DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 701 AL 002 046

By-Spolsky, Bernard

Attitudinal Aspects of Second Language Learning.

Pub Date Sep 69

Note-27p.; Paper read to the Psychology of Second Language Learning Section of the 2nd International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Cambridge, England, September 8-12, 1969.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.45

Descriptors-*Attitude Tests, Cultural Factors, English (Second Language), Foreign Students, *Identification (Psychological), Interference (Language Learning), Language Proficiency, *Learning Motivation, *Psycholinguistics, Questionnaires, *Second Language Learning, Student Attitudes, Student Motivation

The author feels that this study reaffirms the importance of attitude as one of the factors explaining the degree of proficiency a student achieves in learning a second language. Four groups of students representing 80 countries were administered (1) a direct questionnaire on which they were asked to rate the importance of 14 possible reasons for their having come to the United States and (2) an indirect questionnaire consisting of four lists of 30 adjectives such as "busy" and "sincere." Each student was asked to say how well he thought each adjective described him, how well it described the way he'd like to be, how well it described people whose native language was the same as his, and how well it described native speakers of English. For each student, the score on an English proficiency test was known. Using the criterion of the direct questionnaire, no more than 20% of the students could be considered integratively motivated; and there was no significant correlation between this motivation and proficiency. The indirect questionnaire showed a third of the students to be classifiable as considering speakers of English to be a more desirable reference group. The correlation of various parts of the indirect questionnaire with English proficiency was also examined to explore in detail what the nature of integrative motivation might be. (DO)

Attitudinal aspects of second language learning

Bernard Spolsky

The University of New Mexico

This paper has been prepared to be read to the Psychology of Second Language Learning Section of the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Cambridge, England, September 8-12, 1969.

A major difference between first and second language acquisition is in the degree of variation in the levels of proficiency attained by learners.[1] While some speakers have a better control of their first or native language than do others, all normal human beings reach a minimal standard in at least one language and are capable of communication using it. In the case of second languages, however, there is variation in proficiency ranging from no knowledge at all to native-like ability. A central problem in the development of a theory of second language acquisition is to account for this.

Among the factors that have been proposed as significant are method, age, aptitude, and attitude. Of these, teaching method has generally been considered the most easily controllable (it has been considered a sufficient provision for a program in applied linguistics or language pedagogy to offer courses in methodology), but results of research into the effectiveness of various methodologies have generally proved to be disappointing.

The major two year study by Scherer and Wertheimer (1964), for instance, looked into the relative effectiveness of an audiolingual approach and a traditional approach to teaching German in college. The study brought out many interesting points, but basically it showed that there was no real

difference between the two except that the audiolingual students were better at speaking, and the traditional students were better at writing and translation. More recent studies by Smith and Berger (1968) and Smith and Baranyi (1968) of French and German teaching in over one hundred Pennsylvania secondary school classes showed traditional students doing better on all measures than audiolingual students, and showed also that language laboratories as they were used had no effect.

Several other studies have gone even further and questioned the effectiveness of language teaching at all. John Upshur (1968) studied the English learning of foreign student participants in the seven week 1966 orientation program in American law. These participants either received no instruction in English as a foreign language, or one or two hours of formal teaching daily. Analysis failed to produce any evidence that the amount of formal language instruction had any effect on the learning, a result which supports the notion that the adult, as well as the child, learns a language better in a natural environment than in a classroom.

This notion is borne out by another major study recently reported, John Carroll's investigation of the foreign language proficiency achieved by college language majors.

Carroll (1967) found that the students were generally poor at speaking and understanding the language they had been studying for four years at college. Of all the factors he considered, the one that he found to correlate most highly with achievement was time spent overseas.

It would be a serious mistake, then, to consider teaching method to be the only variable that can be controlled; a more serious mistake to measure its influence when the other factors concerned have not also been measured. For this reason, a great number of methodological experiments have proved to be of little value.(2)

The importance of age as a factor is widely recognized. In general, evidence suggests the idea that up to puberty, children can acquire more than one language at once, going through a stage of confusion, but usually separating the two ultimately. Beyond puberty, there is more difficulty, and a much greater degree of variation in the speed and level of acquisition. The arguments put forward for foreign language teaching in elementary schools are generally based on this, although in actual practice the tendency to treat languages in elementary schools as just another subject has tended to minimize the effectiveness of an early start. But it is still there, as Carroll's study (1967) has shown.

Studies of language aptitude by Carroll (1962, 1967) and by Pimsleur (1962, 1963, 1966) have attempted to isolate abilities which are predictive of success in learning. With extraneous variables controlled as much as possible, it has been found that aptitude can be measured to some degree as a learner's ability to remember foreign language material, his ability to handle phonetic aspects of foreign language mastery, and his ability to make grammatical analysis of sentences and to find elements with analogous functions in English sentences. On the basis of this, it has been possible to build language aptitude tests that have a fair degree of validity. In all studies, however, the correlation of measured aptitude and success in language learning has been quite low.

Attitude is the fourth factor that has been proposed to account for variation in the level of achievement in second language acquisition. In a typical language learning situation, there are a number of people whose attitudes to each other can be significant: the learner, the teacher, the learner's peers and parents, and the speakers of the language. Each relationship might well be shown to be a factor controlling the learner's motivation to acquire the language. John Carroll for instance has suggested the importance of the attitude of parents. In his study of foreign language majors, he found

> "the greater the parents' use of the foreign language in the home, the higher were the mean scores of the students. Thus, one reason why some students reach high levels of attainment in a foreign language is that they have home environments that are favorable to this, either because the students are better motivated to learn, or because they have better opportunities to learn."(3)

This finding supports Gardner (1960) who showed that Montreal English-speaking students were apparently reflecting their parents' attitudes to French-speakers; in a later study, Feenstra (1967) has shown clear relationship between Montreal English-speakers' attitudes to the French Canadian community and their children's achievements in learning French.

A number of recent studies, (though not in language learning) have pointed up the importance of the attitude of the teacher to the learner on the latter's achievement. Teacher expectations have been shown to make a great deal of difference to student success. In one experiment, for instance, teachers of retarded children attempted to present a much greater number of new words to students they were erroneously informed to be faster learners, and these students learned more words than the students randomly labelled "slow".

Peer groups too are of great importance in language acquisition. Shuy's study of social dialects in Detroit, for example, shows how various dialect patterns cluster according to age, sex, and socio-economic status; and a study of certain phonological features in the speech of people in a Piedmont community has shown clustering of these features among friends.(5)

One of the most important attitudinal factors is the attitude of the learner to the language and to its speakers. In a number of basic studies, Wallace Lambert and his colleagues (Lambert 1963, Lambert and Gardner 1959, Lambert et. al. 1963, Anisfeld and Lambert 1961) have drawn attention to the major importance of what they call integrative motivation to the learning of foreign languages. They suggest that there are two classes of motivation for language learning, instrumental and integrative, and that the presence of the latter is necessary to successful mastery of the higher levels of proficiency, signalled by the development of a native-like accent and the ability to 'think like a native speaker'. In general, the studies referring to this construct have established the presence or absence of integrative motivation by using an open-ended or multiple-choice questionnaire asking for the reasons for which someone is learning the language in question. Reasons

are considered instrumental if they suggest the language is being used for such a purpose as to fulfill an educational requirement, to get a better position, to read material in the language, and are considered integrative when they suggest the desire to become a member of the community speaking the language. In Lambert and Gardner (1959) for instance, which was a study of English-speaking Montreal high school students and their learning of French, the orientation index was considered integrative if students chose as their reason for learning French that it would be helpful in understanding the French Canadian people and their life or that it would permit meeting and conversing with more and varied people, and instrumental if they chose the reason that it would be useful in obtaining a job or that it could make one a better-educated person. In Lambert et. al. (1963), eight reasons were given, four classified as integrative and four as instrumental, with a ninth open-ended possibility being left to judgement of the experimenters. Some difficulties of the interpretation of such questionnaires were reported by Anisfeld and Lambert (1961).

There are clear advantages in being able to handle this notion of integrative motivation precisely. From the point of view of the development of a theory of second language acquisition, it is necessary to be able to specify each of the

factors that are considered to account for variations in proficiency. Second, for studies of socialization, it would be very valuable to have precise data on the degree to which an individual's proficiency in a language serves as a measure of his attitude towards a social group. In this connection Lambert's work with the matched-guise technique (Lambert et. al. 1960, Anisfeld et. al. 1962. Lambert et. al. 1963, Peal and Lambert n.d.) has made clear the value of getting at social attitudes through the use of speech samples. A clearer understanding of integrative motivation will also be of great use in a study of ways to develop control of the standard dialect in speakers of substandard.

In our study, we were concerned with finding out more about integrative motivation by developing an instrument that would compare a subject's attitude to speakers of a foreign language in which he already has some degree of proficiency. In social psychological theory, a distinction has been established between an individual's membership groups (the groups to which he belongs) and his reference groups, the groups in which he desires to attain or maintain membership. An individual is a member of the group speaking his native language: when he is placed in a second language learning situation, he may choose the speakers of his own language or the speakers of the second language as his reference group.

Integrative motivation is related to a choice of the second language group. Our instrument was designed to show the learner's choice.

METHOD

We worked with four groups of subjects. Group I was composed of 79 foreign students who had just arrived in the United States to attend American universities, had been judged by the sponsoring agency to be quite proficient in English, and were attending an orientation seminar at Indiana University. Group II was composed of 71 similar students attending a seminar at the University of Minnesota. Group III was made up of 135 foreign students enrolling for the first time at Indiana University; it was much more varied both in English proficiency and time spent in the United States. The fourth group was made up of 30 Japanese students at Indiana University. All told, students were included from 80 different countries.

The instrument we prepared consisted of a direct questionnaire on which students were asked to rate the importance of fourteen possible reasons for their having come to the United States and an indirect questionnaire (see appendices). The indirect questionnaire consisted of four lists of thirty adjectives such as 'busy', 'stubborn',

and 'sincere'.[6] In list 1, the student was asked to say how well each adjective described him; in list 2, how well it described the way he would like to be; in list 3, how well it described people whose native language was the same as his; and in list 4, how well it described native speakers of English.

For each student, we also had available a score on an English proficiency test.[7]

The reasons on the direct questionnaire were classified as integrative (e.g., having a chance to be away from home, getting to know Americans, finding out more about what I am like) or as instrumental (getting a degree, finding out how people in my profession work here), and a score calculated according to the relative importance given each reason by the subject.

The responses to the indirect questionnaire were coded for computer handling, and similarity of responses to the various lists was calculated as a coefficient of correlation.

RESULTS

Using the criterion of the Direct Questionnaire, no more than 20% of the students could be considered integratively motivated, the remainder giving instrumental

reasons for study in the U. S. A comparison of the relationship of this motivation with proficiency in English shows however no significant correlation (see Table I). This result, contrary to those reported by Lambert and his colleagues, can be explained by the fact that foreign students when questioned directly, will not, so soon after their arrival admit to motives which suggest they wish to leave their own country permanently, but will tend to insist on instrumental motives (I'm here to get training, to get a degree").

The Indirect Questionnaire, on the other hand, shows a third of the students to be classifiable as considering speakers of English to be a more desirable reference group. The two questionnaires are clearly related, (see Table II), but there is good reason to suspect that the Indirect Questionnaire has been more sensitive, its results less disguised by student inhibition.

To explore in more detail what the nature of integrative motivation might be, we examined the correlation of various parts of the indirect questionnaire with English proficiency scores.

1. The correlation of scores on lists 1 and 2 (see Table III) gives a measure of the difference between self-image and desired self-image; in other words a measure of

the student's self-satisfaction. This showed no significant correlation with proficiency in English.

2. The correlation of scores on lists 1 and 4 (see Table IV) gives a measure of the degree to which a subject perceives himself as already being like speakers of English. There was a significant correlation of this perception with proficiency in English.

3. The correlation of scores on lists 1 and 3 (see Table V) gives a measure of the degree to which a subject perceives himself as being like speakers of his own language. This showed no significant correlation with proficiency in English.

4. When the correlation of lists 1 and 3 is subtracted from the correlation of lists 1 and 4, a positive remainder indicates that the subject perceives himself as being more like speakers of English than he is like speakers of his own language. This correlated slightly (chi-square = 2.8, significant at the .1% level) with proficiency in English (see Table VI).

5. When the correlation of lists 2 and 3 is subtracted from the correlation of lists 2 and 4, a positive remainder is a measure of a greater desire to be like speakers of English than to be like speakers of the native language: in other words, a sign that for the subject, speakers of English constitute his reference

group. This measure appears to be the closest to integrative motivation. A comparison of it and English proficiency shows a clear relationship. For all groups, the correlation is highly significant (chi-square = 8.71, significant at the .01% level) (see Table VII).

The relationship holds in each of the groups taken individually, although the degree of statistical significance varies. In this respect, the correlation is better in Groups I and II, groups relatively homogeneous with respect to English proficiency, than in Group III.

6. Even better results are obtained if certain national groups are excluded. Japanese subjects, for instance, in Groups I and II, were almost all "positively" motivated but in the lower half in proficiency; similarly, results in Group IV did not show a significant correlation.(8)

7. To shed some light on the relative importance to be attached to the factor of integrative motivation, a fourth analysis (limited by availability of subjects) was made of 51 students in Group III by adding another factor, the number of years they had studied English before coming to the United States. There was no correlation between length of study and integrative motivation, but clear correlation between each of these and proficiency in English.

The correlation of integrative motivation and English proficiency (chi-square = 7.42, significant at the .01% level) was clearer than that of length of study and English proficiency (chi-square = 3.85, significant at the .05% level), but the possibility of bias in the sample cannot be ignored.

CONCLUSION

This study, then, has reaffirmed the importance of attitude as one of the factors explaining degree of proficiency a student achieves in learning a second language. His attitude to speakers of the language will have a great effect on how well he learns. A person learns a language better when he wants to be a member of the group speaking that language.

We are led to note the significance of sociolinguistics to second language pedagogy, for while psycholinguistics will continue to contribute vital data on how second languages are acquired, it is only when we look at the social dimensions that we start to understand why. Learning a second language is a key to possible membership of a second society: the desire to join that group is a major factor in language learning.

Notes

1. An earlier version of this paper was read at the Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association, New York, December 28-31 1969. The research reported in it was partially supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation to the Human Resources Development Committee of Indiana University. I am grateful for the assistance of Ernest Migliazza and Faith Morse.

2. See Spolsky (1968).

3. Carroll (1967)

4. Shuy (1967)

5. Crockett and Levine (1967)

6. The use of this instrument, based on Robert L. Lills' Index of Adjustment and Values, was suggested to us by Dr. Alan P. Bell.

7. For Group I and III, this was the overall Test of English Proficiency (Spolsky, et al. 1968).

8. For a more detailed analysis of the Japanese group, see Cowan (1968)

References

1. Moshe Anisfeld, Norman Bogo and Wallace E. Lambert. Evaluational Reactions to Accented English Speech. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. Vol. 65. No. 4. (1962) pp. 223-231.

2. _____ and W. E. Lambert. Social and psychological variables in learning Hebrew. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. Vol. 63. (1961) pp. 524-529.

3. Robert E. Bills. Index of Adjustment and Values. (unpublished manual). College of Education, University of Alabama.

4. John B. Carroll, The prediction of success in intensive foreign language training. In Robert Glazer (ed.) Training Research and Education. (Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1962).

5. _____. Foreign language proficiency levels attained by language majors near graduation from college. Foreign Language Annals, 1 (1967) pp. 131-151.

6. Harry J. Crockett, Jr. and Lewis Levine. Friends' influence on speech. Sociological Inquiry 37 (1967) 109-28.

7. Susie Cowan. English proficiency and bicultural attitudes of Japanese students. The English Teachers' Magazine, 17.9 (1968) 38-44

8. H. J. Feenstra. Aptitude, Attitude, and Motivation in second language acquisition. Dissertation, University of Western Ontario, 1967.

9. R. C. Gardner, Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. Dissertation, McGill University 1960

10. _____. Attitudes and motivation: their role in second-language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 2 (1968) 141-50.

11. Wallace E. Lambert and R. C. Gardner. Motivational variables in second-language learning. Canadian Journal of Psychology. Vol. 13. (1959).

12. _____, R. C. Hodgson, R. C. Gardner and S. Fillenbaum. Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Languages. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. Vol. 60 No. 1. (1960).

13. _____. Psychological Approaches to the Study of Language, Part I on Second Language Learning and Bilingualism. The Modern Language Journal. Vol. XLVII. No. 3. (March 1963).

14. _____, R. C Gardner, L. C. Barik and K. Tunstall. Attitudinal and Cognitive Aspects of Intensive Study of a Second Language. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. Vol. 66. (1963) pp. 358-369.

15. _____, Moshe Anisfeld and Grace Yeni-Komshian. Evaluational Reactions of Jewish and Arabic Adolescents to Dialect and Language Variations. McGill University (mimeo) 1963.

16. Elizabeth Peal and W. E. Lambert. Evaluational Reactions of Bilingual and Monolingual Children to spoken languages. McGill University (mimeo).

17. Paul Pimsleur. Predicting achievement in foreign language learning. International Journal of American Linguistics. Vol. 29. No. 2 (1962).

18. _____. Predicting success in high school foreign language courses. Educational and Psychological Measurements. Vol. 33. No. 2 (1963).

19. _____. Testing foreign language learning. in Valdman, A. (ed.) Trends in Language Teaching. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966).

20. George A. C. Scherer and Michael Wertheimer. A Psycholinguistic Experiment in Foreign-language Teaching (McGraw-Hill, 1964).

21. Roger W. Shuy, Walter A. Wolfram, William K. Riley. Linguistic correlates of social stratification in Detroit speech. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan (1967).

22. Philip D. Smith, Jr. and Emanuel Berger. An assessment of three foreign language teaching strategies utilizing three language laboratory systems. Final Report, USOE Project 5-0683, Grant OE-7-48-9013-273. January 1968.

23. _____ and Helmut A. Baranyi. A comparison study of the effectiveness of the traditional and audiolingual approaches to foreign language instruction utilizing laboratory equipment Final Report, USOE Project No. 7-0133. Grant No. OEC 1-7-070133-0445. October 1968

24. Bernard Spolsky, Lengt Sigurd, Masahito Sato, Edward Walker and Catherine Arterburn. Preliminary Studies in the Development of Techniques for Testing Overall Second Language Proficiency. Problems in Foreign Language Testing, edited by John A. Upshur. Language Learning Special Issue No. 3 (August 1968), 79-101.

25. _____. Recent Research in TESOL. TESOL Quarterly. 2 (December 1968) 304-7.

26. J. A. Upshur. Four experiments on the relation between foreign language teaching and learning. Language Learning 18 (1968) 111-24.

TABLE I

The Direct Questionnaire and English Proficiency

Group I

	A	B
+	5	8
-	34	50

Group II

	A	B
+	7	8
-	24	30

Group III

	A	B
+	21	10
-	48	49

All Groups

	A	B
+	33	26
-	116	109

A = upper group in English proficiency
B = lower group
+ = positive motivation
- = negative motivation

TABLE II

The Two Questionnaires

Group I

	Direct +	Direct -
Indirect +	2	24
Indirect -	11	40

Group II

	Direct +	Direct -
Indirect +	3	15
Indirect -	12	39

Group III

	Direct +	Direct -
Indirect +	20	25
Indirect -	22	71

All groups

	Direct +	Direct -
Indirect +	25	64
Indirect -	45	150

TABLE III

Self-satisfaction

Group I

	A	B
.5 or more	25	21
less than .5	15	18

Group III

	A	B
.5 or more	35	44
less than .5	29	20

TABLE IV

Similarity to speakers of English

Group I

	A	B
.2 or more	21	15
less than .2	19	24

Group I

	A	B
.5 or more	13	5
less than .5	22	34

Group III

	A	B
.2 or more	42	26
less than .2	24	35

Group I and III combined

	A	B
.2 or more	63	41
less than .2	43	59

TABLE V

Similarity to own group

Group III

	A	B
.5 or more	22	24
less than .5	42	39

TABLE VI

Relative similarity to speakers of English

Group III

	A	B
+	24	15
-	40	48

TABLE VII

Integrative Motivation

Group I

	A	B
+	29	21
-	11	18

Group II

	A	B
+	20	15
-	12	24

Group III

	A	B
+	37	28
-	32	36

Group IV

	A	B
+	10	5
-	7	8

All Groups combined

	A	B
+	96	69
-	62	86

APPENDIX A. Indirect Questionnaire (First Page)

Below is a list of words that can be used to describe people. Think of each word as it might describe you. Indicate, by placing an X in the appropriate column, how well the word describes you.

	Very well	Somewhat	Average	Only a little.	Not at all
1. busy					
2. helpful					
3. economical					
4. confident					
5. competitive					
6. broad-minded					
7. intellectual					
8. democratic					
9. optimistic					
10. businesslike					
11. stubborn					
12. kind					
13. clever					
14. efficient					
15. considerate					
16. studious					
17. nervous					
18. tactful					
19. reasonable					
20. successful					
21. stable					
22. friendly					
23. calm					
24. sincere					
25. fashionable					
26. dependable					
27. teachable					
28. happy					
29. logical					
30. shy					

APPENDIX B. Direct Questionnaire

Listed below are some of the reasons people have for coming to the United States to study. Please indicate by placing an X in the appropriate column, how important each reason is for you personally.

	Most Important	Very Important	Quite Important	A little Important	Not at all Important
1. Seeing the United States					
2. Getting to know Americans					
3. Getting a degree					
4. Getting training in my field					
5. Finding out how people live in the United States					
6. Learning about the United States Government					
7. Having a chance to be away from home					
8. Having a chance to live in another country					
9. Finding out how people in my profession work here					
10. Finding out what student life is like here					
11. Finding out more about what I am like					
12. Having different experiences					
13. Learning English					
14. Meeting many different kinds of people					