidenier, 1985; Clément, 1986) proposes that second language proficiency is influenced by the individual's motivation. According to the model, an individual's willingness to learn another language and fear to lose his/her own depend on the respective degrees of linguistic and cultural viability of L₁ and L₂ groups. When it is possible to use L₂ actively, this refers to which of the two speech communities is more self-confident about its L₁ and how often the L₂ will be used.

Clément (1980) explained how aspects of the social milieu influence learners' linguistic outcomes in the L₂

acquisition process. In the model, it was hypothesized that in the L₂ acquisition process in unicultural settings, fear of assimilation would lead to decreased motivation and lower levels of L₂ communicative competence. In multicultural settings, the individual's self-confidence was an interactive function of the frequency and quality of contact with L₂ group members. Thus, it was hypothesized that the primary and secondary motivational processes would determine the learner's L₂ competence, such that competence would be a function of high levels of integrativeness and self-confidence.

In a more recent study, Clément (1986) investigated the relationship between language status and individual differences in attitudes and motivation as they related to proficiency and acculturation in English as a second language. The results of this study showed that minority group members demonstrated more self-confidence in their ability to use the second language and higher levels of proficiency in the second language than majority group members. Contrary to the hypotheses, status did not appear to have any influence on integrativeness, fear of assimilation and motivation. Ethnolinguistic vitality was found to have no relation to the variables defining the primary motivational process. However, the results showed that the influence of status on aspects of contact, self-confidence and proficiency confirmed the hypotheses. The results of the factor analyses indicated that Self-

confidence was related to inter-ethnic contact and Integrative Motive and Self-confidence factors shared loadings from variables describing aspects of contact. These results were parallel to those obtained by Clément, Gardner and Smythe (1977; 1980).

In Clément's 1986 study, the best predictor of proficiency and acculturation was the Self-confidence factor. The role assigned to motivation in Clément's model, that motivation is determined by two processes as mentioned earlier, was not confirmed. Contrary to research results obtained by Clément and Kruidenier (1985), Clément, Gardner and Smythe (1980) and Taylor, Meynard and Rheault (1977), fear of assimilation was positively related to integrativeness, motivation and acculturation for majority group members. Possible explanations for these results were discussed in terms of their implications for the majority and minority group members and for bilingual education programs involving actual contact with members of the second language speaking group.

In Clément's model (1980) it is proposed that self-confidence in L₂ could at times assume a more important role than the integrative motive. Self-confidence forms the basis of a secondary motivational process (as opposed to the integrative motive which is referred to as the primary process) that serves to sustain motivation in the process of learning a second language. Studies in this area have included confidence and anxiety measures, and related them

to L₂ achievement. Gardner, Smythe and Clément (1979), as described earlier, found that French classroom anxiety was related to one of the three L₂ achievement measures in their American sample. Gardner, Smythe and Brunet's (1977) post-test results showed that students' ethnocentricity increased significantly, they were more highly motivated to learn L₂ and had more opportunity to use L₂. The results of this study, as mentioned earlier, showed that they became less interested in foreign languages and less integratively oriented when compared with their pre-test results. However, as their French proficiency level increased, they became less anxious in the second language classroom setting. Muchnick and Wolfe (1982) found that French classroom anxiety was not related to students' grades in Spanish. Pierson, Fu and Lee's (1980) subjects were native speakers of Chinese, learning English in Hong Kong. The results of this study indicated that there was a relationship between self-confidence and the cloze scores in English. However, the students who stated they felt uneasy and insecure when speaking English had higher scores. Thus, high anxiety was associated with high L₂ achievement, which supports Clément's proposal that self-confidence serves as a basis for motivation in the process of learning a second language.

In an earlier study by Taylor and associates (Taylor, Meynard and Rheault, 1977), the two variables most related to L₂ skill were the extent of personal contact with the TL

speaking group, and threat to identity posed by learning the TL. The learners who had more contact with English speakers were themselves better speakers of English, and those who did not feel their own cultural identity to be threatened had a higher level of communicative competence in English. The authors concluded that predicting the success of second language learning programs was not limited to instructional and learner characteristics and suggested that the socio-cultural environment within which a second language program operates must also be taken into account (Ibid., p. 113).

These results also indicate that the distinction between the relative status of the learner group and the target group is important in explaining the influence of the structural context on second language acquisition.

Concerning the relative importance and the influence of status and contact in second language acquisition, Clément and Kruidenier's (1983) study is an attempt to assess the relationship between the following factors: the status of the learning group; the status of the target group; the linguistic composition (bilingual/unilingual) of the community, and the reasons for learning L₂. Clément and Kruidenier (1983, p. 277) state that "the dominance/nondominance aspects of interethnic relations should ... influence the orientations evidenced by ethnic group members. In the Canadian setting, Anglophones and Francophones could be expected to differ markedly in terms of their orientations to learning the language of the other

group". The results of their study indicated that the three factors mentioned above influenced the students' orientations. Control and prestige seeking orientations emerged as a result of the relative dominance of the learning group whereas integration and identification orientations emerged as a result of the relative familiarity with the target language group. The authors stated that the "study was designed to clarify the definitions of orientations in second language acquisition and to reconcile previous contradictory findings by evaluating the influence of the linguistic composition of the milieu, ethnicity and the target language on the emergence of orientations to second language acquisition" (Clément and Kruidenier, 1983, p. 278). Based on their findings, instrumental, knowledge, friendship and travel orientations appeared to be common to all groups studied.

In a similar study, Kruidenier and Clément (1986) obtained data from groups of students according to combinations of three dichotomized sociocultural factors: 1. ethnolinguistic group to which the student belonged; 2. sociopolitical status of the TL (official/minority); 3. cultural composition of the milieu (unicultural/multicultural). The purposes of this study were: to identify the existence of the integrative and instrumental orientations in different learning contexts, to determine if any other undefined orientations do exist, and to assess the effect of the learning context on student

endorsements of orientations and on the relationship between orientations and motivation. The researchers found that general instrumental, travel, friendship and knowledge orientations were common to all groups, as was the case in their 1983 study. Generally, orientations were more highly correlated with motivation in the Anglophone groups than in the Francophone groups. It was also found that sociocultural factors determined both the composition of some orientations and the importance of orientations in the learning process. These results were said to indicate that students were motivated by several relatively specific and concrete orientations simultaneously, and that the relative importance of these orientations varied according to structural factors in the learning environment. The results were also discussed in terms of their implications for changes in the current models of second language acquisition and pedagogical practice.

In referring to the results of both these studies, Gardner and Clément (1990, pp. 25-26) state that "although the studies did not assess second language proficiency and use, these results link second language learning motivation to independent effects of status and contact". In Clément's model, the social context reflects the relative "perceived vitality" of groups and the nature of their contact, which includes Gardner's classroom situation where second language learning takes place.

The results obtained in the studies mentioned above led

some researchers to further investigate the contextual factors in the process of L₂ learning. Noels and Clément (1989), for instance, studied orientations for learning German as a second language, and the relationship between these orientations and the variables associated with L₂ acquisition.

This study was an attempt to assess the effects of language heritage on the L₂ learning process. The researchers suggested that in the cases where students were learning their parents' or ancestors' first language, the patterns of integrative and instrumental orientations might not be defined clearly. The orientations of students learning a heritage language and students learning the same language as L₂ were compared systematically. The results indicated that five orientations existed in the context where the subjects had a German family background. In this case, the students were learning German "in order to develop a skill meant to be useful in pragmatic endeavours, to gain friendship, to identify with and influence the TL group, to travel and to broaden their knowledge" (Noels and Clément, 1989, p. 254). The orientations found are similar to those obtained by Clément and Kruidenier (1983). Noels and Clément (1989) stated that these orientations were related to attitude, motivational strength, aspects of contact and self-confidence. Motivation was found to be associated with L₂ achievement and "related to a cluster of variables which have in the past been identified as reflecting an

integrative motive" (Noels and Clément, 1989, p. 255).

In contrast to students with no German background, students with a German-speaking background showed greater contact, higher self-confidence and a stronger identification with the TL speaker that the authors associate with a desire to become influential in the L₂ community. This differences did not, however, translate into stronger motivation or higher achievement. Frequency of contact was found to be related to a higher level of self-confidence, but the hypothesized relationship to motivation and L₂ achievement was not supported. Frequency of contact was also found to indicate a reduced interest. In explaining their results, the researchers suggested that the desire to identify with and to influence the L₂ community might have been reflected in an increased ability to use verbal communication skills while neglecting to develop reading and writing skills. It was suggested that "their Identity-Influence orientation, which may concord with their life situation, may be contrary to goals addressed by the written exercises of the German class context. Thus, from a motivational point of view, the heritage language learner finds him/herself in an environment which does not fulfill his/her particular needs" (Noels and Clément, 1989, p. 255).

These results appear to be similar to conclusions drawn in previous studies. Concerning the different contexts of L₂ learning, Gardner and Smythe (1974) stated that in a

bilingual community, for instance, the students may develop competency in some aspects of the L₂, whereas in a unilingual context only a few students may be successful in those aspects. In a bilingual context, the L₂ program may emphasize communicational skills, whereas in a unilingual context, the program may focus on what the authors call "a knowledge of the language" rather than the "ability to use" the language.

The types of skills acquired might be influenced by the formal/informal L₂ learning as follows (Gardner, Smythe, Clément and Glikzman, 1976, p. 200):

1. various structural characteristics of the language, such as vocabulary, grammar, are stressed in a classroom situation, whereas 2) it might be expected that individual differences in skills, such as listening to the radio and reading newspapers would be more related to motivational variables than aptitude, because these variables would determine whether or not the student avails himself of these informal language contexts.

Student opinions concerning the role of learning objectives in the L₂ course and the opportunity to use L₂ bring us back to Gardner's model and its relevance to L₂ achievement in school situations. A test of both Gardner's and Clément's models would identify learners' fluency in L₂.

In a more recent study, Moise, Clément and Noels (1990) analyzed the orientations related to foreign language learning endorsed by Francophone and Anglophone university students learning Spanish in a multicultural context, as well as ESL and FSL (French as a Second Language) respectively. This study was an attempt to examine the

relationship between the orientations related to learning Spanish (a foreign language), certain sociopsychological variables - namely attitudes, motivation, self-confidence, interethnic frequency of contact, and achievement in Spanish - and the orientations specifically related to learning French/English as a second language.

The results of this study demonstrated that the Francophones were more integratively oriented to learn a foreign/second language than the Anglophones; they appeared to demonstrate a better language achievement and to evaluate their L₂ competence more positively than the Anglophones. On the other hand, the Anglophone sample endorsed the Travel orientation far greater than the Francophone sample. The Integrative, Travel, Instrumental and General Knowledge orientations common to all groups learning Spanish as a foreign language resemble the orientations obtained by Clément and Kruidenier (1983), where the Integrative orientation corresponds to what the latter termed a Friendship orientation.

The fifth orientation obtained was the Prestige-Influence orientation, which characterized both groups studied. In Clément and Kruidenier's (1983) study, this orientation appeared only for the Francophone group learning Spanish in a multicultural context, but not the Anglophone group learning Spanish in a multicultural context. Moïse, Clément and Noels (1990) suggested that this difference between the two studies might have been due to age and the

subjects' level of study. Since Spanish is widely spoken around the world, learning this language in this particular context appeared to bring a certain personal prestige for the Francophone student within his/her linguistic group.

The differences observed between the two groups in this study were stated to be due to the school context, providing the Anglophones a much larger cultural environment which would not be accessible within their own milieu. The Anglophone students appeared to have instrumental or pragmatic reasons for learning French. This, according to the authors, reflected the constraints of a milieu that favoured knowledge of French at the level of the pedagogical requirements, as well as for hiring practices. In the Canadian context where the study was conducted, Spanish and French languages share a minority status and common etymological roots. Thus, the authors stated that there appeared to be an absence of distinction between learning these two languages for the Anglophone subjects. From the results obtained, it was difficult to identify clearly the motivational or social base underlying learning Spanish for this group. They appeared to be characterized by a relatively low motivation and achievement, and by an orientation towards using Spanish as a tool for travel. The Travel orientation was otherwise associated with seeking prestige within the community; it was not related to Spanish achievement for any of the groups.

For the Anglophone students, this seemed to have

suggested the existence of an approach that did not engender or might not even be compatible with the kind of effort necessary to attain a higher level of achievement in another language.

Other differences between the two groups were attributed to the ethnolinguistic status of the students. For Francophone students, the reasons for learning another language appeared to be related to the functions of the relative status of the TL. For the Francophones, unlike the Anglophones, motivation and language achievement were related to self-confidence. The authors concluded that the results partly replicated those obtained by Clément and Kruidenier (1983) and supported their interpretation of the existence and definitions of the four orientations in L₂ learning.

In a more recent study, Dörnyei (1990) studied adult students learning English as a foreign language in Hungary on a voluntary basis. A questionnaire was designed to assess the areas where the English language would be used and reasons for learning EFL. This study was an attempt to conceptualize motivational variables for foreign language learning contexts. It was hypothesized that motivation in such contexts would be different from L₂ acquisition or from learning English as a second language in the United States in that the learners often do not come into contact with the TL group. The learners' attitudinal reactions towards the TL community, therefore, would involve a general interest in

foreign languages and culture. The relationship between motivation and language achievement was also investigated since the desired proficiency level was assumed to be related to motivation.

The reported results showed that instrumental and integrative motives appeared to exist as the two major subsystems in the underlying construct as well as two other independent motives labeled as Need for Achievement and Attributions about Past Failures. Another component, labeled Desire to Integrate into a New Community formed an overlap between the two subsystems and it was stated to be partly integrative in nature, since it was associated with going abroad for a relatively long period related to one's career. The Need for Achievement was described as an interest in excellence and seeking out opportunities for achievement. The Attributions about Past Failures factor was associated with bad learning experiences specific to foreign language learning. This factor was not represented clearly in the questionnaire. Therefore, it was not possible to identify its relationship to other variables.

The results of this study indicated that the students' need for achievement was positively related to their course achievement. The author suggested that the teacher and the classroom atmosphere would determine the attendance rate, based on the absence of a positive correlation between course attendance and any of the motivational factors investigated. Further enrollment in the program did not

appear to be related to instrumental or integrative orientation. Finally, the learners' efforts to use English outside the classroom was found to be associated with their openness and their affective predisposition towards the other cultures and the people who belong to those cultures.

In Dörnyei's study, the Integrative Motivation comprised four components: interest in foreign languages, cultures and people; desire to broaden one's view and provincialism, which was related to one's intellectual activities; desire for new stimuli and challenges, related to language learning as a new challenge and language use for communication; and finally, desire to integrate into a new community.

In another study, conducted in Norway, learner differences in motivation and L₂ proficiency were investigated (Svanes, 1987). The subjects were from various countries and were learning Norwegian. The instrument used in this study was based on Oller and his associates' (1977) and Gardner and Lambert's (1972) questionnaires. Students from the Western countries scored higher on the integrative motivation than the students from the Middle East, Africa and Asia. The latter group scored highest on the instrumental motivation. Based on these results, the author concluded that the type of motivation was related to the student's background. The Western students were more familiar with the Norwegian way of life and culture, whereas the non-Western students, not having the cultural

background, were learning L₂ to continue their education. Students with the highest grades also scored high on the integrative motivation. On the whole, correlations between grades and motives were reported to be relatively weak.

Svanes' (1987) investigation of the sex differences showed that there were no significant differences in the integrative motivation for any of the groups. The Western women in the sample were found to be slightly more career oriented than the men, but not significantly. The Asian women were found to be significantly less instrumentally motivated than the men in this group. This was suggested to be due to the sex roles and the position of women in Asian countries in general.

In the Maine and Louisiana studies conducted by Gardner and Lambert (1972), sex differences were observed in the aural skills and proficiency in French grammar of subjects who were learning L₂ in the school context. Girls achieved above average competence in these aspects of L₂. In the Louisiana study, differences in attitudes were observed in the ways males and females responded to the bilingual/bicultural requirements of their world (Gardner and Lambert, 1972, p. 70). A factor was identified that was associated with skills in comprehending French discussions, having a good vocabulary, feeling personally adequate in L₂ and holding favourable views of the L₂ group. The girls in this context clearly had favourable dispositions towards L₂ while the boys did not. Although the authors were not able

to explain this sex difference, this factor was reported to be an important one.

In Oller, Baca and Vigil's (1977) study, a negative relationship between the attitudes of Mexican-American women workers and proficiency in English was discovered. In referring to this study, Gardner (1980, p. 266) argued that "perhaps the more successful women were striving to learn English to remove themselves from oppressive conditions brought by their lack of English. That is, negative attitudes in some contexts could be a strong motivating force for some people".

Concerning the differences in learners' motivation, Alptekin (1981) makes a distinction between immigrants, who acquire the TL of the dominant culture as a "second" language, and foreign students, who learn the TL as a "foreign" language. In the case of second language learning, the author suggests that the learner's original motive is integrative. On the other hand, foreign language learners might be temporary residents in the target culture who are learning the TL for academic purposes with no urge to assimilate. Others have argued that a language can be learned in contexts where there is an urgency about acquiring the TL skills, even when anti-integrative motives exist, such as foreign students learning English in the United States to proceed with their academic studies (Macnamara, 1973; Oller, Baca and Vigil, 1977).

Different types of methodology were used to identify

the orientations endorsed in the contexts of foreign/second language learning. Kruidenier and Clément (1986) studied different groups of students learning either a foreign or a second language, whereas Moise, Clément and Noels (1990) analyzed the relationship between the orientations in each context on the same group of students.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) demonstrated in their Maine study that an instrumental orientation towards learning French as a second language existed. In this context, the learners' parents had many French friends, and this facilitated their learning in certain aspects of oral skills. In their Philippine study, at the time the research was conducted, English was becoming the language of the business world. "Success in mastering this second language determined one's upward mobility and ... future. Thus, there was a high instrumental value placed on the English language proficiency in the Philippines" (Gardner and Lambert, 1972, p. 121). According to the authors, "when there is a vital need to master a second language, the instrumental approach is very effective, perhaps more so than the integrative" (p. 130). Other researchers have also demonstrated that students learning L₂ for academic purposes exhibit instrumental motivation (for example, Oller, Hudson and Liu, 1977; Hoadley-Maidment, 1977).

In referring to the languages associated with science and technology, Cooper et al. (1977, p. 83) state that they are often "foreign or second languages for the speech

communities in which they are used ... whose principal language is not a language of wider communication". For example, the authors state that English is a language of science and technology for Israelis, but also for Mexican-Americans, an ethnolinguistic minority within a larger community in which the dominant language is a language of wider communication. The authors state further that English has other functions in Israel; it provides a medium of international pop culture as the most common medium of communication with foreigners.

Learning English as a second/foreign language in contexts other than North America has directed attention to the conflicting values when the two cultures come into contact. Alptekin (1982, p. 56) stated that "English spreads in the Third World as the linguistic by-product of economic development and technological advancement, transmitting, in the process, the norms and values of the Anglo-American world to those traditional cultures involved in the ongoing movement of modernization based on Western models". In referring to "communications technology, pop records, motion pictures, mass publications, large-scale consumer-oriented advertising", he goes on to say that "this new body of information often deliberately manipulated for political, social, and economic reasons, is diffused among a relatively unsophisticated population, causing among them feelings of inferiority concerning their own condition and a concomitant emergence of expectations for a 'better life'".

The author argues that the TL learning group feels obliged to acquire English as it goes through a difficult acculturation process in its own setting. He suggests that learning materials should be produced "which address themselves to and focus on the real and immediate needs of the learners" and that the teachers should be sensitized "to the delicate issue of cultural dominance and its effects on the TL learning" (Alptekin, 1982, p. 61).

In light of this review of the literature, it is clear that the social milieu has a great impact on motivation in second/foreign language learning. It is in this milieu that languages and cultures come into contact, and language learning takes place. The relative status of the first and second language of the learner, the skills expected to be acquired, and characteristics of learners all may facilitate or hinder learning and use of L₂ in different contexts. While these aspects have been thought to be potentially important, there are also other aspects that need to be further investigated.

The issue of context highlights the distinction between foreign and second language learning that was addressed previously when discussing motivation. For example, Oller and his associates (Chihara and Oller, 1978; Oller, Baca and Vigil, 1977) argue that a target language is a "second" language if it is widely used in the learner's milieu; it is called a "foreign" language if it is not widely spoken. Marckwardt (1965) and Gardner and Lambert (1972) state that

learning a second language implies a language which is used by the student in his/her daily activities, outside the language classroom. Kruidenier (1984, p. 28) summarizes the distinction as follows:

Two factors appear to be important: a) the degree to which the learner will use the language in everyday life, and b) the prestige accorded to the language being learned. Foreign language learning describes those contexts where the learner will not regularly use the new language, and the language being learned is less prestigious than that of the learner. Second language learning would then refer to the opposite situation where a relatively prestigious language is being learned in order to be used in everyday life.

The present study looks at the Turkish context, in which English is learned as a "foreign" language by Turkish students. Contrary to Kruidenier's (1984) description based on bilingual contexts, the prestige accorded to English as a foreign language in Turkey is not less than that of the learners' native language, which is Turkish. Although English is not used as a means of social communication in Turkey, it is the main language for international communication, and is used for instruction at some universities and a number of state and private schools.

The present study will attempt to identify and explain the nature of student motivations related to achievement in a foreign language in Turkey and to suggest possible factors that might be operating in this achievement. The specific aims of this study are:

- 1) to identify the orientations for Turkish university students learning English as a foreign language;

- 2) to examine the relations between these orientations and other aspects of language learning, specifically proficiency, motivational intensity and desire to learn L_2 ;
- 3) to compare the proficiency and motivational characteristics - namely, orientations, motivational intensity and desire to learn L_2 - of male and female students and students in Humanities and in Science.

The following chapter will present a description of how learning a foreign language is organized in the educational institutions of Turkey. A knowledge of the various situations that prevail is essential for a better understanding of the language backgrounds of the subjects of the present study, and of Turkey's educational system.

CHAPTER TWO

FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING IN TURKEY

This chapter will examine Turkey's educational system, the history of foreign language learning, the social and cultural context, foreign language learning/teaching at the university level, the various existing language programs, their organization in the universities and their limitations. In addition, some studies by Turkish researchers in this field will be presented.

It was mentioned in Chapter One that English is the language of instruction at some universities and state and private schools in Turkey. The institutions that provide English language instruction can be categorized as follows (British Council, 1980):

1. English-medium universities offering intensive English preparation for higher education;
2. university departments of English and literature
3. university departments with a teacher-training component
4. teacher training institutes
5. university departments or schools offering foreign language courses
6. university-level academies of architecture/engineering and economic/commercial science
7. state secondary schools
8. certain private schools
9. military secondary schools

10. government institutions
11. British/American cultural associations.

TURKEY'S EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

In Turkey, the period of compulsory education lasts five years (primary cycle), from the age of 7 to 12; in case of failure, this period is prolonged to the age of 17. The classification of the educational system is as follows (The OECD Observer, 1972, pp. 86-107):

1. Pre-primary Education

It is optional and does not come within the educational system. This type of education is administered by the Ministry of Education. The teaching staff in these schools hold certificates from either primary teacher training colleges or from technical and vocational schools for girls. Requirement for entry for the students is to be over 4, and under 7 years of age.

2. Primary Education

There are two types of elementary schools:

- a) urban elementary schools, where education is provided for a minimum of 200 days per year.
- b) rural elementary schools, where education is provided for a minimum of 170 days per year.

Years of study is five. Requirement for entry is to be six years of age. At the end of five years of instruction, elementary school certificate is obtained.

3. General secondary education - First cycle

The aim is to provide a guidance cycle after which students will go on to either a vocational secondary course or a general secondary course. Private schools of minority groups have a different syllabus and provide their own courses. The age group in general is 11-14. At the end of three years of study, a "middle school certificate" is obtained. The entrance requirement is to have an elementary school certificate.

4. General secondary education - Second cycle (upper secondary school)

"Middle school certificate" is required for entry. The age group in general is 14-17. At the end of three years of study, "upper secondary school certificate" is obtained. Starting with the second year, the second cycle is divided into a "science" and an "arts" section. The former section is for students who intend to take courses in engineering or pure science; the latter introduces them to the human sciences, literature and social sciences.

This cycle is a continuation of the first cycle, as well as constituting preparation for higher education.

There are four different types of secondary schools in the secondary cycle:

- a) **The former "private" schools**, where the entry requirement is to obtain a passing mark in a competitive "entrance examination" in the form of an aptitude test. Teaching of a foreign language

(English, French, German, Italian) plays an important role in the syllabuses and there is a preparatory year in which the language study starts. The science courses are offered in foreign languages and the syllabus is prepared by the Ministry of Education.

- b) **Schools for religious studies:** Since the majority of Turkish people are Moslems, schools for preachers have a fairly important role in the society. Instruction given is more or less of secondary school level (second cycle). Students who have completed the courses do not have access to universities (with the exception of theology and the higher institutes of Islamic studies. Ibid., p. 88). There are also private training schools for priests and schools of theology.
- c) **Vocational - technical secondary schools:** These schools provide instruction in the fields of agriculture, veterinary services; forestry; commercial education, tourism, secretarial services; paramedical studies, such as health services, clinical technicians, nurses, midwives; construction; chemistry; printing; auto-industry; meteorology; military services; artistic education; fine-arts and teacher training.

5. **Special education**

Entry requirement is to be physically/mentally

handicapped. This type of education is specifically for deaf, dumb, blind and/or mentally retarded students, and provides specialized instruction at elementary and secondary levels. The years of study and age groups vary.

6. Post-secondary education

University faculties are open to candidates holding an "upper-secondary school" certificate. Certificates awarded by vocational, technical schools or secondary teacher training colleges do not give access to university courses. The number of students admitted to certain faculties has to be limited due to lack of accommodation. An inter-university committee offers entrance exams in the form of written tests every year for the candidates. Each candidate indicates, before hand, the faculties s/he wishes to pursue in order of preference. The list of successful applicants is published by the faculties when the results of the tests are known.

Universities can be funded only by the State and by legal channels. The students used to pay a very small amount for registration and the university education was free of charge, but this rule has been changed. Tuition fees vary according to the subjects taken by students.

University courses generally last four years, with the exception of veterinary medicine that lasts five years, and medicine, six years.

In three universities, where the medium of instruction is English, a preparatory year is obligatory for students

who do not have a knowledge of English. Intensive English instruction takes place during this period. In the other universities, English is offered as a compulsory course.

HISTORY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING/LEARNING IN TURKEY

In order to have a better understanding of the current attitudes toward foreign language learning/teaching in Turkey, the actual and potential factors which bring languages into contact situations will be evaluated. The historical context in which such teaching takes place, together with a description of how long these contact factors have been operating, will serve as a background for this study. The cultural context in Turkey will also provide some relevant information to interpret the findings in this study.

For any language to become a second language, its political and economic status, its position in military and international agreements and in cultural, historical and commercial relations play an important role. Bear (1985, pp. 28-30), in describing the Turkish history in foreign language learning, summarized certain unique characteristics which "marked Turkish contact with the West during latter centuries of the Ottoman Empire". He stated that "the Ottoman Turks were the first non-Westerners to become aware of the growing material and technological capabilities of the European nations" (Bear, 1985, p.29). Having access to the technical information possessed by the West could not be "accomplished by means of Turkish, which was itself an

imperial language. However, power appears to have brought with itself a sense of linguistic pride which vitiated attempts to popularize foreign language study among Muslim Turks" (Bear, 1985, p.29).

Foreign language learning had originally begun with the Arabic and Persian languages in the Turkish history, in the areas such as arts, science and literature, after the Islamic religion was adopted in fourteenth century (see Table 1). During the reign of the Ottoman Empire, scientific works were written in Arabic, and Persian was used in literature (Sarica, Ünlü, Özcan 1975, p. 59. Cited in Sözer, 1984, p. 9).

The most important development in foreign language learning was marked with the cultural relations between the Ottoman Empire and the European countries. In 1720, Celebi Mehmet was sent to Europe as an Attaché (Sözer, 1984, p. 9). He examined the cultural novelties in France, and during his one-year stay in Paris, his son, Said Mehmet studied French. Upon returning to his country, Celebi Mehmet, worked with Ibrahim Müteferrika in the establishment of the first publishing house, which led to progress in relations with the European countries (Sözer, 1984, p. 9). Several translations and adaptations from works in French into Turkish were made. One of the first publications in 1730 includes a Turkish grammar book, written in French with the purpose of teaching the Turkish language to French tradesmen who worked in the countries belonging to the Ottoman Empire

TABLE 1¹

CHOICE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDY
IN TURKEY, BASED ON STUDENT ENROLLMENT FIGURES

	Before Year 1773	1773-1923	1923-1950	1950-1980	After Year 1980
1	Arabic	Arabic	French	English	English
2	Persian	Persian	English	French	German
3		French	German	German	French
4		English	Arabic	Arabic	Arabic
5		German		Persian	Persian

1. This table has been adapted from Demircan, 1988, p. 116.
 Language preferences are listed in decreasing order.

(Cem, 1978, pp. 43-45. Cited in Sözer, 1984).

In 1773, French language was included in the syllabus in Turkish schools (Sözer, 1984, p. 10). Military officers studied under the guidance of French educators using textbooks, written in French during the period of 1789-1807 (Kocer 1974, p. 33. Cited in Sözer, 1984, p.10). In 1839, foreign language became a part of the program in an institution at the university level (Sözer, 1984).

In 1864, a foreign language school was established to teach languages such as French, Bulgarian and Greek (Sözer, 1984). In Istanbul, a school was established in 1868, in the name of Galatasaray Sultanisi, where the language of instruction was French for certain subjects in the syllabus, whereas in Robert College, which was established in 1863, English was used in all the courses. There were also schools to serve the children of minority groups (Sözer, 1984). Nevertheless, for the Ottoman intellectuals and those in the higher ranks of governors, French language has been a means for cultural enlightenment and a step towards western civilization.

In 1923 Turkey became a republic, adopting a secular regime. Religious affairs and the State were separated. Turkish became the language of religious worship, replacing Arabic, during this period. Thus, the language for initial literacy would be Turkish, and so would education through the Turkish language be compulsory for the first five years.

In the first fifteen years of the Republic of Turkey, French, English and German languages were taught (see Table 1).

However, after the Second World War, English language teaching surpassed that of the other languages due to reasons such as the post-war political changes and technological developments in countries where English is spoken, and progress in cultural relations with these countries. In this period, communications with the international institutions were mostly held in the English language. Being a republic, Turkey had to take its part in international agreements. Thus, English became the most important language for teaching/learning (Özer 1984, p. 11).

In referring to Turkish history, Fishman (1989, p.314) states that "As part of its overall post-World War I program of seeking a 'new' Turkish identity (in contrast with the old Ottoman-Islamic identity), governmentally sponsored language planning conscientiously and vigorously moved to attain script form (Roman in place of Arabic script), Europeanization of specialized nomenclatures (rather than the Arabic and Persian loan words) hitherto used for learned or cultured purposes". Fishman (1989, p.292), in describing such cases of replacement of certain languages in history, states that "In each case...the language decision was inevitably linked to further language planning, precisely because nationalism was not only a movement of the masses but...also a movement to replace one elite with another, one sociocultural philosophy with another, and one political-operational system with another".

By becoming a member of the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Council of Europe, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Turkey's

economic and cultural relations with the other member nations developed rapidly. Thus, language planning functions were undertaken, either by extending the functions of existing institutions (such as universities), or by the emergence of new language planning activities, such as increased language learning in both national and international languages, script reform, translation, and creation of language societies or academies. Foreign language teaching became a part of the educational system. New programs were designed by the Ministry of Education for the teaching of modern languages with the cooperation of the Council of Europe (Demirel, 1984, p.15).

At present, English is linked with the process of modernization and used in various spheres of activity.

THE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT IN TURKEY

One must recognize that the linguistic and cultural context in Turkey is very different from the North American countries where most of the literature on motivational aspects of language learning has emerged and dominated the field. Clément and Gardner (1990, p.18) propose that the social and psychological perspective on context encompasses "all interpersonal and inter-group phenomena, real or imagined, likely to influence or result from the acquisition of a second language". A great deal can be learned about the aspirations, loyalties, presuppositions, prejudices, fears and other feelings of the members of a society by assessing how they behave linguistically. This aspect will further be analyzed in more detail.

The social organization in the Turkish society is tightly built around a unifying force, that is, nationalism. Thus, there is a general tendency to resist outside influence from the cultural point of view. A broader look at the cultural context in Turkey would help to clarify certain facts concerning the different roles males and females have been given in the society and, as a consequence, the different opportunities each gender has for higher education and a future career.

In general, it is expected that men acquire status through their knowledge and through the jobs they get. Traditionally, men socialize more than women do, meeting with more and varied people, whereas a woman's place is expected to be in the home. Social relations for men are important both in business and in their private life.

The impact of these cultural values is such that many young women marry and raise children rather than work in their field of interest. Even when women do work, the jobs that they are likely to get would be in the areas that do not require university education. This situation is reflected by the university enrollment figures, where the number of female students is generally lower than that of males (Özer, 1984, p.37). Considering such differential access to higher education, the female students naturally feel more pressure to succeed in their studies once they enter the university. They are not expected, however, to seek or gain status through their success, influence and high standing in the community.

As a result of the scientific and technological advancements

in the world, the demand for second/foreign languages is increasing in Turkey. The students are faced with the challenge of studying these developments using the source books available only in languages other than their native tongue. There is an increasing need to learn English especially in the subjects related with science. Table 1 shows the development of student preferences for foreign language study in Turkey over the past several centuries as reflected in enrollment figures. It is clear that English has steadily climbed in preference, reaching first choice in 1950 and remaining so to the present day.

The role of a second/foreign language in different fields of study at the post-secondary level has received little attention from educators in Turkey. Thus, analyzing the differences of motivation in L₂ learning for humanities and science students separately would be useful for curriculum development and for setting the language requirements for these fields of study.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING/LEARNING - UNIVERSITY LEVEL

The need for a second language in Turkey occurs mostly in areas such as politics, technology, economy, science, and in cultural issues. Since Turkey is a developing country, it is constantly in the process of following the technological progress that takes place in industrial countries.

It is also very important for Turkey to advertise and sell the goods and products in the world market in order to cope with its economic problems. Educational institutions are required to equip the learners with the necessary language skills and satisfy

the nation's foreign language needs. To this end, there are public language programs at community education centres, programs at private language-teaching centres, and at the cultural associations of several foreign countries established in three major cities, such as Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir.

Language programs at the elementary school level, that is, the first five years of education, can only be provided by the principal, if staff is available, in the case of requests from parents, with an authorization from the mayor (Özer, 1984). These programs are not to be included in the school syllabus.

At the secondary school level, that is, the following three years after elementary school, and at the upper secondary school level, that is, the following three years after the first cycle, the teaching of a foreign language is included as a compulsory course in the syllabus (M.E.B. Tebligler Dergisi 1983. Cited in Özer 1984, p. 2). The duration for a language course at the secondary level in public schools is three hours per week, whereas at the high school level it ranges from two hours minimum to eight hours maximum per week, and in occupational and technical high schools, from two hours minimum to four hours maximum per week (Özer, 1984). Intensive language teaching programs are provided in thirty six public secondary and high schools, eight occupational and technical high schools, and forty one Turkish and foreign private schools as late-partial immersion, where students begin with a preparatory year of 25-27 hours of language classes per week (Özer, 1984, p.2). Language programs for secondary and high schools are developed by the

Ministry of Education.

At the university level, languages are studied in the literature departments of modern languages such as English, French, German, Italian, Spanish and Russian; eastern languages such as Arabic, Persian, and Urdhu, and classical languages, such as Latin. English, French and German are taught so that the students can use these languages in their own field of study, for specific purposes (see Tables 2 and 3).

With the passing of Bill 2547 for university education in 1981, learning of English as a foreign language became compulsory, starting with the 1983-1984 academic year. At the universities such as Bosphorus University in Istanbul, Middle East Technical University and in some departments of Hacettepe University in Ankara, the language of instruction is English (see Table 4).

Foreign language programs at the universities in Turkey are of three kinds; namely: a) intensive, b) semi-intensive, c) non-intensive (regular).

- a) **intensive programs:** students take twenty/twenty five hours of language per week and no other courses. There are only four universities in Turkey where foreign languages are taught intensively, namely, Bosphorus University, Middle East Technical University, Hacettepe

TABLE 2¹STUDENTS ENROLLED IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND LITERATUREDEPARTMENTS WHERE THE MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION IS L. IN TURKEY

Depart- ments	1940- 1941	1945- 1946	1950- 1951	1960- 1961	1970- 1971	1980- 1981	1985- 1986	1987- 1988
English	34	208	125	373	757	1036	1525	1871
German	8	88	43	144	371	626	1040	1244
French	41	213	110	337	424	546	745	788
Arabic	1	41	13	13	46	66	195	216
Persian	-	-	-	14	-	62	120	163
Italian	-	-	-	1	20	41	115	91
Greek	-	-	-	-	-	35	50	40
Russian	3	1	2	31	22	26	50	41
Spanish	-	-	-	-	-	11	25	50
Chinese	-	3	1	3	3	11	25	20
Japanese	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20

1. This table has been adapted from Demircan, 1988, p. 124.

TABLE 3¹
THE NUMBERS OF DEPARTMENTS WHERE THE MEDIUM OF
INSTRUCTION IS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN TURKEY

Departments	1982- 1983	1983- 1984	1984- 1985	1985- 1986	1986- 1987	1987- 1988
Foreign languages and literature	40	44	44	42	45	50
Foreign language teaching	23	34	34	35	38	38
Translation	-	2	2	2	2	2
Linguistics ²	-	1	1	1	1	1
Science and Social Sciences	48	82	85	93	96	97
Foreign languages ³	25	-	-	-	-	-
Total departments	136	163	166	173	182	188
Total students	4747	9545	10,175	10,558	11,008	12,472

1. This table has been adapted from Demircan, 1988, p. 124.

2. English only

3. Two-year certificate programs

TABLE 4¹STUDENTS ENROLLED IN ENGLISH-MEDIUM UNIVERSITIES IN TURKEY²

Name of University	1980-1981	1981-1982	1982-1983	1983-1984	1984-1985	1985-1986	1986-1987	1987-1988
BILKENT ³	-	-	-	-	-	-	350	875
BOSPHORUS	730	690	744	1127	1302	1370	1531	1340
HACETTEPE	-	-	100	200	180	180	160	163
MARMARA	-	-	-	180	218	238	398	399
METU ⁴	2110	2070	3903	3671	3905	4147	4341	3921

1. This table has been adapted from Demircan, 1988, p. 123.
2. Students enrolled in the departments of foreign languages and literature, linguistics, foreign language teaching and translation are not included in these figures.
3. Bilkent is a new university. 1986-87 was the first academic year.
4. METU : Middle East Technical University

University and Marmara University. At Hacettepe and Marmara Universities, only some faculties provide intensive language programs, where the language of instruction is the language being taught. At Bosphorus and Middle East Technical Universities, the language of instruction is English in all of the faculties.

b) **semi-intensive programs:** The students take a language course of 12-15 hours per week, alongside the other courses in their field of study. This kind of program is offered at Istanbul University and in some departments at Anatolia University. The students take language courses throughout their education.

c) **non-intensive programs:** These language programs are offered for less than twelve hours per week, and they vary in length.

Most of the universities in Turkey, namely Selçuk University, Atatürk University, Ege University, Ankara University, Karadeniz University, and Uludağ University, offer non-intensive language courses.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF ENGLISH AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL IN TURKEY AND THE ORGANIZATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

The developments in science and technology; the constant spread of international institutions throughout the world in different fields of interest and occupations; economical and cultural exchanges between countries lead the

individuals to be equipped for new situations by acquiring the necessary skills through education. There is a great need for change in the educational programs, particularly in language programs, because of the vast increase in scientific sources of information in recent years. In Turkey, the passing of Bill 2547 (1981) by the Parliament can be considered as an event of major importance that will certainly exert a powerful influence on educational policies and practices in the field of foreign language learning. Bill 2547 provided a "Framework for Foreign Language Teaching Programs" at the universities in Turkey, and made English Language Teaching (ELT) compulsory throughout the university education, starting with the 1983-1984 academic year (see Appendix 1 for content).

Students learning English at the universities in Turkey have very little or no opportunity to use a foreign language outside their formal learning context, which is the classroom. Their chances of coming into contact with a native speaker of L2 are extremely low, as well. On the other hand, through mass media, they are constantly exposed to the Western culture, such as, imported television series and shows, music, magazines, and through the use of certain products made in Western countries. Some students do reach an advanced level of foreign language learning, to the extent that they can use it in their doctoral studies, without having had any native L2-speaking teachers or traveled outside Turkey.

English is used as a foreign language mainly in cultural, educational and commercial exchanges between Turkey and the Western world. English is also used among the Turkish people as the language of education and technology. The small population of Turks who are in contact with native speakers of English in the areas mentioned above, are educated and highly specialized in their professions. They read and write in English, and much of their leisure activity, such as reading fiction and watching films and documentaries, is in English too.

In the previous section, the classification of the educational system, and the history of foreign language teaching/learning in Turkey has been described, followed by a brief summary of foreign language teaching at the university level and the kinds of language programs offered. It will be essential to present how learning a foreign language is organized in the educational institutions in Turkey, for a better understanding of the students' language backgrounds in this study. To this end, the following section will include the kinds of organization for foreign language programs, and the limitation of these programs.

1. Organization of foreign language programs.

There are two kinds of organization at the university level language programs: a) centrally organized, b) prepared by each faculty.

- a) **Centrally organized language programs:** This kind of organization exists at the universities where

the medium of instruction is English. Foreign language programs are offered by a "School of Foreign Languages" which is set up by each university. In this department, there typically is a chairperson, staff members, lab assistants and committees for other tasks, where the language programs for all the faculties at the university are prepared. At these universities, namely, Bosphorus University, Hacettepe University and Middle East Technical University, English is offered as an intensive course.

b) Language programs prepared by each faculty:

At other universities, some of which are Ankara, Anadolu, Akdeniz, Selchuk, and Marmara, each faculty prepares its own foreign language program through its staff members. The number of hours for the program depends on the number of students registered, the contents of the syllabus, the language skills to be developed, methodology in teaching and the facilities of each faculty.

2. Limitations of the language programs

In spite of the growing need and interest, especially at higher levels of education, the problems related with foreign language learning/teaching in Turkey have not yet been solved. In this section a brief discussion will follow on the limitations of the language programs concerning the

content of teaching materials; the teaching methodology presently used, versus different approaches to foreign language teaching; the time spent on learning the target language; the number of students in language classes at the universities and language instructors' qualifications.

In many universities in Turkey, the objectives for foreign language teaching/learning were not clearly specified until the passing of Bill 2547 (1981) for "The Framework for University Language Programs". The programs at lower levels of education have not proven to be effective, since students have access to limited functional application of foreign language skills during their six years of secondary school education. Özer (1984, p. 23) in his study states, that the university education provides the students with a final opportunity to acquire foreign language skills for further use in their future occupation.

Soytekin (1979, cited in Özer, 1984, p. 24) states that, because the textbooks used in these language programs were prepared for students in Western countries, their content has never been geared toward the needs and interests of Turkish students. Furthermore, they were not appropriate for the students' particular learning situation. The author also states that grammar was over-emphasized, especially in the programs where foreign language was taught for general purposes, a condition which led to "learning about the language" rather than "learning the language" per se.

Ceyhan (1982, p. 109. Cited in Özer, 1984, p. 25)

states that "grammar-translation" has been the most commonly used method in foreign language teaching at the universities in Turkey. The main purpose of this method is described in the literature as the learning of rules of the foreign language structure and their application in translation.

Language teaching specifically designed for students' own fields of study, labeled as "language for specific purposes" (LSP) in the literature, is not commonly practised at the universities in Turkey, but its function has been recognized recently. This approach can not be used widely and efficiently because of the lack of sources available for every field of study, and insufficient knowledge and skills of staff in this area.

Another limitation of the language programs in Turkey is the number of hours for foreign language learning, which is stated to be insufficient for the mastery of basic language skills (Özer, 1984, p. 25). In some universities the number of students in language class is also stated to vary from one institution to another, and in some universities as being over a hundred.

Qualifications of language instructors employed are an important asset for the effectiveness of these programs. Research findings indicated that some instructors did not have any teacher training or did not hold teaching certificates (Özer, 1984, p.25).

Despite the fact that all students study a foreign language throughout their education in Turkey, starting with

elementary school, they face several difficulties in getting jobs due to their inability to function in the language skills required. Thus, the university graduates who are able to pay fees for private courses offered at several foreign language teaching institutes and cultural associations, attend these courses.

Another way of learning a language, for Turkish students, is to register in language courses in foreign countries for a certain period of time. However, not a large number of students have the opportunity to do so, due to financial limitations.

RESEARCH ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING IN TURKEY

Since Özer's, Sözer's and Ceyhan's studies were the major investigations conducted in the field of foreign language learning in Turkey and since they provide a clear picture of the conditions prevailing relative to teaching and learning foreign language skills, they will be described extensively.

Özer (1984) in his research, examined the already existing foreign language learning/teaching situation at the university level in Turkey to propose a program for curriculum development. In doing so, the researcher provided some background information about the structure and organization of programs and suggested certain alternatives in terms of objectives, content, length and effectiveness. A relatively smaller number of students learning Arabic,

Persian, Russian and Italian; foreign students learning Turkish as a foreign language, and the universities and faculties where English is used as the medium of instruction were not included in this study.

Questionnaires were administered to 106 language instructors of French, German and English, and 1074 fourth-year university students in three different universities in Turkey. The researcher (Özer, 1984) designed three instruments to collect data. The first was a questionnaire to gather information on the already existing foreign language programs, at the universities. It consisted of open-ended statements, fill-in-blanks, and multiple-choice questions. The second was a questionnaire for language instructors, to obtain information about their personal opinions for a future foreign language program proposal. Question types were the same as above. The third was a needs analysis for students. Question types were the same as in the first and second questionnaires.

In Özer's study, 35.5% of the students were female and 64.5% were male. 9.9% of the students were learning German, 10.8% French, and 79.3% English. Some of the results of the needs analysis in particular seemed most relevant for the purposes of the present study. In some cases percentages add up to more than one hundred because the students were asked to rate their answers according to their priority of needs.

The results indicated that 70% of the students strongly

needed to learn a foreign language during and after their university education, for general purposes. 40.9% of the students indicated that there was much need for a foreign language in their own field of study. 32.5% of the students indicated even a stronger need to learn a foreign language. When the students were asked to indicate the frequency of the use of English sources in students' fields of study, 15.8% answered "very often", 29.8% answered "sometimes" and 21.5% marked "not at all". For the question on foreign language skills needed by the students, 80.6% marked reading comprehension, 41% marked oral communication skills, 39.9% marked listening comprehension skills, and 23.2% marked writing skills. The students were also asked to indicate their willingness to attend foreign language classes. Their answers showed that 58% attended the classes willingly while 21% attended unwillingly. 40.2% of the students indicated that classes should be "compulsory", whereas 59.8% believed they should be "elective".

The results of Özer's study presented above show that Turkish students in three different universities mostly needed to learn a foreign language for their university education and for their future careers in order to read and comprehend the learning material written in a foreign language. The results indicate a hierarchy of language skills needed in students' field of study: reading comprehension; listening comprehension; oral communication; translation skills, and advanced speaking skills.

Another study was done by Sözer (1984) in order to evaluate the already existing foreign language programs at the universities in Turkey, in terms of their relevancy and application to students' field of study; to determine empirically language instructors' and students' opinions about foreign language education future needs, and to put forth suggestions for the development of foreign language programs for students' field of study, specifically. Sözer (1984, p. 31) suggested that a foreign language program that is closely related with students' field of study and their needs would lead to greater success, and to better opportunities on the part of the learner. He stated that his study would contribute to further developments in foreign language programs recently suggested by the Higher Education Committee for the Framework for Foreign Language Teaching Programs at the universities in 1981. (Cited in Sözer 1984). His study evaluates the effectiveness and limitations of these programs, to determine whether or not the programs meet student needs. For the purposes of his study, the students were asked to rate their reasons for learning L2. The results will be presented further in this section.

The population of Sözer's (1984) study consisted of twenty five universities in Turkey, and excluded the two universities, namely Bosphorus University and the Middle East Technical University, and some departments at Hacettepe University, where the medium of instruction is English.

Data obtained includes 119 language instructors and 426 fourth-year students selected from different departments registered in language classes such as German, English and French, at a random sampling. The instruments used in this study are as follows (Sözer, 1984): a questionnaire to gather personal information; a questionnaire to gather opinions about the existing foreign language programs at the universities in Turkey; and a questionnaire to gather opinions/suggestions on developments of programs in the future.

In their answers to the questionnaire about the existing foreign language programs, 50.4% of the instructors indicated that student needs are not considered enough in the development of language programs. 31.9% of the instructors stated that 50% of the language programs were geared towards language instruction for general purposes and 50% of the programs were geared towards language for specific purposes. For the same question the students indicated that 49.5% of the programs were geared towards general language instruction, and 47.9% towards language in their field of study (i.e. for specific purposes). These results show that the instructors and the students agree on the content of the existing programs. On the other hand, the students stated that 67.6% of the language programs at the university level should be geared towards their field of study.

In Sözer's study, students were asked to rate their

purposes of learning a foreign language on a four-point scale. The results indicated that for 82% of the students, the main purpose in learning a foreign language was to be successful in their own professions; 45.8% indicated that it would be useful to speak a foreign language in a foreign country; 44.4% indicated that foreign language learning would facilitate finding a good job, and 83.5% indicated they were learning a foreign language to be respected by others as their last reason.

Sözer (1984, pp. 70-75), in discussing the factors leading to student success in foreign language learning, states that the effectiveness of language programs also depends on whether or not they are centrally organized by the language institution of the university. He argues that at the universities where the language programs are prepared by each faculty separately, student success depends on the time spent on learning. Sözer further suggests that, at the universities where a central institute for foreign language teaching is non-existent, the programs should be designed by referring to, and in cooperation with, the language instructors who actually are in the process of teaching a foreign language.

In Sözer's study, the instructors and students were asked to rate their reasons for students' poor performance in foreign language programs at the universities. Another reason, "instructor's resourcefulness and ability to teach", which did not exist in the instructor's questionnaire, was

added to the students' version. In doing so, Sözer does not refer to any measurement that displays results of student success or failure. Thus, in his study it is implied, rather than demonstrated empirically that poor performance in foreign language learning is prevalent at the universities in Turkey.

The results obtained indicated that 51.9% of the Ss rated "lack of effectiveness of language programs at the secondary school level" as the most important reason. 32.9% of the Ss rated "instructors' resourcefulness and ability to teach" and 27% rated "lack of motivation for learning" as the last important reasons affecting student success in a negative way.

The results of Sözer's study also indicate that in the existing foreign language programs at these universities 46.2% of the content included general topics, 35.3% included topics in Ss' field of study, 17.6% included general language instruction in terms of its structure. The instruments that Sözer used in this study included a needs analysis of the language skills to be rated by Ss on a four-point scale. The results of this analysis showed that 62.9% of the students rated reading-comprehension as the area in which they needed help; listening comprehension was rated secondly by 45.1%; speaking skills were rated thirdly by 31%, and writing skills were rated thirdly by 58% of the students.

Sözer (1984, p. 101) argues that Ss' motivation for

language learning should be given more emphasis. The cooperation of foreign language departments with the departments of other fields of specialty is also suggested for higher student motivation in learning and for the effectiveness of the foreign language programs at the Turkish universities.

In Sözer's study (1984, p.101), instructors were also asked to rate their students' level of interest in language classes. The results showed that 16% of the language instructors rated their students as being "highly interested" in the language classes, whereas 60.6% rated "average interest" and 19.3% rated "low interest".

For the question of whether or not learning a foreign language for specific purposes (LSP) would have a motivating effect on student learning, the results indicated that 37.8% of the instructors favored LSP, 50.4% partly favored LSP, whereas only 5.9% rated against LSP.

Ceyhan (1988) looked at student orientations for language learning at a university in Turkey. He studied four groups of students enrolled in English language programs: preparatory year, intensive English; first year, continuing English; evening classes for students outside the university; and the two-year Technical School Certificate program. The results showed that first-year students who continued taking English classes were more oriented toward learning English for their future career, when compared to other groups. The students in the intensive language

program were oriented to learn L₂ for its importance in cultural communication. On the whole, the results showed that all four groups of students were learning L₂ not because it was a requirement in their university, but because it was important to learn for reasons such as going to the United States or England to live for a period of time and to improve their language skills, or to use English in their future career. The students enrolled in evening classes also indicated that they would like to join an English club to practice in L₂ with their peers and that they were willing to take an advanced English course later in their studies.

Ceyhan (Ibid., p. 83) suggests that studies analyzing the relationship between motivation and language achievement should be conducted, and that there is a great need for standardized instruments for such studies.

As mentioned earlier, all university students are required to reach a certain level of English for their future studies. Since most of the textbooks and the L₂ teaching material are prepared in Western countries, the content of language courses offered in these universities reflects the Western world-view and culture. This results in a conflict on the part of the Turkish students, whose way of life and educational needs are not similar to those in the West.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The students were selected from two universities. The sample can be considered as a cross-section of the Turkish university student population since they come from all sections of the country to pursue their higher education.

A. SUBJECTS

Table 5

S E X		F I E L D		Total
		Science	Humanities	
	Females	51	31	82 41.6
	Males	87	28	115 58.4
	Total	138 70.1	59 29.9	197 100.0

Data were gathered from 200 male and female university students studying English as a foreign language in Turkey, divided according to gender and their field of study. Table 5 presents this division. Three sets of data had to be omitted because of lack of necessary background information, leaving a total of 197 subjects, their ages ranging between 16 to 27. The students were selected from two universities in the capital city, Ankara. At one of these universities,

that is Middle East Technical University, the language of instruction is English. At the other, that is Hacettepe University, this is the case in many programs, and even the programs where Turkish is the language of instruction, course materials are in English. Therefore, both universities offer an intensive English learning program during a preparatory year for students who do not have a sufficient knowledge of the language to pursue their studies. Their level of English is determined by a general exam. Those who get a passing mark on this exam are exempted.

At the time of testing, all subjects in this study were enrolled in these programs. In addition, based on their university entrance examination results, they had been divided into two general fields of study, namely "humanities" and "science".

"Science" students are in engineering, medicine, and nursing. Engineering is divided into branches such as metallurgical, mechanical, electrical, chemical, and food and industrial engineering.

"Humanities" students are in counselling, international relations, philosophy, psychology, sociology, economics, history, physics and chemistry teaching, English language teaching, physical education and statistics.

B. INSTRUMENTS

The instruments used in this study are made up of three questionnaires and a cloze test, as follows:

1. Reasons for Learning English
2. The Motivational Intensity Scale
3. The Desire to Learn English Scale
4. Cloze test: Secrets of Success.

The three questionnaires were translated from English into Turkish by two Turkish-English bilingual academics who were not familiar with the items. Two other individuals, who were not familiar with the original items, back-translated the questionnaire from Turkish to English. The final Turkish version was created with the agreement of the four individuals involved in this process. The resulting translation closely matched the original version.

Motivation is a composite index of the individual's motivation to learn English. In this study, it incorporates the effort expended in learning English and the desire to learn English. The index is the sum of the scores on Motivational Intensity and Desire to Learn English. What follows is a more detailed description of each instrument.

1. Reasons for Learning English:

This questionnaire was composed of 31 items designed to suggest reasons for studying L₂ (see Table 6). These items were originally used in studies done by Burstall, et al. (1974); Carroll (1975); Chihara and Oller (1978); and Spolsky (1969a).

TABLE 6
REASONS FOR LEARNING ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE

Following are a number of statements with which some people agree and others disagree. There are no right or wrong answers since many people have different opinions. Please rate how much you personally agree or disagree with these statements using the scale below:

-3 strongly disagree	+3 strongly agree
-2 moderately disagree	+2 moderately agree
-1 slightly disagree	+1 slightly agree

For each statement, write in the left margin the letter corresponding to the amount of your agreement or disagreement. Note, there is no right or wrong answer. All that is important is that you indicate your personal feeling.

1. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me find out how people live in English-speaking countries.
2. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I may need it to be admitted to a university.
3. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job.
4. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I would like to go to England.

5. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I'll need it for my future career.
6. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I want to live in an English-speaking country for a period of time.
7. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me if I need to study another language later on.
8. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me understand the British and Americans and their way of life.
9. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I would like to go to the United States.
10. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will make me a more knowledgeable person.
11. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I would like to meet some American people.
12. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I'll need it some day to get a degree.
13. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me understand my own language better.
14. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I would like to make friends with some American people.
15. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will make me appear more cultured.

16. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me be successful in business.
17. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will be useful for me after I leave school.
18. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I feel that no one is really educated unless s/he is fluent in the English language.
19. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me if I should ever travel.
20. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I would like to get a job where I could use my English.
21. _____ Studying English can be important for me because other people will respect me more if I have a knowledge of another language.
22. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me get to know English speaking people.
23. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will permit me to become an influential member of my community.
24. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me acquire new ideas and broaden my outlook.
25. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me get a better paying job.

26. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me learn about myself.
27. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.
28. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me if I ever enter foreign business enterprises in my field at the managerial and executive levels.
29. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will help me understand how the British and Americans think and behave.
30. _____ Studying English can be important for me because I would like to travel to a English-speaking country.
31. _____ Studying English can be important for me because it will allow me to understand and appreciate British and American art and literature.
-

The original English version of the questionnaire used by Kruidenier (1984) included 37 items (see Appendix 2). Five items were omitted for the purposes of this study, since this questionnaire was originally designed for groups learning a second language in bilingual contexts. These items were non-applicable in a unilingual and unicultural society, like Turkey. Item 29 in the original version, reflected a reason to learn L_2 in order to finish high school. This item had to be omitted because the subjects of this study were already at the university level. The 31 items used in the present study are shown in Appendix 3. In the questionnaire, each reason was preceded by the phrase "Studying English is important for me because..." (see Table 6). The students rated each reason on a Likert-type six-point scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" at one end, and "strongly agree" at the other. A high score indicated a strong endorsement of the proposed reason.

2. The Motivational Intensity Scale:

The ten motivation items were based on those used by Gardner, Clément, Smythe and Smythe (1979) (see also Kruidenier, 1984). This scale (presented together with the Desire to Learn English Scale in Table 7) was designed as a multiple-choice questionnaire to assess anglophone students' expended efforts in studying L_2 inside and outside the formal instruction setting (Gardner, Clément, Smythe and Smythe, 1979). A student's Motivational Intensity score was equal to the sum of the weights of responses on the following ten items

TABLE 7
MOTIVATIONAL INTENSITY AND DESIRE TO LEARN ENGLISH
QUESTIONNAIRE¹

Please answer each of the following items by circling the letter of the alternative which appears to be most applicable to you.

1. If I had the opportunity to speak English outside of school, I would
 - a. speak English most of the time, using Turkish only if really necessary (6)
 - b. speak English occasionally, using Turkish whenever possible (5)
 - c. never speak English (4)
2. During English class, I would like
 - a. to have as much English as possible spoken (6)
 - b. to have a combination of English and Turkish spoken (5)
 - c. to have only Turkish spoken (4)
3. I actively think about what I have learned in my English class
 - a. once in a while (5)
 - b. hardly ever (4)
 - c. very frequently (6)
4. If there were an English club in my school, I would
 - a. be most interested in joining (6)
 - b. attend meetings once in a while (5)
 - c. definitely not join (4)

5. If English were not taught in school, I would
 - a. try to obtain lessons in English somewhere else (6)
 - b. not bother learning English at all (4)
 - c. pick up English in everyday situations (i.e., read English books and newspapers, try to speak it whenever possible, etc.) (5)
6. When I am in English class, I
 - a. never say anything (4)
 - b. answer only the easier questions (5)
 - c. volunteer answers as much as possible (6)
7. If I had the opportunity and knew enough English, I would read English magazines and newspapers
 - a. not very often (5)
 - b. as often as I could (6)
 - c. never (4)
8. If there were a local English TV station, I would
 - a. turn it on occasionally (5)
 - b. never watch it (4)
 - c. try to watch it often (6)
9. Compared to my other courses, I like English
 - a. the same as all the others (5)
 - b. the most (6)
 - c. least of all (4)

10. When I hear an English song on the radio, I
 - a. change the station (4)
 - b. listen to the music, paying attention only to the easy words (5)
 - c. listen carefully and try to understand all the words (6)
11. If it were up to me whether or not to take English, I
 - a. would drop it (4)
 - b. don't know whether I would take it or not (5)
 - c. would definitely take it (6)
12. When I have a problem understanding something we are learning in English class, I
 - a. just forget about it (4)
 - b. immediately ask the teacher for help (6)
 - c. only seek help just before the exam (5)
13. If there were English-speaking families in my neighborhood, I would
 - a. speak English with them sometimes (5)
 - b. speak English with them as much as possible (6)
 - c. never speak English with them (4)
14. When it comes to English homework, I
 - a. just skim over it (4)
 - b. put some effort into it, but not as much as I could (5)
 - c. work very carefully, making sure I understand everything (6)

15. If I had the opportunity to see an English play, I would
 - a. definitely go (6)
 - b. go only if I had nothing else to do (5)
 - c. not go (4)
16. Considering how I study English, I can honestly say that I
 - a. really try to learn English (6)
 - b. will pass on the basis of sheer luck or intelligence because I do very little work (4)
 - c. do just enough work to get along (5)
17. If the opportunity arose and I knew enough English, I would watch English TV programs
 - a. never (4)
 - b. sometimes (5)
 - c. as often as possible (6)
18. After I get my English assignments back, I
 - a. just throw them in my desk and forget them (4)
 - b. look them over, but don't bother correcting mistakes (5)
 - c. always rewrite them, correcting my mistakes (6)
19. I find studying English
 - a. no more interesting than most subjects (5)
 - b. not interesting at all (4)
 - c. very interesting (6)

20. If my teacher wanted someone to do any extra English, I would
- a. definitely volunteer (6)
 - b. only do it if the teacher asked me directly (5)
 - c. definitely not volunteer (4)
-

¹Numbers in parentheses are weights given to responses. They were not included on the questionnaire when it was given to students.

(see Table 7): 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 20. The scale has demonstrated a high degree of internal consistency for both anglophone and francophone students with a median Cronbach α (alpha) of .82 for anglophones (Gardner, Clément, Smythe and Smythe, 1979) and .77 for francophones (Clément et al., 1976).

3. The Desire to Learn English Scale:

The ten multiple-choice items constituting this scale were also taken from Gardner, Clément, Smythe and Smythe (1979). The items, as found in Table 7, are: 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19. These items were described as assessing the degree to which a student wants to learn L₂. Item responses were weighted as in the Motivational Intensity scale and a median Cronbach α (alpha) of .86 was reported for this scale for groups of Canadian anglophones learning French (Gardner, Clément, Smythe and Smythe, 1979) and .80 for francophones learning English (Clément, et al., 1976).

In the present study, the Motivational Intensity and the Desire to Learn scales' measures of internal consistency were initially found to be low (α = .50; α = .39 respectively). In order to increase the overall Cronbach α , two items from each scale were deleted, and the two scales were combined, with the remaining items. Thus, one measure of internal consistency was obtained for the combined Motivation scale (α = .84). The criterion set for the internal consistency measure was .83, and the items deleted were selected on the basis of their coefficients influencing the overall α . Appendix 4 presents

the figures for the combined scale while appendices 5 and 6 show the figures for the separate scales before they were combined. The combined Motivation scale is presented in Table 7.

4. Cloze test:

"Secrets of Success" is a cloze test for the intermediate English language learner (see Appendix 7). This test was designed by deleting every seventh word of the reading passage with a total of forty blanks. For each blank, there are four multiple-choice answers, three of which are the distractors and one of which is the correct answer. The first sentence in the passage is a complete one to provide context. This test was a part of a proficiency test designed by the Center for Second Language Learning at the University of Ottawa and was administered to 203 students of English as a second language in December, 1979. Its internal consistency is reported to be .97, and test-time twenty minutes.

"Tests used in the evaluation of achievement in second/foreign language learning are focused on measuring the students' acquisition of course content, that is to say, those aspects of phonology lexicon and structure, to which the student has been formally exposed in textbooks, classroom sessions or through other instructional materials" (Clark, 1978, p. 18). A cloze test is an indirect proficiency test that measures achievement providing a context for the examinee, rather than listing a number of questions in isolation. Originated by W.L. Taylor (1953) in connection

with native language learning, the cloze procedure was intensively examined by Carroll, et al. (1959). A number of additional studies were conducted using various adaptations of the original cloze test. Darnell (1968) developed a "clozentropy" procedure in which the test responses of native speakers were used to define and weight acceptable answers. In other studies, Oller and Inal (1971) administered an English cloze test in which only prepositions were deleted and obtained a correlation of .75 with total scores on the UCLA English placement exam, consisting of multiple-choice and free response questions covering vocabulary grammar, reading comprehension and dictation. Oller (1972) found that a scoring system where the student gains credit for any of his/her contextually acceptable words, and not necessarily the original deletion, resulted in higher test reliability than the exact-word-replacement method, as well as a higher correlation (.83 versus .75) with the UCLA placement examination. However superiority of the "any-acceptable-word" scoring procedure was not corroborated in a later study by Hanzeli (1977). Further experimentation was conducted using the cloze procedure in a multiple-choice format (Jonz, 1976; Griffin, et al., 1978).

Spolsky (1969b, p. 170) states that "knowing a language involves the ability to understand a distorted message, to accept a message with reduced redundancy". This highlights the usefulness of such testing techniques as the cloze test. Redundancy is a concept developed as part of the statistical

theory of communication (Shannon and Weaver, 1949). Spolsky (1969b, pp. 167-168) indicates that "in this theory, a message carries information to the extent that it effects a reduction in uncertainty by eliminating certain possibilities. It is our knowledge that permits us to rule out 50% of the possibilities...

In natural languages, more units are used than are theoretically necessary; that is to say, natural languages are redundant...

Redundancy reduces the possibility of error and permits communication where there is interference in the communicating channel...The redundancy of natural language can be illustrated in many ways", such as when words have been left out in a purely statistical way, as in cloze tests. Spolsky (Ibid., p. 170) emphasizes that "While testing specific linguistic items is likely to be valuable in the control of instruction, the assessment of proficiency in a language must rather be based on functioning in a much more linguistically complex situation than is provided by the one-element test".

In view of the above, the exact-word-replacement method of the cloze test was chosen for this study due to its reported measures of reliability, its ease of administration and scoring for large numbers of students.

C. PROCEDURE

The tests were administered at the beginning of the second term of the academic year. The students answered the

questionnaire and completed the cloze test during regular class hours, without any time limit. Before they started the questionnaire, the students were informed that they were free to make a choice to participate or not in this study, and that their answers would remain confidential. Each student, before starting the questionnaire, was required to fill in background information on the first page about his/her age, gender, field of study and time on task. Two test administrators who were not associated with the students' language program were present at the time of testing.

D. ANALYSES

There are several dependent variables in this study, namely proficiency, motivation and reasons for learning L₂. The measures for proficiency and motivation have already been described previously. In this section the analyses used to interpret the data will be presented.

Four types of analyses were conducted using SPSSx statistical program (1975), as follows:

1. Factors were defined according to the items loading significantly on each factor (the absolute value greater than .30) on the thirty one-item Reasons to Learn English Scale. Analyses using the Scree test (Catell, 1966) and the factor analysis to determine the orientations that are common to all four groups indicated that seven factors best represent the data. A description of each factor will be presented in the following section of this chapter.

2. To estimate the degree of relationship between the dependent variables, correlation coefficients were calculated. The results are presented in Chapter Four.
3. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to investigate student proficiency, motivation and orientations as a function of their sex and field of study. The results will be discussed in the next chapter.
4. In order to assess the relationships between the seven orientations obtained in the first factor analysis and the other constructs, motivation and proficiency, a second factor analysis was conducted for males and females separately. The results of this second analysis will be presented and discussed in the next chapter.

E. FACTOR ANALYSIS I

Data was gathered by asking the students to rate the importance of each of 31 reasons for learning English as a foreign language using a six-point Likert-type scale. Factor analysis was then conducted on the responses to the 31-item questionnaire in order to reduce the number of variables to a smaller number of constructs. From the factors thus obtained, it was possible to identify those reasons that clustered to form the various orientations. Table 8 presents the thirty-

one reasons for learning L₂ and the significant loadings for each of these items. The complete data, with all loadings, are presented in Appendix 8.

Seven factors common to all groups were extracted from the matrix of correlations between orientation items and rotated to simple solution via the varimax procedure. Table 9 presents the Eigen values for these seven factors ranked according to their relative importance after the varimax rotation. The percentage of variance in the system is explained by the corresponding factor. The addition of more factors would not have contributed significantly to the total variance. The last three factors with latent roots less than 1.00 were added to increase the percentage of total variance in the system (Tabachnik and Fidell, 1983). Thus, all of the seven factors account for 42.2% of the variance. Factor I accounts for 20.6% of the variance. It receives significant loadings (absolute value greater than .30, see Table 8) from items indicating students' reasons to learn L₂ to live in a country where L₂ is spoken (item 6), to go to a country where L₂ is spoken (items 9, 30 and 4), to get a job where L₂ is used (item 20), and from an item expressing students' wish to meet Americans (item 11). Relatively higher loadings of three items relating to travel, as in wanting to live in an L₂ country, meeting L₂ people and getting a job where L₂ is spoken, indicate a desire to travel, therefore this factor is labeled as reflecting a Travel orientation.

Factor II accounts for 6.2% of the total variance and

TABLE 8
VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

I T E M S	F A C T O R S						
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1. Find out about L2 people	-	-	-	-	-	-	50*
2. Enter the university	-	36	-	-	-	-	-
3. Get a good job	-	57	-	-	-	34	-
4. Go to England	56	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. For a future career	-	41	-	-	-	-	-
6. Live in an L2 country	74	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Study another language in future	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Understand L2 people and way of life	-	-	-	-	-	-	52
9. Go to U.S.	63	-	-	33	-	-	-
10. Be more knowledgeable	-	32	-	-	46	-	-
11. Want to meet Americans	32	-	-	83	-	-	-
12. Get a degree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Understand L1 better	-	-	-	-	43	-	-
14. Make friends with Americans	-	-	-	65	-	-	-
15. Appear knowledgeable	-	-	-	-	-	59	-
16. Be successful in business	-	71	-	-	-	-	-
17. Need L2 after leaving school	-	48	53	-	-	-	-
18. Be more educated	-	-	-	-	-	35	-
19. Travel	-	-	57	-	-	-	-
20. Get a job where L2 is used	42	-	-	-	-	31	-
21. Be respected by others	-	-	-	-	36	49	-
22. Know L2 people	-	-	-	31	-	-	-
23. Have an influence on L1 community	-	36	-	-	46	37	-
24. Acquire new ideas and broaden perspectives	-	-	-	-	54	-	-
25. Get a better paying job	-	-	-	-	-	48	-
26. Learn about myself	-	-	-	-	49	-	-
27. Meet and speak with more and varied people	-	-	61	-	-	-	-
28. Need L2 at different occupational levels	-	-	37	-	-	-	-
29. Understand L2 thinking and behaviour	-	-	-	-	-	-	46
30. Go to an L2 country	60	-	-	-	-	-	-
31. Appreciate L2 art and literature	-	-	-	-	-	-	51

* The factor loadings are expressed without decimals and those less than 0.30 have been deleted.

TABLE 9RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS AFTER VARIMAX ROTATION

	Factor	Eigen Value	Percentage of Variance
I	Travel	6.39	20.6
II	Career Development	1.94	6.20
III	Instrumental	1.38	4.50
IV	Friendship	1.10	3.50
V	Self-actualization	0.86	2.80
VI	Prestige-Instrumental	0.77	2.50
VII	Cultural Understanding	0.64	2.10

receives significant loadings from items indicating reasons for learning L₂ as a foreign language for a future career, such as to be successful in business (item 16), to get a good job (item 3), learning L2 for a future career (item 5), and to enter the university (item 2). It also receives significant loadings from an item that indicates the need for a foreign language after leaving school (item 17) and the items that indicate reasons such as, to learn L2 to have an influence on the learner's own community (item 23), and to be more knowledgeable (item 10). Thus, it has been labeled a Career Development factor.

Factor III accounts for 4.5% of the variance and receives significant loadings from a combination of items expressing the need to meet more and varied people (item 27), to travel (item 19), the need for L2 after leaving school (item 17), and the need for L2 at different occupational levels (item 28). In general these reasons show instrumental purposes, therefore this factor is called an Instrumental factor.

Factor IV accounts for 2.5% of the total variance and it receives significant loadings from items related with reasons to learn L2 to meet Americans (item 11), to make friends with Americans (item 14), to go to the United States (item 9), and to get to know L2 speaking people (item 22). This factor is composed of reasons for learning L2 that deal with friendship, therefore, it has been labeled a Friendship factor.

Factor V accounts for 2.8% of the total variance. The items loading significantly on this factor include those concerning reasons to acquire new ideas and broaden perspectives (item 24), to learn about oneself (item 26), to be more knowledgeable (item 10), to have an influence on one's own community (item 23), to understand one's L₁ better (item 13), and to be respected by others (item 21). All of these items appear to be concerned with learning L₂ for knowledge-seeking, as well as personal advancement reasons. This factor, therefore, has been labeled a Self-actualization factor.

Factor VI accounts for 2.5% of the total variance. It receives significant loadings from items reflecting reasons to learn English as a foreign language in order to appear more knowledgeable (item 15), to be respected by others (item 21), to get a better paying job (item 25), to have an influence on one's own community (item 23), to be more educated (item 18), to get a good job (item 3), and to get a job where L₂ is used (item 20). This factor, similar to factor III, is composed of three instrumental reasons for learning English that include getting a job (items 25, 3 and 20), as well as seeking respect and prestige in one's own community (items 15, 18, 21 and 23). Therefore, this factor has been labeled a Prestige-Instrumental factor, that is mostly job related.

Factor VII accounts for 2.1% of the total variance. It receives significant loadings from items concerning the

students' reasons to learn L2, such as, to understand English-speaking people and their way of life (item 8), to appreciate L2 art and literature (item 31), and to understand their thinking and behavior (item 29).

"Understanding", as it is used in the items, reflects a positive development of awareness towards the L₂ speaking people, therefore, it is labeled a Cultural Understanding factor that is English-specific.

After the factor analysis and the description of orientations, the role of orientations on students' motivation to learn English as a foreign language was analyzed. This analysis was done to determine the combination of orientations that best predicted students' motivation to learn. Motivation was assessed by summing together the Motivational Intensity and the Desire to Learn scales. Orientations were assessed by using the factor scores. These scores were obtained by averaging item scores for each student so that they were unique and specific to each factor.

PAGINATION ERROR.

ERREUR DE PAGINATION.

TEXT COMPLETE.

LE TEXTE EST COMPLET.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA.

BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA.

CANADIAN THESES SERVICE.

SERVICE DES THESES CANADIENNES.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

In the last chapter, the procedure, instruments and analyses were described and the initial factor analysis was discussed. In this chapter, the results from the three remaining analyses will be presented and discussed in turn. They are the correlational analysis, the univariate and multivariate analyses of variance and the second factor analyses for each sex.

1. CORRELATIONS AMONG DEPENDENT VARIABLES

In order to determine the degree of relationship among the different variables used in this study, correlations were calculated for all the possible relationships among proficiency, motivation and the seven orientation factors that emerged from the factor analysis. Table 10 presents the correlation coefficient matrix for the male and female groups. Because the multivariate analysis of variance revealed that there were significant main effects for sex but not for field, only the results for males and females are presented. Table 11 presents the MANOVA results for both sex and field. There is no significant relationship between Proficiency and any of the seven orientations for either sex. These MANOVA results will be discussed in the next section.

The correlation matrix indicates that there is a significant relationship between Proficiency and Motivation

TABLE 10

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS^a

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Proficiency		*0.32	0.15	0.01	0.04	0.15	-0.02	0.00	0.08
2. Motivation	-0.04		*0.24	*0.20	*0.30	0.11	0.13	0.01	*0.24
3. Travel factor	-0.09	*0.17		*0.29	*0.51	*0.46	0.05	*0.39	*0.42
4. Career Development factor	-0.02	*0.25	*0.35		*0.30	0.08	*0.19	*0.22	-0.03
5. Instrumental factor	-0.01	*0.22	*0.31	*0.39		*0.46	*0.21	*0.40	*0.40
6. Friendship factor	-0.09	*0.31	*0.58	*0.43	*0.40		0.08	*0.38	*0.34
7. Self-actualization factor	0.09	*0.18	0.14	*0.40	*0.32	*0.28		*0.48	0.18
8. Prestige - Instrumental factor	-0.13	0.09	*0.41	*0.37	*0.29	*0.40	*0.25		*0.25
9. Cultural Understanding factor	0.04	*0.38	*0.35	*0.32	*0.42	*0.49	*0.30	*0.21	

a The coefficients above the diagonal are for females (N=84) and those below the diagonal are for males (N=115)

* Significantly different from zero at $\alpha = 0.05$

for females ($r = .32$) but not for males ($r = -.04$). Those females who are highly motivated to learn English in the first place can be expected to do well, while those who are not, can be expected to do poorly. This is not true for males, however. Considering the differential access to the universities in Turkey for male and female students, the pressure on female students to succeed in their studies is higher than on males. This could explain why motivation and proficiency are correlated for females in this study and not for males.

For females, there is a significant relationship between Motivation and four of the orientations: Travel ($r = .24$), Career Development ($r = .20$), Instrumental ($r = .30$) and Cultural Understanding ($r = .24$). For males, the relationships between Motivation and all orientations except the Prestige-Instrumental factor are significant. The significant correlation coefficients range between .17 and .38.

As for relationships among the orientations themselves, for males, all relationships are significant (r ranges between .21 and .58) except for that between the Travel factor and the Self-actualization factor. For females, while most of the relationships among factors are significant, five are not. These are the relationships between Travel and Self-actualization, as with the males, Career Development and Friendship, Career Development and Cultural Understanding, Friendship and Self-actualization

and Self-actualization and Cultural Understanding. For males, the highest correlation is that between the Travel and Friendship factors ($r = .58$) while, for females, it is that between the Travel and Instrumental factors ($r = .51$).

It has already been noted that the correlation coefficient matrix shows discrepancies between males and females for Proficiency and Motivation. There is also a discrepancy between sexes in the correlation coefficients for Motivation and the Friendship orientation factor ($r = .11$ for females; $r = .31^*$ for males). In Turkish society, males traditionally socialize more than females do, meeting with friends more frequently and with a wider variety of people. Motivation to learn a foreign language can be related with socializing with people who speak that language, English in this case, only for males in this study. For males, learning English seems to lead to making friends with the target language group.

The correlation matrix demonstrates a parallel discrepancy between sexes for Motivation and the Self-actualization factor ($r = .13$ for females; $r = .18^*$ for males). Here, there is a significant correlation between Motivation and the Self-actualization factor for males and not for females. Some of the orientation items that contributed to this factor include being respected by others, having an influence on L₁ community, acquiring new ideas and broadening perspectives, and being more knowledgeable. Consequently, the discrepancy between sexes

can be explained by the fact that Turkish society expects males to acquire status through their knowledge, their influence and their standing in the community. However, no such expectations are placed on women and so it is not surprising that such reasons for learning L_2 do not correlate with Motivation.

Looking now at the correlations among orientation factors, a similar discrepancy exists for the Career Development and the Friendship orientation factors. These two factors correlate significantly for males ($r = .43^*$) but not for females ($r = .08$). As mentioned above, it is expected that males are more socially active and friendship would be expected to play a more important role in their career development. Thus, these two orientations correlate for males but not for females. While there is a significant correlation between the Career Development and Self-actualization orientation factors for both males ($r = .40^*$) and females ($r = .19^*$), a markedly higher correlation coefficient is indicated for males. Therefore, the same two orientation factors that correlate significantly with Motivation for males also correlate more with the Career Development orientation for males than for females.

The correlation coefficients between the Career Development and Cultural Understanding factors for females and males indicate another discrepancy ($r = -0.3$ for females; $r = .32^*$ for males). The Cultural Understanding factor, as described earlier in this study, reflects a

positive development of awareness towards English-speaking people and an appreciation of their art and literature. Thus, a significant correlation between these two factors for males may mean that there is a relationship between learning L_2 to understand the target culture and learning L_2 for a better and more successful future career. This may again reflect the greater importance of friendship and social life for males in Turkish society. As for the female students in this study, it could be argued that although Career Development is an important factor for learning L_2 , it is not related with a cultural understanding of the target group.

A similar pattern exists in the correlation coefficients between the Friendship and Self-actualization and the Self-actualization and Cultural Understanding orientation factors. For males, there is a significant correlation in each case ($r = .28^*$ and $r = .30^*$ respectively), whereas there is none for females ($r = .08$ and $r = .18$ respectively). As has been shown in the previous examples, males have a variety of related orientations towards learning L_2 that reflect the societal expectations placed upon them. Because these expectations do not exist for females, these particular orientations for learning L_2 do not correlate. Furthermore, these same orientation factors that cluster for the males in this study also correlate with motivation to learn L_2 while they do not for females. This suggests that the nature of motivation to

learn a second language is somewhat different in the males and females in this study.

Finally, it should be noted that there is a significant correlation between the Self-actualization and Prestige-Instrumental orientation factors for both males and females. However, the correlation coefficient is greater for females ($r = .48^*$) than for males ($r = .25^*$). As described earlier in this study, the Prestige-Instrumental factor received significant loadings from items reflecting reasons for L_2 learning such as getting a good job and seeking respect in one's own community. Thus, a greater correlation between these two factors for females indicate that learning L_2 to have an influence on one's own community is related with learning L_2 to get a job and to be respected by others. It should be recalled that the Self-actualization Orientation factor also correlated significantly with the Career Development factor for females, though not as much as for males. This also suggests a narrower focus on job-career-related orientations for females as compared to the broader range of orientations found for males.

2. MANOVA FOR SEX AND FIELD EFFECTS

Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance comparing male and female students and science and humanities students were conducted on their proficiency scores, motivation scores and orientations toward learning English in order to determine if there were any significant

differences between sexes and between fields of study. Table 11 presents the results of the analysis of variance for the two sexes. Hotelling's statistics were used to compare group means when evaluating significant interaction effects. Table 12 presents the means for each sex for the nine variables. The multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) indicates that there was a significant interaction between sexes ($p = .001$). The univariate results indicate that, among the individual variables, Motivation ($p = .007$) and the Career Development factor ($p = .001$) played the greatest role in this interaction.

Because of the cultural restrictions mentioned earlier, women have to try harder than men to enter the university. This suggests that females who have actually gained access to university can be expected to be more motivated to acquire skills, such as English, that will help them in the advancement of their education. It is interesting, in this regard, to recall that Proficiency and Motivation correlate significantly for females but not for males.

The same argument can be made to explain the fact that females score higher than males on the Career Development factor. Among the seven factors that emerged as important reasons for learning English, only Career Development showed a significant sex effect. This suggests that, for the females in this study, career advancement is a more

TABLE 11

MULTIVARIATE AND UNIVARIATE TESTS FOR SEX AND FIELD EFFECTS

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS FOR SEX AND FIELD EFFECTS

Effect	Parameters (S,M,N)	Hotellings' Statistics	df	F	p-Prob
Sex	(1,3.5,92)	0.156	(9.186)	3.22	0.001
Field	(1,3.5,92)	0.056	(9.186)	1.16	0.326

UNIVARIATE F-TESTS FOR SEX EFFECTS [df = (1.194)]

Variable	Hypoth MS	MS	F	p-Prob
Proficiency	16.32	55.53	0.29	0.588
Motivation	188.06	25.40	7.40	0.007
Travel factor	3.26	1.09	3.00	0.085
Career Development factor	4.40	0.36	12.28	0.001
Instrumental factor	1.02	0.53	1.92	0.168
Friendship factor	0.54	1.14	0.47	0.462
Self-actualization factor	0.04	0.80	0.05	0.817
Prestige-Instrumental factor	0.11	0.98	0.12	0.734
Cultural Understanding factor	0.36	0.92	0.40	0.530

UNIVARIATE F-TESTS FOR FIELD EFFECTS [df = (1.194)]

Variable	Hypoth MS	MS	F	p-Prob
Proficiency	48.20	55.37	0.87	0.352
Motivation	56.62	26.08	2.17	0.142
Travel factor	0.19	1.10	0.17	0.679
Career Development factor	0.50	0.38	1.32	0.252
Instrumental factor	0.41	0.53	0.77	0.381
Friendship factor	3.44	1.13	3.05	0.082
Self-actualization factor	0.02	0.81	0.03	0.875
Prestige-Instrumental factor	0.33	0.97	0.34	0.560
Cultural Understanding factor	0.01	0.92	0.01	0.928

TABLE 12DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS IN THE SAMPLE

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	SD
Proficiency	F	84	24.00	10.09
Proficiency	M	115	23.36	4.74
Motivation	F	84	88.32	4.64
Motivation	M	115	86.48	5.34
Travel factor	F	84	4.28	1.06
Travel factor	M	114	4.06	1.05
Career Development factor	F	84	5.58	0.38
Career Development factor	M	115	5.29	0.72
Instrumental factor	F	84	5.20	0.67
Instrumental factor	M	115	5.06	0.76
Friendship factor	F	83	3.61	1.05
Friendship factor	M	113	3.72	1.09
Self-actualization factor	F	83	3.83	0.90
Self-actualization factor	M	115	3.81	0.90
Prestige-Instrumental factor	F	83	3.51	1.02
Prestige-Instrumental factor	M	115	3.55	1.00
Cultural Understanding factor	F	84	3.70	0.86
Cultural Understanding factor	M	115	3.80	1.02

important reason for learning English than it is for the males. This greater career orientation is consistent with their higher motivation to learn English in the first place.

It should be noted that the travel factor approaches significance ($p = .085$) and may suggest a greater importance of travel for the female group in this study.

Appendix 9 presents the group means for humanities and science students for the nine variables. Table 11 presents the results of the analysis of variance. The MANOVA indicates that there were no significant field effects ($p = .326$). This suggests that humanities and science students in this study did not differ in their achievement, their motivation or their orientations for learning English. The significance of this will be discussed in the next chapter.

3. FACTOR ANALYSIS II

In order to assess the relationships between the seven orientations and other constructs such as motivation and proficiency, the respective indices were included in a second factor analysis for males and females separately. This analysis was carried out using principal axis extraction and varimax rotation. The varimax rotated factor matrices for females and for males are presented in Table 13. The results accounted for 42.5% of the variance from four factors obtained for the females, and for 49.1% of the variance from three factors obtained for males in the sample. Table 14 presents these findings.

TABLE 13
FEMALES: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

Variable	Factors			
	I	II	III	IV
1. Proficiency	-24*	-48	-48	12
2. Motivation	-02	-15	-63	-05
3. Travel factor	58	18	29	-02
4. Career Development factor	21	34	27	-50
5. Instrumental factor	47	27	45	-02
6. Friendship factor	72	03	04	05
7. Self-actualization factor	03	75	13	02
8. Prestige-Instrumental factor	31	42	12	11
9. Cultural Understanding factor	14	22	14	45

MALES: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

Variable	Factors		
	I	II	III
1. Proficiency	01	-09	14
2. Motivation	-55	-07	33
3. Travel factor	56	29	31
4. Career Development factor	27	54	-12
5. Instrumental factor	49	45	11
6. Friendship factor	73	35	24
7. Self-actualization factor	20	73	-38
8. Prestige-Instrumental factor	18	73	25
9. Cultural Understanding factor	74	22	02

* Decimal points have been omitted on all loadings

TABLE 14
RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS AFTER
VARIMAX ROTATION FOR FEMALES

Factor	Eigen Value	Percentage of Variance
I. Friendship-Travel	2.29	25.4
II. Social Status	.64	7.1
III. Instrumental	.49	5.4
IV. General Knowledge	.41	4.6

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS AFTER
VARIMAX ROTATION FOR MALES

Factor	Eigen Value	Percentage of Variance
I. Personal Growth	3.22	35.8
II. Self-advancement/Instrumental	.71	7.9
III. General Travel	.48	5.3

FEMALES: Factor I accounted for 25.4% of the variance and had an eigenvalue of 2.29. It received significant loadings from four variables (items 6, 3, 5 and 8). The composition of this factor suggests that students who want to learn English in order to meet with and get to know English-speaking people (item 6) also want to learn L₂ to travel to an English-speaking country (item 3). Other loadings obtained indicate that these students also want to learn L₂ to be more educated, to get a better paying job, to be respected by others and to have an influence on their own community (items 3 and 4). Since the major loadings on this factor were received from those items that indicate a strong desire to build friendships with English-speaking people and to travel to countries where English is spoken, this dimension was labeled a Friendship-Travel orientation.

Factor II accounted for 7.1% of the variance and had an eigenvalue of 0.64. This factor received appreciable loadings from four variables (items 7, 1, 8 and 4). While the loadings received from the Self-actualization, Prestige-Instrumental and Career Development Orientation indices (items 7, 8 and 4) were positive, it received a negative loading from the proficiency index (item 1). This combination reflected reasons for learning L₂ to acquire new ideas and broaden perspectives, to be more knowledgeable, to have an influence on one's own community, to be respected by others (item 7), to get a better paying job where L₂ is used and to be successful in business (items 3 and 4). All of

these variables indicate an interest in learning English in order to gain prestige and be respected by others through one's general standing in the community. Therefore, this factor was labeled a Social Status dimension.

Factor III accounted for 5.4% of the variance and had an eigenvalue of 0.49. It received appreciable loadings from three variables (items 2, 1 and 5). While the loading received from the Instrumental orientation index (item 5) was positive, the loadings received from the motivation and the proficiency indices (items 2 and 1) were negative. Since the major orientation that defined this factor reflected the more pragmatic reasons to learn L2, such as, getting a better job, and using L₂ in a future career, it was labeled an Instrumental dimension.

Factor IV accounted for 4.6% of the variance and had an eigenvalue of 0.41. It received significant loadings from two variables (items 4 and 9). A significant negative loading received from the Career Development orientation index (item 4) was evident. The major loading that appeared to identify this factor was received from the Cultural Understanding orientation (item 9), which reflected a desire to learn English in order to learn more about how people live in English-speaking countries, about their thinking and behaviour, and their art and literature. It was also evident that Career Development and cultural understanding dimensions were negatively associated with each other. Therefore, this factor was labeled a General Knowledge

dimension.

MALES: Factor I accounted for 35.8% of the variance and had an eigenvalue of 3.22. It received significant loadings from five variables (items 9, 6, 3, 2 and 5). The loadings received from Cultural Understanding (item 9), Friendship (item 6), Travel (item 3) and Instrumental (item 5) Orientation indices were positive, however, this factor received a significant negative loading from Motivation (item 2). A desire to learn English for gaining cultural understanding, for reasons of friendship and travel was evident. Because of the relationship between these properties and self-improvement, this factor reflects a Personal Growth dimension, and is labeled as such.

Factor II accounted for 7.9% of the variance and had an eigenvalue of .71. It received appreciable loadings from five variables (items 7, 8, 4, 5 and 6). This factor was most strongly defined by Self-actualization, Prestige-Instrumental and Career Development (items 7, 8 and 4) and less strongly by Instrumental and Friendship Orientations (items 5 and 6). These properties suggest a desire to learn English to acquire new ideas and broaden perspectives, to learn about oneself, to be more knowledgeable and to gain prestige in one's own community by getting a better paying job, becoming successful in business and making friends. Therefore, this factor is identified as a Self-advancement/Instrumental dimension.

Factor III accounted for 5.3% of the variance and had

an eigenvalue of .48. This factor received significant loadings from three variables (items 7, 2 and 3). While the loadings received from the Motivation and the Travel Orientation indices (items 2 and 3) were positive, the loading received from the Self-actualization orientation index (item 7) was negative. This dimension is labeled a General Travel Orientation.

Based on the results of the factor analysis, and the multivariate analysis of variance, proficiency and motivation seemed to be related to female students in the sample. Male students were motivated to travel in general, but not for cultural understanding, friendship and instrumental reasons.

These results indicated that for males Factor III, General Travel Orientation, was the only factor that received a significant loading from Motivation. Self-actualization loaded negatively on the same factor. Factor I, the Personal Growth Orientation, received significant loadings from both Travel and Motivation, but the results indicate a negative association between these two orientations for this particular factor. The possible reasons for their desire to travel will be discussed further on in this section.

Self-actualization, Prestige-Instrumental, Career Development, Instrumental and Friendship Orientations loaded significantly on Factor II, which is the Self-advancement/Instrumental dimension. This will also be

discussed further in comparison with the female ratings.

The results of the second factor analysis indicated that Motivation and Proficiency were negatively related to the Instrumental Orientation for female students in this study. This might mean that the English language programs offered in these universities may not be relevant to the students needs in this particular context that was investigated. There appeared to be no other cross-loadings for Motivation. Friendship is related to the Travel dimension for female students, as well as Self-actualization is related to Prestige-Instrumental Orientation.

English proficiency and motivation to learn L_2 are more closely related to female students' ratings. However, it is evident that the more motivated and proficient the student is, the less instrumentally oriented she is to learn English, in this context.

The Travel Orientation appears to be related to male students in this sample. General Travel is the only factor that receives significant loadings from both Motivation and the Travel Orientations. These orientations load on the Personal Growth factor, however, in this case, they appear to be related negatively. There are no other cross-loadings to reflect clearer ratings for the relationship between the Travel and Motivation variables. The highest ratings by the male students are: Cultural Understanding, Friendship, Self-actualization, Prestige-Instrumental, Travel, Career Development and Instrumental orientations. This, on the

other hand, does not imply that they are oriented to learn English for these reasons, based on the results. Since Cultural Understanding, Friendship, Self-actualization and Prestige-Instrumental orientations were scored the highest values males, they appear to be the major values for the male group. One of the traits is the Instrumental orientation, which indicates that all they want is better standards of living by getting a better job and becoming successful.

Self-actualization, Friendship, Travel, Career Development Instrumental, Cultural Understanding and Prestige-Instrumental orientations were the highest ranked by female students in the sample. This indicates that these represent the values they wish to acquire in their own community in general.

Proficiency appeared to be related to Motivation only for females, but not instrumentally. For males, Motivation appeared to be closely related to Travel in general. It should be expected that the changing social conditions stemming from the increasing inflation rates in Turkey's economy might be associated with their motivation to travel to other lands in pursuit of relatively better standards of living.

Certain clusters of variables obtained as a result of the factor analyses made the above explanations possible for the nature of the students' motivation related to their proficiency in English. On the other hand, the relatively

small size of the groups in the sample makes it difficult to draw generalizations based on these results.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

There have been various studies on variables related to achievement in English as a second or foreign language over a twenty-year period. The differences in learner orientations in several contexts have been described by Gardner's and Clément's models of second language learning. These theoretical models proposed explanations for the psychological variables operating in the language learning process as well as certain orientations related to L₂ achievement in certain contexts.

There are several important applications of these theories for second/foreign language educators. The identification of motivational and contextual factors facilitate the assessment of variation in language learning success. This is particularly useful for curriculum design and program evaluation.

The use of instruments, validated with English and French as second languages, in contexts other than North America helps researchers to investigate the nature of orientations for achievement in the TL in these contexts. It should be expected that the results of such studies would open channels of communication between local university departments, make scholars more conscious of the role of language in their disciplines and bring them into contact with government administrators in educational policy-making.

The institutions that provide English language

instruction in Turkey have been listed in the second chapter of this study. It was also noted that there can be hardly any contact with the native speakers of English for the Turkish learner, in general. However, the results of this study indicated the existence of seven orientations common to all groups, and of four orientations for the female and three orientations for the male samples. The multivariate analysis of variance revealed that there were no significant interaction effects for field. Therefore, student endorsements have not been factor analyzed separately for the humanities and science groups. The results also showed that there was a significant relationship between proficiency in EFL and motivation for females. However, no significant relationship was observed between proficiency and any of the seven orientations for either sex.

Four of the seven factors obtained from the first factor analysis resemble the orientations common to all groups that were obtained by Clément and Kruidenier (1983). These orientations were Instrumental, Travel, Friendship and Knowledge. In the present study, the four orientations common to all groups in the sample with eigen values over 1.00 were Travel, Career Development, Instrumental and Friendship. Together, they accounted for 34.8% of the total variance. This indicates that the students' orientations towards learning EFL in this study cannot be explained by the original instrumental and integrative motivational construct (Gardner and Lambert, 1959; 1972).

The Friendship orientation appeared in general orientations as a component of the integrative orientation described by Gardner and Lambert (1972). This orientation received significant loadings from items expressing a desire to meet and make friends with members of the L₂ group as well as to go to the United States. This reflects a positive affective regard towards English-speaking people, however, this orientation exists in combination with a travel reason. The desire to identify with the valued members of the TL group does not appear to be important in this context. In this respect, the orientations obtained in this study differ slightly from those found to be common to the groups studied by Noels and Clément (1989). In their study, the students were learning L₂ in order to develop skills for pragmatic purposes, to gain friendship, to identify with and influence the TL group, to travel and to broaden their knowledge.

There have been disagreements in the definitions of orientations in the past. Spolsky (1969a) and Burstall and his associates (1974) called Travel an Integrative orientation. Dörnyei (1990) also included Travel as a constituent of his Integrative Motivational construct, which was associated with a desire for new stimuli and changes, and a desire to be integrated temporarily into the TL community. Travel was also related to the Instrumental Motivational construct because, the author argued, work and professional development are major reasons for immigration

to another country. In the present study, the Travel orientation appeared to be associated with the desire to go to and live in an English-speaking country, and to get a job where English is used. This orientation reflects both an integrative and an instrumental motivation, thereby rendering its interpretation ambiguous.

The desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages through knowledge of a foreign language has been referred to as an instrumental orientation by Gardner and Lambert (1972, p. 14). The instrumentally oriented learner has been described by the authors as "a person [who] prepares to learn a new code in order to derive benefits of a noninterpersonal sort". The Career Development and Instrumental orientations endorsed by the subjects in this study reflect the desire to learn English for a future career, to be successful in business, to have an influence on the L₁ community, and to meet more and varied people. In Kruidenier's (1984) study such "instrumental" orientations were common to each of the learning contexts and were similarly composed. These orientations consisted of only career and school advancement motives for learning. However, in the present study, the Instrumental orientation received a significant loading from the item stating a reason to travel.

The existence of both the Career Development and the Instrumental orientations for the learners in this study and the way these orientations were composed also replicates the

results of Muchnick and Wolfe (1982), in which a meaningful instrumental orientation for studying Spanish was observed.

In the present study, different orientations were endorsed by males and females due to different roles expected from them in Turkish society. The factors obtained from the factor analysis for females showed the existence of a Friendship-Travel orientation. This factor is similar to Friendship/Travel orientations that were observed by Clément and Kruidenier (1983) for Anglophones learning French, Francophones learning English, Francophones learning Spanish in multicultural areas and Francophones learning Spanish in a unicultural milieu.

The findings in the present study also support the results of studies conducted in Turkey. Sözer's (1984) study demonstrated that, on the whole, the major reasons endorsed by the students in his sample were: to be successful in their future career, to be able to use L_2 in a country where L_2 is spoken, to find a good job and to gain respect. The first and the fourth reasons listed here indicate an instrumental orientation and the third reason indicates a travel orientation. These results are similar to those found in the present study where Travel, Career Development and Instrumental orientations were found to be common to all groups. The fourth reason, to gain respect, is similar to the Prestige-Instrumental orientation found in the present study.

In Ceyhan's (1988) study, the students from outside the

university who were enrolled in evening classes were willing to seek opportunities to practice L₂ outside the classroom, such as joining an English-language club. They were also willing to take an advanced English course later on. This group of students were taking English voluntarily, compared to other groups in the study for which English language learning was a compulsory part of the program. These results demonstrated a clear desire to learn English. All the groups in Ceyhan's sample indicated that they wanted to learn English not to fulfill the requirements in the program but because it was important to learn for reasons such as going to the United States to live there for a period of time and to improve their language skills, and because they wanted to use English in their future career. Their reasons of travel and career development resemble the Travel and Career Development orientations found to be common to all groups in the present study.

Although the percentages of male and female student enrollments were presented in Özer's (1984) study, sex differences concerning orientations were not analyzed separately. A majority of students in his sample indicated a need to learn a foreign language to use during and after their studies. It is evident that learning a foreign language is needed by these university students to pursue their academic studies and in their future career, which indicates a general instrumental orientation toward learning L₂.

In the second factor analysis, an Instrumental orientation was observed for the female group and not for the male group. This finding contrasts with the results of Svanes' (1987) study, where men were reported to have shown higher instrumental motivation than the women in the Asian group.

The analyses reported in this study do not distinguish between Humanities and Science students. However, this does not necessarily mean that field effects do not exist, but that they remained undetected due to the unequal sample sizes and the deletion of cases with missing observations (see Table 5). If larger samples had been obtained, there may have been more significant results. Another aspect that might be explored further is whether the ratio of Science to Humanities students in this study reflects general attitudes within Turkish society towards these two fields of study.

The exigencies and scientific developments of modern life demand the use of a second/foreign language as a medium of instruction in the higher levels of education in Turkey. However, the degree of learners' cultural identification with their own group might promote or hinder motivation to learn L_2 , as described in the literature. Further analysis of learners' preferences regarding language of instruction and their relationship to cultural identity and motivation to learn L_2 would help language planners and teachers to evaluate the formal language learning situation and to adapt language programs to the real and changing needs of

learners. Further research on students' perceptions as to which language would be best suited to studying technical versus non-technical subjects at the post-secondary level would contribute to the analysis of differences in L₂ motivation for humanities and science groups.

The present research adds to studies that have already been done on contexts outside North America. The educational, social and cultural background and the research conducted in Turkey described in Chapter Two provides additional material for comparative research and in-depth case studies on motivational aspects of second/foreign language learning.

REFERENCES

- Alptekin, C. (1981). Sociological and pedagogic considerations in L₂ acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 15, 275-284.
- Alptekin, C. (1982). Cultural dominance and EFL. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 39, 56-62.
- Anisfeld, M. and Lambert, W.E. (1961). Social and psychological variables in learning Hebrew. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, 524-529.
- Au, Shun Y. (1988). A critical appraisal of Gardner's social-psychological theory of second-language (L₂) learning. Language Learning, 38, 1, 75-100.
- Bear, J. (1985). Historical factors influencing attitudes toward foreign language learning in Turkey. Journal of Human Sciences, 4, 27-36.
- British Council (1980). English Language Teaching Profile: Turkey. London: England. English Language and Literature Division.
- Burstall, C.M., Jamieson, M., Cohen, S., and Hargreaves, M. (1974). Primary French in the balance. Windsor, England: NFER Publishing.
- Carroll, J.B. (1962). The prediction of success in intensive foreign language training. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Training research and education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 87-136.
- Carroll, J.B. (1975). The teaching of French as a foreign language in eight countries. New York: Wiley.
- Carroll, J.B., Carton, A.S. and Wilds, C.P. (1959). An investigation of "cloze" items in the measurement of achievement in foreign languages. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Laboratory for Research in Instruction, Harvard University Graduate School of Education.
- Catell, R.B. (1966). The Scree test for the number of factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1, 245-276.
- Ceyhan, E. (1988). Yabancı dil öğretiminde güdüleme etmenleri. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Chihara, T., and Oller, J.W., Jr. (1978). Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: a sociolinguistic study of adult Japanese speakers. Language Learning, 28, 55-68.

- Clark, J.L.D. (1978). Psychometric considerations in language testing. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), Approaches to language testing. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, pp. 15-30.
- Clément, R. (1978). Motivational characteristics of Francophones learning English. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
- Clément, R. (1979). Immersion and residence programs: their effects on attitude and anxiety. Interchange, 9, 52-58.
- Clément, R. (1980). Ethnicity, contact and communicative competence in a second language. In H. Giles, W.P. Robinson and P.M. Smith (Eds.), Language: Social psychological perspectives. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 147-154.
- Clément, R. (1984). Aspects socio-psychologiques de la communication inter-ethnique et de l'identité sociale. Recherches sociologiques, 15, 293-312.
- Clément, R. (1986). Second language proficiency and acculturation: An investigation of the effects of language status and individual characteristics. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 5, 271-290.
- Clément, R., Gardner, R.C. and Smythe, P.C. (1977). Motivational variables in second language acquisition: A study of francophones learning English. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 9, 123-133.
- Clément, R., Gardner, R.C. and Smythe, P.C. (1980). Social and individual factors in second language acquisition. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 12, 293-302.
- Clément, R. and Kruidenier, B.G. (1983). Orientations in second language acquisition: I. The effects of ethnicity, milieu, and target language on their emergence. Language Learning, 33, 273-291.
- Clément, R. and Kruidenier, B.G. (1985). Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language proficiency: a test of Clément's model. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 4, 21-37.
- Clément, R., Major, L., Gardner, R.C. and Smythe, P.C. (1977). Attitudes and motivation in second language acquisition: an investigation of Ontario francophones. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 12, 1-20.

- Clément, R., Smythe, P.C. and Gardner, R.C. (1976). Echelles d'attitudes et de motivations reliées à l'apprentissage de l'anglais, langue seconde. La revue canadienne des langues vivantes, 33, 5-26.
- Cooper, R.L., Fishman, J.A., Lown, L., Schaier, B. and Seckbach, F. (1977). Language, technology and persuasion in the Middle East: three experimental studies. In H. Giles (Ed.), Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations. London: Academic Press, pp. 83-98.
- Darnell, D.K. (1968). The development of an English Language Proficiency Test of foreign students, using a clozentropy procedure. Boulder, Colorado: Dept. of Speech and Drama, University of Colorado.
- Demircan, Ö. (1988). Dünden bugüne Türkiye'de yabancı dil. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Demirel, Ö. (1984). Yabancı dil öğretimi: İlkeler, yöntemler, teknikler. Unpublished manuscript. Ankara: Hacettepe University.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. Language Learning, 40, 45-78.
- Ervin-Tripp, S.M. (1973). Identification and bilingualism. In S.M. Ervin-Tripp, Language acquisition and communicative choice. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 1-14 (original work published in 1954).
- England, L. (1982). Role of the integrative motivation in English as a second language learning. Paper presented at the 16th Annual Convention of TESOL, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Fishman, J.A. (1989). Language and ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gardner, R.C. (1960). Motivational variables in second language learning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, McGill University, Montreal.
- Gardner, R.C. (1966). Motivational variables in second language learning. In D.W. Najam (Ed.), Language learning: the individual and the process. Bloomington, Indiana: University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics, pp. 22-44.

- Gardner, R.C. (1977). Social factors in second language acquisition and bilinguality. In W.H. Coons, D.M. Taylor, and M.A. Tremblay (Eds.), The individual, language and society in Canada. Ottawa: The Canada Council, 105-148.
- Gardner, R.C. (1979). Social psychological aspects of second language acquisition. In H. Giles & R.N. St. Clair (Eds.), Language and social psychology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 193-220.
- Gardner, R.C. (1980). On the validity of affective variables in second language acquisition: conceptual, contextual and statistical considerations. Language Learning, 32, 255-269.
- Gardner, R.C. (1981). Second language learning. In R.C. Gardner and R. Kalin (Eds.), A Canadian social psychology of ethnic relations. Toronto: Methuen Publications, pp. 92-114.
- Gardner, R.C. (1982). Social factors in language retention. In R. Lambert and B. Freed (Eds.), The loss of language skills. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery: technical report. London, Ont.: University of Western Ontario.
- 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. and Clément, R. (1990). Social and psychological perspectives on second language acquisition. In H. Giles and W.P. Robinson (Eds.) The handbook of language and social psychology. Chichester, England: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 495-517.
- Gardner, R.C., Clément, R., Smythe, P.C. and Smythe, C.L. (1979). Attitudes and motivation test battery - revised manual (Research Bulletin No. 15). London: University of Western Ontario, Language Research Group, Department of Psychology.
- Gardner, R.C. and Lalonde, R.N. (1985). Second language acquisition: A social psychological perspective. Paper presented at the 93rd American Psychological Association Convention, Los Angeles, CA, August 23-27.
- Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13, 266-272.

- Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R.C. and Smythe, P.C. (1974). Second-language acquisition: motivational considerations. In S.T. Carey (Ed.), Bilingualism, biculturalism and education. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Gardner, R.C. and Smythe, P.C. (1975). Second language acquisition: a social psychological approach. Research Bulletin No. 332. University of Western Ontario.
- Gardner, R.C. and Smythe, P.C. (1981). On the development of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery. Canadian Modern Language Review, 37, 510-525.
- Gardner, R.C., Smythe, P.C. and Brunet, G.R. (1977). Intensive second language study: Effects on attitudes, motivation. Language Learning, 27, 243-261.
- Gardner, R.C., Smythe, P.C. and Clément, R. (1979). Intensive second language study in a bicultural milieu: an investigation of attitudes, motivation and language proficiency. Language Learning, 29, 305-320.
- Gardner, R.C., Smythe, P.C., Clément, R. and Glikzman, L. (1976). Second language learning: a social psychological perspective. Canadian Modern Language Review, 32, 198-213.
- Giles, H., Bourhis, R. and Taylor, D.M. (1977). Towards a theory of ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations. New York: Academic Press, pp. 307-348.
- Griffin, P., Dietrich, T. and Freeman, C. (1978). Assessing comprehension in a school setting. In P. Griffin (Ed.) Papers in Applied Linguistics, Linguistics and Reading Series, 3. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Hanzeli, V.E. (1977). The effectiveness of cloze tests in measuring the competence of students of French in an academic setting. French Review, 50, 865-874.
- Hoadley-Maidment, E. (1977). The motivation of students studying EFL in London. English Language Teaching Journal, 31, 203-207.
- Hogg, M.A. and Abrams, D. (1988). Social identifications: a social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes. London: Routledge.

- Jonz, J. (1976). Improving on the basic egg: the M-C Cloze. Language Learning, 26, 255-265.
- Kachru, B. (1976). Models of English for the Third World: White man's linguistic burden or language pragmatics. TESOL Quarterly, 10, 221-239.
- Kruidenier, B.G. (1984). The effect of context on the composition and role of orientations in second language acquisition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Ottawa, Canada.
- Kruidenier, B.G. and Clément, R. (1986). The effect of context on the composition and role of orientations in second language acquisition. Quebec City: International Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Laval University.
- Lambert, W.E. (1963). Psychological approaches to the study of language (Part II): On second language learning and bilingualism. Modern Language Journal, 48, 114-121.
- Lambert, W.E. (1967). A social psychology of bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues, 23, 91-109.
- Lambert, W.E. (1974). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F.E. Aboud and R.D. Meade (Eds.), Cultural factors in learning and education. Bellingham, Washington: Fifth Western Washington Symposium on Learning.
- Lambert, W.E. (1979). The social psychology of language: a perspective for the 1980's. In H. Giles and W.P. Robinson (Eds.), Language: social psychological perspectives. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 415-424.
- Macnamara, J. (1973). Attitudes and learning a second language. In R.W. Shuy and R.W. Fasold (Eds.), Language attitudes: current trends and prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pp. 36-40.
- Marckwardt, A. (1965). English as a second language and English as a foreign language. In H.B. Allen and R.N. Campbell (Eds.), Teaching English as a second language: A book of readings. 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 3-8.
- Moise, L.C., Clément, R. and Noels, K. (1990). Aspects motivationnels de l'apprentissage de l'espagnol au niveau universitaire. La revue canadienne des langues vivantes, 46, 689-705.

- Muchnick, A.G. and Wolfe, D.E. (1982). Attitudes and motivations of American students of Spanish. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 38, 254-261.
- Noels, K.A. and Clément, R. (1989). Orientations to learning German: the effects of language heritage on second-language acquisition. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 45, 245-257.
- Oller, J.W., Jr. (1972). Scoring methods and difficulty levels for cloze tests of proficiency in English as a second language. Modern Language Journal, 56, 151-158.
- Oller, J.W., Jr., Baca, L. and Vigil, F. (1977). Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: a sociolinguistic study of Mexican Americans in the southwest. TESOL Quarterly, 11, 173-182.
- Oller, J.W., Jr., Hudson, A.J., and Liu, P.F. (1977). Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: a sociolinguistic study of native speakers of Chinese in the United States. Language Learning, 28, 1-27.
- Oller, J.W., Jr. and Inal, N. (1971). A cloze test of English prepositions. TESOL Quarterly, 5, 315-326.
- Özer, B. (1984). Türk üniversiteleri için yabancı dil eğitimi program modeli. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Pierson, H.S., Fu, G.S. and Lee, S.Y. (1980). An analysis of the relationship between language attitudes and English attainment of secondary students in Hong Kong. Language Learning, 30, 289-316.
- Shannon, C.E. and Weaver, W. (1949). The mathematical theory of communication. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Sözer, E. (1984). Türkiye'deki üniversitelerde bilim-meslek alanlarına yönelik yabancı dil eğitimi. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Spolsky, B. (1969a). Attitudinal aspects of second-language learning. Language Learning, 19, 271-283.
- Spolsky, B. (1969b). What does it mean to know a language; or how do you get someone to perform his competence? In J.W. Oller, Jr. and J.C. Richards (Eds.), Focus on the learner. Massachusetts: Newbury House, pp. 164-176.

- SPSSx: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Second Edition. (1986). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Svanes, B. (1987). Motivation and cultural distance in second-language acquisition. Language Learning, 37, 341-359.
- Tabachnik, B.G. and Fidell, L. (1983). Using multivariate statistics. New York: Harper and Row.
- Taylor, D.M., Meynard, R. and Rheault, E. (1977). Threat to ethnic identity and second language learning. In H. Giles (Ed.), Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations. London: Academic Press, pp. 99-118.
- Taylor, W.L. (1953). Cloze procedure: a new tool for measuring readability. Journalism Quarterly, 30, 414-438.
- Teitelbaum, H., Edwards, A. and Hudson, A. (1975). Ethnic attitudes and the acquisition of Spanish as a second language. Language Learning, 25, 255-266.
- The OECD Observer. (1972). Paris: OECD Publication Service.

APPENDIX 1

Framework for Foreign Language Programs

prepared by the Higher Education Committee

(Bill 2547, 1981. Cited in Özer, 1981, p. 21)

1st year - vocabulary

- grammar (morphology and syntax) 6 hrs. a week.

2nd year - study of short passages (oral/written)

- grammar (comparative study of difficulties
for Turkish students) 4 hrs. a week.

3rd year - reading comprehension (in students' field
of study)

- listening comprehension 4 hrs. a week.

4th year - speaking (general)

- translation (in students' field of study,
from English to Turkish) 2 hrs. a week.

In substance the content of Bill 2547 is as follows:

I. Objectives:

At the end of their university education, all students
should be able to:

1. read and understand the texts in their own field
of study, by using a dictionary if necessary,
2. translate these texts into Turkish,
3. participate in daily conversation.

II. Proficiency Test:

A proficiency test is offered after the students'
admission to a university.

1. The proficiency test consists of two stages:
 - a) The first part determines the students' vocabulary and grammatical knowledge planned for the first two years of foreign language programs at the university. The students who are not successful in this part of the test are not permitted to take the next part, but will start their first year foreign language program.
 - b) The second part of the test measures the students' listening comprehension and their skills in translating a text in their field of study into Turkish by using a dictionary when necessary, and in participating in daily conversation in the foreign language.
2. The students who have been successful in both stages of the proficiency test will receive a "Foreign Language Proficiency Certificate" and they do not have to take the English Program.
3. The students who have not been successful at the second stage of the test are admitted to the third of the four-year program.
4. The results of the proficiency test are indicated as "pass" or "fail".

III. Evaluation:

The results of the final exams at the end of the year are indicated as "pass" or "fail".

- IV. Students who have not been successful must repeat the program that they failed.
- V. A foreign language program will be compulsory at every university for students who have been admitted to the 1983-1984 academic year as their first year.

Temporary items:

- 1) Students who started the foreign language program at the university in their previous years of study, including the 1982- 1983 academic year, are permitted to complete the program they have started.
- 2) In the 1982-1983 academic year, second year students who have not been registered for the foreign language program, must start with the second year's language program as planned in this framework, but they must complete the first year's program with the help of compensatory courses.

APPENDIX 2REASONS FOR LEARNING

Following are a number of statements with which some people agree and others disagree. There are no right or wrong answers since many people have different opinions. Please rate how much you personally agree or disagree with these statements using the scale below:

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| -3 strongly disagree | +3 strongly agree |
| -2 moderately disagree | +2 moderately agree |
| -1 slightly disagree | +1 slightly agree |

For each statement, write in the left margin the number corresponding to the amount of your agreement or disagreement. Note, there is no right or wrong answer. All that is important is that you indicate your personal feeling.

1. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will allow me to be more at ease with fellow Canadians who speak French.
2. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me find out how people live in French-speaking areas.
3. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I may need it to be admitted to a higher school.
4. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job.

5. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I would like to go to Quebec.
6. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I'll need it for my future career.
7. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I want to become a member of the French Canadian community.
8. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me if I need to study another language later on.
9. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me understand French Canadians and their way of life.
10. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I would like to go to France.
11. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will make me a more knowledgeable person.
12. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I would like to meet some French people.
13. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me appreciate the problems that French people have in a predominantly English-speaking milieu.
14. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I'll need it someday to get a degree.
15. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me understand my own language better.

16. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I would like to make friends with some French people.
17. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will make me appear more cultured.
18. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me be successful in business.
19. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will be useful for me after I leave school.
20. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I feel that no one is really educated unless s/he is fluent in the French language.
21. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me if I should ever travel.
22. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I would like to get a job where I could use my French.
23. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will enable me to gain good friends more easily among French-speaking Canadians.
24. _____ Studying French can be important for me because other people will respect me more if I have a knowledge of another language.
25. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me get to know French speaking people.

26. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will permit me to become an influential member of my community.
27. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I will be able to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups.
28. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me acquire new ideas and broaden my outlook.
29. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I need it in order to finish high school.
30. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me get a better paying job.
31. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me learn about myself.
32. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will allow me to gain influence over French Canadians.
33. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.
34. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will help me if I ever enter politics.
35. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will enable me to think and behave like French Canadians.

36. _____ Studying French can be important for me because I would like to travel to a French-speaking area.
37. _____ Studying French can be important for me because it will allow me to understand and appreciate French Canadian art and literature.

APPENDIX 3ITEMS**REASONS FOR STUDYING L2**

1. Find out about L2 people
2. Enter the university
3. Get a good job
4. Go to England
5. For a future career
6. Live in an L2 country
7. Study another Language in future
8. Understand L2 people and their way of life
9. Go to U.S.
10. Be more knowledgeable
11. Want to meet Americans
12. Get a degree
13. Understand own language
14. Make friends with Americans
15. Appear knowledgeable
16. Be successful in business
17. Need it after leaving school
18. Be more educated
19. Travel
20. Get a job where L2 is used
21. Be respected by others
22. Know L2 people

23. Have an influence on L1 community
24. Acquire new ideas and broaden perspectives
25. Get a better paying job
26. Learn about one self (myself)
27. Meet and speak with more and varied people
28. In business at different occupational levels
29. Understand L2 thinking and behavior
30. Go to an L2 country
31. Appreciate L2 art and literature.

MOTIVATIONAL INTENSITY AND DESIRE TO LEARN SCALES

32. Seeking opportunities for L2 practice outside class
33. Preference for frequent use of L2 in class
34. Thinking about L2 material
35. Joining an L2 club at school if it were possible
36. Seeking possibilities to learn L2 if it were not taught at school
37. Participation in L2 class
38. L2 reading outside class
39. Watching L2 TV channel if it existed
40. Preference of L2 course compared to other courses
41. Listening to L2 songs on the radio
42. Choosing L2 course
43. Asking the teacher's help in L2 class
44. Speaking L2 with L2 families if there were any
45. Doing L2 homework

- 46. Watching live plays in L2
- 47. Degree of effort in studying L2
- 48. Watching L2 TV programs if possible
- 49. Looking over L2 assignments, correcting mistakes
- 50. Finding L2 course interesting
- 51. Volunteering for extra L2 assignments.

'Each reason was preceded by the phrase "Studying English can be important for me because..."

APPENDIX 4RELIABILITY ANALYSIS FOR THE MOTIVATION AS A COMBINATION OF
THE MOTIVATIONAL INTENSITY AND DESIRE TO LEARN SCALES

Variable		Corrected item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
33.	Preference for frequent use of L2 in class	0.35	0.83
37.	Participation in L2 class	0.44	0.83
38.	L2 reading outside class	0.21	0.84
39.	Watching L2 TV channel if it existed	0.41	0.83
40.	Preference of L2 course compared to other ccourses	0.53	0.82
41.	Listening to L2 songs on the radio	0.36	0.83
42.	Choosing L2 course	0.46	0.83
43.	Asking the teacher's help in L2 class	0.60	0.82
44.	Speaking L2 with L2 families if there were any	0.49	0.83
45.	Doing L2 homework	0.49	0.82
46.	Watching live plays in L2	0.36	0.83
47.	Degree of effort in studying L2	0.55	0.82
48.	Watching L2 TV programs if possible	0.41	0.83
49.	Looking over L2 assignments, correcting mistakes	0.44	0.83
50.	Finding L2 course interesting	0.56	0.82
51.	Volunteering for extra assignments	0.45	0.83

Items deleted

32. Seeking opportunities for L2 practice outside class
 34. Thinking about L2 material learned in class
 35. Joining an L2 club at school if it were possible
 36. Seeking possibilities to learn L2 if it were not taught
 at school

N = 184

Number of items = 16

Global α = 0.84

APPENDIX 5RELIABILITY ANALYSIS FOR THE MOTIVATIONAL INTENSITY SCALE

	Variable	Corrected item-total correlation	Squared Multiple correlation	Alpha if item deleted
37.	Participation in L2 class	0.42	0.28	0.73
39.	Watching L2 TV Channel if it existed	0.25	0.16	0.75
41.	Listening to L2 songs on the radio	0.31	0.13	0.75
43.	Asking the teacher's help in L2 class	0.56	0.40	0.70
45.	Doing L2 homework	0.54	0.44	0.70
47.	Degree of effort in studying L2	0.56	0.36	0.70
49.	Looking over L2 assignments, correcting mistakes	0.48	0.31	0.72
51.	Volunteering for extra L2 assignments	0.41	0.21	0.73

Items deleted :

34. Thinking about L2 material learned in class
35. Seeking possibilities to learn L2 if it were not taught
at school

N = 183

Number of items = 8

Global α = 0.75

APPENDIX 6RELIABILITY ANALYSIS FOR THE DESIRE TO LEARN SCALE

	Variable	Corrected item-total correlation	Squared Multiple correlation	Alpha if item deleted
33.	Preference for frequent use of L2 in class	0.34	0.20	0.69
38.	L2 reading outside class	0.17	0.07	0.71
40.	Preference of L2 course compared to other courses	0.48	0.35	0.65
42.	Choosing L2 course	0.49	0.32	0.65
44.	Speaking L2 with L2 families if there were any	0.42	0.21	0.67
46.	Watching live plays in L2	0.34	0.18	0.69
48.	Watching L2 TV programs if possible	0.41	0.23	0.67
50.	Finding L2 course interesting	0.48	0.32	0.65

Items deleted :

32. Seeking opportunities for L2 people outside class.
35. Joining an L2 club at school if it were possible.

N = 183

Number of items = 8

Global α = 0.70

APPENDIX 7CLOZE TEST¹**SECRETS OF SUCCESS**

Recently our local paper published an interview with the town's most successful barber, Mr. Joe Morley. Mr. Morley started out as a barber 1 December 4th, 1929. "I always thought I 2 like to be a barber," he 3 the interviewer. "I grew up on 4 farm and I thought that being 5 in white and working indoors would 6 pretty nice."

Although Mr. Morley has 7 a barber for fifty years, 8 says that he enjoys the work 9 than ever. He wishes that the trend 10 longer hair had taken place years 11. "It used to be that every 12 wanted the same thing, a shave and 13 haircut. Now everyone wants an individual style; 14, that's what makes the job 15 challenging."

Ten years ago, Mr. Morley 16 that things were changing in his 17 and so he went back to 18 two nights a week to learn 19 to be a hair-stylist. "Many men 20 age," he said, "didn't bother to modernize 21 technique. They thought it was a 22 of time. Now they are standing 23 their chairs wondering why no customers 24 in."

"There is more to this profession 25 people realize," Mr. Morley continued. "You 26 be the best hairstylist in the 27 and still not be a success. 28 are many qualities that separate ordinary 29 from successful ones like me. First 30 all, you have to know and understand 31 clientele. There are three things I 32 tell my new employees. You need 33 know when to talk and when 34 to talk and how to talk." Mr. Morley 35 all three. Although he lets his 36 chose the topic, he has made 37 rule which is that neither politics 38 religion can be discussed too vigorously 39 he has found that can 40 dangerous.

¹This condensed format is not the version presented to the Ss.

In the original, the numbered blanks were larger just as in a standard cloze test.

MULTIPLE-CHOICE ANSWERS FOR THE CLOZE TEST

1. a) in
b) on
c) shop
d) the
2. a) am
b) will
c) wish
d) would
3. a) answered
b) said
c) tell
d) told
4. a) a
b) big
c) little
d) some
5. a) clothing
b) dress
c) dressed
d) working
6. a) act
b) be
c) been
d) look
7. a) been
b) had
c) opened
d) was
8. a) and
b) but
c) he
d) it
9. a) more
b) most
c) much
d) same
10. a) about
b) for
c) of
d) toward
11. a) ago
b) early
c) now
d) soon
12. a) body
b) customer
c) men
d) people
13. a) a
b) an
c) his
d) style
14. a) also
b) however
c) moreover
d) so
15. a) as
b) become
c) so
d) too
16. a) realized
b) remarked
c) think
d) wished
17. a) mind
b) profession
c) technique
d) way
18. a) course
b) education
c) school
d) work
19. a) become
b) better
c) how
d) more
20. a) his
b) my
c) of
d) old
21. a) its
b) the
c) their
d) there
22. a) loss
b) matter
c) period
d) waste
23. a) behind
b) besides
c) in
d) on
24. a) coming
b) come
c) enter
d) get
25. a) many
b) some
c) than
d) that
26. a) could
b) must
c) should
d) would
27. a) business
b) day
c) department
d) house
28. a) here
b) there
c) they
d) what
29. a) barbers
b) hairstylist
c) people
d) unsuccessful
30. a) after
b) before
c) of
d) thing
31. a) a
b) his
c) majority
d) your
32. a) always
b) first
c) should
d) try
33. a) have
b) of
c) to
d) not
34. a) must
b) never
c) not
d) you
35. a) does
b) has
c) is
d) knows
36. a) customers
b) employees
c) mind
d) to
37. a) one
b) no
c) only
d) some
38. a) neither
b) nor
c) not
d) or
39. a) also
b) as
c) even
d) example
40. a) been
b) prove
c) to
d) very

APPENDIX 8

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

I T E M S	F A C T O R S						
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1. Find out about L2 people	*0.28	-0.05	-0.07	0.06	0.19	0.07	0.50
2. Enter the university	0.10	0.36	-0.15	0.12	0.01	0.12	0.20
3. Get a good job	0.05	0.57	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.34	-0.02
4. Go to England	0.56	0.18	-0.09	0.20	-0.05	0.14	0.24
5. For a future career	0.18	0.41	0.17	-0.03	0.18	0.08	0.00
6. Live in an L2 country	0.74	0.17	0.18	0.12	-0.01	0.09	0.02
7. Study another language in future	0.28	0.25	0.01	0.02	0.21	0.11	0.25
8. Understand L2 people and way of life	0.08	0.06	0.30	0.17	0.06	0.12	0.52
9. Go to U.S.	0.63	0.07	0.15	0.33	-0.13	0.08	0.16
10. Be more knowledgeable	0.16	0.32	0.20	0.17	0.46	0.12	-0.00
11. Want to meet Americans	0.32	0.06	0.09	0.83	0.01	0.13	0.10
12. Get a degree	0.23	0.22	0.03	0.05	0.09	0.19	0.09
13. Understand L1 better	-0.10	0.04	0.07	-0.01	0.43	0.14	0.03
14. Make friends with Americans	0.21	0.09	0.14	0.65	-0.07	0.15	0.20
15. Appear knowledgeable	0.16	0.05	0.01	0.14	0.16	0.59	-0.01
16. Be successful in business	0.09	0.71	0.52	0.12	0.20	-0.02	-0.01
17. Need L2 after leaving school	0.05	0.48	0.53	0.17	0.15	-0.06	-0.05
18. Be more educated	-0.00	0.10	0.07	0.20	0.12	0.35	0.15
19. Travel	0.19	0.07	0.57	0.12	0.10	0.20	0.13
20. Get a job where L2 is used	0.42	0.19	0.17	-0.04	-0.06	0.31	0.05
21. Be respected by others	0.22	0.07	0.13	0.15	0.36	0.49	-0.02
22. Know L2 people	0.17	0.15	0.29	0.31	0.29	0.16	0.16
23. Have an influence on L1 community	0.19	0.36	-0.05	0.05	0.46	0.37	0.05
24. Acquire new ideas and broaden perspectives	0.01	0.19	0.10	-0.08	0.54	-0.02	0.10
25. Get a better paying job	0.19	0.23	0.25	-0.01	-0.10	0.48	0.03
26. Learn about myself	-0.00	-0.06	0.03	-0.02	0.49	0.02	0.25
27. Meet and speak with more and varied people	0.11	0.02	0.61	0.06	0.20	0.03	0.17
28. Need L2 at different occupational levels	0.10	0.24	0.37	0.07	-0.09	0.26	0.30
29. Understand L2 thinking and behaviour	0.05	0.13	0.28	0.30	0.04	0.12	0.46
30. Go to an L2 country	0.60	-0.01	0.25	0.20	0.05	0.12	0.24
31. Appreciate L2 art and literature	0.15	-0.00	0.12	0.05	0.18	-0.13	0.51

* The factor loadings less than 0.30 have been deleted.

APPENDIX 9DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES STUDENTS IN THE SAMPLE

Variable	Field	N	Mean	SD
Proficiency	S	139	24	8.37
Proficiency	H	60	22.92	4.74
Motivation	S	139	86.89	5.21
Motivation	H	60	88.10	4.88
Travel factor	S	138	4.18	1.05
Travel factor	H	60	4.11	1.08
Career Development factor	S	139	5.44	0.54
Career Development factor	H	60	5.33	0.76
Instrumental factor	S	139	5.15	0.75
Instrumental factor	H	60	5.05	0.68
Friendship factor	S	136	3.76	1.04
Friendship factor	H	60	3.47	1.11
Self-actualization factor	S	138	3.82	0.91
Self-actualization factor	H	60	3.83	0.88
Prestige-Instrumental factor	S	138	3.56	0.94
Prestige-Instrumental factor	H	60	3.48	1.15
Cultural Understanding factor	S	139	3.76	0.94
Cultural Understanding factor	H	60	3.75	0.99