

## Is Oral Performance Affected by Motivation?

Seyyed Mohammad Ali Soozandehfar

Shiraz University

**Soozandehfar, S. (2010). Is Oral Performance Affected by Motivation? *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 105-119.**

The present investigation intends to make a comparison between integratively motivated students of English at Islamic Azad University of Shiraz and their instrumentally motivated peers in terms of their oral performance. To this end, 35 junior students (15 males and 20 females) were selected out of 54 initial participants based on their scores on the Oxford Placement Test. A 20-item motivation questionnaire adopted from Laine (1969) was employed to constitute two groups of 13 integrative and 22 instrumental students. The students' scores on the two courses of Oral Reproduction 1 & 2 were used to represent their oral proficiency. The statistical analysis, using independent t-test, revealed that there was no significant difference between the integratively oriented participants and their instrumentally oriented counterparts as far as their speaking was concerned. Teachers in an EFL context can use either instrumental or integrative motivation to develop students' L2 speaking ability.

**Key Words:** instrumental, integrative, motivation, oral performance

### 1 Introduction

Many of the current theories of second language motivation come from the early work of Gardner and Lambert (1959). They are the first to make a distinction between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation and this has a tremendous influence on almost all second language related research in this area. According to Gardner and Lambert (1972), integrative motivation is related to those who learn a second language in order to identify with a member of the language community. Instrumental motivation is, on the other hand, motivation to learn the language for an instrumental purpose, such as getting a better job or earning more money and so on. Gardner and his associates proposed a model referred to as *Socio-Educational Model of Language Learning*. In their model, Gardner and Lambert argued that success in a foreign/second language is likely to be lower if the underlying

motivational orientation is instrumental rather than integrative. But research (for example, Au, 1988; Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Svanes, 1987) since then has cast doubt on the application of this claim to foreign language learners in general. Furthermore, some researchers (Chihara & Oller, 1978; Clement, Dornyei, & Noels, 1994; Dornyei, 1990, 1998; Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy, 1996) have argued that differences in contexts between SLA and foreign language learning (FLL) are significant. Because learners in FLL do not have enough contact with the target language group, integrative motivation is determined by more general attitudes and beliefs.

As a matter of fact, different studies, with the purpose of testing Gardner and Lambert's (1972) model, have compared integratively and instrumentally motivated learners of a target language from different perspectives, such as proficiency, achievement, strategy use, etc. However, few researches have made such a comparison in terms of oral proficiency, a skill which more than the others needs contact with native speakers. Furthermore, in an EFL context, speaking a foreign language is perhaps the most desirable manifestation of knowing a language among people. When somebody claims that s/he knows a language, people usually expect him/her to be able to speak that language rather than read, write or listen to it. Unfortunately, there is a real paucity of research on speaking not only in Iran but also in other countries. Out of more than 30 volumes of a journal, you can hardly find five or six articles on speaking. Research on the relationship between speaking and motivation is no exception.

## **2 Literature Review**

Gardner and Lambert (1959) pioneered the studies of language learning motivation through a social psychological perspective. Gardner and Lambert focused their study on students in Montreal, Canada, studying French as a second language. In this study they identified two important factors. One was identified as Language Aptitude, and the other was identified as Motivation, which comprised measures of attitudes toward French Canadians, motivation to learn French, and orientation. It suggested that it was the orientation that provided a strong motivation to learn the other group's language. The individuals who were classified as integratively oriented obtained higher scores on the measure of French proficiency than students classified as instrumentally oriented, leading to the conclusion that the students who were integratively oriented were more successful in learning a second language than the students who were instrumentally oriented.

While early studies on language learning orientation (e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1959; 1972) supported the importance of the integrative over the instrumental orientation, other studies began to investigate the relationship between orientation and language proficiency. As Clement and Kruidenier (1983) suggested:

Some supported the importance of an instrumental orientation (e.g., Gardner and Lambert 1972, the Maine studies; Lukmani 1972), and in still others, a negative relationship was obtained between the integrative (Oller, Hudson, & Liu 1977) or the instrumental (Oller, Baca, & Vigil 1977) orientation and proficiency. Finally, no significant relationships were obtained by Chihara and Oller (1978) between either the integrative or the instrumental orientation and proficiency in English. (p. 274)

Due to the contradictory results obtained from different studies comparing the effectiveness of different orientations to second language acquisition, Clement & Kruidenier (1983) designed a study to clarify the definition of orientations in second language learning and to resolve previous contradictory findings by considering the influence of the linguistic composition of the milieu (unicultural vs. multicultural), ethnicity (French vs. English), and the target language (official vs. minority language) on the emergence of orientations to second language learning. A total of 871 grade 11 students in eight groups participated in this study. A questionnaire, which included 37 orientation items chosen from previous studies, was delivered to the subjects. In addition to instrumental orientation, travel, friendship, and knowledge orientations were found for all groups of subjects, while the results did not support the construct validity of a general tendency of integrative orientation. Clement & Kruidenier suggested that “given their stability and generality, reasons related to the acquisition of knowledge, travel, friendship, or instrumentability should be considered as independent orientations in future studies” (p. 286). While the previous studies of the orientation have emphasized the universality and thoroughness of integrative and instrumental orientations, Clement and Kruidenier advised an extension of orientations with respect to the influence of the learning context, and they claimed that “the emergence of orientations is, to a large extent, determined by ‘who learns what in what milieu’” (p. 288).

Belmechri & Hummel (1998) did a similar study on language learning orientation with the hypothesis that “orientations are context-dependent, not exclusively instrumental or integrative” (p. 224). 93 high school students learning English as a second language participated in this study. The final results indicated that students’ orientations were: *travel, understanding/School* (for academic purpose; i.e. instrumental), *friendship, understanding* (for understanding English art), and *career* (instrumental). The results differed from those of Clement & Kruidenier’s (1983) had obtained in the same context, but there was some important overlap. As for the integrative orientation, Belmechri and Hummel claimed that their subjects in the study did not show an integrative orientation for learning English, although “the integrative orientation appeared as part of general orientation” (p. 239). According to

Gardner & Lambert (1959, 1972), integrative orientation associated with a positive tendency toward the L2 group and a desire to interact with and even become a valued member of that group. Therefore, Belmechri & Hummel denied the existence of integrative orientation in their study results because of the subjects' negative desire to become a member of the Anglophone community. In addition, they concluded that some orientations, either instrumental or integrative, 1) emerged as important; 2) stood on their own as general orientations, and 3) exhibited different definitions from one context to another, suggesting that the definition of orientation was context-dependent.

A similar research conducted to clarify the language learning orientations in different language learning contexts was carried out by Dornyei (1990). In his study, a motivational questionnaire was developed and administered to 134 learners of English in Hungary, a typical European FLL environment. Based upon the results, a motivational construct consisted of 1) an instrumental motivational subsystem, 2) an integrative motivational subsystem, 3) need for achievement, and 4) attributions about past failure. Actually, in the first two parts, Dornyei found several factors which were instrumental or integrative oriented. Although he did not call them orientations, he did mention that "the instrumental motivational subsystem is conceived as a set of motives organized by the individual's future career striving" (p.65). As for the integrative motivational subparts, he identified four distinct dimensions: 1) socialcultural orientation, 2) knowledge orientation, 3) travel orientation, and 4) friendship orientation. In fact, Dornyei classified the orientations such as knowledge, travel, and friendship into the integrative subsystem by claiming that "the integrative and instrumental subsystems overlap in some areas, which is particularly obvious in the case of the desire for actual integrative into a new community" (p. 66).

Dornyei (2002) concluded that the traditional instrumental orientation does not really refer to the utilitarian dimension in using English in Hungarian context. Csizer & Dornyei (2002) remarked that other incentives such as traveling, making foreign friends, understanding the lyrics of English songs rather than getting a job, or a place in higher education were involved.

On the other hand, integrativeness was viewed as the association with one's ideal self in the mastery of a second language. This ideal language self is a cognitive representation of all incentives associated with second language mastery, and is also linked to professional competence. Csizer & Dornyei (2002) extended the concept of integrativeness further to explain the motivational set-up in different learning contexts, even there is little or not direct contact with second language speakers.

Yashima (2002) extended the concept of integrativeness to refer generalized international attitudes to the international community. He suggested the concept of 'international posture' in English language motivation. By international community he meant a non-specific global community of English speaker users.

## Is Oral Performance Affected by Motivation?

Ushioda (2006) saw that the non-specific global community can be viewed as part of an internal representation of oneself, and this internal domain of self and identity shifts the thinking of integrative motivation. Political dimension of language learning motivation relates to language choice and also the processes of engagement with language learning, language use and social interaction with second language speakers. In short, as Koiso (2003) states:

Integrative motivation is no longer regarded as the one dominant motivation in L2 acquisition. The definition of integrative motivation /integrativeness shifted from identification with the community where the target language is spoken to a new place. Integrative motivation, especially in EFL (English as a foreign language) contexts, is now regarded to relate to factors such as interest in foreign language and desire for interaction with the target language community. Also many other orientations are extracted by factor analysis in recent research on motivation. (p. 3)

In the EFL context of Iran, some studies, based on Gardner and Lambert's (1972) model, have made comparisons between integratively and instrumentally motivated learners from different perspectives. For example, Hassanpur (1999) carried out a study on 102 Shiraz University Science students and found that the students with integrative motivation make use of more memory and cognitive strategies as compared with their instrumentally motivated peers. The results of this study confirm Gardner and Lambert's argument that integratively motivated students are more successful learners.

Another extensive study was conducted by Roohani (2001) who studied the motivational variables (integrative and instrumental) towards learning English as a foreign language among senior students majoring in English at Shiraz State and Shiraz Islamic Azad University. The participants were 91 senior students from State University and 70 senior students from Shiraz Islamic Azad University. The results indicated that the students at Shiraz State University were more integratively oriented as compared with their peers at Azad University. Furthermore, a positive correlation was found between integrative motivation and proficiency level.

Needless to say, an excessive amount of studies have been done on motivation globally. The focus of the present study is on the instrumental /integrative dichotomy proposed by Gardner and Lambert (1972). Educators unanimously agree that motivation has a central and vital role in enhancement of any given educational context. What is under focus in the present study is the distinction Gardner and Lambert (1972) came up with, which had been investigated by quite a few researchers in the Iranian context by this time. More importantly, the effect each dichotomy can have on *speaking* has never been studied in Iranian context.

## Objective of the Study

Based on Gardner and Lambert's (1959, 1972) psychological framework which claims that success in foreign/second language is likely to be lower if the underlying motivational orientation is instrumental rather than integrative, the present study is going to test the following hypothesis:

*Students of English at Shiraz University are likely to be less successful in English language speaking if the underlying motivation orientation is instrumental rather than integrative.*

## 3 Method

### 3.1 Participants

The participants of the study were initially 54 students from a junior class with basically 63 students who studied English Literature in English Languages and Linguistics Department at Shiraz University College of Literature and Humanities. The age of the participants ranged from 21 to 27. After the scores of Oxford Placement Test were obtained, those students whose scores were within one SD minus and one SD plus the mean were selected (N=37) and the rest were excluded. The type of motivation each student possessed was then determined. It was found that 13 students were integratively motivated, 22 instrumentally motivated and two stood in borderline. The two borderline students were left out and the remaining 35 students were selected for the purposes of the study. To make sure that the two groups did not differ in terms of their language proficiency, a t-test was run on the scores of the students on the Oxford Placement Test and no statistically significant difference was found.

Table 1. Independent t-test for Proficiency Scores

Groups	NO.	Mean	SD	t-value	DF	SIG
Integrative	13	42.62	1.89	0.89	33	0.36
Instrumental	22	42.54	2.20			

As shown in Table 1, the computed significance is 0.362, which is greater than the significance level set for the study (0.05). Statistically, it follows that there is not a significant difference between the two groups. Consequently, the groups are not different in terms of their proficiency scores; it all boils down to the fact that the students in the two groups are statistically at the same level in terms of their proficiency performance.

### 3.2 Instruments

The instruments chosen were:

1) Oxford Placement Test (1, B1) by Allen (1985), which consists of 50 items, each with in three alternative choices of which the testees have to choose the correct response. The first 20 items are meaning-wise independent of one another, the remaining 30 items, however, are sequential.

2) A motivation questionnaire designed by Laine (1987) and validated by Salimi (2000). To avoid any confusion and enhance validity, the Persian version of the questionnaire was utilized. The questionnaire is made up of 20 questions; questions 1 to 4 measure the students' direction of motivation, questions 5 to 8 attempt to measure the students' intensity (strength) of motivation, items 9 to 12 measure the student instrumental motivation and questions 13 to 16 measure the students' cognitive motivation. It goes without saying that, items 9 to 12 and 13 to 16 are needed for the purpose of this study.

3) As to the participants' oral proficiency, their scores on the two courses of Oral Reproduction 1 & 2 taken during the first and second semesters in the second year were used. In each course the students had been divided into two sections which were taught by two different instructors. In order to gain reliable oral proficiency scores, the means of the students' scores in the courses were calculated and then turned into Z-scores based on which subsequent data analyses were carried out. In addition, the instructors of the courses were interviewed and asked to give detailed accounts of their scoring systems.

### 3.3 Procedures for Data Collection and Analyses

To gather data, students were asked to do the Oxford Placement Test and complete the motivation questionnaire at the beginning of one of their classes whose instructor generously gave 30 minutes of her class time to the researcher. This was done at the beginning of the class because students are naturally more energetic and have higher care and concentration for doing the tests compared to their status at the end of the class.

Following clear instructions on how to take the test, they were given Oxford Placement Test. The students were given ample time to mark their answers with utmost care and attention. It took the slowest of them around 15 minutes to complete the test. Subsequently, the questionnaires for the motivation type were handed out and the students were requested to complete the questionnaires patiently and with utmost attention. It took them around 5 minutes.

The independent t-test procedure was used to compare the proficiency scores of the two groups of instrumentally oriented students with those of their

integratively oriented peers so as to realize whether the participants in the two groups differ in their proficiency or not. Once ensured that the two groups were not different in terms of their performance on the proficiency test, the means of the instrumentally motivated group and the integratively motivated one were compared, based on their oral proficiency scores and through another independent t-test (the level of significance was set at 0.05), the rationale behind which was to find out whether the two groups (instrumental versus integrative) were different as far as their oral performance is concerned.

#### 4 Results and Discussions

In the table below (Table 2) the participants are characterized with respect to their motivation type and their scores on the proficiency test as well as theirs on the oral performance test.

Table 2. Participants' Motivation Types and Their Proficiency Levels

Motivation	Instrumental	Integrative
Number	22	13
Proficiency Mean	42.54	42.62
Proficiency SD	2.20	1.89
Oral Proficiency Mean (Z-score)	-0.109	0.187
Oral Prof. SD	1.88	0.72

In order to control the proficiency level of the instrumental and integrative groups, an independent t-test was run. To find out which group (instrumental or integrative) of the students was better in terms of their oral performance, another independent t-test was made use of. In Table 3, the means of instrumental and integrative groups are compared, based on the mean of the scores obtained from the proficiency test and the oral proficiency scores so as to determine which group (integrative or instrumental) scored higher on their oral performance.

Table 3. The t-values of Proficiency Levels

Proficiency t-value	0.857
Proficiency DF	33
Proficiency SIG	0.362
Oral Perf. T-value	0.734
Oral Perf. DF	33
Oral Perf. SIG	0.441

#### 4.1 Independent t-test results

##### Proficiency

As Table 3 shows the computed significance is 0.362, which is greater than the significance level set for the study (0.05). Statistically speaking, it follows that



there is not a significant difference between the two groups. Consequently, the groups are not different in terms of their proficiency scores; it all boils down to the fact that the students in the two groups are statistically at the same level in terms of their written performance.

#### Oral performance

As displayed in table 3, the significance computed is 0.441, which is much greater than 0.05 (the significance level) and statistically there is no statistical difference between the two groups regarding their speaking and neither group is better as their speaking is concerned.

### **4.2 Discussion**

This study was intended to test the hypothesis that junior students of English Literature at Shiraz University are likely to be less successful in English language speaking if the underlying motivation orientation is instrumental rather than integrative. But like the original study, the results of this replication did not show any significant difference between integratively and instrumentally motivated participants in terms of their oral performance and consequently the hypothesis is rejected. In fact, the results of this study is in line with other researches (Au, 1988; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dornyei, 1990; Ely, 1986; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, Smythe & Clément, 1979; Kraemer, 1993; Lukmani, 1972; Muchnick & Wolfe, 1982; Oller, 1981; Oller, Baca & Vigil, 1977) carried out in different contexts, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts and found contradictory results with regard to Gardner and Lambert's claim.

The not-much-expected findings can be accounted for in different ways. One plausible explanation is the fact that in the EFL context of Iran, English learners do not come into contact with native speakers of English very often, hence even if students are integratively motivated and have the desire to be able to speak like a native speaker, they might not be able to fulfill this demand and make a significant difference with their instrumentally motivated peers. In fact, the isolation from native speakers prevents the development of cultural empathy necessary for linguistic fluency (Brown, 1993; Dornyei, 1990, 1994) and this is most obvious in speaking rather than other skills. Skills like reading writing, and even listening do not demand as much interaction with native speakers as speaking does; therefore, those who are integratively motivated and have a desire to identify with a member of the target language community, have a tendency to develop their reading skill as much as they can by reading different books in the target language. They can also make great progress in writing by practicing and composing different types of texts in the target language through imitating the writing styles available in the target language books. Even listening can be practiced to a great extent, in an EFL context, by those who are integratively motivated. Recent advances in mass media,

especially satellites and internet have provided motivated people with a rich source for listening. As a result, those who are really interested and integratively motivated might surpass their instrumentally motivated counterparts and reveal their type of orientation (integrativeness) in these three skills. But what about speaking? Even if you are an integratively motivated person, because there is no direct contact with native speakers and consequently enough opportunities to practice speaking in an EFL context, there might not be a significant difference between integratively motivated learners and their instrumentally motivated peers in terms of their speaking ability. And this is exactly what the results of this study have revealed.

Furthermore, in the context of Iran one of the biggest and in actual fact the main concern of the young people is success in the entrance examination and matriculation; subsidiary to that, those who are high school students need to do well on their high school tests. Likewise, those language learners who are university students, for the most part, need English for academic purposes. Similarly, those who belong to none of the aforementioned groups may need English for career advancement and promotion as in the case of company staff. They also may learn English in the hope of finding a better job as in the case of unemployed graduates; needless to say, because nowadays the prerequisite to computer literacy is being at least to some extent familiar with reading and writing in English. All this means that even if there are some language learners in Iran who want to integrate with English culture, the present status of English and the type of its usage in our country forces them to concentrate more on literacy skills of reading and writing rather than on speaking.

This is in line with what Au (1988) and Dornyei (1990) have put forth. They contend that the concept of integrative motivation is less relevant for EFL contexts learners than for those in an ESL setting. In addition, Dornyei concluded that in case of foreign language learners the motivation they have is mainly instrumental. The findings of this study seem to corroborate the conclusions of Dornyei (1990) and Au (1988). Consequently, as Koiso (2003) states, integrative motivation is no longer regarded as one dominant motivation in L2 acquisition. The definition of integrative motivation/integrativeness shifted from identification with the community where the target language is spoken to a new place. Integrative motivation, especially in EFL (English as a foreign language) contexts, is now regarded to relate to factors such as interest in foreign language and desire for interaction with the target language community.

After all, although the distinction between integrative and instrumental orientations is a common one in this field of research and some studies (for example, Chihara & Oller, 1978; Lukmani, 1972; Oller, Baca, & Vigil, 1977; Oller, Hudson, & Liu, 1977), including the present one, have used orientation items as their major affective measures, as Gardner and MacIntyre (1991) remark, this approach places too much emphasis on orientation. In the research that has demonstrated the importance of affective factors (for example,

Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1972), it has been shown repeatedly that it is not so much the orientation that promotes achievement but rather the motivation. If an integrative or instrumental orientation is not linked with heightened motivation to learn the second language, it is difficult to see how either could promote proficiency. Gardner, Smythe and Lalonde (1984) assert that Research that focuses only on orientations is faced with at least two conceptual difficulties. First, as might be expected, the integrative and instrumental orientations have been shown to be positively correlated with one another and indeed often contribute to the same dimension in factor analytic studies. Second, as demonstrated by Clement and Kruidenier (1983), there are many possible orientations depending on the linguistic/cultural context, and even the definition of integrative and instrumental motivation orientations differ in different settings. Thus, even if one finds that one orientation correlates higher with achievement than another, there is little theoretical significance in the result.

### **6 Conclusion**

The results of the study rejected the hypothesis that students of English at Shiraz University are likely to be less successful in English language speaking if the underlying motivation orientation is instrumental rather than integrative. In fact, the instrumentally motivated students at Shiraz University did not show any significant difference from their integratively motivated peers in terms of their speaking and their oral performance. Based on the above findings we may conclude that both types of motivation are equally influential as far as oral proficiency and the EFL context is concerned. That is, in an EFL context like Iran both instrumental and integrative motivation may facilitate learning and particularly speaking English and it is not the case that integratively motivated learners are better speakers.

### **7 Implication**

This study implies that the orientations of motivation, i.e. integrative and instrumental, are almost equally influential on the learners' success in a foreign language and particularly in speaking. Therefore, as previous studies indicate, too much emphasis on integrative motivation, especially in an EFL context like Iran is not appropriate, as it is the case in Gardner and Lambert's model. Furthermore, comparing the numbers of instrumentally and integratively motivated learners in this study, we may conclude that in the EFL context of Iran English learners are for the most part instrumentally motivated;

that is, Iranian people mostly learn English for utilitarian purposes rather than for the sake of English culture.

Iranian teachers of English can make use of the findings of this study and improve students' oral proficiency by making them instrumentally motivated in speaking English in a country where inspiring students with integrative motivation is a difficult task in the absence of native speakers and the native culture. In fact, as Gardner and MacIntyre (1991) maintained, "motivation facilitates learning and that any factors that motivate an individual to learn will result in successful acquisition. That is both instrumentally motivated and integratively motivated subjects learn better than subjects not so motivated" (p. 68). According to Chomsky (1988), "about 99 percent of teaching is making the students interested in the material" (p. 181).

### **8 Limitations of the study**

The results need to be interpreted with caution because the number of integratively motivated students (N=13) was about half as many as the number of their instrumentally motivated counterparts (N=22). This may have had an effect on the findings of the study. The fact is that, in real life situation and particularly as far as speaking is concerned, in the EFL context of Iran where there is no need to interact with native speakers of English, it is frequently observed that mostly those who are integratively motivated are interested in developing their English speaking. In Iran one does not need to be able to speak English if he/she wants to get accepted at a university, to gain computer literacy and consequently find a better job. In most cases what you need is to be able to read and write rather than speak English. As a result, trying to learn to speak English must need another type of motivation rather than the instrumental one and that could be the integrative type of motivation.

Another limitation is that this study did not consider sex as an influential factor. Out of 13 integratively motivated students only 4 of them were male and the rest were female. This might not be considered as a representative sample of the real population. Thus, further research needs to be carried out with a larger number of subjects considering sex as another influential factor as well.

### **References**

- Allen, D. (1985). *Oxford Placement Test, 1 B1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Au, S.Y. (1988). A critical appraisal of Gardner's socio-psychology theory of second language learning. *Language Learning Journal*, 38(2), 75-100.

- Belmechri, F., & Hummel, K. (1998). Orientations and motivation in the acquisition of English as a second language among high school in Quebec City. *Language Learning*, 48(2), 219-244.
- Brown, H. D. (1993). *Principles of language learning and teaching, Third Edition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Chihara, T. & Oller (1978). Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: A sociolinguistic study of adult Japanese speakers. *Language Learning*, 28, 55-68.
- Chomsky, N. (1998). *Language and problems of knowledge*. Cambridge Mass: MLT Press.
- Clement, R., Dornyei Z., & Noel, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44(3), 419-448.
- Clement, G., Kruidenier, B. G. (1983). Orientations in second language acquisition: I. The effects of ethnicity, milieu, and target language on their emergence. *Language Learning*, 33, 273-291.
- Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41, 469-512.
- Csizer, K. & Dornyei, Z. (2005). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, 19-36.
- Dornyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning*, 40, 45-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 278-284.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31, 117-135.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2002). The motivational basis of language learning tasks. In Z. Dornyei, & P. Skehan (Eds.). *Individual differences in second language acquisition* (pp. 137-158). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ely, C. (1986). Language learning motivation: A descriptive and causal analysis. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 28-35.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 14, 266-272.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- 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, 57-72.

- Cardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., & Lalonde, R. N. (1984). The nature and replicability of factors in second language acquisition. (Research Bulletin No. 605) Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.
- Hassanpur, M. (1999). *Science Students Use of Language Learning Strategies and its Relation to Motivation, Attitude and Gender*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Shiraz Islamic Azad University. Shiraz.
- Koiso, K. (2003). *The characteristics of motivation of Japanese adult English learners*. Retrieved July 11, 2007, from [http://jgss.daishodai.ac.jp/japanese/5research/jgssm5pdf/jgssm5\\_8.pdf](http://jgss.daishodai.ac.jp/japanese/5research/jgssm5pdf/jgssm5_8.pdf).
- Kraemer, R. (1993). Social psychological factors related to the study of Arabic among Israeli high school students: A test of Gardner's socioeducational model. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 83-104.
- Laine, J. E. (1987). *Affective Factors in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching Cross-Language Studies*, (No. 13). Jyvaskyla: Jyvaskyla University, Department of English.
- Lukmani, Y. M. (1972). Motivation to learn and language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 22, 261-273.
- Muchnick, A. G. & Wolfe, D. E. (1982). Attitudes and motivations of American students of Spanish. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 88, 254-261.
- Oller, J. W. (1981). Research on affective variables: Some remaining questions. In R. Andersen (Ed.). *New dimensions in second language acquisition research* (pp. 14-27). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Oller, J. W., Baca, L., & Vigil, F. (1977). Attitude and attained proficiency in ESL: A sociolinguistic study of Mexican-American in the Southwest. *TESOL Quarterly*, 11, 173-183.
- Oller, J. W., Hudson, A., & Liu, P. (1977). Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: A sociolinguistic study of native speakers of Chinese in the United States. *Language Learning*, 27, 1-27.
- Roohani, A. (2001). An Investigation into EFL Students' Motivation in Shiraz State and Islamic Azad University. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.
- Salimi, M. R. (2000). *Affective Factors in Learning English: A study of the Filter*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.
- Schmidt, R., Boraie, D. & Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign language motivation internal structure and external connections. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.). *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 9-70). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

## Is Oral Performance Affected by Motivation?

- Svanes, B. (1987). Motivation and cultural distance in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 37(3), 341-358.
- Ushioda, E. (2006). Language motivation in a reconfigured Europe: Access, identity, autonomy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(2), 148-161.
- Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 54-66.
- Yashima, T., Zenuk-Nishide, L., & Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and effect on willingness to communicate and second language communication. *Language Learning*, 54, 119-152.

Seyyed Mohammad Ali Soozandehfar  
Department of Foreign Languages and linguistics,  
Shiraz University  
13, 10/1 Lane, Anvari St., Zand Blvd., Shiraz, Iran  
Tel: 0098-711-2337817  
Email: soozandehfar@yahoo.com

Received: May 3, 2010

Revised: November 16, 2010

Accepted: December 5, 2010