DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 714 TM 034 878

AUTHOR Benjamin, Jane

TITLE Construct Validity of "Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales": for Spanish as a Foreign Language.

PUB DATE 2003-04-00

NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Chinese American Educational Research and Development Association (11th, Chicago, IL, April 2003).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *College Students; *Construct Validity; Cultural Differences; Higher Education; Learning Strategies; Likert Scales; *Second Language Learning; *Spanish; *Student Motivation; Test Bias

IDENTIFIERS Motivational Orientation Scale

ABSTRACT

This study examined the construct validity of the Motivation Orientation and Language Learning Strategy Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS). The MOLLS is a Likert-type scale, that has 20 items in 5 broad categories in the motivation orientation scale (MOS) and 18 items in 3 broad categories in the language learning strategies scale (LLSS). These items were adapted for learning English as a foreign language from previous research (M. Entwhistle and P. Ramsden, 1983; J. Nicholls and others, 1985; J. Nicholls, 1989; and W. Lambert and others, 1972). and then were modified to be used for students learning Spanish as a foreign language. A total of 321 students attending a rural U.S. university participated in the study. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to examine the construct validity of the instrument, and internal consistency reliability was examined within each category. The suggested model was not confirmed for the MOS or the LLSS. Further exploratory factor analyses were performed to examine the underlying structures for both MOS and LLSS. The paper discusses items that were culturally biased and that need revision. Three appendixes contain the MOLLS and suggested factors for each item in the MOS and the LLSS. (Contains 4 tables and 35 references.) (Author/SLD)

Construct Validity of "Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language

JANE BENJAMIN, Ph.D.

Associate Professor

Mansfield University, PA

jbenjami@mnsfld.edu

Paper presented at CAERDA 11th Annual Conference

Chicago, April 2003

Construct Validity of "Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language

Abstract

The purpose of this study lies in examining the construct validity of "Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS). The MOLLS is a Likert-type scale, including twenty items in five broad categories in motivation orientation scale (MOS) and 18 items in three broad categories in language learning strategies scale (LLSS). These items were adapted for learning English as a foreign language from previous research (Entwhistle & Ramsden's, 1983; MOS, in Nicholls et al., 1985 and Nicholls, 1989; Lambert et al.,1972) and was slightly modified to be used for students learning Spanish as a foreign language.

A total of 321 students attending a rural American university participated in the study. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to examine construct validity of the instrument. In addition, internal consistency reliability was performed within each category. As a result, the suggested model was not confirmed in either MOS or LLSS. Further exploratory factor analyses were performed to examine the underlining structures for both MOS and LLSS. Items which were culturally biased and needed to be revised were discussed.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this study lies in examining the construct validity of "Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS). The MOLLS is a Likert-type scale, including twenty items in five broad categories in motivation orientation scale (MOS) and 18 items in three broad categories in language learning strategies scale (LLSS) (See Appendix A). These items were adapted for learning English as a foreign language from previous research (Entwhistle & Ramsden's, 1983; MOS, in Nicholls et al., 1985 and Nicholls, 1989; Lambert et al.,1972) and was slightly modified to be used for students learning Spanish as a foreign language.

Previous research has been done in different countries addressing motivation of second language acquisition and the learning strategies. However, these researches focused on students' learning English as a second language. Since Spanish is a popular second language in American college, it will be interesting to see the motivation and the learning strategies students have in learning Spanish as a second language. As a reliable and valid instrument is necessary for any research findings to be meaningful, the validation of the instrument is essential. It is believed that once the instrument is reliable and valid, it can be used to provide valuable information regarding the motivation and the learning strategies of students learning Spanish as a second language. It will also support insights that demonstrate the potential to increase instructional effectiveness and student success in university foreign language programs.

Since the instrument addresses both motivation and learning strategies of learning a second language, this paper will discuss the construct validity of the instrument in motivation and in learning strategies separately.

Theoretical Framework

A: *Learning Strategies of learning a second language*

From the perspective of education, researchers confine learning strategies to the domains of cognition and metacognition. Learning strategies are the general approaches or plans of a learner as well as the higher-level clusters of learning tactics that work together to produce a uniform learning outcome (Schmeck, 1988). These higher-level clusters include 1) conceptualizing (e.g. categorizing, comparing, contrasting, hierarchically organizing, abstracting, and networking ideas), 2) personalizing (e.g. self-referencing, generating examples, translating into personal language and images, and linking new information with prior personal experience), and 3) memorizing (repetitive rehearing of information, using mnemonics, and encoding verbatim).

Learning strategies also refer to a learner's behaviors that intend to influence how the learner processes information. During learning, these behaviors control one's cognitive processes, attention, rehearsal, encoding, and retrieval. These are techniques used for selecting information and building internal and external connections (Mayer, 1988).

Furthermore, Entwhistle and Ramsden (1983) distinguished two types of general study strategies: deep processing and surface-level strategies. Deep processing strategies include processes such as discriminating important from unimportant information, trying to figure out

how new information fits with existing information, and monitoring comprehension. Surface-level strategies include simply practicing over and over, memorizing all the new words, and rehearsing information.

Generally speaking, studies in education show at least one class of learning strategies related to deep processing (or covert cognitive process) and another related to surface processing (overt cognitive process). Although some may include subscales of deep processing and surface processing (Chissom & Iran, 1992), the general concepts of deep and surface processing still hold true. More importantly, results have found that deep processing strategies are significantly and positively related to GPA, an indication of achievement (Kardash & Amlund, 1991; Chossom & Iran, 1992).

In a cross-cultural study, Wong et al. (1996) tested the validity of Biggs's (1987) "Learning Process Questionnaire" (LPQ) and identified three factors (deep, surface, and positioning of achieving). The dimensions of deep and surface approaches to learning received cross-cultural support, while the positioning of achieving dimension varied from culture to culture. In conclusion, the study supported the factors of deep and surface approaches of the LLS scale across different cultural groups.

In addition to the studies mentioned above, a class of strategies is listed in Oxford's "Strategy Inventory For Language Learning" (SILL), which closely relates to **functional practice strategies** (Nyikos & Oxford, 1993). Several studies have used SILL and confirmed the validity of this instrument (Oxford, 1986).

Presently, empirical support in the area of language learning strategies using factor analysis and related techniques is required, in order to generate conceptualized categories of language learning strategies that can be significantly and consistently related to other language learning variables. Accordingly, the LLSS in the "Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales" instrument was developed to include three factors, namely, deep-processing, surface-level, and functional factors (see appendix c)

B: ***Motivation of learning a second language***

1. Intentional Theory of Motivation

From the intentional perspective of achievement motivation, Nicholls and colleagues (Nicholls, 1984; Nicholls, Patashnick, & Nolen, 1985; Nicholls, 1992) postulated that students' motivation orientation is their predisposition to seek certain types of experience and the related beliefs about the causes of success; this framework is intended to be generalized across different fields.

Studies based on intentional theory have focused on three motivation orientations: task orientation, ego orientation, and work avoidance. Task orientation has to do with one's purpose of gaining knowledge, working one's best and collaborating with others. On the other hand, ego orientation has to do with one's purpose of studying to demonstrate superior ability over others. Another dimension, work-avoidance, has also been identified which has to do with making least amount of effort to get away with it.

Empirical studies supporting the three orientations included students of various age groups (Nicholls, et al., 1985; Nicholls, Cobb, Wood, and Yackel, 1990; Thorkildson &

Nicholls, 1998). Results generally found that a greater personal concern with learning and understanding was significantly related to the belief that success is attributed to interest, effort (Thorkildsen & Nocholls, 1998), trying to understand (Nicholls, et al., 1985), and cooperation with peers (Nicholls, et al, 1990). Furthermore, students who seek to be more able than others (i.e., more ego oriented) were more likely to believe that schooling leads to wealth and status (Nicholls et al., 1985), and that competitiveness causes success (Thorkildsen & Nicholls, 1998).

A cross-domain study (Duda and Nicholls, 1992) found that student's motivation orientation can be generalized across academic work and sports. This study associating personal goals and beliefs about the causes of success found that the students' ego orientation in schoolwork and that in sports were highly correlated and task orientation in both schoolwork and sports were also significantly related.

2. Gardner's socio-psychological model

In the area of second language acquisition, students learn a language not simply to understand it, to accomplish a task, or to appear more able than others; they learn a second/foreign language for instrumental reasons, such as, for career promotion (Dornyei, 1990; Gardner, 1985) or integrative reasons, e.g., making friends with the people who speak the language (Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Such social-educational model of language learning, developed by Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972) postulated that there are two major motivation orientations for language learning: integrative and instrumental. Integrative motivation is identified with positive attitudes toward the target language group and potential for integrating into that group, or at least an interest in meeting and interacting with members of the group. Instrumental orientation refers to more functional reasons for learning a language, such as to pass a required examination or to get a better job or promotion.

Early empirical studies have shown that integrative motivation is important for successful acquisition of a second language (Gardner, 1972; Lambert, Gardner, Barik, & Tunstall, 1972) and also important for the intention to continue to study the language (Clement, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977), and that instrumental orientation did not seem to relate to successful language learning (Gardner, 1979; Lambert et al., 1972). Studies in 1980s, however, found that integrative motivation may not be the strongest predictor for language learning (Gardner, 1988; Gardner & McIntyre, 1991; Au, 1988). Furthermore, studies in the 90s have suggested that motivation for learning a second language may not be as simple as integrative-instrumental dichotomy; other motivation components can also play important role: desire for knowledge, a new challenge, need for achievement (Dornyei, 1990, 1994a, 1994b), intellectual stimulation, and personal challenge (Oxford & Shearin, 1994).

In conclusion, intentional theory of motivation emphasizes the task, ego, and work-avoidance orientations (Nicholls, 1984), which were tested to cross different subject domains (Duda & Nicholls, 1992). However, in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), Gardner (1985, p. 65) emphasized that motivation – such as instrumental and integrative orientations -- and attitude determine the extent to which individuals will actively involve in learning the target language. The MOS in the "Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales" instrument was developed to include 5 orientations, namely, task, ego, work-avoidance, instrumental and integrative orientations (see Appendix B)

Method

Participants:

A total of 321 students enrolled in Spanish classes in the Fall 2001, Spring 2002 and Summer 2002 semester at a rural university participated in the study.

Instrument:

The MOLLS is a Likert-type scale, including twenty items in five broad categories in motivation orientation scale (MOS) and 18 items in three broad categories in language learning strategies scale (LLSS). These items were adapted for learning English as a foreign language from previous research (Entwhistle & Ramsden's, 1983; MOS, in Nicholls et al., 1985 and Nicholls, 1989; Lambert et al.,1972) and was slightly modified to be used for students learning Spanish as a foreign language.

Procedures:

The MOLLS was slightly modified (For Spanish as a Foreign Language) and was administered to a total number of 321 rural American university students in their first Spanish course.

Research questions:

This study intends to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the underlying dimensionality of the LLSS?
2. What is the underlying dimensionality of the MOS?
3. Is the instrument consistent within constructs?

Results

A: *LLSS*

In previous study Chen (1999) suggested a three factor structure model of the LLSS. The three factors included deep-processing, surface-level, and functional factors. We used this suggested model to perform confirmatory factor analysis to examine whether the LLSS's structure was consistent with the previous study. The results did not confirm the suggested 3-factor model (N=321, df=132, X^2=926.51, RMSEA=0.14, GFI=0.74, AGFI=0.67, NFI=0.71, NNFI=0.70, CFI=0.74, CN=60.65). Since the confirmatory factor analysis did not confirm the 3 factor model, an exploratory factor analysis was used to examine the number and the nature dimensions. Factors were extracted using a principal component analysis maximum likelihood method. The exploratory factor analysis suggested a 3-factor model, as the first three factors accounted for fifty-five percent of the total variance. Table 1 shows the factor structure coefficient for each item. By carefully examining the items loading on each factor, we found that seven items loaded on different factors, than indicated by the suggested model.

Internal consistency reliability was performed to test the correlation among items for each

factor. Table 2 shows the internal consistency reliability of the LLSS in each factor. The internal consistency reliabilities were above 0.8 for the functional and deep-processing factors. However, the surface-processing factor had lower reliability coefficients.

B: *MOS*

Since the previous study (Chen, 1999).suggested 5 factors of the MOS, confirmatory factor was performed to examine whether the MOS structure was consistent with the previous study. The results did not confirm the suggested 5-factor model (N=321, df=160, X^2=791.65, RMSEA=0.11, GFI=0.81, AGFI=0.75, NFI=0.73, NNFI=0.72, CFI=0.77, CN=83.68).

As the confirmatory factor analysis did not confirm the suggested model from the previous study, the number and nature of dimensions measured by the MOS were identified through an exploratory factor analysis. Factors were extracted using a principal component analysis maximum likelihood method. The exploratory factor analysis suggested a 5-factor model. The first five factors accounted for fifty-nine percent of the total variance. Table 3 shows the factor structure coefficient for each item. However, after examining and comparing the factor pattern matrices for the five factor solution, some items were problematic. Questions 5 and 8 appeared to load on a separate factor. In addition, questions 13 and 17 were loaded on one factor and questions 16 and 19 were on another factor, although these 4 items were supposed to measure Integrative Orientation.

Internal consistency reliability was performed to test the correlation among items for each factor. Table 4 shows the internal consistency reliability of the LLSS in each factor. All of the internal consistency reliabilities were above 0.7 except Task and Instrumental factor.

Conclusion

A valid and reliable instrument is essential to the meaningful interpretation of research findings. The confirmatory factor analysis did not confirm the model that was suggested in the previous study for both LLSS and MOS. This suggests that the instrument may not be used without further validation. Perhaps items on the instrument were not clearly written and could be interpreted in different way. The MOS was originally developed to include 5 different orientations (task, ego, work-avoidance, integrative, and instrumental). However, after carefully examining the factor structure and the correlation among the factors, four factors were more suitable. We combined the ego and work-avoidance as one factor since the correlation is high between the two factors.(r=.72). Perhaps, some items which classified as work- avoidance could also be Ego-related. For example, Question number 6: I don't have to work hard in finishing assignments, could also interpreted as Ego orientation. Question 11: I don't do homework yet I get away with it, was very vague. It could be interpreted as work- avoidance or could be something else.

The internal consistency reliability coefficient was high in the deep-processing and functional factors in LLSS. The items within these two factors appear to be suitable. However, the surface-processing factor yielded a low reliability coefficient. This may be contributed to unclearly written items and/or a small number of items within this particular scale. Further study may include adding more items to the surface-processing scale and rephrasing the unclear items. As in MOS, since current data showed the original ego items and work-avoidance items loaded in one single factor, it probably suggested that those who are orientated toward performing better

than others (ego orientation) also work hard only to show superiority to others, otherwise, they just want to make least amount of effort in order to get away with the task (work avoidance). Ego orientation is closely related to work avoidance.

Although this study did not confirm the suggested structure of the LLSS and MOS, it did provide information regarding the items of the MOLLS. This preliminary validation study suggested the revision of the instrument for further study. Once the instrument is valid and reliable, it can be used to obtain information to support insights that demonstrate the potential to increase instructional effectiveness and student success in university foreign language programs.

REFERENCES

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

Biggs, J. G. (1987). Student approaches to learning and studying. Hawthorn, Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Chen, Y. L. (2001, June 28-30). Deep versus surface: LLS of college students learning English as a foreign language in Taiwan, paper presented at the Second Regional Conference of Cross-Link of College English language teaching, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Chen,Yih-Lan. (1999). Motivation and Language Learning Strategies in Learning English as a Foreign Language. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

Chen, Yih-Lan. and Mizokawa, D. T. (2002). Reasons to learn English as a Foreign Language: General versus Domain-Specific Orientations. Unpublished manuscript.

Chissom, B. & Iran, N. A. (1992). Development of an instrument to assess learning strategies. Psychological Reports, 71(3), 1001-1002.

Clement, R., Gardner, R. C., and Smythe, P. C. (1977). Motivational variables in second language acquisition: A study of Francophones learning English. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 9(2), 123-133.

Dornyei, Z. (1994a). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. Modern Language Journal, 78(3), 273-284.

Dornyei, Z. (1994b). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge! Modern Language Journal, 78(4), 515-523.

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

Duda, J, L. & Nicholls, J. G. (1992). Dimensions of achievement motivation in schoolwork and sport. Journal of Educational Psychology, 84(3), 290-299.

Entwhistle, M. J. & Ramsdan, P. (1983). Understanding student learning. London: Croom Helm.

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

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

Gardner, R. C. (1979). Social psychological aspects of second language acquisition. In Giles, H. & St. Clair, R. (Eds.), Language and social psychology (pp. 193-220). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gardner, R. C. (1972). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. In R. C. Gardner & W. Lambert (Eds), Attitudes and motivation in second language learning (pp. 119-216). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13, 191-197.

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

Grainger P. R. (1997). Language-Learning Strategies for Learners of Japanese: Investigating Ethnicity. Foreign-Language-Annals, 30(3), 378-85.

He, H. (1996). Chinese Students' Approach to Learning English: Psycholinguistic and

Sociolinguistic Perspectives, Master's Thesis, Biola University.

Kardash, C. M. & Amlund, J. T. (1991). Self-reported learning strategies and learning from expository text. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 16(1), 117-138.

Lambert, W. E., Gardner, R. C., Barik, H. C., & Tunstall, K. (1972). Attitudinal and cognitive aspects of intensive study of a second language. In R. C. Gardner & W. E. Lambert (Eds), Attitude and motivation in second-language learning (pp. 228-245). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Mayer, R. E. (1988). Learning strategies: An overview. Learning and study strategies: Issues in assessment, instruction, and evaluation. Eds. C. E. Weinstein, E. T. Goetz, and P. A. Alexander. New York: Academic Press, 11-22.

Nicholls, J. G. (1992). Students as educational theorists. In D. Schunk & J. Meece (Eds), Student Perception in the Classroom (pp. 267-286). Erlbaum.

Nicholls, J. G. (1989). The competitive ethos and democratic education. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. Psychological Review, 91, 328-346.

Nicholls, J. G., Cobb, P. , Wood, T. , & Yackel, E. (1990). Assessing students' theories of success in mathematics: Individual and classroom differences. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 21(2), 109-122.

Nicholls, J. G., Patashnick, M., & Nolen, S. B. (1985). Adolescents' theories of education. Journal of Educational Psychology, 77, 683-692.

Nyikos, M. & Oxford, R. L. (1993). A factor analytic study of language-learning strategies use: Interpretations from information-processing theory and social psychology. Modern Language Journal 77(1), 11-22.

Oxford, R. L. (1986). Development and psychometric testing of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). Army Research Institute Technical Report, 728. Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Science.

Oxford, R. L. & Cohen, A. D. (1992). Language learning strategies: Crucial issues of concept and classification. Applied Language Learning, 3, 1-35.

Oxford, R. L. & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: expanding the theoretical framework. Modern Language Journal, 78(1), 12-28.

Park G. P. (1997). Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency in Korean University Students. Foreign-Language-Annals, 30(2), 211-21.

Schmeck, R. R. (1988). An introduction to strategies and styles of learning. Learning strategies and learning styles. Ed.R. R. Schmeck. New York: Plenum Press, 3-19.

Thorkildsen, T. A. & Nicholls, J. G. (1998). Fifth graders' achievement orientations and beliefs: Individual and classroom differences. Journal of Educational Psychology, 90(2), 179-201.

Wong, N. Y., Lin, W. Y., & Watkins, D. (1996). Cross-cultural validation of models of approaches to learning: An application of confirmatory factory analysis. Educational Psychology, 16(3), 317-327.

Table 1: Factor Structure Coefficient for Each Item in LLSS

	Component		
	1	2	3
F1	.086	.801	.096
D1	.518	.170	-.242
F2	.578	.567	.029
D2	.683	.217	.123
D3	.747	.137	.168
D4	.728	.124	.191
D5	.684	.267	.044
F3	.585	.538	.039
F4	.163	.821	.000
S1	.687	-.040	.297
S2	.565	-.151	.403
F5	.096	.782	.154
F6	.338	.436	.313
D6	.387	-.208	.603
F7	.-.010	.480	.555
S3	.040	.172	.675
S4	.278	.063	.662
D7	.261	.171	.636

Table 2: Internal Consistency Reliability of the LLSS in Each Factor

	N=321 Correlation Coefficient (r)
Functional	.8361
Deep- Processing	.8045
Surface- Level	.6582

Table 3: Factor Structure Coefficient for Each Item in MOS

	1	2	3	4	5
T1	.29	.28	.24	.58	-.22
T2	.12	.13	.18	.59	.00
E1	.68	-.07	.42	.11	-.12
W1	.82	.09	-.02	.09	.03
T3	-.02	.15	.57	.10	.14
W2	.82	.00	-.09	-.02	.00
E2	.74	.00	.33	.16	-.13
T4	-.21	.11	.58	.41	.14
E3	.49	.17	.64	.12	.03
W3	.83	.05	-.16	.03	.09
W4	.37	.27	.09	-.56	.11
E4	.54	.09	.51	-.26	-.07
G1	-.07	.74	.08	-.02	-.03
I1	.01	.78	.16	-.01	.04
I2	.12	.67	-.06	.16	.02
G2	-.02	-.25	.08	-.12	.71
G3	.00	.62	.27	.27	.07
I3	.00	.15	.10	.13	.72
G4	.17	.25	-.11	.60	.27
I4	.09	.74	.06	.08	-.16

Table 4: Internal Consistency Reliability of the MOS in Each Factor

Orientation	N=321
Task	.5712
Ego	.8227
Work-Avoidance	.7686
Integrative	.7658
Instrumental	.2520

Appendix A

Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS for SFL, version 2.3)

I. Motivation:
The following items are descriptions about people learning Spanish. Please indicate how much you think each description applies to you.
5 indicates **Strongly Agree** **4** indicates **Agree** **3** indicates **Neutral**
2 indicates **Disagree** **1** indicates **Strongly Disagree**
Under the following situation, you feel you have had a really successful day in school.
I feel most successful if

1. ( )What I learn in Spanish motivates me to know more.
2. ( )I have learned a lot more than I used to be.
3. ( )My performance is better than others.
4. ( )The Spanish exam is very easy.
5. ( )My friends and I help each other working on problems and assignments.
6. ( )I don't have to work hard in finishing assignments.
7. ( )My Spanish score is higher than others.
8. ( )I finish an assignment by working hard.
9. ( )I show others my Spanish is good.
10. ( )The Spanish assignment is easy.
11. ( )I don't do homework yet I get away with it.
12. ( )I am the only one who can answer the teacher's questions in Spanish.

Why are you learning Spanish?
I am learning Spanish because.....

13. ( )I want to be like the Spanish-speaking people
14. ( )Learning Spanish enables me to make friends with Spanish-speaking people.
15. ( )A person with good Spanish ability is highly recognized in our society.
16. ( )Spanish credits are required.
17. ( )I want to know more of the culture of Spanish-speaking countries.
18. ( )I want to pass related examinations, such as teacher license exams, etc.
19. ( ) Good Spanish proficiency will increase job opportunities.
20. ( ) So one day I can live at an Spanish-speaking country.

II. Learning strategies:
The following are some strategies that you may use for learning Spanish. Please indicate how much you think each description applies to you.

1. ( ) I often listen to Spanish broadcasting.
2. ( ) I analyze sentence structure so I can understand the meaning.
3. ( ) I look for opportunities to speak with others in Spanish.
4. ( ) I often think about my progress in Spanish.
5. ( ) I have clear goals in how I am going to study Spanish.
6. ( ) I make plans and arrangement to study Spanish.
7. ( ) I try to figure out how new things I learn in Spanish fit with what I know.
8. ( ) I find many ways to use Spanish.

9. ( ) I read Spanish other than text books.
10. ( ) I spend a lot of time in memorizing and reciting things I learn in Spanish.
11. ( ) In order to memorize the sentences, I read them again and again.
12. ( ) To be familiar with Spanish conversation, I often watch Spanish-speaking movies.
13. ( ) I talk to myself in Spanish.
14. ( ) In order to understand the meaning of the sentence, I read it several times.
15. ( ) I write diary, take notes in Spanish.
16. ( ) I take notes word by word without skipping anything.
17. ( ) When I come across any new work while I read, I immediately look up the dictionary.
18. ( ) I look for rules in Spanish structure.

III. Please provide the following information or circle whichever items that best describe you.

Age:_____ Gender: Male, Female Year in college: _____

Major:_____

Military service: _____for _____years

Work Experience: _____ for _____ years

Parents' Spanish proficiency: None, Low, Medium, High

Location of Hometown: Urban, Country

Computer Usage : None, Infrequent , Sometimes, Frequent

Leisure activities: _____

The End of Scales.

If you have questions concerning this survey, please e-mail: jbenjami@mnsfld.edu
Thank you for your cooperation.

Appendix B

The suggested factors for each item in the Motivation Orientation Scale: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS for SFL, version 2.3)

The following items are descriptions about people learning Spanish. Please indicate how much you think each description applies to you.
5 indicates **Strongly Agree** **4** indicates **Agree** **3** indicates **Neutral**
2 indicates **Disagree** **1** indicates **Strongly Disagree**
Under the following situation, you feel you have had a really successful day in school.

I feel most successful if
1. (t1) What I learn in Spanish motivates me to know more.
2. (t2) I have learned a lot more than I used to be.
3. (e1) My performance is better than others.
4. (w1) The Spanish exam is very easy.
5. (t3) My friends and I help each other working on problems and assignments.
6. (w2) I don't have to work hard in finishing assignments.
7. (e2) My Spanish score is higher than others.
8. (t4) I finish an assignment by working hard.
9. (e3) I show others my Spanish is good.
10. (w3) The Spanish assignment is easy.
11. (w4) I don't do homework yet I get away with it.
12. (e4) I am the only one who can answer the teacher's questions in Spanish.

Why are you learning Spanish?
I am learning Spanish because.....
13. (g4) I want to be like the Spanish-speaking people
14. (g1) Learning Spanish enables me to make friends with Spanish-speaking people.
15. (i1) A person with good Spanish ability is highly recognized in our society.
16. (i2) Spanish credits are required.
17. (g2) I want to know more of the culture of Spanish-speaking countries.
18. (i3) I want to pass related examinations, such as teacher license exams, etc.
19. (i4) Good Spanish proficiency will increase job opportunities.
20. (g3) So one day I can live at an Spanish-speaking country.

t: task orientation; w: work-avoidance; e: ego orientation; i: instrumental orientation;

g: integrative orientation

Appendix C

The suggested factors for each item in the Language Learning Strategies Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS for SFL, version 2.3)

The following items are descriptions about people learning Spanish. Please indicate how much you think each description applies to you.
5 indicates **Strongly Agree** **4** indicates **Agree** **3** indicates **Neutral**
2 indicates **Disagree** **1** indicates **Strongly Disagree**

1. (f1) I often listen to Spanish broadcasting.
2. (d1) I analyze sentence structure so I can understand the meaning.
3. (f2) I look for opportunities to speak with others in Spanish.
4. (d2) I often think about my progress in Spanish.
5. (d3) I have clear goals in how I am going to study Spanish.
6. (d4) I make plans and arrangement to study Spanish.
7. (d5) I try to figure out how new things I learn in Spanish fit with what I know.
8. (f3) I find many ways to use Spanish.
9. (f4) I read Spanish other than text books.
10. (s1) I spend a lot of time in memorizing and reciting things I learn in Spanish.
11. (s2) In order to memorize the sentences, I read them again and again.
12. (f5) To be familiar with Spanish conversation, I often watch Spanish-speaking movies.
13. (f6) I talk to myself in Spanish.
14. (d6) In order to understand the meaning of the sentence, I read it several times.
15. (f7) I write diary, take notes in Spanish.
16. (s3) I take notes word by word without skipping anything.
17. (s4) When I come across any new work while I read, I immediately look up the dictionary.
18. (d7) I look for rules in Spanish structure.

f: Funtional Strategies; d: Deep-processing strategies; s: Surface-level strategies;

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM034878

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Construct Validity of "Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales" for Spanish as a foreign Language.

Author(s): Jane Benjamin

Corporate Source: Mansfield University, PA.

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Jane Benjamin	Printed Name/Position/Title: Jane Benjamin, Associate Professor
Organization/Address: Mansfield University. 203B Retan Center Mansfield, PA 16933	Telephone: (570) 662-4791 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: jbenjami@mnsfld.edu Date: 4/2/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: **University of Maryland**
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Lab, Bldg 075
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

University of Maryland
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Lab, Bldg 075
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions