

Iranian EFL Engineering Students' Motivational Orientations towards English Language Learning along Gender and Further Education in Language Institutes

Naemeh Nahavandi (Corresponding author)

Department of Language and Humanities Education

Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia

Tel: 98-937-917-3225 E-mail: naemeh.nahavandi@gmail.com

Jayakaran Mukundan

Department of Language and Humanities Education

Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia

Tel: 60-012- 209-9717 E-mail: jaya@educ.upm.edu.my

Received: Nov. 13, 2012 Accepted: December 10, 2012 Published: February 28, 2013

doi:10.5296/ijl.v5i1.2684

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i1.2684>

Abstract

The aim of the present study was to understand motivational orientations of the Iranian EFL engineering students towards the language and their attitudes towards learning English, English-speaking people and their culture. To do this end, all 596 engineering students taking general English course in engineering faculty of Tabriz Azad University (different engineering majors) were selected based on random sampling. Gardner's 104-item AMTB (Attitude, Motivation Test Battery) questionnaire was administered to the selected respondents. All 12 domains were considered. Furthermore there was an attempt to understand whether any statistically significant differences existed due to the participants' gender and further education in foreign language institutes or not. The results of the study showed that engineering students in the present study learn the English language both instrumentally and integratively and they have positive attitudes towards the target language community and its members. Furthermore, gender and further education in language institutes affected some motivational orientations and attitude domains significantly. Those

with further education in language institutes were more motivated and the level of their anxiety was lower. The study concluded with some pedagogical implications.

Keywords: AMTB, Motivation, Attitude, Iranian EFL engineering students

1. Introduction

Language learning, being a process which is affected by many factors, has always been an important field of study. One of the important factors of language learning is motivation, which is considered as one of the key factors that determines L2 achievement and attainment (Gardner, 1985; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992, Skehan 1991; Oxford & Shearing, 1994; Dörnyei, 1994). Motivational studies began with Gardner and Lambert's sociolinguistic study of English-speaking students studying French in 1959. They claimed that two factors that shared common variance with the measure of L2 proficiency were Language Aptitude and Motivation. Gardner (1985) defines L2 motivation as "the extent to which an individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so (p.10). Gardner claims that Motivation "refers to the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning plus favorable attitudes towards learning the language" (p. 10). For Cohen & Dörnyei (2002, p. 172), "Motivation is often seen as the key learner variable because without it, nothing much happens." For Cheng & Dörnyei, (2007) motivation is initially an incentive for generating learning and later is a sustaining force to the tedious process of acquiring a target language. For Gomleksiz, (2001) achieving motivation lets the learner a desire in learning a language. Studies on motivation show that motivated learners are more successful in second language acquisition. Papi (2010) believes that motivation is one of the most complicated concepts in (SLA) research, and due to its complex nature conflicting results have been reported.

Since Gardner and Lambert's (1959) theory of motivation, there have been plenty of studies trying to explore the nature and role of motivation in the L2 learning process (Lin & Warden, 1996; Teweles, 1996; Warden & Lin, 2000; Yamshiro & McLaughlin, 2001). Many of these studies gave rise to proposals related to what motivation as a concept and a theoretical construct includes, as well as in relation to practical dimensions of the issue, e.g. classroom setting (Moskovsky & Alrabai, 2009). Brown (2007) reviews the definitions of motivation based on three schools of thought namely as Behaviorism, Cognitivism, and Constructivism. The first perspective considers motivation as the anticipation of reward driven to obtain positive reinforcement and based on our prior experience we repeat the action to get rewards. Second perspective considers motivation as choices people make; the forces behind our decisions are the needs or drives. The third perspective claims that each person is motivated differently and the emphasis is on social context and individual personal choices. Needless to say that the original incentive in second/foreign (L2) motivation research comes from the social psychology since to learn the language of another community one cannot simply separate it from the learners' social dispositions towards the speech community in question (Moiinvaziri, 2008, p.126). Cohen & Dörnyei (2002) believe that motivation in learning a second or foreign language is totally different from learning any other subjects. The reason is that L2 language is not merely a communication code, but also it is a representative of the l2 culture where it is spoken. Therefore, l2 motivation can have a socio cultural component.

Due to the contradictory research results dealing with foreign language motivation in the Iranian context, the need for more research in this area seems to be emphasized. Thus, the present study might provide more information offering insights about the role of motivation for EFL learners in Iran. Furthermore, the findings of the present study may contribute to

educators' understanding of the issue of motivation among Iranian EFL learners.

2. Background of the Study

2.1 Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation

In theory of SLA research there are plenty of conceptualizations of motivation. Motivation can be intrinsic which occurs in the classroom and educational setting. It is the result of socio cultural influences and social reinforces (Birjandi, et.al. 2006). For some researchers (Purkey & Schmidt, 1991; Purkey & Stanley 1987) intrinsic motivation includes enhancing people's self-concept through engaging them in an activity which motivates them. Intrinsic motivation is defined as a motivation to engage in activity because it is enjoyable and satisfying to do (Ryan & Deci, 1985). However, some other researchers (Malone & Lepper, 1987) define intrinsic motivation in terms of what people will do without external inducement. Extrinsic motivation on the other hand, is defined as motivation for engaging in activities for their own sake (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). Therefore it can be said that extrinsic motivation is the performance of an activity to attain some separable result, so it contrasts with intrinsic motivation, which refers to doing an activity for the inherent satisfaction of the activity itself (Lucas, et.al, 2010).

2.2 Instrumental and Integrative Motivation

Hudson (2000) classifies motivation into two groups: a concrete one (instrumental) and a universal one (integrative). Lightbown & Spada (2003) state that motivation, a complex phenomenon; can be defined in terms of two factors of learners' communicative needs and their attitudes towards the second language community. Gardner & Lambert (1972) coin the term integrative motivation to refer to language learning for personal and cultural enrichment, and instrumental motivation for language learning to obtain more immediate or practical goals.

For Lucas, et.al (2010), integrative motivation refers to a desire in learning the L2 in order to have contact with, and probably to identify with members from the L2 community. This definition can be contrasted with the instrumental definition, which refers to a desire in learning the L2 to achieve some practical goal, such as job advancement or course credit. To put it in other words learners who are instrumentally motivated have got narrow goals for learning a foreign language, for example to read books, to listen to the radio, to watch TV programs and etc. On the other hand, those learners who are integratively motivated follow several global goals, such as mastering a foreign language as a precondition, a key to know the country of the language they study. For Masgoret and Gardner (2003) the integratively motivated student "is one who is motivated to learn the second language, has openness to identification with the other language community and has favorable attitude toward the language situation" (p.127). For Finegan (1999) status of this foreign language for them is as high as their mother. In other words, "integrative motivation typically underlies successful acquisition of a wide range of registers and a native like pronunciation" (Finegan, 1999, p. 568). Noels (2001) states that motivation to language learning is a complex set of variables such as effort; desire to reach goals, as well as attitudes toward the learning of the language.

Falk, (1978) claims that most of the successful students learning a target language are those who like the people who speak that language, appreciate the culture and have a desire to become familiar with, or even integrate into, the society in which the language is used.

According to Ellis (1999), Crookes & Schmidt (1991) while both instrumental and integrative motivations are important elements of success, it is integrative motivation that sustains long-term success in learning a second language. However, Birjandi, et.al (2006), believes that L2 motivation shouldn't be considered as a forced choice between these two. Both types are important as separately or combined together, because one does not rule out the other, or with other motivations.

2.3 Attitude

Ajzen (1988) defines attitude as a disposition to respond favorably or unfavorably to an object, person, institution, or event. For Oxford & Shearin (1994) attitude is one of the six factors that influence motivation in language learning. They define attitude as "sentiments toward the learning community and the target language" (Oxford & Shearin 1994, p.12-28). Mostly individuals' attitudes are dormant and can only appear as reactions to special stimuli in the form of stated beliefs, expressed feelings, or exhibited behaviors. Therefore, it cannot be directly observed or measured (Shirbagi, 2010). It is claimed that Attitude does not affect learning directly but it is instrumental in the development of motivation. Krashen (1985) claims that attitude can act both as a barrier or a bridge in learning a new language and is the essential environmental ingredient for language learning. He continues to claim that learning can only happen if certain affective conditions, like positive attitude, self-confidence, and low anxiety exist. Lightbown & Spada (2003) claim that depending on the learners' attitudes learning a second language can be a source of resentment or enrichment.

Davies (1996) states that:

"In learning how to use a language effectively, students must be actively engaged in using language. The teacher of English must create opportunities within the classroom situation, which enable students to think through language and to express their learning through the language modes of speaking, listening, reading and writing. A variety of strategies have been developed which encourage students as active meaning-makers, using language to go beyond the literal in investigating how language works and is used as a form of thinking and communication."

2.4 Motivation and Gender

Regarding the important role of motivation, nowadays there is a growing concern among L2 educators in Canada that male students lack the motivation in learning French (Kissau, 2006). Some Canadian studies have brought evidence to suggest that males are less motivated in learning French than females (Massey, 1994; Pagliaroli, 1999). In one study conducted by Netten et al. (1999), concern was raised about male involvement and achievement in French programs. The results of their study showed that boys were less likely to study French after Grade 9. Although 59% of the 380 participants showed a desire to continue studying French in Grade 10, majority of the participants were female nearly a 3 to 1 ratio. In another study,

Burden & Lanvers (2002) claimed that in their study involving 228 students, males were less motivated in learning French than females. In other study by Csizér & Dörnyei (2005) including more than 8000 it was found that male students are less motivated learners. In response to these concerns, lack of enough studies on motivation and gender differences in Iranian context and due to the researchers own experiences in teaching English for more than 12 years and observing low participation of male students in English classes and lower marks at the end of term, the researcher set out to investigate if Iranian males are less motivated in learning English as a foreign language than their female counterparts and why.

2.5 Current Status of English in Iran

Due to today's growing science and technology all over the world, learning English language has been given much more importance compared to past years, and it is not an exception in Iranian context. Nevertheless, teaching English in Iran has been a difficult task both for EFL students and teachers because of lack of resources and little contact with the target language outside the classroom Compared to other EFL learners in other contexts. (Sadeghi, 2005). There are very few English programs broadcasted on TV or radio. Of course, due to advancements in technology and the more frequent use of the Internet, satellite, and rapid growth of private language institutes in Iran, the opportunities for English language learning have greatly improved (Talebinezhad & Aliakbari, 2002). In addition, increasing the number of language institutes and can confirm the increase in value and importance that is given to English language in Iran. In the Iranian curriculum, English language is one of the compulsory subjects. English language is a foreign language in Iran and students are officially taught English from the first year of the guidance school. Therefore, Iranian students have to study English for nearly seven years. Three years in Guidance school, three years in Secondary school and one year in Pre-University level. In addition, those students who study non-English Majors in universities study English in maximum of 6 credits. They study 3 credits of general English instruction and 3 credits of ESP in which the focus is on their field, related English texts and related terminology. However, after learning English for almost 7 years in school and one more year at university, Iranian EFL learners' are not proficient enough in learning English language. The education they receive neither enables the students to attain full competence in using the English language nor helps them to interact with confidence (Nahavandi & Mukundan, 2013).

2.6 Related Studies about Motivation

In Iran some researchers have tried to examine motivational orientation and attitudes of the learners towards learning English and have reported different results. In an early study Sadighi & Maghsudi (2000) studied the effect of the two types of motivation namely as integrative and instrumental one) on the English proficiency of the EFL senior students. Their study results showed a significant difference between the means of English proficiency scores of the instrumentally motivated students and the integratively motivated ones.

In another study Moiiinvaziri (2008) claimed that Iranian students were both instrumentally and integratively motivated to learn English. In another study, Vaezi (2008) claimed that Iranian students were highly motivated and had positive attitudes towards learning English

and that they were more instrumentally motivated. In other study Chalak & Kassaian, (2010) claimed that Iranian students learn the language for both 'instrumental' and 'integrative' reasons and they have positive attitudes towards the target language community and its members. Shirbagi (2010) claimed that students in his study showed favorable attitude towards learning English, and that Iranian students learn a foreign language mainly for its utilitarian value rather than integrative motivation. In a more recent study Zafarghandi & Jodai (2012) claimed that Iranian students in their study were less motivated and their attitudes toward English and English learning seemed to be more neutral. Finally, in the most recent study Mahdinejad, Hasanzadeh, Mirzaian & Ebrahimi (2012) studied motivational orientations of 306 female students. The results of their study indicated that there was a statistically significant and positive relationship between intrinsic motivation and students' English language learning. However, there was no significant relationship between extrinsic motivation and students' English language learning.

3. The Study

In general the present descriptive study tried to understand the language attitudes and motivation of Iranian EFL university students taking General English Course in Engineering Department of Azad University of Tabriz, Iran. In particular, the study tried to find motivational orientations of the Iranian EFL university students towards the language and their attitudes towards learning English, English-speaking people and their culture.

3.1 Research Questions

Based on the objectives of the study the following research questions were raised:

- 1) Are Iranian EFL students motivated to learn English as a foreign language?
- 2) Are the students motivated instrumentally or integratively to learn English?
- 3) What are the attitudes of the students towards learning English and English-speaking people?
- 4) Do Iranian EFL learners experience language anxiety?
- 5) Does gender influence motivation of Iranian EFL learners in learning English as a foreign language?
- 6) Does gender influence attitudes of Iranian EFL students in learning English as a foreign language?
- 7) Does studying in foreign language institutes influence attitudes of Iranian EFL students in learning English as a foreign language?
- 8) Does studying in foreign language institutes influence motivation of Iranian EFL learners in learning English as a foreign language?

3.2 Research Design

This descriptive study was conducted on 596 EFL university students taking General English Course in Engineering Department of Azad University of Tabriz, Iran. Gardner's 104-item AMTB (Attitude, Motivation Test Battery) questionnaire was administered to the selected respondents.

3.3 Participants

The participants were all 596 EFL university students taking General English Course in Engineering Department of Azad University of Tabriz, Iran during the academic year of 2012. Gardner's 104-item AMTB (Attitude, Motivation Test Battery) questionnaire together with a demographical questionnaire was administered to the selected respondents in all 12 general English classes in engineering department. The age range of participants ranged from 18-43 with the average mean of 19.81. From 596 questionnaires only 570 complete questionnaires were fed into SPSS for analysis and other 26 distorted and incomplete questionnaires were discarded. The following table summarizes the participants' characteristics.

3.3.1 Demographic background of the participants

As can be seen in table 1-3, from whole 570 respondents 301 were male and 296 were female students. Considering their first language only 37 students first language was Persian and the rest 533 were Turkish. Furthermore, 344 students had further education in English in language institutes and the rest 226 students didn't have.

Table 1. Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	301	52.8	52.8	52.8
	Female	269	47.2	47.2	100.0
	Total	570	100.0	100.0	

Table 2. First Language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Turkish	533	93.5	93.5	93.5
	Persian	37	6.5	6.5	100.0
	Total	570	100.0	100.0	

Table 3. Further Education in Institution

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	344	60.4	60.4	60.4
	no	226	39.6	39.6	100.0
	Total	570	100.0	100.0	

3.4 Instrumentation

In order to collect the data, Gardner's (1985) 104-item AMTB (Attitude, Motivation Test Battery) questionnaire together with a demographical questionnaire was administered to the selected respondents in all 11 general English classes in engineering department. The questionnaire is a 6-point Likert Scale ranging from 'Strongly Disagree' to 'Strongly Agree'. The AMTB is reported to have good reliability and validity (Gardner, 1985). AMTB items are made of 12 scales measuring 1. Interest in Foreign languages 2. Parental Encouragement 3. Motivational intensity 4. English class anxiety 5. English teacher evaluation 6. Attitudes towards learning English 7. Attitudes towards English-speaking people, 8. Integrative orientation 9. Desire to learn English 10. English course evaluation 11. English use anxiety and 12. Instrumental Orientation

Since the participants were all EFL students registering in general English Course, the given questionnaire was translated to Persian language. The items of the questionnaire were translated into Persian in order to prevent any misunderstanding. To do so, first the translated questionnaire was checked by a Persian language lecturer in Tabriz Azad University to make sure that the items retained their meaning and that the translated version was easily understood. Then, it was back translated into English by a second Persian lecturer to test for inaccuracies and ambiguities. In case of any inconsistencies in translated English version, both lecturers were consulted. It is worth noting that minor changes were made to the wording of some of the items to be more easily understood by Iranian EFL students. Second, in order to ascertain the reliability of the items, a pilot study was carried out with 42 pre-intermediate students at Jihad-e -Daneshgahi institute. After checking the reliability, the translated questionnaire was administered to all 11 classes. Finally, respondents were given 20 minutes to answer the questions. The researcher repeated the same procedure for all 11 classes. The researcher herself was present in data collection procedure, therefore in case of any ambiguity or problem in understanding the questionnaire items assistance and guidance was provided by her. It is worth mentioning that permission to distribute the questionnaire was obtained from the dean of engineering faculty and all five lecturers in that department. Respondents were informed that the information they gave would be used only for research purposes, and there was no need for them to write their names on the questionnaire.

3.5 Procedure

First permission to distribute the questionnaire was obtained from the dean of engineering faculty and all five lecturers in that department (some lecturers were same, meaning they had 2 or 3 general English classes during that term. Then, the researcher conducted the survey once the department head or the college dean approved the request. In engineering department five lecturers were supposed to teach to all 11 classes of general English. The number of students in each class ranged from 43 to 58. All 11 classes were requested to fill up the questionnaire. The researcher herself was present in all 11 classes and collected data were tallied and subjected to parametric statistical analyses.

3.6 Method of Analysis

The students' responses to the questionnaire were analyzed in terms of descriptive and inferential statistics. First, the raw data was fed into the computer and after testing for normality parametric test was run by the Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) 20 software. The data were analyzed using ANOVA, LSD and t-test. To ensure the quality of the analysis and interpretations, consultations with statisticians were made.

4. Results of the Study

For all variables Minimum, Maximum, Mean, Std. Deviation, Variance, Skewness, and Kurtosis were calculated. As Skewness and Kurtosis were near 0/5 and sample population was large, data distribution was considered normal. Therefore parametric statistics was used. As can be seen in table 4, the age range of respondents is from 18-43 with the average mean of 19.81.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics for all 12 Domains of Anxiety

- 1) Considering the first domain 'interest in foreign languages', the average mean is 4.70 meaning that most participants' interest in foreign languages is high.
- 2) Considering the second domain 'Parental Encouragement', the average mean is 4.21, meaning that most participants' Parental Encouragement' is high.
- 3) Considering the third domain, Motivational intensity the average mean is 3.86, meaning that most participants' Motivational intensity is high.
- 4) Considering the fourth domain, English class anxiety the average mean is 3.60, meaning that most participants' English class anxiety is nearly high.
- 5) Considering the fifth domain, English teacher evaluation the average mean is 4.30, meaning that most participants' English teacher evaluation is nearly high.
- 6) Considering the sixth domain, Attitudes towards learning English the average mean is 4.78, meaning that most participants' Attitudes towards learning English is nearly high.
- 7) Considering the seventh domain, Attitudes towards English-speaking people the average mean is 3.99, meaning that most participants' Attitudes towards English-speaking people is nearly high.
- 8) Considering the eighth domain, Integrative orientation the average mean is 5.15, meaning that most participants' Integrative orientation is high.
- 9) Considering the ninth domain, Desire to learn English the average mean is 4.39, meaning that most participants' Desire to learn English is high.
- 10) Considering the tenth domain, English course evaluation the average mean is 4.35, meaning that most participants' English course evaluation is high.

- 11) Considering the eleventh domain, English use anxiety the average mean is 3.16, meaning that most participants' English use anxiety is high.
- 12) Considering the twelfth domain, Instrumental Orientation the average mean is 4.94, meaning that most participants' Instrumental Orientation is high.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis
Age	570	18	43	19.81	2.869	8.229	1.613	9.316
Interest in Foreign languages	570	2.30	6.00	4.7047	.80431	.647	-.621	-.215
Parental Encouragement	570	1.13	6.00	4.2180	1.17451	1.379	-.702	-.173
Motivational intensity	570	2.20	5.50	3.8653	.63784	.407	-.245	-.203
English class anxiety	570	1.20	6.00	3.6021	1.00417	1.008	-.013	-.318
English teacher evaluation	570	1.90	6.00	4.3004	.95434	.911	-.306	-.442
Attitudes towards learning English	570	2.30	6.00	4.7830	.93642	.877	-.847	-.154
Attitudes towards English-speaking people	570	1.88	6.00	3.9943	.86413	.747	-.124	-.358
Integrative orientation	570	3.25	6.00	5.1531	.76797	.590	-.798	-.311
Desire to learn English	570	2.30	5.80	4.3998	.72426	.525	-.588	-.263
English course evaluation	570	1.90	6.00	4.3570	.94644	.896	-.465	-.496
English use anxiety	570	1.00	5.80	3.1639	.96837	.938	.217	-.197
Instrumental Orientation	570	2.75	6.00	4.9421	.86802	.753	-.778	-.170

4.2 Comparing Male and Female Learners through Independent T-Test

To compare male and female students in their motivational orientation, independent t-test is used. The results of the study in all 12 scales are as follows:

- 1) Mean of Interest in Foreign languages among male students is 4.65 and in female students is 4.76. As the level of significance is 0/105 which is bigger than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that there isn't a significant difference between male and female students in Interest in Foreign language.
- 2) Mean of Parental Encouragement among males is 4.12 and among females is 4.33. As the level of significance is 0.037 which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded Parental Encouragement among females is significantly higher than males.
- 3) Mean of Motivational intensity among male is 3.76 and among women is 3.98. As the level of sig is 0.000 is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that Motivational intensity among females is significantly higher than males.
- 4) Mean of English class anxiety among males is 3.55 and in females is 3.65. As the level of sig is 0.238 which is bigger than 0.05, it can be concluded that there isn't a significant difference between male and female students in English class anxiety.

- 5) Mean of English teacher evaluation among males is 4.09 and among females is 4.53. As the level of sig is 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that English teacher evaluation among females is significantly higher than males.
- 6) Mean of Attitudes towards learning English among males is 4.66 and among females is 4.92. As the level of sig is 0/001 which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that Attitudes towards learning English among females is significantly higher than males.
- 7) Mean of Attitudes towards English-speaking people among males is 3.99 and is 4.07 among females. As level of sig is 0.061 which is bigger than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that there isn't a significant difference between male and female students in Attitudes towards English-speaking people.
- 8) Mean of Integrative orientation among males is 5.05 and among females is 5.27. As the level of sig is 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05, it can be concluded that Integrative orientation among females is significantly higher than males.
- 9) Mean of Desire to learn English among males is 4.37 and among females is 4.44. As the level of sig is 0.259 which is bigger than 0.05, it can be concluded that there isn't a significant difference between male and female students in Desire to learn English.
- 10) Mean of English course evaluation among males is 4.26 and among females is 4.47. As the level of sig is 0.008 which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that English course evaluation among females is significantly higher than males.
- 11) Mean of English use anxiety among males is 3.14 and among females is 3.19. As the level of sig is 0.59 which is bigger than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that there isn't a significant difference between male and female students in English use anxiety.
- 12) Mean of instrumental Orientation among males is 4.88 and among females is 5.02. As the level of sig is 0.053 which is bigger than 0.05 therefore it can be concluded that there isn't a significant difference between male and female students in instrumental Orientation.

Table 5. Male & Female Comparison

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
					F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Interest in Foreign languages	Male	301	4.6532	.82630	.898	.344	-1.622	568	.105
	Female	269	4.7625	.77645					
Parental Encouragement	Male	301	4.1208	1.18325	.844	.359	-2.095	568	.037
	Female	269	4.3267	1.15718					
Motivational intensity	Male	301	3.7625	.62061	.095	.758	-4.127	568	.000
	Female	269	3.9803	.63834					
English class anxiety	Male	301	3.5551	.99981	.018	.892	-1.181	568	.238
	Female	269	3.6546	1.00830					
English teacher evaluation	Male	301	4.0920	.95093	.600	.439	-5.661	568	.000
	Female	269	4.5335	.90451					
Attitudes towards learning English	Male	301	4.6621	.93121	.808	.369	-3.287	568	.001
	Female	269	4.9182	.92535					
Attitudes towards English-speaking people	Male	301	3.9302	.88448	.813	.368	-1.877	568	.061
	Female	269	4.0660	.83661					
Integrative orientation	Male	301	5.0473	.80651	7.764	.006	-3.538	567.739	.000
	Female	269	5.2714	.70530					
Desire to learn English	Male	301	4.3674	.74633	1.401	.237	-1.129	568	.259
	Female	269	4.4361	.69835					
English course evaluation	Male	301	4.2575	.96543	2.561	.110	-2.670	568	.008
	Female	269	4.4684	.91370					
English use anxiety	Male	301	3.1432	.96069	.068	.795	-.539	568	.590
	Female	269	3.1870	.97817					
Instrumental Orientation	Male	301	4.8762	.91779	12.299	.000	-1.935	567.780	.053
	Female	269	5.0158	.80401					

4.3 Comparing Further Education in Language Institutions

To compare students who had further education in language institutions and those who didn't, independent t-test is used. To make the reporting of the results easier, those students who had further education in language institutions are named group 1, and those who didn't have are named group 2. The results of the study in all 12 scales are as follows:

- 1) Mean of Interest in group 1 is 4.85 and in group 2 is 4.49. As the level of significance is 0/000 which is bigger than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that Interest in Foreign languages in group 1 is significantly higher than group 2.

- 2) Mean of Parental Encouragement in group 1 is 4.42 and in group 2 is 3.91. As the level of significance is 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded Parental Encouragement in group 1 is significantly higher than group 2.
- 3) Mean of Motivational intensity in group 1 is 4.02 and in group 2 is 3.64. As the level of sig is 0.000, which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that Motivational intensity in group 1 is significantly higher than group 2.
- 4) Mean of English class anxiety in group 1 is 3.26 and in group 2 is 4.12. As the level of sig is 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05, it can be concluded that English class anxiety in group 2 is significantly higher than group 1.
- 5) Mean of English teacher evaluation in group 1 is 4.49 and in group 2 is 4.01. As the level of sig is 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that English teacher evaluation in group 1 is significantly higher than group 2.
- 6) Mean of Attitudes towards learning English in group 1 is 5/05 and in group 2 is 4.37. As the level of sig is 0/001 which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that Attitudes towards learning English in group 1 is significantly higher than group 2.
- 7) Mean of Attitudes towards English-speaking people in group 1 is 4.19 and in group 2 is 3.69 among females. As level of sig is 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that Attitudes towards English-speaking people in group 1 is significantly higher than group 2.
- 8) Mean of Integrative orientation in group 1 is 5.22 and in group 2 is 5.06. As the level of sig is 0.017 which is smaller than 0.05, it can be concluded that Integrative orientation in group 1 is significantly higher than group 2.
- 9) Mean of Desire to learn English in group 1 is 4.54 and in group 2 is 4.19. As the level of sig is 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05, it can be concluded that Desire to learn English in group 1 is significantly higher than group 2.
- 10) Mean of English course evaluation in group 1 is 4.64 and among in group 2 is 3.92. As the level of sig is 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that English course evaluation in group 1 is significantly higher than group 2.
- 11) Mean of English use anxiety in group 1 is 2.85 and in group 2 is 3.65. As the level of sig is 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that English use anxiety in group 2 is significantly higher than group 1.
- 12) Mean of instrumental Orientation in group 1 is 5.02 and in group 2 it is 4.82. As the level of sig is 0.01 which is smaller than 0.05 therefore it can be concluded that instrumental Orientation in group 1 is significantly higher than group 2.

Table 6. Comparison of Group 1 & 2

	Institution	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
					F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Interest in Foreign languages	yes	344	4.8480	.75843	2.566	.110	5.372	568	.000
	no	226	4.4867	.82462					
Parental Encouragement	yes	344	4.4179	1.05120	19.795	.000	4.917	413.991	.000
	no	226	3.9137	1.28448					
Motivational intensity	yes	344	4.0157	.58093	3.510	.061	7.255	568	.000
	no	226	3.6363	.65355					
English class anxiety	yes	344	3.2645	.93666	.269	.604	-10.874	568	.000
	no	226	4.1159	.87930					
English teacher evaluation	yes	344	4.4878	.90822	.372	.542	5.958	568	.000
	no	226	4.0150	.95408					
Attitudes towards learning English	yes	344	5.0517	.78250	30.376	.000	8.588	399.124	.000
	no	226	4.3739	1.00279					
Attitudes towards English-speaking people	yes	344	4.1930	.77542	6.487	.011	6.834	428.813	.000
	no	226	3.6919	.90532					
Integrative orientation	yes	344	5.2166	.73884	7.020	.008	2.405	453.252	.017
	no	226	5.0564	.80234					
Desire to learn English	yes	344	4.5384	.66067	8.280	.004	5.619	431.014	.000
	no	226	4.1889	.76624					
English course evaluation	yes	344	4.6416	.80562	16.365	.000	9.151	414.891	.000
	no	226	3.9239	.98163					
English use anxiety	yes	344	2.8451	.85150	1.548	.214	-10.604	568	.000
	no	226	3.6491	.93501					
Instrumental Orientation	yes	344	5.0196	.82848	3.900	.049	2.591	447.766	.010
	no	226	4.8241	.91426					

4.4 Comparing Instrumental and Integrative orientation

To understand whether engineering students learn English language for either instrumental or integrative reasons, paired t-test was used. As it can be seen in table 7, mean of Integrative orientation is 5.15 and Instrumental Orientation is 4.94 respectively. As the level of sig is 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05, therefore it can be concluded that Integrative orientation is significantly higher than Instrumental Orientation.

Table 7. Comparison of Instrumental and Integrative orientation

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Integrative orientation	570	5.1531	.76797	6.624	569	.000
Instrumental Orientation	570	4.9421	.86802			

4.5 Comparing the Relationship among All Variables

To compare relationship among all variables Pearson correlation was used. Zero hypothesis in this test is no relationship among all variables. If the level of sig is less than 0/05, zero hypothesis will be rejected, meaning there will be significant relationship among variables. Results of correlation show that there is a direct significant relationship among all variables. Level of significance is less than 0.05.

Table 8. Pearson Correlation Test

		Parental Encourage ment	Motivational intensity	English class anxiety	English teacher evaluation	Attitudes towards learning English	Attitudes towards English-speaking people	Integrative orientation	Desire to learn English	English course evaluation	English use anxiety	Instru mental Orient ation
Interest in Foreign languages	R	.366**	.470**	-.316**	.388**	.775**	.437**	.592**	.729**	.657**	-.517**	.531**
	P	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Parental Encouragement	R		.353**	-.211**	.281**	.437**	.355**	.383**	.347**	.403**	-.359**	.396**
	P		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Motivational intensity	R			-.396**	.464**	.605**	.364**	.361**	.529**	.593**	-.453**	.253**
	P			.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
English class anxiety	R				-.300**	-.450**	-.361**	-.140**	-.333**	-.455**	.737**	-.036
	P				.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.386
English teacher evaluation	R					.530**	.400**	.323**	.439**	.575**	-.337**	.263**
	P					.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Attitudes towards learning English	R						.530**	.583**	.795**	.831**	-.595**	.522**
	P						.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Attitudes towards English-speaking people	R							.457**	.435**	.479**	-.481**	.400**
	P							.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Integrative orientation	R								.578**	.482**	-.324**	.574**
	P								.000	.000	.000	.000
Desire to learn English	R									.729**	-.480**	.478**
	P									.000	.000	.000
English course evaluation	R										-.562**	.433**
	P										.000	.000

N=570

www.macrothink.org/ijl

6. Conclusion & Implications of the Study

Based on the results and suggestions of the present study, it is hoped that improvement in our English teaching system in Iranian context could be obtained, and the motivation of our students could accordingly be increased especially at universities. Furthermore, it is hoped that some steps be taken at universities to decrease the anxiety level of our students. Based on the results of the present study some pedagogical implications can be obtained. Teachers should value their students' preconceptions in their language classes. What a student think of a teacher and the course can affect their success in learning foreign languages. Based on the literature review which confirms that high motivation is one factor that leads to successful learning, it can be suggested that successful learning may cause high motivation as well (Birjandi,et.al,2006). Therefore it can be claimed that in presenting teaching materials and information content of the lessons, students' motivation should accordingly be considered. Teachers can assist learners in setting goals for themselves in learning languages and they can help their students in achieving their goals by giving them feedback, using familiar content or examples of previously learned materials, using praise, having interesting contexts, using simulation and learning games, and being responsive to students' attitudes. Furthermore, classroom atmosphere should be meaningful, purposeful, creative and encouraging. According to Lightbown & Spada (2003), if teachers make their classes places "where students enjoy coming because the content is interesting and relevant to their age and level of ability, where the learning goals are challenging yet manageable and clear, and where the atmosphere is supportive and non-threatening" (p.57), teachers can make a positive contribution to students' motivation to learn. Teachers should accept that their instruction should be flexible, planned, creative and organized. To do so, they can motivate the students into the lesson, vary the activities and tasks and materials and use cooperative rather than competitive goals (Crooks, & Schmidt, 1991). In addition, students should be told to control and feel the responsibility for their own learning. Nahavandi (2013) states that nowadays, teaching shouldn't be seen as a product but as a process. So activities in which students are involved in real communication and which promote learning should be considered very important. To use Widdowson's words teachers should be "facilitator of students' learning" or to put it in other words to function as an authoritative rather than an authoritarian (Nahavandi, 2011; Nahavandi & Mukundan 2012; Nahavandi & Mukundan in press). Last but not least, students' growth should be the general aim of education.

Finally the fact that language learning motivation is a new area of research in Iran and the fact that it is a psychologically complex phenomenon cannot be ignored. So it is hoped that some steps might be taken in universities and language institutes of Iran to decrease anxiety of Iranian EFL learners. Last but not least, it is hoped that the present research may encourage further research in the area of motivation and the related problems that lack of motivation and high anxiety can cause for EFL learners by other interested researchers.

References

- Ajzen I. (1988). *Attitudes, Personality, and Behavior*. Chicago, IL Dorsey Press.
- Al-Tamimi, A., & Munir Shuib (2009). Motivation and attitudes towards learning English: a

study of petroleum engineering undergraduates at Hadhramout University of sciences and technology. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies*, 9(2), 29-55.

Birjandi, P., Mosallanejad, P., & Bagheridoust, E. (2006). *Principles of teaching and Foreign languages*. Rahnovan publications.

Brown, D. H. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, Inc

Chalak, A., & Kassaian, Z. (2010). Motivation and Attitudes of Iranian undergraduate EFL students toward Learning English. *GEMA online journal of language studies*, 10(2).

Cheng, H. F., & Dornyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1, 153-174.

Cohen, A. D., & Dornyei, Z. (2002). Focus on the language learner: Motivation, Styles, and Strategies in Schmitt, N. (2002). *An introduction to applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, M., & Z. Dörnyei. (2002). Focus on the language learner: Motivation, styles and strategies. In N. Schmitt (ed.). *An introduction to applied linguistics*. London: Arnold, 170–190.

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the Research Agenda. *Language Learning*, 41, 469-512.

Crooks, G., & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation. Reopening the research Agenda. *Language learning*, 41(4), 469-512.

Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). ‘The internal structure of language ‘learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort’. *Modern Language Journal*, 89(1), 19-36.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.

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

Falk, J. (1978). *Linguistics and language: A survey of basic concepts and implications* (2nd ed.).

Finegan, E. (1999). *Language: Its structure and use* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second Language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of psychology*, 13, 266 – 272.

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

- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gomleksiz, M., (2001). The effects of age and motivation on second language acquisition. *Firat University Journal of Social Science*, 11(2), 217-224.
- Hamp-Lyons, E. (1983). Motivation for learning English as a world language: Integrative and instrumental. *World Englishes*, 2(3), 145-149.
- Hudson, G. (2000). *Essential introductory linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kissau, S. (2006). Gender differences in second language motivation: An investigation of micro and macro level influences, *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 73-96.
- König, G. (2006). Orientation, Motivation and Attitudes of Turkish University Students Learning a Second Foreign Language. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht* Abrufbar unter. Retrieved from <http://www.ualberta.ca/~german/ejournal/Koenig6.htm>
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis*. London: Longman.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2003). *How languages are learned?* Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Lin H. J., & Warden C. (1996). Different attitudes among non-English major EFL students. *The Internet TESL Journal*. Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Warden/Difference>
- Lucas, R, Pulido, D, Miraflores, E, Ignacio, A, Tacay, M., & Lao, J. (2010). A Study on the Intrinsic Motivation Factors in Second Language Learning Among Selected Freshman Students. *The Philippine ESL Journal*, 4, 3-23.
- Mahdavi Zafarghandi., A., & Jodai, H. (2012). Attitudes toward English & English Learning at an Iranian Military University: A Preliminary Survey. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 2(1).
- Mahdinejad, G, Hasanzadeh, R., & Mirzaian, B. (2012). Motivational Orientations and Students' English Language Learning: The Case of Iranian EFL Learners. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 32(2), 239-250.
- Malone, T., & Lepper M. (1987). Making learning fun: a taxonomy of intrinsic motivations for learning. In: Snow RE, Farr MJ, Eds. *Aptitude, learning and instruction: conative and affective process analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Masgoret, A. M., & R. C. Gardner. (2003). Attitudes, Motivation and Second Language Learning: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Conducted by Gardner and Associates. *Language Learning*, 53, 123-163.
- Massey, A. (1994). Why choose French? Secondary school students' accounts of their decision to leave or enroll in the Ontario regular FSL programme. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, 714-735.

- Moiinvaziri, M. (2008). Motivational orientation in English language learning: A study of Iranian undergraduate students .Global practices of language teaching. *Proceeding of International Online Language Conference (IOLC)*.Universal publishers. Boca Raton, Florida, US, 126-135.
- Moskovsky, Ch., & Alrabai, F. (2009). Intrinsic Motivation in Saudi Learners of English as a Foreign Language. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 2, 1-10.
- Nahavandi, N. (2011). The effect of task-based activities on EFL learners' reading comprehension. In Mukundan, J., Nimehchisalem, V., Menon, S., Jin, Y.J., Roslim, R., Leong, A., Mohamad, A., & Philip, A. (Eds.), (2011). *ELT Matters*, 5, (pp.56-69). Petalingjaya, Malaysia: Galaxy.
- Nahavandi, N. (2013). *Task-based Activities in Reading Comprehension Classes: Task-based Language Teaching & Learning*. Germany: LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Nahavandi, N. & Mukundan, J. (2012). Task-based language teaching from teachers' perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(6), 115-121. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.6p.115>
- Nahavandi, N. & Mukundan, J. (2013). Foreign Language Learning Anxiety among Iranian EFL learners Along Gender and Different Proficiency Levels. *Language in India*, 13(1), 133-161.
- Nahavandi, N. & Mukundan, J. (in press). Task-based cycle in reading comprehension classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*.
- Netten, J., C. Riggs, & Hewlett, S. (1999). Choosing French in the senior high school: Grade 9 student attitudes to the study of French in the Western Avalon School District. St. John's: Memorial University, Faculty of Education.
- Noels A. N. (2001). Learning Spanish as a second language: Learners' orientations and their teachers' communication style. *Language Learning*, 51(1), 107-144.
- Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12-28.
- Pagliaroli, S. (1999). *Motivation and gender in the second language classroom*. Master's thesis, University of Windsor, Windsor, ON.
- Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self system,L2 anxiety & the motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach .*system*, 38(3).
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk D. H. (1996). Motivation in education: theory, research, and applications. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Purkey W. W., & Stanley P. H. (1991). *Invitational teaching, learning and living*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Purkey, W. W., & Schmidt J. J. (1987). *The inviting relationship: an expanded perspective*

for professional counseling. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sadeghi, A. R. (2005). ESP in Iran: A transition from present state. In: G. R Kiany, and M. Khayyamdar, (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference*, 2, Tehran.

Sadighi, F., & Maghsudi, N. (2000). The Relationship between Motivation and English proficiency among Iranian EFL Learners. *Indian journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 39-52.

Scarcella, R., & Oxford, R. (1992). *The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in the Communicative Classroom*. Boston: Heinle.

Shirbagi, N. (2010). Orientations and attitudes Of Iranian University Students for English Language Learning. *PEDAGOGIKA*, 99.

Talebinezhad, M. R., & Aliakbari, M. (2002). Evaluation and justification of a paradigm shift in the current ELT model in Iran. *Linguistik online*, 10(1), 21-28. Retrieved from www.linguistik-online.de/10_02/talebinezhadaliakbari.pdf

Taylor, D. M., Meynard R., & Rheault E. (1977). Threat to ethnic identity and second-language learning. In: *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*. Ed. H. Giles. Academic Press, 99–118.

Teweles, B. (1996). Motivational differences between Chinese and Japanese learners of English as a foreign language. *JALT Journal*, 18, 211–228.

Vaezi, Z. (2008). Language Learning Motivation among Iranian Undergraduate Students, *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 5(1), 54-61.

Warden, C. A., & Lin H. Ju. (2000). Existence of integrative motivation in Asian EF L setting. *Foreign Language Annals*, 535–547.

Williams, M., R. Burden, & U. Lanvers. (2002). French is the language of love and stuff: Student perceptions of issues related to motivation in learning a foreign language. *British Educational Research Journal*, 28, 503–528.

Yamashiro A. D., & McLaughlin, J. (2001). Relationships among attitudes, motivation, anxiety, and English language proficiency in Japanese college students. In *Second Language Acquisition Research in Japan*. Eds. P. Robinson, M. Sawyer, S. Ross. Tokyo: Japan Association for Language Teaching, 113–127.