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ABSTRACT

The relationships between adult English-as-a-second-language (ESL) learners' long term goals for language study (orientation), their feelings of competence and self-determination in the classroom (perceptions of personal causation), and their levels of motivation (motivational intensity) for learning ESL were investigated using a correlational research design. A newly developed questionnaire was completed by 132 adult ESL students, seven of whom also participated in open ended interviews. Six ESL teachers were interviewed in a similar manner. Correlational analysis of the questionnaire data revealed that both orientation and perceptions of personal causation were significantly related to motivational intensity ($p<.01$). Analysis of the interview data reinforced these findings. Implications of the results include the necessity for further investigations of classroom factors that relate to the motivation to learn a second language (L2).
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Chapter 1

Research Question

Introduction

Why do people choose to behave in a certain way? While researchers may vary in their explanations, most agree on the term "motivation" as a general construct to describe the reasons for such behavior.

The link between behavior and learning is strong. As a result, there is universal agreement among educational psychologists that motivation affects learning. According to Stipek (1993), motivation is relevant to learning because learning is an active process requiring conscious and deliberate activity. In other words, no one can learn without attention and effort, two motivation-linked behaviors. Levin and Long (1981) suggested that, in comparison with students with lower levels of motivation, highly motivated students spend more time actively involved in learning, have greater concentration and care, are more cooperative, and have more positive interaction with instructors. In their review of 40 studies of motivation and achievement outcomes, which involved a combined sample size of over 637,000 elementary and secondary school students, Uguroglu and Walberg (1979) concluded that a low level of motivation may be extremely detrimental to

1
learning.

Motivation is seen as a vital part of learning, and has been examined in a number of educational contexts. The context for the present study is the second language (L2) classroom.

**Purpose of the study**

The purpose of the present study is to investigate learners' levels of motivation, their long-term goals for language study, and their perceptions of competence and self-determination in the adult English-as-a-second-language (ESL) class.

**Justification for the Study**

According to Keller (1983), motivation "refers to the choices people make as to what experiences or goals they will approach or avoid, and the degree of effort they will exert in that respect" (p. 389). Educational psychologists generally agree that motivation is related to achievement, but its actual sources are various. Skehan (1989) suggested, for example, (a) the learning activity itself (intrinsic theory), (b) out-of-class factors (learner orientation), (c) previous learning success (resultative theory), and (d) external influences and incentives (extrinsic theory).

L2 acquisition researchers also agree that motivation is related to learner achievement. However, unlike the
multi-dimensional approach to examining learner motivation taken in the broader field of educational psychology, research on motivation and L2 acquisition has traditionally had a more narrow focus. For several decades such research has been grounded on the assumption that L2 acquisition is primarily a social psychological rather than an educational phenomenon. According to this assumption, the main factors driving learners' motivation for L2 learning are their original reasons for wanting to learn the language and their attitudes toward the L2 group.

From the perspective of both educational psychologists and L2 teachers, the social psychological explanation of L2 motivation may be inadequate. "Discussion of the topic of motivation in second-language (SL) learning contexts has been limited by the understanding the field of applied linguistics has attached to it. In that view, primary emphasis is placed on attitude and other social psychological aspects of SL learning" (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991, p. 469).

In an effort to explain some of the controversy surrounding the research on L2 learners' reasons for language study, Gardner (1985) stated that "motivation is a major determinant of second language acquisition. The source of the motivation impetus is relatively unimportant provided that motivation is aroused" (p. 169). For
practical purposes, however, the source of the motivation impetus is very important: "Without knowing where the roots of motivation lie, how can teachers water those roots?" (Oxford & Shearin, 1994, p. 15). If a learner is motivated primarily by factors outside the learning environment, a teacher's influence on the learner's level of motivation is limited. In contrast, if factors within the learning environment are a significant source of learner motivation, a teacher may be able to effectively manipulate levels of learner motivation.

The social psychological aspects of L2 acquisition theory have had little direct impact on either foreign language education policy or on teaching methodologies (Crookall & Oxford, 1988). Research which focuses on the reasons why someone learns a L2 may be perceived as distant from daily classroom concerns. For these reasons, researchers have recently begun to question the practicality of the social psychological approach to L2 motivation research (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dornyei, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994).

In his 1994 survey of research on language learning and teaching, Johnstone (1995) suggested that motivation has again become an important issue. With renewed interest, researchers are pursuing a consolidated theory of L2 motivation. Their objective is a theory that will explain
not only the factors that bring learners to the L2 classroom, but also what teachers can do to motivate learners in the L2 classroom. With this call for a more "education friendly" (Dornyei, 1994, p. 283) theory of L2 motivation, the L2 motivation research agenda has been reopened.
Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

The Social Psychological Perspective

Researchers consider motivation as much as aptitude to be one of the main determining factors in successful L2 acquisition. "Motivation determines the extent of active, personal involvement in L2 learning" (Oxford & Shearin, 1994, p. 12). Such behavior is crucial to the successful acquisition of a L2, and researchers recognizing this have been examining L2 motivation for decades.

Much of the research on L2 motivation has been built on the Gardner and Lambert (1959) model. They hypothesized that an individual learning a L2 must adopt certain behavior patterns characteristic of another cultural group, so attitudes toward that group partly determine success in learning the L2. Seventy-five Montreal high school students learning French completed a questionnaire containing items which determined (a) their reasons for wanting to learn French, (b) their attitudes toward French Canadians and (c) their effort and enthusiasm for studying French (conceptualized as "motivational intensity"). Students were classified into one of two categories depending on the reasons they gave for wanting to learn French: Those who had utilitarian reasons were classified as "instrumentally
oriented"; those whose reasons reflected a desire to become closer to the French speaking community were classified as "integratively oriented". The completed questionnaires were compared with the students' French achievement scores. The results showed that students who were integratively oriented were generally more successful in acquiring French, had more favourable attitudes toward French people, and were more strongly motivated to learn French.

This social psychological approach was common in subsequent studies of L2 motivation. In an examination of the reasons for the uneven spread of bilinguals in Canada, Lambert (1967) supported the contention that social attitudes (in the form of stereotypes) strongly influenced the acquisition of a L2. Spolsky's (1969) study of foreign students learning English in American colleges reaffirmed the importance of attitudinal variables in L2 acquisition, and suggested that a person learns a L2 more effectively when they want to be a member of the L2 group. Randhawa and Korpan (1972) followed with a study involving grade seven and eight students learning French in a mid-western Canadian city. They found that attitude and motivation accounted for 33% of the variance in French achievement among the students. Most recently, Clement, Dornyei, and Noels (1994) studied English as a foreign language (EFL) students in Hungary and showed that socially grounded factors were
related to the students' attitudes, effort, classroom behavior, and achievement. These and other similar studies (e.g. Clement, 1978) led researchers to generally agree that social psychological variables play a critical role in a person's attempts to learn a L2 (Jakobovits, 1979; McDonough, 1981).

In contrast, a number of researchers disagreed with Gardner and Lambert over the predictive power of attitude and motivation in the L2 acquisition process (e.g. Backman, 1976; Pierson, Fu & Lee, 1980; Savignon, 1972; Svanes, 1987; Ytsma, 1993; Zammitt, 1993). Hermann (1980) and Strong (1984) both found that students' positive attitudes increased with time spent studying a L2. Their results indicated that success in L2 acquisition causes more positive attitudes and increased motivation in learners. The direction of causality implied is opposite to that suggested in most research studies.

Much of the debate has surrounded the instrumental-integrative categorization of learners' reasons for L2 study. Support for the contention that integratively oriented learners tend to be more successful has come from various researchers, including Gardner and Smythe (1975) who examined English speaking French as a second language (FSL) students and found integrative orientation to be correlated with French success. In addition, Gliksman, Gardner, and
Smythe (1982) showed that integratively oriented students tended to volunteer more answers in class, were more correct in their responses, and were more satisfied with and rewarded for their participation. There was no difference in the number of times the teacher elicited answers, leading to the conclusion that the behavioral differences were due to motivational differences brought to the classroom.

In contrast, a number of studies have produced results which contradict the view that integrative orientation is of prime importance to L2 acquisition. In a study of Marathi-speaking high school students in India, Lukmani (1972) reported that an instrumental orientation was more significantly related to achievement in EFL than an integrative orientation. Gardner and Lambert (1972) tested students learning French in three different American locations: Louisiana, Maine, and Connecticut. Integrative orientation was found to be a significant predictor of achievement in only Connecticut. Finally, in a study of Spanish speaking kindergarten students learning English in the United States, it was found that the faster learners progressed without an overt desire to identify with Anglophone children (Strong, 1984).

The results of research on integrative versus instrumental orientation have been inconclusive. Dornyei (1990) provided one explanation after his examination of
students learning EFL in Hungary. The results of the study showed that an instrumental orientation most significantly contributed to learner motivation. Dornyei concluded however that while an instrumental orientation appeared to be most effective in reaching intermediate levels of L2 competence, an integrative orientation seemed to be necessary to reach advanced levels. As a result, the suggestion was made that the context of L2 learning is a crucial variable.

Another contentious issue has been the range of learner orientations addressed by researchers. Graham (1984) found the instrumental-integrative categorization of learner orientation to be inadequate, and introduced the concept of "assimilative orientation". A learner was categorized as assimilatively oriented if the goal of complete identification with the L2 community was expressed as a reason for L2 study. In their investigation of learner orientations, Kruidenier and Clement (1986) found four general orientation clusters: instrumental reasons, travel reasons, friendship reasons, and knowledge reasons. Conspicuous by its absence was a cluster which could be defined as an integrative orientation.

Finally, the lack of focus on the actual level of learner motivation has been a source of debate among L2 researchers. Scarcella and Oxford (1992) stated that "the
arguments that have dominated the research literature might be less important than the absolute degree of motivation possessed by the individual" (p. 53). This was supported by Williams (1993), and by Ely (1986), who found that the actual strength of learners' motivation was a positive predictor of L2 proficiency. Similarly, Gardner, Lalonde and Pierson (as cited in Ely, 1986), Lalonde (as cited in Ely, 1986), and Ely (as cited in Ely, 1986), all suggested that the degree of motivation is a mediating variable between integrative orientation and proficiency. Further support came from a recent study of graduate EFL students in Thailand (Wongsothorn, 1989). The results of this study showed that the learner's overall degree of motivation, in comparison with other independent variables, had the strongest relationship with L2 success.

Despite the variety of issues, one main commonality exists in these studies: Each approached the investigation of L2 motivation from a social psychological perspective. Recently, this limited viewpoint has been the source of criticism as researchers try to turn to a more practical focus for future research.

**Classroom Factors**

In a review of existing L2 motivation research, Crookes and Schmidt (1991) discussed motivation from the teacher's perspective:
When teachers say that a student is motivated, they are not usually concerning themselves with the student's reasons for studying, but are observing that the student does study, or at least engage in teacher-desired behavior in the classroom and possibly outside it. (p. 480)

From this perspective the authors were able to suggest a number of directions in which the L2 motivation construct could be expanded, and outlined a research agenda for L2 motivation which included descriptive, measurement and analysis, and theoretical issues. The goal was a broader L2 motivation theory that would be of more utility to the L2 teacher.

This expansion was supported by Oxford and Shearin (1994), who suggested that L2 motivation research has primarily been concerned with the individual in the context of a group, and attempted to outline some aspects of motivation that do not deal with these kinds of relationships. They proposed an investigation of the motivational aspects of L2 classroom factors such as the nature of tasks, the learner's attributions of success and failure, and classroom reward systems.

The opinion that L2 motivation research had been limited in scope was shared by Dornyei (1994), who proposed a more practical approach. He outlined an expanded three
level model of L2 motivation, consisting of a language level, a learner level, and a learning situation level. The language level is the most general, and includes learner orientation. The learner level focuses on learner affects and cognitions, including the motivational components of need for achievement and self-confidence. The learning situation level is concerned with classroom factors such as materials, teaching methods, teacher authority type, and classroom goal structure. Dornyei concluded by offering thirty practical suggestions for teachers to use as motivational strategies in the L2 classroom, such as developing learners' instrumental motivation through classroom discussion, encouraging learners to set attainable goals, and promoting learner autonomy.

It is evident that the renewed attention on expanding L2 motivation theory has resulted in particular interest in classroom factors. The effects of these on learner motivation was approached in a limited number of early L2 research studies through an examination of learners' attitudes. Although most such studies focused on social attitudes (e.g. Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Oller, Hudson & Liu, 1977; Spolsky, 1969), some investigated classroom related attitudes. In a longitudinal study of L2 learners, Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, and Todesco (1978) concluded that learners' attitudes toward the language learning situation
were more important for motivational purposes than their social attitudes or their orientation. Gardner stated that although his focus had been social psychological factors, the lack of attention paid to classroom variables "was not meant to denigrate their importance. They are clearly important factors which have a definite impact on student achievement" (p. 5).

With a primary focus on classroom factors, Julkunen's (1992) investigation of Finnish sixth and seventh grade EFL students provided empirical evidence that these factors play a significant role in L2 motivation. In this study learner motivation was investigated as it related specifically to the learning situation, as well as to the learners' general motivation to learn English. It was suggested that the overall level of motivation is the result of an interaction between trait (general orientation) and state (situation-specific) motivation. State motivation was said to be determined by the learner's appraisals of the learning task, including its attractiveness, difficulty level, and personal significance, and also the learner's perception of personal competence and eagerness to participate. The research design involved a breakdown of motivation into nine different types, including both trait (e.g. orientation) and state (e.g. classroom level intrinsic motivation). The results showed that situational factors like teacher,
teaching method and intrinsic motivation accounted for most of the variance in overall levels of motivation. Based on these results, it was concluded that classroom factors play a decisive role in foreign language learning.

Julkunen's (1992) study and the articles by Crookes and Schmidt (1991), Oxford and Shearin (1994), and Dornyei (1994) point to the classroom as a source of L2 learner motivation. Integral to the classroom, of course, is the teacher and the teacher's behavior. According to McCombs and Pope (1994), almost everything a teacher does in a class has a motivational influence on learners, including the way information is presented, the kinds of exercises used, the way learners are interacted with, and the opportunities learners are given to work in groups or alone. Brophy (1987) stated that "teachers are not merely reactors to whatever motivational patterns their students had developed before entering their classrooms but rather are active socializing agents capable of stimulating the general development of student motivation to learn and its activation in particular situations" (p. 41).

As L2 motivation researchers begin looking toward the classroom, a variety of models are apparent which can be used as a framework for research. One which is appealing is intrinsic motivation theory.
Intrinsic Motivation

In the broader field of psychology, research on motivation led to the development of a number of different theories or approaches. Behavioristic theories stressed the role of rewards and punishments in motivating behavior. Psychoanalytic theorists asserted that people's behavior is determined by a complex interaction between their subconscious drives and the environment. Humanistic theories focused on the wholeness of a person. Affective theorists asserted that people develop patterns of behavior as a result of feelings associated with the behavior. Finally, cognitive theories centred on the thought processes individuals use in making decisions.

In an examination of L2 motivation research, Brown (1991) suggested that the most powerful conceptualization of motivation is the intrinsic-extrinsic view. Extrinsically motivated behaviors are carried out in anticipation of a reward from beyond the self. Typical extrinsic rewards are money, prizes, grades and praise. Intrinsically motivated behaviors on the other hand "are ones for which there is no apparent reward except the activity itself. People seem to engage in the activities for their own sake and not because they lead to an extrinsic reward" (Deci, 1975, p. 23).
Intrinsic motivation theory therefore concerns the enjoyment people feel during activities and the source of the interest or appeal of such activities. At the heart of intrinsic motivation theory, however, is the assumption that people need to feel competent and self-determining, or in other words to experience a sense of personal causation.

**Perceptions of Personal Causation**

One of the factors hypothesized by researchers to be crucial to intrinsic motivation is a person's perceptions of competence. Competence is defined as "an organism's capacity to interact with its environment" (White, 1959, p. 297).

In an examination of drive theories of motivation, White (1959) suggested that existing theories did not adequately account for the fact that humans develop a competence in dealing with the environment that is not present at birth. The term "competence" was used to describe the goal of various kinds of behavior which have to do with effective interaction with the environment (e.g. a baby sucking, grasping, crawling, and walking). White proposed that such behavior continues not because it serves primary drives, but because it satisfies an intrinsic need to deal with the environment. He suggested that competence arouses feelings of efficacy in an individual, and labelled this concept "effectance motivation".
The relationship between perceived competence and motivation was subsequently examined and found to be significant in various studies (e.g. Blanck, Reis & Jackson, 1984; Deci, 1971; Fisher, 1978; Vallerand, Gagne, Senecal & Pelletier, 1994). In an investigation of children's perceptions of competence, Harter (1974) examined the gratification which fifth and sixth graders derived from solving anagram problems of varying levels of difficulty. The children showed greater pleasure (through smiling and self-rated enjoyment) with items that were correctly solved, a result which supported the proposed relationship between competence and motivation.

An additional finding of the Harter (1974) study was that among those items which were correctly solved, a positive relationship appeared between pleasure and difficulty level: The children showed increasing amounts of pleasure when they solved increasingly difficult problems. This finding led to the development of the concept of optimal challenge, which refers to the level of difficulty of an activity. If an activity is too easy, it may lead to boredom; if it is too difficult, it may lead to frustration. Somewhere in between is a level of difficulty at which the activity will be found both interesting and challenging. People tend to choose activities that represent optimal challenges and which therefore permit them to experience a
sense of competence. In fact, Deci (1975) found that not only do people select challenging activities when given a choice, their need for competence leads them to actively seek and conquer challenges that are optimal for their capacities.

In a follow-up to her 1974 study, Harter (1978) examined the concept of optimal challenge by studying the responses of a group of sixth graders to puzzles at four different difficulty levels. The results showed that when the subjects were given no choice over the puzzles they attempted, the relationship between pleasure and difficulty level for correctly solved items was curvilinear. There appeared to be a point at which the high difficulty level led to excess time or effort required, annoyance, embarrassment, or frustration, which then affected the subject's pleasure. Danner and Lonky (1981), testing a similar hypothesis, examined three groups of four to ten year olds who were given a choice among learning centres which differed in the level of required understanding. All three groups spent the most time at the learning centre just beyond their pre-determined ability level, and rated that centre as most interesting and moderately difficult.

In these and other similar studies, competence and optimal challenge appeared to be important motivational considerations. There was, however, a second factor
hypothesized to be related to a person's level of intrinsic motivation: perceptions of autonomy, or self-determination.

Perceived self-determination refers to the control an individual feels with respect to his or her own behavior. According to De Charms (1968), "man's primary motivational propensity is to be effective in producing changes in his environment. Man strives to be a causal agent, to be the primary locus of causation for, or the origin of, his behavior; he strives for personal causation" (p. 269).

The relationship between perceived self-determination and intrinsic motivation was shown in a number of studies. Swann and Pittman (1977) investigated the effects of choice on motivation in two experiments conducted with elementary school children. Half of the children were given a choice over which drawing game to participate in, while the other half were not. An examination of the children's subsequent task persistence revealed that the children who had been given no choice showed a greater decline in task persistence than those who had been given a choice. In a similar study, Zuckerman, Porac, Lathin, Smith, and Deci (1978) studied a group of university undergraduates asked to solve geometric puzzles. Half of the participants were given a choice in which puzzles to attempt, while the other half were not. Intrinsic motivation, measured through the choice of activity during a subsequent free time period, was
significantly higher for those participants who had been given a choice of puzzles.

The motivational implications of self-determination were recognized by a number of researchers who built theories around this concept. Rotter (1966) developed a motivation theory around the concept of "locus of control", which relates to an individual's belief that a behavior will or will not influence the attainment of a reinforcement. The locus of control concept was described in the following way:

When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as ... not being entirely contingent upon his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, as under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When the event is interpreted in this way by an individual, we have labelled this a belief in external control. If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control. (Rotter, 1966, p. 1)

Based on his investigations, Rotter concluded that individuals with the perception of a high internal locus of control were more likely to accept responsibility for their
activities and were more highly motivated to carry them out than individuals with the perception of a low internal locus of control.

In De Charms' (1968) theory of personal causation, the terms "Origins" and "Pawns" were used to differentiate between individuals with perceptions of high internal locus of control and individuals with perceptions of low internal locus of control. The theory was built on the assumption that the most basic human experience is that of effecting change in the environment. At the root of the theory was the postulate that individuals are the origins of their own behavior. In comparing Origins and Pawns, De Charms (1976) stated that the "Origin is positively motivated, optimistic, confident, accepting of challenge. The Pawn is negatively motivated, defensive, irresolute, avoidant of challenge" (p. 5).

Another theory which deals with the motivational implications of perceptions of control is attribution theory. Attribution theory addresses the beliefs individuals have about the causes of their successes and failures in achievement situations (Weiner, 1979). A basic assumption is that human beings naturally want and need to find out why things happen, particularly after negative, unexpected or atypical outcomes. There are four common perceived causes for success or failure: ability, effort,
task difficulty, and luck; these causes differ along dimensions of locus, stability and controllability. Attributions have important implications, as it has been shown that attributing success to ability and failure to lack of effort is associated with positive motivation, while attributing failure to lack of ability and success to external causes is associated with negative achievement motivation (e.g. Eccles & Wigfield, 1985; Weiner, 1979).

Feedback in the Classroom

Feedback in the classroom comes in a variety of forms: verbal praise or affective displays from the teacher, concrete rewards such as stickers or candy, report cards, test scores, selection of work to be publicly displayed, and victory or loss in competitive activities. These are all used or occur frequently in classrooms everywhere. For this reason, researchers have investigated the various effects of classroom feedback on students. One area that has received a great deal of attention is the effect of classroom feedback on students' levels of intrinsic motivation.

Feedback in the classroom can affect students' perceived competence and perceived self-determination. In order to test for relationships, researchers examined the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. In one of the early studies, Deci (1971) examined a group of college students working on puzzles. Upon completion of the
activity, one group of students received positive verbal feedback regarding their performance, while the other group received money. On a subsequent measure of the subjects' intrinsic motivation, results showed that the subjects who had received positive verbal feedback had increasing levels of intrinsic motivation for the activity, while those who had received money had decreasing levels of intrinsic motivation.

The results of the Deci (1971) study indicated that some types of feedback lead to increased levels of intrinsic motivation, while other types lead to decreased levels of intrinsic motivation. To explain this, Deci (1975) proposed that feedback has two functional aspects. The first of these aspects is control. Feedback in the classroom, particularly in the form of rewards, is often used to control behavior. Students are frequently given candy, a sticker or some form of praise for behaving as the teacher wishes them to behave. The second functional aspect of feedback is information. When a student receives feedback regarding his or her performance on a test, this feedback serves to provide information to the student regarding his or her competence and self-determination.

Classroom feedback can serve either or both controlling and informational functions. The individual who receives
the feedback may respond in different ways depending on the saliency of the two aspects. According to Deci (1975):

When the controlling aspect of the reward is very salient, such as in the case of money or the avoidance of punishment, the change in perceived locus of causality will occur. The person is 'controlled' by the reward and he perceives that the locus of causality is external. On the other hand, if the control aspect is not salient, then the informational aspect of the reward will initiate the change in feelings of competence and self-determination process. (p. 142)

Those subjects in Deci's 1971 study who had received positive verbal feedback showed increased levels of intrinsic motivation because the most salient aspect of the feedback was its informational function: The feedback indicated to the subjects that they were competent at the activity, and their levels of intrinsic motivation increased. The subjects who had received money, on the other hand, showed decreased levels of intrinsic motivation because the most salient aspect of the feedback they received was its controlling function: The feedback indicated to the subject that their behavior was externally controlled, and their intrinsic motivation levels decreased.

Informational feedback in the classroom is generally viewed as either positive or negative. Positive feedback
carries the message of competence to the student, and when in the form of praise has been shown to relate to increases in intrinsic motivation (e.g. Blanck, Reis & Jackson, 1984; Vallerand & Reid, 1984). Negative feedback, on the other hand, carries the message of incompetence.

Evidence of incompetence, from failure or from verbal feedback, tends to lead subjects to lose interest in activities and undermines intrinsic motivation. In one experiment, Deci, Cascio and Krusell (cited in Deci, 1975) tested the hypothesis that negative feedback should decrease a person's intrinsic motivation by diminishing feelings of competence and self-determination. The experimental groups were divided into those who would receive negative feedback after they completed a puzzle and those who were given more difficult puzzles so they would get negative feedback in the form of failure. The results showed that both forms of negative feedback resulted in significant decreases in intrinsic motivation. In a subsequent study, Vallerand and Reid (1984) examined subjects who were working on an interesting motor activity. After being given either positive, negative or no feedback about their performance, subjects' levels of intrinsic motivation were measured. Those who had received negative feedback showed decreased levels of intrinsic motivation, while those who had been given positive feedback became more intrinsically motivated.
Information about one's competence is generally seen as a positive influence on intrinsic motivation. As a result, positive evaluations (such as tests) would be expected to lead to increased levels of motivation. However, evaluations, although they provide information about competence, may be viewed as controlling. Ryan (1982) and Pittman et al. (1980) found that when feedback was administered in a controlling context, it resulted in a significantly lower level of intrinsic motivation than when it was administered in a non-controlling context. Surveillance with cameras (Plant & Ryan, 1985), in person (Pittman, Davey, Alafat, Wetherill & Kramer, 1980), imposed deadlines (Amabile, De Jong & Lepper, 1976), and goal impositions (Mossholder, 1980) may all be perceived as pressure to perform in a certain way, thereby limiting self-determination and undermining intrinsic motivation. Based on an examination of existing research, Deci and Ryan (1992) concluded that positive feedback may foster intrinsic motivation only when it is perceived as non-controlling.

Similar to evaluation, competition in the classroom can be seen as a source of information regarding competence and has therefore been hypothesized to enhance intrinsic motivation. Competition, however, has controlling characteristics as well. Deci, Betley, Kahle, Abrams, and Porac (1981) asked their subjects to work on a series of
puzzles in the presence of another person who was also working on the puzzles. Half of the subjects were told to try to beat the other person; the other half were told to do as well as they could. All of the subjects experienced positive feedback in the form of finishing first, but the competition directed subjects showed less subsequent intrinsic motivation toward the activity than the non-competitive subjects.

In addition to the implications of evaluation and competition, researchers have examined the relationship between general classroom climate and intrinsic motivation. Deci, Nezlek, and Sheinman (1981) examined the effects of teacher orientation (supportive of autonomy versus controlling) on students' motivation levels. They found that students whose teachers were more autonomy supportive displayed higher levels of perceived competence, self-esteem, and intrinsic motivation than students with more controlling teachers. Ryan and Grolnick (1986) reported that students who perceived their classroom climate to be supportive of autonomy were more intrinsically motivated and had higher self-esteem than students in controlling classrooms. With a similar focus, De Charms (1976) found that teacher training may in this sense make a difference, as students whose teachers were trained to be more
supportive of autonomy showed higher levels of intrinsic motivation.

Finally, as an example of the variety of sources of the feedback students receive, it has been suggested that students can gain information about the causes of their achievement outcomes from the affective displays of teachers (Graham, 1990). The information they gain from these displays can be instrumental in the attributions the student makes regarding their success or failure. Graham outlined three teacher behaviors that can result in low ability cues, and may therefore be detrimental to student motivation:

1. Pity and anger. When a teacher believes that a student's failure is due to lack of ability, they generally show pity; if they feel it is due to lack of effort, the teacher tends to show anger.

2. Praise and blame. Students tend to be praised for high effort and blamed for low effort in learning task failures.

3. Help and neglect. Teachers are more likely to help others when the cause of their need is due to uncontrollable factors.

In each of these cases, a student may perceive the teacher's behavior as an indication of their own lack of ability or effort, and the subsequent attribution they make can affect their intrinsic motivation.
In addition to being aware of this type of classroom feedback, teachers can increase students' feelings of competence and self-determination by ensuring success experiences in the classroom. According to White (1959), increasing students' feelings of competence through mastery engenders a positive emotional experience, and leads to feelings of efficacy. Bloom (1981) suggested that ensuring successful learning is a powerful motivational strategy:

The student desires some feeling of control over his environment, and mastery of a subject gives him some feeling of control over his environment. Interest in a subject is both a cause of mastery of the subject as well as a result of mastery. Motivation for further learning is one of the more important consequences of mastery. (p. 173)

Ensuring success can be accomplished using a variety of instructional strategies, including personal goal setting, progressive levels of material and task difficulty, and flexibility in assessment methods.

Regardless of the strategies employed, it is apparent that helping students to feel competent and in control in the classroom has motivational benefits. In addition, despite the lack of research, there is no reason to believe that these benefits would be any different in a L2 classroom.
Personal Causation in L2 Motivation Research

The concept of competence is familiar in L2 acquisition literature. Competence is defined as an "underlying knowledge of the system of a language - its rules of grammar, its vocabulary, all the pieces of a language and how those pieces fit together" (Brown, 1994, p. 31). Language competence is contrasted in the literature with language performance, which is the actual production (speaking and writing) or the comprehension (listening and reading) of linguistic events. Noam Chomsky (1965) pointed out that a theory of language had to be a theory of competence; to focus on performance variables would be to focus on variables that do not necessarily reflect the underlying linguistic ability of the subject.

As a motivational construct, competence in the linguistic context has not been the subject of research. A L2 acquisition theory in which some parallels can be seen with the cognitive psychology view of competence is Krashen's (1982) input hypothesis. Krashen stated that in a progression through the various stages of L2 acquisition, we "acquire ... only when we understand language that contains structure that is a little beyond where we are now" (p. 21). Krashen referred to this as "comprehensible input", and used the formula "i+1" to describe input that is at an optimum
level of difficulty for the learner: not too difficult to be overwhelming (i+2) and not too easy to provide no challenge (i+0). Affective factors are addressed in Krashen's theory as influences on an "affective filter". Krashen hypothesized that the affective filter controls the rate and ultimate level of success of L2 acquisition. When a learner feels comfortable the affective filter is low, and acquisition occurs more readily than when the learner feels anxious and the affective filter is high.

Krashen did not however address learners' competence from a motivation perspective. Interestingly, the "i+1" hypothesis bears striking similarity to the optimal challenge construct in intrinsic motivation theory (Brown, 1990). Psychologists might suggest that the reason language at this level of difficulty leads to success is because it provides enough of a challenge to make success difficult but attainable. This situation leads to a high level of intrinsic motivation for the learner, increased effort, and ultimately L2 acquisition.

Learner self-determination has been a goal in various approaches to L2 instruction. The traditional grammar translation method, Berlitz's direct method and the more recent audiolingual method were relatively inflexible approaches to L2 instruction. The communicative approach to
L2 instruction, which is popular in many contemporary L2 programmes, is generally much more flexible, focusing on lessons and materials that are relevant to the students' lives rather than non-contextualized grammar rules and vocabulary. Students are encouraged to communicate freely in the classroom, with the teacher expectation that by facilitating meaningful use of the language L2 acquisition will occur.

One approach used in the L2 classroom is the Language Experience Approach (LEA). Instead of using generic materials to help students learn to read, materials are student-composed, transcribed by teachers and used in lessons. LEA has been used with children since the 1960s; because of the adult need for meaningful, relevant instruction (Wlodkowski, 1985), this approach is used with adult L2 learners as well.

Common in Europe, Language Awareness (LA) is also an approach in which learner autonomy is fostered. Learners are encouraged to take control in the classroom through active planning and conscious development of learning strategies. The LA approach is based on research which has shown that effective language learning is a consciously self-directed process (e.g. Naiman et al, 1978).

According to Diffey (1995), LA has recently begun to impact on L2 teaching in Canada. The National Core French
Study (Leblanc et al, cited in Diffey, 1995), which provides a framework for French as a second language courses in Canada, is comprised of four components: language syllabus, communicative/experiential syllabus, cultural syllabus, and general language education. The general language education component covers various types of linguistic and socio-cultural learner awareness. Autonomy is listed as one of four proficiency outcomes of the general language education component. General language education is based on the notion that explicit language learning is of value: "L'apprenant qui prend conscience des objets de son apprentissage et des moyens qu'il utilise sera un apprenant à la fois plus efficace et mieux forme" (quoted in Diffey, 1995, p. 7).

As with competence, the integration of self-determination enhancing techniques in L2 instructional practices has not been examined from a motivational perspective. Motivation researchers might suggest that the success of the communicative approach, LEA, and LA is due to the feelings of self-determination they arouse in learners, which lead to higher levels of intrinsic motivation, increased effort, and finally successful L2 acquisition.

Predictions

The present study examines orientation (long-term goals for language study) and perceptions of personal causation
(perceived competence and perceived self-determination in the class) as they relate to learners' motivational intensity (level of motivation for learning English) in the adult ESL classroom. The following predictions are being made:

1. There will be a relationship between learners' motivational intensity and orientation in the adult ESL classroom.

2. There will be a relationship between learners' motivational intensity and perceptions of personal causation in the adult ESL classroom.

3. No learner orientations will be revealed which have not already been addressed in existing L2 motivation research.

4. Teachers of adult ESL students will show a general understanding of learner motivation in the classroom.
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Methods

Sample

Subjects for the present study were drawn from adult ESL classes in Windsor and Essex County. A number of programmes which provide such classes exist in this area. The following participated in the study: the Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County, The South Essex Community Council, St. Clair College of Applied Arts and Technology, and the Windsor and Essex County Family YMCA.

The four participating ESL programmes varied in a number of ways, including size, funding source, and focus of instruction. Tables A1 to A5 in the Appendixes outline the main similarities and differences between the programmes.

Each of the four ESL programmes was approached during the summer of 1995 and asked to participate in the study. It was decided that only intermediate and advanced level students would be targeted for the study because some lower level students would not have the skills necessary to complete the questionnaire. The students and teachers who agreed to participate formed the sample for the study.

The total number of questionnaires completed was 132. Tables 1 to 5 present demographic information collected with the questionnaires.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 20 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or over</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>married</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not married</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian citizen</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-citizen</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Source</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>job</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social assistance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gov't sponsorship</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployment ins.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Size of Participants' Ethnic Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 200</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 to 400</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 to 800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 to 1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 to 1200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401 to 1600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801 to 2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 to 2200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2201 to 2400</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201 to 3400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3601 to 3800</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 to 5200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18601 to 18800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The participants in the study represented 34 different countries of origin (see Appendix B). This table presents the number of participants in each category of ethnic community size (Statistics Canada, 1993). This is a continuous scale; however, intervals which contain no data have been omitted to conserve space.
Table 3

Time spent in Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in Canada</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 1 year</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 to 33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Time is in years. This is a continuous scale; however, intervals which contain no data have been omitted to conserve space.
Table 4

**Time spent studying English in Country of Origin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 1 year</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 to 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Time is in years. This is a continuous scale; however, intervals which contain no data have been omitted to conserve space.
### Table 5

**Time spent studying English in Canada**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 1 year</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Time is in years. This is a continuous scale; however, intervals which contain no data have been omitted to conserve space.
Seven students and six teachers participated in the interview phase of the present study. The students were selected, based on availability and agreement to participate, from the sample that had completed the questionnaires. The teachers were selected, using the same criteria, from the group of teachers whose classes participated in the study. Teacher variables that were considered most relevant for this study were teacher training and number of years of experience. The participants varied in teacher training from no formal training (one participant), to an Ontario Teaching Certificate (three participants), to graduate degrees in education (two participants). With regard to the number of years teaching ESL, the participants ranged from six weeks to twenty-one years (M = 6.1 years).

**Instruments**

Three instruments were used in the collection of data: a student questionnaire (Appendix C), a student interview question sheet (Appendix D), and a teacher interview question sheet (Appendix E).

The student questionnaire was arranged in the following format:

1. Five multiple choice questions regarding age, sex, marital status, citizenship status, and source of income.

2. Seven open-ended questions regarding country of
origin, time spent in Canada, time spent studying English in country of origin, time spent studying English in Canada, and three reasons (in order of importance) for studying English.

3. Thirty-two statements followed by five-point Likert-type scales on which the participant could indicate a level of agreement or disagreement. The thirty-two items represented the conceptual areas of orientation, motivational intensity, and perceived personal causation. Motivational intensity and orientation were each represented by eight items on the questionnaire; perceived personal causation was represented by sixteen items (see Appendix F for a detailed presentation of the questionnaire clusters and their reliability estimates).

The questionnaire was an adaptation of existing instruments combined with original items. It was determined through the review of the literature that existing instruments were suitable for measuring some of the variables in question, but not others. The eight items which measured orientation were taken directly from Gardner's (1985) research instrument. The eight items measuring motivational intensity were taken from both Gardner's (1985) research instrument and Ely's (1986) research instrument. The remaining sixteen items (eight
items measuring perceived competence and eight items measuring perceived self-determination) were developed specifically for the present study, and were based on extensive readings in those areas. Existing instruments were not used because none approached the measurement of these two variables from a specific classroom perspective. It was expected that such a classroom perspective would result in more practical implications for the ESL instructor.

The student interview question sheet consisted of six open-ended questions. The questions were developed specifically for the present study, with the goal of gaining a more detailed understanding of students' perceptions of motivating factors in their classrooms. The interview questions were open-ended to allow subjects to share information that perhaps hadn't been revealed by the questionnaires.

The teacher interview question sheet was taken directly from Wlodkowski's (1985) book on motivating adult students. The questions were originally intended to be used as a self-assessment tool by teachers, but were viewed as appropriate for the teacher interviews for the present study. The participating teachers were first asked two background questions regarding their experience and training in ESL instruction. These were followed by nineteen open-ended
questions broken down into the following five areas: the teacher's perception of students' motivation (five questions), the teacher's perception of their instructional situation (four questions), the teacher's objectives as an instructor (four questions), the teacher's assumptions about student motivation (three questions), and the teacher's self perception in terms of being a motivating instructor (three questions).

**Procedures**

The data gathering occurred in three phases:

1. Questionnaire Phase (November 1995). An appropriate time was arranged with each participating teacher for administration of the questionnaires. The teacher was informed of the details of the questionnaire procedure: it was to be completed individually by the students during class time, and should take between fifteen and thirty minutes. On the arranged date the class was visited and monitored while the students completed the questionnaires. Questionnaires were collected immediately upon completion.

2. Student Interview Phase (November, 1995). Student interviews followed directly after participants had completed the questionnaires. Each subject was interviewed individually outside the classroom. Each interview lasted approximately fifteen minutes. Questions were read from the
interview question sheet to the participant and answers were recorded on paper by the interviewer. The answers were read back to the participant for verification. Probing questions were used when appropriate to encourage participants to go into greater depth with their responses.

3. Teacher Interview Phase (December 1995). Teacher interviews were performed after the questionnaire and student interview phases had been completed. Participating teachers were interviewed individually at their convenience (generally before or after a class, or during a class break). Each interview lasted approximately thirty minutes. Questions were read from the interview question sheet and the participant's answers were recorded on paper by the interviewer. The responses were read back to the participant for verification. Probing questions were used where appropriate to encourage the participants to answer in greater depth.

**Data Analysis**

Motivational intensity was treated as the dependent variable for the study. The main independent variables were orientation and perceived personal causation (see Figure 1), though background factors (e.g. sex, age, and marital status) were also examined.

Statistical data was analyzed in two stages. The first
stage involved the generation of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for the relationships between motivational intensity, the orientation clusters (integrative orientation and instrumental orientation), the perceived personal causation clusters (perceived competence and perceived self-determination) and subclusters (general perceived competence, specific perceived competence, perceived personal responsibility, perceived personal meaningfulness, perceived personal choice, and general perceived self-determination), and quantitative background variables (age, size of ethnic community, time in Canada, time spent studying English in country of origin, and time spent studying English in Canada).

The second stage included a series of t-tests for independent samples. The purpose of these tests was to determine the existence of relationships between the categorical background variables (sex, marital status, and citizenship) and motivational intensity, orientation, and perceived personal causation.

Anecdotal data were analyzed independently of statistical data. Information given by subjects during the student and teacher interviews was examined for patterns or common themes which related to the concepts under investigation.
Figure 1. The main independent variables, orientation and perceived personal causation, and their clusters and subclusters.
Chapter 4

Results

Statistical Data Analysis

Motivational Intensity

The focus for primary data analyses was motivational intensity and its relationships with a number of variables. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated to examine the relationship between motivational intensity, orientation, and perceived personal causation. The analysis revealed that motivational intensity was significantly related to both of the orientation clusters (instrumental orientation and integrative orientation), and both of the perceived personal causation clusters (perceived competence and perceived self-determination). Table 6 shows the values of these relationships.

A more fine-grained analysis was undertaken by dividing perceived competence into two subclusters and perceived self-determination into four subclusters. Of these six subclusters, only one (specific perceived competence) did not relate significantly with motivational intensity. These results are presented in Table 7.

Background variables also were examined for relationships with motivational intensity. Correlational analysis revealed that none of the quantitative background variables (age, size of ethnic community, time in Canada,
Table 6
Correlation Coefficients for Motivational Intensity with Clusters of Orientation and Perceived Personal Causation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Motivational Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Competence</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Self-determination</td>
<td>.54***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01. ***p<.001.

Table 7
Correlation Coefficients for Motivational Intensity with Subclusters of Perceived Competence and Perceived Self-determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subclusters</th>
<th>Motivational Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Perceived Competence</td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Perceived Competence</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Personal Responsibility</td>
<td>.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Personal Meaningfulness</td>
<td>.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Personal Choice</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Perceived Self-determination</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.
time spent studying English in country of origin, and time spent studying English in Canada) related significantly with motivational intensity (see Table 8 for values). A series of t-tests were performed with the categorical background variables (sex, citizenship, marital status, and income source) as they related to motivational intensity. The results revealed that none of the groups tested differed significantly in motivational intensity from their respective counterparts (see Table 9 for values).

Orientation and Perceived Personal Causation

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated to determine if relationships existed between the orientation clusters (integrative orientation and instrumental orientation) and the perceived personal causation clusters (perceived competence and perceived self-determination). Each of the four clusters correlated significantly with each of the other three. Table 10 outlines the results of this analysis.

Background variables were also examined for relationships with the orientation clusters and the perceived personal causation clusters. Correlational analysis revealed that none of the quantitative background variables (age, size of ethnic community, time in Canada, time spent studying English in country of origin, and time
Table 8
Correlational Coefficients for Motivational Intensity with Quantitative Background Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Variable</th>
<th>Motivational Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIC</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSO</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSC</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SEC = size of ethnic community; TIC = time in Canada; TSO = time spent studying English in country of origin; TSC = time spent studying English in Canada.
Table 9

**Categorical Background Variables and Motivational Intensity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-citizens</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Assistance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Sponsorship</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Insurance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** None of the groups tested differed significantly (p > .05) from the other group or groups under the same heading.
Table 10

Correlation Coefficients for Relationships Between
Orientation Clusters and Perceived Personal Causation

| Clusters | 
|----------|-------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|          | INS     | INT    | PC  | PSD |     |
| INS      | 1.00    | .53*** | .23**| .33***| |
| INT      | --      | 1.00   | .25**| .35***| |
| PC       | --      | --     | 1.00 | .18* | |
| PSD      | --      | --     | --  | 1.00 | |

**Note.** INS = instrumental orientation; INT = integrative orientation; PC = perceived competence; PSD = perceived self-determination.

*_{p} < .05. **_{p} < .01. ***_{p} < .001.
spent studying English in Canada) related significantly to instrumental orientation, integrative orientation, or perceived competence. Perceived self-determination had a weak but significant relationship with time in Canada, and a slightly stronger one with time spent studying English in Canada (see Table 11 for values).

A series of t-tests were performed with the categorical background variables (sex, citizenship, marital status, and income source) as they related to instrumental orientation, integrative orientation, perceived competence, and perceived self-determination. Results revealed that none of the groups tested differed significantly with regard to instrumental orientation. However, participants whose source of income was government sponsorship had a significantly stronger integrative orientation than those who had jobs. In addition, participants who were not married had a significantly higher level of perceived competence than those who were married. Finally, participants who were Canadian citizens had a significantly higher level of perceived self-determination than those who were not. Tables 12 and 13 describe these results.

**Anecdotal Data Analysis**

The responses to the questionnaire items regarding reasons for studying English varied widely. Analysis of the answers given revealed that there were thirty-two different
Table 11

Correlation Coefficients for Orientation and Perceived Personal Causation with Quantitative Background Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Variable</th>
<th>INS</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>PSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIC</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSO</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSC</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. INS = instrumental orientation; INT = integrative orientation; PC = perceived competence; PSD = perceived self-determination; SEC = size of ethnic community; TIC = time in Canada; TSO = time spent studying English in country of origin; TSC = time spent studying English in Canada.

*p < .05.
Table 12

Categorical Background Variables and Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>INS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>INT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-citizens</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. INS = instrumental orientation; INT = integrative orientation; SA = social assistance; GS = government sponsorship; UI = unemployment insurance. The only significant difference (p<.05) was between the Job group and the GS group, with integrative orientation.
### Table 13

Categorical Background Variables and Perceived Personal Causation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PC M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>PSD M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-citizens</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** PC = perceived competence; PSD = perceived self-determination; SA = social assistance; GS = government sponsorship; UI = unemployment insurance. The only significant differences (p < .05) were between the married and single groups, with perceived competence, and between the citizen and non-citizen groups, with perceived self-determination.
responses to this question. These responses were subsequently examined for common themes, and as a result were grouped into seven clusters. The clusters, together with examples of responses, are as follows:

1. Daily life activities (e.g. to communicate, to survive, to be able to watch tv, or to see a doctor).
2. Work related (e.g. to get a job, or to find a better job).
3. Education related (e.g. to continue with education).
4. Personal reasons (e.g. to feel good about oneself, or because it is a nice language).
5. Canada related (e.g. to be able stay in Canada, to make friends in Canada, or to be like Canadians).
6. Language related (e.g. to improve English skills).
7. Passive reasons (e.g. because it is necessary, because Canadians speak English, or because it is the most important language in the world).

Table 14 shows the number of responses in each category given as either the most important reason or as a secondary reason given for ESL study.

The teacher interviews were analyzed for themes or patterns in the responses that related to any of the concepts under investigation. To begin with, in response to questions concerning perceptions of students' motivation,
Figure 2. Number of reasons given in each category as the primary reason for ESL study.
Figure 3. Number of reasons given in each category as secondary reasons for ESL study.
all of the subjects stated that their students were motivated and capable of self-direction and self-determination (two of the teachers qualified this response by suggesting that lower level students required guidance, particularly in the early stages of instruction).

The subjects were subsequently asked about the instructional behaviors they utilized to allow their more motivated students to exhibit self-determination and self-direction. The most common response was to allow students various kinds of freedom in the classroom. Allowing students the freedom to ask questions, the freedom to do things such as reading and choosing activities on their own, and freedom experienced through problem-solving and open-ended exercises in class were the types of strategies mentioned. Other answers included providing successful, motivated role models for the class (e.g. former students), allowing the students to take turns teaching the class, and creating lots of opportunities for student interaction.

In response to a question regarding strategies used to allow for the development of self-direction and self-determination in students with lower levels of motivation, the most common answers dealt with the topics of competence, relevance and choice. To help students feel competent at what they are doing, subjects discussed efforts to present lessons at an appropriate level (e.g. lots of pictures to
help lower level students with vocabulary), as well as to provide positive feedback and answer keys to exercises (or, according to one subject, the students tend to become frustrated!). In order to make lessons relevant to students, subjects discussed attempts to use items from the local news as class material and to present activities in an "adult" way. To ensure student choice in the class, subjects mentioned trying to use strategies such as providing a variety of activities for students to choose from (i.e. learning centres) or allowing students a choice of topics in extensions of exercises. Other answers to this question included providing motivated role models (e.g. former students) for the class, encouraging group work, respecting the students, and making them feel comfortable in class.

When the subjects were asked about the needs which influence students' motivation in learning activities, all of them stated that their students were influenced by general needs, as opposed to educational needs. Jobs or life skills were rated as the most important need by all six subjects. Other needs included "communication", "acculturation", "education", "dealing with friends and family" and specifics such as dealing with housing, money, or social services.
In response to a series of questions concerning instructional objectives, the answers covered a wide range of themes. These included helping students to adapt to their new way of life, helping students to feel fulfilled in the school and workplace, helping students to enjoy class and learning English, helping students to develop self-confidence and independence, and simply helping students to develop communication skills.

When the subjects were probed about their understanding of motivation, definitions varied from "being able to learn independently", to "whatever it is that keeps them coming to class". A desire or determination to learn or to succeed was a common understanding of the concept, as well as simply wanting to do something for the joy of doing it. When the subjects were asked to list three observable behaviors of motivated students, common answers included the following: "(voluntary) interaction or participation", "asking for extra work", "being energetic or excited in class", "bringing own materials or topics to class", "attendance", and "correcting work so it's accurate".

Finally, analysis of answers to questions concerning the subjects' strategies for motivating students yielded the following themes: (a) making learning joyful, (b) using a variety of materials or techniques, (c) using humour, (d) being enthusiastic, and (e) working hard. Other answers
included providing positive reinforcement for the students and giving the students challenging exercises.

The final interview question involved the projected completion of the statement, "my instructor helps me to feel motivated because (s)he ... ". Answers to this question included the following: (a) "... is also motivated", (b) "... is helpful", (c) "... is energetic", (d) "... makes class interesting", (e) "... makes us feel comfortable (i.e. there are never any wrong answers)", and (f) "... gives us freedom".

The student interviews were performed with the expectation of expanding on the information gathered in the questionnaires and teacher interviews. In response to a question concerning reasons for learning English, the most common response was "job" or "college/university". Other responses included "speaking to people", "making friends", "watching t.v./reading books/using the telephone/visiting the bank", "so people don't think I'm stupid", "travel", "to improve my life", and "because I like the way English sounds". The responses to this question reflected but did not provide any additional insight to the information gathered from the questionnaires.

When asked why they did or did not work hard in English class, the most common reason given for effort was future goals. Another common reason was the quality of the
teacher. Future goals were also the most common reason given for the effort of other students in class; having a good teacher was a common response to this question also. One subject stated that some students did not work hard in the class because the class was not demanding enough.

Analysis of answers to a question concerning the ways students can be motivated revealed some patterns, though none was dominant. "Provide lots of conversation, reading, writing and grammar" appeared a few times, and may be related to "make the class demanding", which also appeared more than once. Another answer that appeared repeatedly was "give the students a choice in what they learn". Other responses included "relevant lessons", "variety", "make the students comfortable", and "respect for the students". A third common response was "my teacher works hard".

The final part of the interview concerned the subjects' preferences for learning English outside compared to inside the class. All of the subjects stated that they enjoyed learning English in class, although four stated that both contexts were equally important. None stated that they preferred learning outside the classroom. The most common response was that both contexts were important because while the class provides grammar and vocabulary, "outside" is more realistic, providing a place to practice what has been
learned. Reasons for preferring the classroom included its collaborative nature (in terms of group work and conversation), and the fact that if something is not understood, the teacher can be asked for an explanation.
Chapter 5

Conclusions

Summary and Discussion

This study set out to examine the relationships between motivational intensity, orientation, and perceptions of personal causation among learners in the adult ESL classroom. The first prediction concerned the relationship between learner orientation and motivational intensity. The primary goal of this study with respect to orientation was to determine if out-of-class goals for language study (i.e. orientation) in general relate with motivational intensity. This was in contrast to earlier studies in which the purpose was to determine which orientation was more closely related to higher levels of motivation or achievement. Correlational analysis revealed that both orientations (integrative and instrumental) were significantly related to motivational intensity. This result leads to the conclusion that out-of-class goals for learning English are an influential factor on a learner’s level of motivation to learn English. Based on the review of literature, this significant relationship was to be expected. The small difference in the strength of the relationships indicates that the type of out-of-class goal is not as important as the presence of such goals in
general.

The second prediction pertained to the relationship between perceived personal causation and motivational intensity. Based on the review of literature, it was expected that a significant relationship would exist. Results of statistical data analysis supported this prediction, as both perceived competence and perceived self-determination were found to be significantly related with motivational intensity. These results indicate that what occurs in the classroom with respect to learners' perceptions of personal causation is an important motivational consideration. The difference in strength between the two relationships was substantial, leading to the conclusion that, assuming the scales measured what they were intended to measure, feelings of self-determination in the classroom were more important than feelings of competence. Of particular importance among this group of learners were feelings of personal meaningfulness with regard to the ESL class and the class material.

The results of the correlational analysis allowed some interesting comparisons to be made. While instrumental orientation, integrative orientation, perceived competence, and perceived self-determination were each significantly related to motivational intensity, perceived self-determination had the strongest relationship (followed by
integrative orientation, instrumental orientation, and perceived competence). As a result, the lack of attention received by perceived personal causation constructs in the L2 motivation literature seems conspicuous.

In addition, statistical data analysis resulted in a number of secondary findings. To begin with, a significant relationship existed between instrumental and integrative orientations. It appears that those learners with strong instrumental goals tended to have strong integrative goals as well. It is encouraging that these (in many cases) newcomers to Canada are not interested only in instrumental goals such as finding a job or only in integrative goals such as being more comfortable with Canadians. A balance seems to exist for this group of learners.

Statistical data analysis also revealed that instrumental orientation and integrative orientation both related significantly with perceived competence and perceived self-determination. These relationships were however not strong. While in some cases learners with strong out-of-class goals will have strong perceptions of competence and self-determination, this will not always be the case. These results indicate that it is possible for learners with strong out-of-class goals to have weak perceptions of competence and self-determination, and vice versa. In other words, it is possible for a learner who
comes to the ESL class with high levels of motivation due to their strong long term goals to have weak perceptions of personal causation in the class. The expected result would be a lower than optimum level of learner motivation.

Finally, correlational analysis revealed that a significant but very weak relationship existed between perceived competence and perceived self-determination. This result leads to the conclusion that learners who feel self-determined in the class don't necessarily feel competent, and vice versa. This is an important consideration, as weak perceptions of either self-determination or competence would be expected to have a detrimental effect on the learner's motivation.

The third prediction addressed the reasons given by the subjects for learning ESL. A unique classification system was used to categorize the responses given (see Chapter 4). It is suggested that such a multi-category classification system is of more practical use to the ESL teacher than one with the traditional broader categories (e.g. instrumental and integrative). Nevertheless, it appeared that among this group of learners there were very few reasons given that had not been accounted for in earlier studies. However, difficulty occurred classifying some of the reasons as either instrumental or integrative. Of the seven categories used in the present study, the first three consisted of
practical reasons for language study, and so can easily be classified as instrumental. The remaining categories are more difficult to classify. The fourth category consisted of personal reasons, such as studying simply because the language is enjoyable. These reasons have nothing to do with Canada or Canadians, so cannot be classified as integrative. They also do not fit the original definition of instrumental reasons. However, they do seem to relate to instrumental purposes for language study, such as making oneself feel good. The fifth category, which deals with "Canada related" responses (e.g. "to make friends in Canada"), appears to be integrative. However, due to the context of the ESL learner in Canada, these reasons may be considered quite practical and therefore classified as instrumental. Clusters six and seven included responses which do not provide enough information to be accurately classified as instrumental or integrative.

Because interest in the field of L2 motivation has shifted from the classification of learners' reasons for language study, these problems may be relatively unimportant. They do however strengthen the argument that context is an important consideration in the L2 learning process.

The final prediction concerned the understanding of motivational constructs among ESL teachers, and stated that
teachers would be aware of both learner perceptions of personal causation and learner orientation as motivational factors. This prediction was supported, as analysis of the teacher interviews revealed that the subjects had a general understanding of both concepts. In response to the more general questions regarding learner motivation, the subjects tended to focus on out-of-class factors, particularly the learners' long-term goals; in response to the more specific classroom related questions, the subjects tended to focus on in-class factors, including the learners' perceptions of personal causation. Both concepts were addressed at some point in each interview.

Some of the individual responses in the teacher interviews deserve mention. One subject indicated that the use of games in the classroom was often met with student disapproval. It seems that the students felt that games were for children, and if they were playing games they could not be learning. In addition to the possibility of culturally diverse perceptions of what may or may not be considered appropriate in the classroom, it is likely that if students feel that a certain instructional strategy is below their level or perhaps useless, their perceptions of competence will suffer. In addition, if students are forced to comply with any method, their perceptions of self-determination will weaken. The result in each case will be
a decrease in motivation. Another subject stated that if some students are not given answer sheets to exercises, they become frustrated, and other students will correct and re-correct work until it is perfect. For these students, perceptions of competence are very important, and the lack of opportunities to reinforce these perceptions will likely lead to decreases in motivation.

The student interviews were intended to provide supplementary information to the questionnaires and teacher interviews. As with the teacher interview subjects, student interview subjects seemed to be aware of both orientation and perceived personal causation as they related to motivation. With the general questions, subjects focused on out-of-class factors, such as orientation. With the classroom focused questions, subjects tended to discuss classroom factors, such as perceived personal causation. While the concepts of orientation and perceived personal causation were both touched on by most of the subjects, neither was dominant.

Some of the individual responses in the student interviews deserve mention. Of particular interest was a response concerning the lack of challenge in some ESL classes. This subject felt that the reason many students in the class did not work hard was because the class was not challenging enough. This was also the reason for a change
of classes for this particular subject. This reasoning is congruent with the concept of perceived competence as a motivational factor. Another subject, when asked to state a preference between learning in class and out of class, stated that learning in class was preferable because the teacher could be approached when misunderstandings arose. The lack of understanding that may come outside the English class can be frustrating because in one sense it can be an indication of a lack of competence. Interestingly, in response to the same question, the majority of the subjects stated that learning English outside the class is equally important, primarily because it is viewed as "real life". This may be an indication that classroom instruction is not as relevant to the subjects' lives as they would like it to be. Such a perception would negatively influence learners' feelings of self-determination in the class, which would result in decreased motivation.

Implications

From a theoretical perspective, the results of this study provide support for the recent call for a more practical theory of L2 motivation (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dornyei, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). The results suggest that learners' perceptions of competence and self-determination in the classroom play a significant role in ESL learning. If this is the case, the lack of attention
paid to classroom variables in L2 motivation research has left the picture incomplete.

One point made clear by both Oxford and Shearin (1994) and Dornyei (1994) in their suggestions for a more practical approach to the study of L2 motivation is that a complete departure from the approach taken in earlier studies would be a mistake. Social psychological variables were repeatedly shown to play a significant role in the L2 learner's motivation and achievement, and should therefore be included in any comprehensive theory of L2 motivation. The suggested broadening of scope is meant to add to existing theory, in an attempt to further develop the understanding of L2 motivation.

This argument is supported by the results of the present study which showed the motivational importance of the L2 learner's long-term goals for language study. The fact that long-term goals in general - not one type or another - related significantly with the learner's level of motivation is perhaps the most valuable finding related to orientation. Regardless of type, the learner's long-term goals are an important factor which cannot be ignored in the search for a broader, more practical theory of L2 motivation.

From a practical perspective, the results of this study may lead in useful directions. First, the results show that
the strength of a learner's long-term goals relates positively with the learner's motivational intensity. If it is possible for a teacher to help students increase the strength of their long-term goals, the motivational benefits would likely be worthwhile.

The findings also indicate that perceptions of personal causation are positively related to learners' motivational intensity in the ESL classroom. The practical corollary of this finding is the suggestion that teachers provide opportunities in the classroom for learners to develop perceptions of competence and self-determination. This can be achieved in a variety of ways, including some that were shared during the teacher interviews:

(1) Give students choices in the classroom. Allow them opportunities to choose activities, topics of study and materials. One method for doing this is to organize learning centres which can be used during part of the class. One of the teachers stated that using centres with adult ESL students can be a very successful motivational strategy.

(2) Make the class relevant to the students' lives. For example, doing this by allowing them to bring in materials and topics from the local news will help develop feelings of self-determination.

(3) Provide challenging exercises that reinforce students' feelings of competence. Make accurate and regular
assessments of students' proficiency levels, and present exercises at a level high enough to be challenging but not so high as to be impossible. Give students opportunities to view their own progress in a variety of ways. For example, positive verbal feedback and encouragement from the teacher, peer evaluations from fellow students, and self assessment while listening to or watching self-recordings on audio or video tape are strategies which provide competence feedback to students. Give the students opportunities to correct work if they desire. In addition, minimizing the overt attention paid to student mistakes may help develop feelings of competence.

(4) Some strategies will address both perceptions of competence and perceptions of self-determination. Allowing students plenty of opportunities in class to interact among themselves and allowing students to occasionally instruct the class are possible strategies.

A final suggestion is that teachers consider the cultural appropriateness of these strategies before implementing any of them in the classroom. Philosophies of education, as well as instructional approaches, techniques, and strategies, vary widely across cultures. For example, in the present study, the negative student reaction one of the teachers experienced to the use of games in the classroom may have been linked to a cultural difference in
the educational value of games. An awareness of cultural differences in values and of the possibility of conflicts may be a very important tool for the ESL teacher.

In summary, it has become apparent in the course of this research that the two most salient independent variables, orientation and perceptions of personal causation, may be conceptually related. The perception that something is meaningful or relevant to one's life is hypothesized to be an integral part of one's feelings of self-determination. The perception that something is relevant or meaningful depends on the connection it has with various aspects of a person's life. A connection with one's long-term goals would potentially reinforce perceptions of personal meaningfulness or relevance. In this way a link is apparent between perceived personal causation and orientation. If, for example, an ESL learner has the goal of learning English to find a job, classes that revolve around workplace communication or job search skills will be perceived as relevant or meaningful by that learner. This perception will add to the feelings of self-determination the learner has in the English class, which will, according to the results of this study, result in a higher level of motivation to learn English. Ultimately then it appears that the two independent variables examined in the present study are connected.
Limitations

The limitations that apply to all empirical research studies must be considered with respect to the present study. To begin with, it is always possible that a significant result occurred due to chance. The fact that the data collection was done in English, the second language for all of the students, should also be considered. Another obvious limitation is that a partially new instrument was used to collect statistical data. Finally, internal reliability was very low with some sections of the instrument (see Appendix F), which indicates that caution should be employed during any interpretations.

In terms of internal validity in the research design, a number of factors must be considered. First, subject characteristics were a threat because the sample was so diverse. In addition, the fact that a convenience sample was used is also limiting. A location threat existed due to the variety of locations in which subjects completed the questionnaires and interviews. Subject history was an unavoidable threat due to the fact that the subjects were students and teachers with different backgrounds, from a variety of classes of different size, level, and focus, and from different programmes in which they had been involved for different lengths of time. Subject attitude was a threat, particularly when considering that for unknown
reasons some of the students in the participants' classes showed considerable reluctance to participate in the study.

In order to minimize these threats to internal validity, the following steps were taken:

(1) Conditions were standardized as much as possible for both questionnaires and interviews. All questionnaires and interviews were administered by the same person, using the same introductory comments, examples where necessary, and instructions.

(2) As much relevant subject background information was gathered as possible. This was done in order to include such variables in the data analyses, and to facilitate replication of the study.

(3) In consideration of the goals for the present study, as well as resource and time limitations, the most appropriate research design was utilized.

It was hoped that the results of this present research would be generalizable to any ESL programme, class, student or teacher. However, as shown in the review of literature, the context of L2 learning can vary a great deal and can have a strong impact on variables such as student motivation. This factor must be considered before any generalizations from these results can be made.

Despite any limitations, the results of the present study should not be overlooked. To begin with, while
reinforcing some of the conclusions made in earlier studies, these results indicate that the traditional approach in L2 motivation research has produced an incomplete picture. In this case, in addition to the reasons that bring a learner to the ESL classroom, the learner's feelings of competence and control within the classroom were a significant factor to the learner's level of motivation. As a result, needed empirical support has been provided for the theoretical expansion of the L2 motivation construct.

Oxford and Shearin (1994) highlighted the importance to teachers of knowing precisely where the source of a L2 learner's motivation lies. The present results indicate that the source is not only outside the classroom, but also within. The perceptions of competence and self-determination that a student feels in the classroom are variables a teacher can attempt to manipulate through effective instructional design. Through such manipulation, an ESL teacher may be able to influence levels of student motivation in the class. Such an ability will be of value to many teachers.

In conclusion, it should be noted that perceptions of personal causation are just one aspect of the classroom situation that may have motivational significance (see Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dornyei, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). To fully understand the potential a teacher has for
developing student motivation in the L2 classroom, further research is necessary on learner perceptions of personal causation as well as on the large number of other classroom factors. Through such studies doors will continue to open, and the search for a more complete L2 motivation theory will come closer to its goal.
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ESL Programme Data
Table A1

**ESL Programme Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCWEC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECC</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCAAT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2(^a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10(^b)</td>
<td>10(^c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. MCWEC = Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County; SECC = South Essex Community Council; SCCAAT = St. Clair College of Applied Arts and Technology; YMCA = Windsor and Essex County Family YMCA.

\(^a\)Not including occasional courses funded by the Canada Employment Centre. \(^b\)Not including extra conversation classes for students enrolled in regular ESL classes. \(^c\)Not including volunteer teachers and tutors.
Table A2

Programme Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCWEC</td>
<td>Department of Citizenship and Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECC</td>
<td>Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Citizenship and Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCAAT</td>
<td>Tuition fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Citizenship and Immigration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. MCWEC = Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County; SECC = South Essex Community Council; SCCAAT = St. Clair College of Applied Arts and Technology; YMCA = Windsor and Essex County Family YMCA.
Table A3

Programme Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Focus of Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MCWEC     | English language training and life skills  
(LINC programme\textsuperscript{a}) |
| SECC      | English language training and life skills  
(LINC and NLOC programmes\textsuperscript{b}) |
| SCCAAT    | English language training  
(TEOFL\textsuperscript{c} preparation and LMLT\textsuperscript{d}) |
| YMCA      | English language training and life skills  
(LINC and NLOC programmes) |

\textbf{Note.} MCWEC = Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County; SECC = South Essex Community Council; SCCAAT = St. Clair College of Applied Arts and Technology; YMCA = Windsor and Essex County Family YMCA.

\textsuperscript{a}LINC - Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada  
\textsuperscript{b}NLOC - Newcomer Language Orientation Classes  
\textsuperscript{c}TOEFL - Test of English as a Foreign Language  
\textsuperscript{d}LMLT - Labour Market Language Training
Table A4

**Teacher Qualifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Teacher Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCWEC</td>
<td>preferred Ontario Teaching Certificate (OTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECC</td>
<td>preferred OTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCAAT</td>
<td>degree, and preferred OTC and teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>preferred OTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** MCWEC = Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County; SECC = South Essex Community Council; SCCAAT = St. Clair College of Applied Arts and Technology; YMCA = Windsor and Essex County Family YMCA.
Table A5

Programme Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Targeted Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCWEC</td>
<td>no specific target group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECC</td>
<td>no specific target group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCAAT</td>
<td>no specific target group, but are aiming to attract more international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>no specific target group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** MCWEC = Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County; SECC = South Essex Community Council; SCCAAT = St. Clair College of Applied Arts and Technology; YMCA = Windsor and Essex County Family YMCA. LINC programmes require that a student be a landed immigrant or convention refugee in Canada (Canadian citizens and refugee claimants cannot participate). In this manner LINC programmes target students who have been in Canada less than three years.
Appendix B
Country of Origin

Participating students represented the following countries of origin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belarus</th>
<th>Bosnia</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Student Questionnaire
Please CIRCLE your answers to the following questions ...

Age: [under 20] [21-30] [31-40] [41-50] [over 50]

Sex: [male] [female]

Married: [yes] [no]

Are you a Canadian citizen? [yes] [no]

Source of income: [job] [social assistance]
[government sponsorship] [unemployment insurance]

Please WRITE your answers to the following questions ...

Which country are you from? ____________________________

How long have you been in Canada? _____________________

How long did you study English in your country? _____________________

How long have you been studying English in Canada? _____________________

What is the most important reason why you study English? _____________________

Please give two other reasons why you study English:

(a) ____________________________

(b) ____________________________
Now, please complete the rest of the questionnaire. Read each question carefully, and circle your answer. In each question, the numbers mean:

1 = "I disagree a lot"
2 = "I disagree a little"
3 = "I don't agree or disagree"
4 = "I agree a little"
5 = "I agree a lot"

For example:

A. Ice cream is delicious.  [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

... I agree a little because I like many kinds of ice cream, but there are a few I don't like.

B. Summer is cold.  [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

... I disagree a lot because summer is always very hot!

Now, please answer the following questions like the two examples above ...

1. Studying English is important to me because it will help me to be more comfortable with Canadians.


   <- disagree .. agree ->

2. Outside of class, I never think about what I learn in my English class.


3. I learn something new in English class everyday.


4. In my English class, I think I am responsible for my own learning.

5. Studying English is important to me because I will need it for my career.

   <- disagree .. agree ->

6. In the future I would like to take a more advanced English class.


7. My English is improving because I go to English class.


8. In my English class, I learn things that are important to me.


9. Studying English is important to me because it will help me to meet and speak with lots of different people.


10. I try very hard to learn English.


11. If I stop going to English class, I will not learn English.


12. The most important reason I do well in my English class is because I try very hard.


13. Studying English is important to me because I will become a more knowledgeable person.

14. When I don't understand something we learn in English class, I immediately ask the teacher for help.

   <- disagree .. agree ->

15. I will become a very good English speaker if I keep going to English class.


16. I do well in my English class because the work is easy.


17. Studying English is important to me because it will help me to understand Canadian art and literature.


18. When I have English homework, I work very carefully so I understand everything.


19. I can learn English very well even if I don’t go to English class.


20. I choose what I want to learn in English class.


21. Studying English is important to me because I will be able to participate more in Canadian activities.


22. I really study hard in class so I can learn English.

23. My English classes are too difficult.
   <-> disagree .. agree ->

24. In my English class, I choose my goals.

25. Studying English is important to me because other people will respect me more if I can speak two languages.

26. I always think carefully about what I have learned in my English class.

27. My English improves every lesson.

28. In English class, my teacher chooses what goals I will work toward.

29. Studying English is important to me because it will help me get a good job.

30. When I am in English class, I give answers as much as possible.

31. Sometimes in English class I can’t learn the material.
32. If I work hard in English class, I will become a very good English speaker.

<- disagree .. agree ->

This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you very much for taking the time to answer these questions and participate in this study.
Appendix D

Student Interview Question Sheet
1. Why do you want to learn English? (give as many reasons as you like ... which one is the most important?)

2. Do you work as hard as you can in English class?
   Why (not)?

3. Do the other students in your class work hard?
   Why (not)?

4. If you were a teacher, how would you make your students work hard?

5. What does your teacher do to make you work hard?

6. Which do you like better: learning English by yourself, outside school, or learning English in class?
   Why?
Appendix E

Teacher Interview Question Sheet
How long have you been teaching E.S.L.?

What kind of training do you have for teaching E.S.L.?

1. Your perception of your students' motivation.
   a) Do you see them as motivated and capable of self-direction and self-determination in learning activities?

   In the case of the more motivated students, list two instructional behaviors on your part that allow them to exhibit these qualities.

   In the case of the less motivated students, what sequence of your instructional process would allow for development of these qualities?

   b) Specifically, which needs (educational or general) seem to strongly influence your students' motivation in learning activities?

   In your estimation, list the three most important among them.

   1)

   2)

   3)
2. *Your perception of your instructional situation.*
   
a) How much freedom do you have for flexibility in the instructional process?

In which areas are you most capable of change and the introduction of new methods?

In which areas are you most restricted?

b) In what part of your instructional programme do you feel a need for more creative approaches to learner motivation?

3. *Your objectives as an instructor.*
   
a) What specifically do you want to happen as a result of your instruction? (list and rank your three most important objectives as an instructor)

   ___ *
   ___ *
   ___ *

   b) How successful are you in the accomplishment of these?
Any dissatisfaction with these?

If so, where?

4. Your assumptions about student motivation.
   a) What does motivation mean to you?

(list three observable behaviors of motivated students)

1)

2)

3)

b) How often do you see these among students in your class?

5. Your perception of yourself as a motivating instructor.
   a) List the three things you most often do to enhance learner motivation.

1)

2)

3)
b) What particular behavior or characteristic do you possess that you see as a strength for helping adults/students want to learn?

c) Complete this sentence as you believe your students would: "My instructor helps me to feel motivated because he/she ... "
Appendix F

Questionnaire Item Clusters

These are the items which appear on the student questionnaire. The item numbers are the same as they appear on the questionnaire, but the items have been rearranged here into the following five clusters: motivational intensity; instrumental orientation; integrative orientation; perceived competence; perceived self-determination. Following each cluster heading is the reliability estimate (Cronbach’s alpha) for that cluster. For perceived competence and perceived self-determination items, the subcluster is indicated after the statement.

Motivational Intensity ($\alpha=.56$)

2. Outside of class, I never think about what I learn in my English class.

6. In the future I would like to take a more advanced English class.

10. I try very hard to learn English.

14. When I don’t understand something we learn in English class, I immediately ask the teacher for help.

18. When I have English homework, I work very carefully so I understand everything.

22. I really study hard in class so I can learn English.

26. I always think carefully about what I have learned in my English class.
30. When I am in English class, I give answers as much as possible.

**Instrumental Orientation** (α = .48)

5. Studying English is important to me because I will need it for my future career.

13. Studying English is important to me because I will become a more knowledgeable person.

25. Studying English is important to me because other people will respect me more if I can speak two languages.

29. Studying English is important to me because it will help me get a good job someday.

**Integrative Orientation** (α = .65)

1. Studying English is important to me because it will help me to be more comfortable with Canadians.

9. Studying English is important to me because it will help me to meet and speak with lots of different people.

17. Studying English is important to me because it will help me to understand Canadian art and literature.

21. Studying English is important to me because I will be able to participate more in Canadian activities.
Perceived Competence ($\alpha = .34$)
(two subclusters: general perceived competence [GPC], $\alpha = .40$, and specific perceived competence [SPC], $\alpha = .12$)

3. I learn something new in English class every day. (SPC)
7. My English is improving because I go to English class. (GPC)
11. If I stop going to English class, I will not learn English. (GPC)
15. I will become a very good English speaker if I keep going to English class. (GPC)
19. I can learn English very well even if I don't go to English class. (GPC)
23. My English classes are too difficult. (SPC)
27. My English improves every lesson. (SPC)
31. Sometimes in English class I can't learn the material. (SPC)

Perceived Self-determination ($\alpha = .21$)
(four subclusters: perceived personal responsibility [PPR], perceived personal meaningfulness [PPM], perceived personal choice [PPC], $\alpha = .19$, and general perceived self-determination [GPSD], $\alpha = -.04$)

4. In my English class, I think I am responsible for my own learning. (PPR)
8. In my English class, I learn things that are important to me. (PPM)
12. The most important reason I do well in my English class is because I try very hard. (GPSD)

16. I do well in my English class because the work is easy. (GPSD)

20. I choose what I want to learn in English class. (PPC)

24. In my English class, I choose my goals. (PPC)

28. In English class, my teacher chooses what goals I will work toward. (PPC)

32. If I work hard in English class, I will become a very good English speaker. (GPSD)
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