

# Motivation and Students' Academic Success in Learning English as A Second Language

Dr. Saif Hashim Al-Ansari  
Department of Foreign Languages,  
College of Arts, University of Bahrain

الدافعية ومستوى نجاح الطلبة أكاديمياً  
في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية بوصفها لغةً ثانيةً

د. سيف هاشم الأنصاري  
أستاذ مشارك، قسم اللغات الأجنبية وآدابها  
كلية الآداب - جامعة البحرين

---

## الدافعية ومستوى نجاح الطلبة أكاديمياً في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية بوصفها لغةً ثانيةً

د. سيف هاشم الأنصاري  
أستاذ مشارك، قسم اللغات الأجنبية وآدابها  
كلية الآداب - جامعة البحرين

### ملخص البحث:

تهدف هذه الدراسة الى البحث في العلاقة بين مستوى النجاح في اللغة الإنجليزية لمجموعة مؤلفة من ١٠٠ من الطلبة المتخصصين في اللغة الإنجليزية في جامعة البحرين ومستوى دافعتهم لتعلم اللغة. تبين النتائج عدم وجود علاقة دالة بين متغيرات الدافعية ومستوى الكفاءة الأكاديمية في اللغة الإنجليزية على الرغم من امتلاك الطلبة حافزاً تكاملياً ووظيفياً ونسبة عالية في دافعية تعلم اللغة ولم تكن هناك علاقة تبادلية بين هذه المتغيرات ونجاح الطلبة. لذا فان نظرية الدافعية في تعلم اللغة لجاردنر ولمبرت لم تظهر أية نتائج ايجابية في هذه الدراسة. ان نجاحهم الأكاديمي يرتبط بدرجة عالية لاتقانهم اللغة، بمعنى آخر أنهم كلما كانوا في درجة عالية من الاتقان في اللغة الإنجليزية كانت نسبة نجاحهم الأكاديمي أعلى. تتعارض نتائج هذه الدراسة مع نتائج الدراسات التي أجريت حول تعلم اللغة الثانية، وهي تعكس الدور الذي تلعبه أحادية اللغة والثقافة لدى الطلبة. وحتى يمكن تطبيق الدوافع لدى الطلبة الذين أجريت الدراسة عليهم فانهم بحاجة الى فرص للاحتكاك بالناطقين بهذه اللغة كما أن كلا الحافزين يحتاجان الى تنمية من خلال المواقف الايجابية للوالدين إزاء هذه اللغة ومدى رغبة الطالب في التحدث باللغتين.

## Motivation and Students' Academic Success in Learning English as A Second Language\*

By: Dr. Saif Hashim Al-Ansari  
Department of Foreign Languages,  
College of Arts, University of Bahrain

### Abstract :

The purpose of the study reported here is to investigate the relation between the level of attainment in English of a sample of 100 English major students at the University of Bahrain and their degree of motivation in learning the language. The results demonstrate no significant association between the motivational variables and students' academic success in English. In spite of being highly instrumentally and integratively orientated and holding a high degree of motivation while learning the language, neither of these did attribute to their success in the subject matter. Thus Gardner and Lambert's motivational theory is not found to be workable among these students. Their academic success correlates highly significantly with their proficiency in the language. In other words, the more proficient they are in English, the more successful they are in their academic disciplines. The results obtained for the motivational variables were in contrast with the results of most studies undertaken in second language learning situations and are thus interpreted as perhaps reflecting the role played by the monolingual and monocultural background of the students. For the motivation to work among the group of learners studied here, they need to have opportunities of coming into contact with speakers of the language. Both types of motivation need perhaps to be fostered by positive parental attitudes towards the language and by the students' own willingness to accept themselves as bilinguals.

## Motivational variables and second language learning

The influence of motivational variables in second language learning was first examined in a study conducted by Gardner and Lambert (1959). They were not totally convinced that achievement was largely because of linguistic aptitude suggesting that variables other than linguistic aptitude were involved. Such an assumption was mainly based on the fact that when measures of aptitude were correlated with grades in language courses, the validity coefficients show considerable variability from situation to situation even with tests developed through factor analytic methods. Their study brought to our attention the issue of motivation as a factor influencing both the level of proficiency and the rate of success in learning a foreign or second language. In a later study (Gardner & Lambert, 1972) they set out to measure the influence of different motivational variables on learning second languages. Their pioneering work led to the construction of a socio-psychological theory of second or foreign language learning, according to which learners' level of success in a second language is determined by the extent to which they are psychologically prepared to adopt various aspects of behaviour which characterize members of the target linguistic cultural group. Gardner and Smythe (1975) came up with a taxonomy presenting sixteen motivational variables in four categories. The first category denoting Group Specific Attitudes reflect attitudes toward groups which speak the language. The second category denoting Course related Characteristics reflect attitudes toward learning French, attitudes toward the French course and its teacher and parental encouragement to learn the second language. The third category labelled Motivational Indices reflect the students' goals in learning French, the amount of effort he spends in trying to learn the language and his desire to learn it. The integrative orientation reflects the students' reasons for learning the language so as to learn more about, communicate with and possibly interact with speakers of the second language. This orientation contrasts with the instrumental one. More explanations differentiating between the two types of orientation will be given in the next section of the paper. The fourth category, identified as general attitudes, is not necessarily associated with either of the first two categories.

Since the development of their motivational theory, interest in the exploration of motivation has grown considerably and a number of exploratory studies have been undertaken, mainly in second language situations, which have brought similar or alternative insights into this recent discipline of socio-psycholinguistics. A number of studies mainly in second language situations set out

to determine the influence of motivational variables on students' proficiency. Hermann (1980) considered the new language itself to be rewarding to the learner, and not so much his integration into another cultural group or the achievement of particular utilitarian aims. The mere satisfaction one derives from achievement in the learning task may influence one's attitudes to the target language community and may even result in a degree of change in these attitudes.

If learning a second language signifies the key to possible membership of a secondary society then it is the second language learner's desire to join that group that is seen to act as a major sociolinguistic factor. This crucial element of sociolinguistic integrativeness does not seem to function in a society such as Bahrain where the social and cultural patterns are largely mono-lingually and mono-culturally dominated. This social pattern domination is believed to inhibit learners' motivational orientation from being fulfilled. It is thus assumed that variables associated with learners' motivational orientation are not likely to act as predictors of achievement in an educational milieu as in Bahrain where English is predominantly treated as a foreign language.

### Instrumentality and integrativeness

Gardner and Lambert (1972) were the first to maintain that learners' success in acquiring a second language is dependent on the existence of motivational variables that work in favour of acquiring the language. Learners' reasons for acquiring a second or foreign language are examined in terms of their instrumental or integrative values that are derived from learning it. Krashen (1981) defined a learners' type of integrative motivation as a learner's desire to be valued as a speaking member of the second language community and the learner's possession of such integrative motivation should encourage him to interact with speakers of the second language and obtain intake. Instrumental type of motivation was defined by Krashen (1981) as the learner's desire to achieve proficiency in the language for utilitarian or practical purposes and the presence of this type of motivational orientation will encourage its performers to interact with the second language speakers so as to achieve certain ends.

Learners of English as a foreign language in Bahrain possibly possess an adequate degree of motivation to learn the language, particularly those who have reached a noticeable state of maturity. At this stage they become fully aware of the instrumental and the integrative values which can be derived from learning the language. But as long as interaction with the target language group is not sig-

nificantly permissible, particularly since most of the basic language functions will be met by the mother tongue, motivational orientation is not likely to exert any influence. Immigrants normally experience social pressure that requires them to acquire a foreign language. Learners' degree of integrative and instrumental values for learning a second language are here examined in order to measure their extent of prediction in achievement of learners in an EFL context. It will be interesting to find that learners' lack of social interaction with speakers of the target language are not likely to establish these variables as predictors of achievement in an EFL situation in a country such as that of Bahrain.

### Views and results of studies

Interest in the study of the influence of motivational- and attitudinal-factors has initially gained its popularity in second language learning situations. Lukmani (1972) found that integrative and instrumental motives were highly correlated with each other as well as with achievement in ESL. In her study, contrary to expectation, the instrumental motive was more highly correlated with achievement than the integrative motive. In other words, 'the higher their motivation to use English as a means of career advancement, etc., the better their English scores: 272'. Results of Savignon's experimental study (1972) showed, 'no significant correlations between student interest in learning French. These findings were interpreted as indicating that interest in learning French is of little or no value in predicting success in elementary language acquisition in a uni-cultural Midwestern community. This interpretation contrasts with that of Gardner (1960) which emphasizes the importance of motivational variables in determining success in second-language acquisition: 17-18'. Studies of Oller, 1977a; and 1977b; Gardner, 1960; Feenstra, 1968; Gardner, 1983; Strong, 1984; Gardner and MacIntyre, 1993; Wigzell and Al-Ansari, 1993; Oxford and Shearin, 1994; and many others examined the influence of socio-psychological variables on the acquisition of a second language. Jayatilaka (1982) undertook a multiple correlational study, which revealed that instrumentally motivated students (86% of his subjects) performed better on the language proficiency test than integratively motivated students (34% of his subjects). A regression analysis showed that among the best predictors of subjects' scores on the proficiency test is desire to live abroad temporarily, desire to live abroad permanently, parental encouragement, authoritarianism, and motivation intensity. If second language learning is considered to constitute a truly social psychological experiment, Gardner (1983:223) argued that motivation is expected to play a more

dominant role than aptitude in informal contexts, such as watching films in the other language, because it is assumed that motivational levels will determine whether or not students avail themselves of such informal opportunities to learn the language. Once the student enters an informal language acquisition context, language aptitude would become influential, but motivational factors dominate because they determine whether or not students even take advantage of these contexts. Svanes (1987) stated that closeness in culture would probably promote an integrative motivation to study the target language. Results of Al-Ansari's study (1985 & 1993) on Bahrainis' level of English showed that instrumental motivation tended to correlate significantly with the attainment proficiency of all the studied groups. However no significant correlation was found among the high achievers. Teweles (1995) studied a sample of 40 freshman and sophomores at 2 national universities in mainland China and Japan. He found that students' level of motivation did not correlate highly with proficiency. Coleman (1995) studied over 3,000 British college and university students who were learning different foreign languages. He found a slight but measurable relationship between integrative and/or instrumental motivation and foreign language proficiency. Lang et al (1996) found that integrative motivation correlated significantly with American Sign Language (ASL) proficiency. Instrumental motives, however, were perceived as less important. Kember et al (1996) studied 174 students in a mechanical engineering course at a Hong Kong university. Their English language ability correlated weakly with the motivational variables studied. Results of Kang's study (1999) indicated that the students' language use was restricted to instrumental purposes, that their orientation was intrinsic and extrinsic as well as instrumental and integrative.

It appears from the results of the studies discussed here that the influence of attitudinal-motivational variables on learners' rate of success tended to vary from one setting to another. This noticeable degree of variation resided in learners' socio-cultural background. The researcher's attention has thus been focused on the influence of motivational attributes on foreign language proficiency attainment in order to determine the extent to which previous findings could be generalized to a sample of students who were participating in a university degree-language programme in Bahrain.

Although all of the studies discussed investigated the effects of motivation on foreign language acquisition, there is no definite answer about the causes of individual differences in acquiring a foreign language. However, many educa-

tors agree that the most crucial factor in learning the new language is the role of the learner (Savignon, 1983). In this regard, Wongsorthorn (1987:31) stated that success in learning a foreign language depends on various learner's variables. The literature summarizes these variables in two major divisions: language proficiency and learners' attitudes and motivations and learners' background factors (Wongsorthorn, 1987; Gradman & Hanania, 1991; Wilhelm, 1995). In a study conducted on 101 students taking intensive English at Indiana University, Gradman and Hanania (1991) found that factors such as previous experience of learning English, exposure to and the use of English inside and outside the classroom influenced students' levels of English proficiency.

These background factors not only influence the learning of language, but they contribute to the learners' motivations and attitudes towards learning the target language. Travelling abroad, watching TV programmes, communicating with speakers of English affect the perceptions of learning English by children. Giota (1995) made a survey of the use of English in a non-academic environment by Swedish 9 year-old students. The researcher found that 16% of the children visited English speaking countries; they used English differently, speaking, learning, reading and writing in their leisure time. And 89% of the children considered that their parents helped them with doing homework. And finally, almost all of these children felt that English was important for Swedes to know (Giota, 1995). Studies of Lee (1997), Yager (1998) and Spezzini and Oxford (1998) have all confirmed the importance of motivation in learning a second language.

### Background and rationale of the present study

As is the case in other Gulf States, English is the only foreign language that has had a significant impact on the whole Bahraini educational structure in that it is being taught as a compulsory subject in all State schools. In many respects, Bahrain, unlike other areas in the Gulf or, indeed, in the Middle East generally, approximates to an ESL rather than an EFL environment. Certainly the classroom is not the only source from which Bahraini learners of English get their language input. It is estimated that the English-speaking expatriate community on the island constitutes 25 per cent of the total population. As a result of this, a large proportion of middle-class Bahrainis come into regular contact, usually in their place of work, with the English-speaking community living on the island. Instruction in tertiary institutions, furthermore, is conducted through the medium of English and the language is considered a prerequisite for seeking employment in the private sector.

Despite the fact that a large number of English-speaking residents are present in various work environments, there is little social integration with the local inhabitants in their homes, in clubs or other social milieu. Schumann (1978) considers acculturation to be a significant variable in second language acquisition. If this is so, most Bahraini learners of English will be severely handicapped by their monocultural orientation in their attempts to acquire a working knowledge of English. Yet most middle-class Bahrainis do achieve an acceptable level of both academic and professional proficiency in the language.

Over the past few years, the impression has been growing among the English teaching staff at the University of Bahrain that at higher levels of learning, especially when students are required to use the language for academic purposes, acculturation and motivation are not major factors in determining the level of attained proficiency in English. The consensus view is that other factors become increasingly dominant. These other factors can be collectively referred to as 'general academic ability'. This general ability factor becomes clear when students approach graduation. In a recent survey, a high significant correlation coefficient of .66 ( $p < .001$ ) was found to obtain between the cumulative grade point average (cgpa) and the TOEFL scores of graduating English majors over the past four semesters.

The first purpose of the present study was to determine the relationship of success of Bahraini students in a BA degree at the University of Bahrain as measured by GPA, with their scores obtained on the proficiency test, together with their scores on the cloze test. The second purpose of the study was to determine whether the students' total score on the motivational scale or their overall score on the proficiency test tended to be a better predictor of their success at the university as measured by GPA. It would clearly be of considerable pedagogic relevance to know at what level, if any, the significance of motivational variables as factors influencing learning starts to decline and with what type of students. The relation between the variables was investigated at the third- and fourth-year graduation levels, which in Bahrain means after students have completed nine years of English instruction in the schools, one semester of intensive preparatory programme at the University and a further two-year study in the major discipline.

## Research method

**Subjects:** A total number of 100 students in the English Department at the University of Bahrain volunteered to take part in the study by filling out the questionnaire. These represent more than 80% of the entire graduate student population in the programme. In addition to the students being drawn from the same specialisation, they were very homogenous in respect of age, nationality, mother tongue and both cultural and educational background. The selection of these subjects contrasts with the samples used in many other motivational studies. Much of earlier reported research has been conducted with linguistically and culturally heterogeneous groups of language learners. These may have been open to a much wider range of background influences than the sample used in the present study.

**Instrumentation:** A motivational scale was developed. Most of the items in the developed scale were adapted from Gardner and Lambert's Attitudinal/Motivational Scale (1972). The scale contains items which measure the following variables: Integrative motivation, Instrumental Motivation, Desire to Learn English and Motivational Intensity. Because of the resemblance between the developed scale and Gardner and Lambert's Attitudinal/Motivational Scale, the reported reliability of coefficient of .85 for Gardner and Lambert's scale (Gardner and Lambert, 1972) will be considered for the developed scale.

**Materials:** A questionnaire consisting of the following variables was developed and administered to the selected sample. The components of the questionnaire are as follows:

**Motivational Intensity:** The alternative responses and the multiple-choice statement developed here reflect the degree of commitment the students show in their learning of English (maximum=42). This motivational intensity is measured through both an index of motivation to study English and their desire to learn it. The alternative items were on a 3-point scale while the multiple-choice statements were on a 4-point scale. The statements of the motivational intensity scale included here measure the extent of work they do for homework, whether they are going to study English and make use of it in the future. Others deal with their preference for English over other school subjects, their eagerness to do the homework, their degree of attention in class and their overall interest in learning and using the language. The items here focus more on measuring students' moti-

vation to learn English while the items of their desire to learn the language measure an actual effort being made while acquiring the language.

**Instrumental motivation:** This seven-item scale (maximum=28) assesses the extent to which subjects perceive utilitarian reasons for studying English. Their responses must be descriptive of their feelings. The students were asked to rate on a 4-point scale the extent to which each of the seven instrumental reasons for learning English was descriptive of his or her feelings. The higher a student's score on this measure is, the more he or she is identified as being instrumentally oriented.

**Integrative motivation:** This four-item scale (maximum=16) assesses the extent to which students believe that learning English is important because it enables them to interact and share cultural experiences with the English speaking community. The students were asked to rate on a 4-point scale four integrative reasons for learning English that were descriptive of his or her feelings. If the students are highly integratively motivated in their learning of English, they will be assumed to place more emphasis on the integrative value of learning it as a foreign language, e.g. as a means of learning more about or meeting members of the target community. The higher the student's score on this measure is, the more he or she is identified as being integratively oriented.

**Motivational orientation:** The scale of this orientation index provided the students with the same eleven alternative reasons for studying English. The students were asked to rank the eleven items as to their relevance to them personally. The higher the scores, the more the students are said to be motivationally oriented (both instrumentally and integratively) in their learning of English as a foreign language.

### Proficiency measures

The students' responses to the items on the questionnaire were correlated with scores obtained from a programme-neutral proficiency test. This incorporated a multiple choice reading comprehension test, a multiple choice grammar and usage test, a free composition test doubled marked by two independent examiners and a cloze test in the standard format for reading, with the passage gapped at fifths and the answers marked in accordance with the exact word criterion. Correlation coefficients of .67 (reading), .61 (listening), .65 (grammar), and .63 (composition), all significant at the  $p < .01$  level, were obtained between

the results of the cloze test and the results of the proficiency test. The four components of the proficiency test were all equally weighted and each scored out of 25. It needs to be pointed out that the test was not designed as a test of functional or communicative competence. In particular, it did not incorporate any test of oral fluency. Although it did not contain any material relating directly to the students' academic programme, it nonetheless tests the 'academic' rather than the 'communicative' component of language proficiency. Since my ultimate purpose was to determine the influence of both motivation and instrumental and integrative types of motivation on the students' ability to use the language for academic purposes, this bias was considered entirely appropriate.

Table 1: Students' mean scores on the proficiency and cloze tests

proficiency measures	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
Cloze	10	20	15.20	2.49
Proficiency	52	97	76.53	9.78

The mean scores obtained in the above table clearly indicate that the subjects selected for the study achieved a reasonable degree of English proficiency. Such results were predictable since these students were approaching their graduation years at the University. Joint distribution analyses of these results, together with their academic achievement, will be discussed in more detail at a later stage of the study.

## Results of the study

### I QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES

An analysis of the questionnaire scores for the tested motivational variables of all the respondents is shown in Table 2. The mean scores obtained for all the motivational variables clearly indicate that the sample selected for the study do possess a high degree of motivation to learn English. The mean scores are high in all cases. In fact, a mean score of 33.80, out of a possible of 42, reflects the high degree of motivational intensity the students exert while attempting to acquire the language. The standard deviations, which are all less than 1.00, fur-

ther support the mean scores obtained. Had the standard deviations been closer to the mean scores, the validity of the items tested would have been called into question.

Table 2: Mean score and standard deviation  
for the motivational variables tested

variable	min	max	mean	S.D.
1. Before the English language lesson, I ... my homework	.00	2.00	1.65	.53
2. Before the English language lesson, I ... read through the previous lesson.	.00	2.00	1.11	.57
3. I find the subject of English very interesting.	1.00	3.00	2.55	.59
4. I think English should be taught to all students at all levels.	2.00	3.00	2.88	.32
5. If I knew enough English, I would read foreign books.	1.00	3.00	2.76	.44
6. During English classes, I find myself absorbed in the subject matter.	.00	3.00	2.67	.60
7. Whenever I have homework in English, I do it before others' homework.	1.00	3.00	2.40	.53
8. I prefer English much more than most of other school subjects.	.00	3.00	2.41	.58
9. In comparison with other school subjects, I work harder for English	.00	3.00	2.39	.72
10. After my secondary education, I will continue to improve my English.	1.00	3.00	2.58	.51
11. On average, the time I spend each week studying English is about.... hours	.00	3.00	2.26	.75
12. If English was not taught at my school, I would attend a course.	.00	3.00	2.61	.73
13. I prefer to sit at the back of the classroom during my English classes. ( <i>negatively worded</i> )	.00	2.00	1.52	.56
14. I study English without accomplishing much ( <i>negatively worded</i> )	.00	2.00	1.33	.52
15. I learn grammatical rules and structural items without really understanding them ( <i>negatively worded</i> )	.00	2.00	1.65	.49
16. Whether I like English or not, I work hard to get a good grade.	.00	2.00	1.52	.69
<b>Total (Motivational Intensity)</b>	<b>13.00</b>	<b>42.00</b>	<b>33.80</b>	<b>4.32</b>

Table 3 below gives the result of the Pearson correlation matrix obtained for all the motivational variables tested.

**Table 3: Pearson correlation matrix for the motivational variables**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	-															
2	.16	-														
3	-.14	.08	-													
4	-.06	.01	.18	-												
5	.12	.23	.14	.03	-											
6	-.08	.10	.26	.00	.03	-										
7	.13	.28	.25	.10	.14	.28	-									
8	-.09	.04	.45	.10	.21	.28	.30	-								
9	.19	.36	.25	.16	.00	.19	.13	.25	-							
10	.14	.23	.12	.18	.22	.09	.25	.17	.27	-						
11	.09	.14	.11	.13	.09	.05	.14	.12	.22	.38	-					
12	-.02	.03	.13	.14	.25	-.04	.06	.20	.01	.28	.25	-				
13	.11	.10	.11	.01	.05	.21	-.03	-.04	-.03	.03	.07	-.00	-			
14	-.05	.08	.11	.11	.00	-.06	.02	.20	.03	-.03	.18	.15	.21	-		
15	.03	.06	.16	.05	.33	.09	.11	.32	.24	.19	.04	.22	-.02	.18	-	
16	.00	.18	-.04	-.12	-.03	-.05	-.12	-.09	.06	.04	.09	.00	-.19	-.10	-.18	-
Total	<b>.22</b>	<b>.48</b>	<b>.40</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>.31</b>	<b>.39</b>	<b>.42</b>	<b>.50</b>	<b>.53</b>	<b>.55</b>	<b>.50</b>	<b>.41</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.25</b>	<b>.42</b>	<b>.08</b>

In this table correlations of  $\pm .20$  or higher are significant at  $p < .05$ ; correlations of  $\pm .30$  or higher are significant at  $p < .01$ ; and correlations of  $\pm .35$  or higher are significant at  $p < .001$ . (The significant results are in bold type)

It can be seen from the above table that certain motivational variables tended to correlate with only certain motivational variables. However, the total score of the motivational scale correlates highly significantly with almost all the variables tested. The result of this correlation matrix also supports the reliability of the data collected. The reliability coefficient for each variable tested is shown in the copy of the questionnaire given in the appendix.

The mean score obtained for all the instrumental motivation to learn demonstrates positive instrumental reasons to learn the language. A mean score of 19.73, out of a possible one of 28, shows that the subjects studied here see high instrumental values in learning English. This has been true of all subjects stud-

ied previously. However, this has not been the case with their integrative motives to learn the language. A score of 8.64, out of a possible 16, shows that the students possess a moderate degree of integrative motivation to learn English. The mean score for item 1 shows that English majors at the University of Bahrain are not learning English because it will make them able to think and behave as foreign language speakers do. This strong integrative motivation appears to be too extreme to learners who do not see this motive to be applicable to their learning contexts where full integration with the target language is hard to come by. However, the mean scores obtained for the three other integrative items are moderate. On the whole the subjects value the language for its instrumental reasons more than for the integrative ones.

**Table 4: Mean score and standard deviation for the instrumental/integrative variables tested**

variable	min	max	mean	S.D.
<b>I am learning English because</b>				
1. I do not consider one to be really educated unless he has the capability to communicate in English	.00	4.00	2.00	1.44
2. it will be useful in getting a good job	.00	4.00	3.22	.99
3. it is socially desirable that a person should know at least one foreign language besides his own language	.00	4.00	2.90	1.19
4. it is one of the major school subjects	.00	4.00	2.05	1.40
5. the language used nowadays in science and technology is English	.00	4.00	3.14	1.11
6. I need it in order to pursue my higher studies.	.00	4.00	3.05	1.05
7. It is the principal language of communication among most countries of the world.	.00	4.00	3.61	.65
<i>Degree of Instrumentality (total)</i>	4.00	28.00	19.73	4.80
<b>I am learning English because</b>				
1. it will make me able to think and behave as foreign language learners do.	.00	4.00	.76	1.28
2. it will enable me to meet and converse with those who speak English.	.00	4.00	3.03	1.06
3. it will enable me to understand foreign language speakers more and get to know their social habits	.00	4.00	2.91	1.07
4. it makes it easier for me to make friends among those who speak the language.	.00	4.00	1.97	1.37
<i>Degree of integrativeness (total)</i>	.00	16.00	8.64	3.18
<i>Motivational orientation (both instrumentality and integrativeness)</i>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>44.00</b>	<b>28.73</b>	<b>6.78</b>

The correlation matrix obtained in Table 5 is high in most cases. In other words, their motivational reasons to learn the language tend to correlate highly significantly with each other. The fact that the total motivational orientation is found to be highly correlating with all the variables tested further supports the reliability of the motivational scale used.

**Table 5: Pearson correlation matrix for the instrumental & integrative variables**

variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Instrumental variable 1	–													
2. Instrumental variable 2	<b>.26</b>	–												
3. Instrumental variable 3	<b>.28</b>	.12	–											
4. Instrumental variable 4	.12	<b>.27</b>	.14	–										
5. Instrumental variable 5	.06	<b>.19</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>.24</b>	–									
6. Instrumental variable 6	<b>.25</b>	<b>.48</b>	.08	<b>.29</b>	<b>.43</b>	–								
7. Instrumental variable 7	.19	<b>.33</b>	<b>.19</b>	.08	<b>.33</b>	<b>.39</b>	–							
8. Integrative variable 1	<b>.40</b>	<b>.42</b>	.16	<b>.27</b>	.08	<b>.24</b>	-.04	–						
9. Integrative variable 2	<b>.21</b>	<b>.20</b>	.06	-.02	-.01	.13	<b>.21</b>	<b>.24</b>	–					
10. Integrative variable 3	.09	<b>.27</b>	.03	.18	.06	<b>.27</b>	.15	<b>.19</b>	<b>.32</b>	–				
11. Integrative variable 4	<b>.26</b>	<b>.38</b>	<b>.27</b>	<b>.22</b>	.16	<b>.24</b>	.14	<b>.20</b>	<b>.34</b>	<b>.29</b>	–			
12. Degree of instrumentality	<b>.46</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>.55</b>	<b>.56</b>	<b>.68</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.25</b>	.17	<b>.19</b>	<b>.39</b>	–		
13. Degree of integrativeness	<b>.35</b>	<b>.42</b>	<b>.21</b>	<b>.25</b>	.12	<b>.33</b>	.17	<b>.62</b>	<b>.68</b>	<b>.63</b>	<b>.72</b>	<b>.39</b>	–	
14. (Motivational Orientation)	<b>.49</b>	<b>.57</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.49</b>	<b>.44</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>.40</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.44</b>	<b>.43</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>.90</b>	<b>.79</b>	–

In this table correlations of  $\pm .19$  or higher are significant at  $p < .05$ ; correlations of  $\pm .30$  or higher are significant at  $p < .01$ ; and correlations of  $\pm .35$  or higher are significant at  $p < .001$ . (The significant results are in bold type)

## II ANALYSIS

A general linear multivariate regression was made using the SPSS for all the motivational variables, together with their proficiency measures. These analyses were supplemented by a stepwise regression to explore the contribution of certain sub-scores to the multivariate model. The general linear multivariate regres-

sion was also applied for the students' composite grade point average (GPA) and for their GPA in the English courses (ENGLPA). The general linear model differs from a stepwise regression in its considerations of the contributions of all the test scores simultaneously. In effect, the final product of a stepwise regression in which all of the independent variables were entered into the model is equivalent to the linear regression.

Based on the multivariate regression equations predicted grade point averages (GPAs) were computed. For students, who achieved each rounded predicted GPAs, the mean observed GPA was computed and these were plotted against the predicted GPAs. These plots were examined to determine if they fit the predicted GPAs and that they were equally accurate throughout the range of observed GPAs, that is in relation to the level of the students' academic success in the language.

### 1 Bivariate (zero order) correlations

It is clear in Table 6 that none of the motivational variables studied here correlates with any of the scores relating to students' academic attainment in English. Their GPA and ENGLPA are found to highly correlate with their performance on the cloze test and their proficiency attainment only.

**Table 6: Bivariate correlation coefficients among motivational scores, cloze, proficiency, GPA and GPA in English courses (ENGLPA)**

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Instrumental motivation	–							
2. Integrative motivation	<b>.41*</b>	–						
3. Motivational orientation	<b>.90*</b>	<b>.76*</b>	–					
4. Motivational intensity	.19	.08	.18	–				
5. Cloze	.06	.06	.07	-.20	–			
6. Proficiency	-.04	-.11	-.08	.05	<b>.39*</b>	–		
7. GPA	.04	-.00	.03	-.07	<b>.47*</b>	<b>.62*</b>	–	
8. ENGLPA	-.00	-.14	-.07	-.02	<b>.49*</b>	<b>.69*</b>	<b>.68*</b>	–

\*  $p < .001$

## 2 Multivariate correlations

Tables 7 and 8 show the results of the stepwise regression predicting students' grade point average GPA, and GPA in English courses, respectively, using the components scores of the motivational variables and academic proficiency as independent variables. Note that none of the motivational variables contribute enough to the prediction of students' GPA to be maintained in the linear model. The same appears to be true with regard to the students' GPA in English courses.

**Table 7: Stepwise regression of all the tested scores onto overall GPA**

Dependent Variable	Entry Order	Independent Variables	Partial r-square
Overall GPA	—	Instrumental motivation	—
	—	Integrative motivation	—
	—	Motivational orientation	—
	—	Motivational intensity	—
	1	Proficiency	<b>.39</b>
2	Cloze	<b>.06</b>	
Total r-square			<b>.45</b>

**Table 8: Stepwise regression of all the tested scores onto overall GPA in English courses**

Dependent Variable	Entry Order	Independent Variables	Partial r-square
Overall GPA	—	Instrumental motivation	—
	—	Integrative motivation	—
	—	Motivational orientation	—
	—	Motivational intensity	—
	1	Proficiency	<b>.47</b>
2	Cloze	<b>.06</b>	
Total r-square			<b>.53</b>

### 3 Joint distribution

Table 9 below gives the joint distribution for the students' academic success at the University. It is difficult to interpret the data since there is no exact agreement among the tests of the construct under measure. However, some interesting patterns have emerged. Students who are less academically successful at the University tends to share an almost equal number to those with less proficiency attainment in English tests. These students tend to represent only a small proportion to the bulk of the students used in the study. This has been predictable since the subjects here are approaching their graduation at the University and are bound to be attaining an acceptable standard in the degree programme in order to graduate successfully. Thus not less than 80% of the subjects can be identified as moderate or high achievers. It is only 20% who can be labeled as low achievers.

**Table 9: Joint frequencies of both the proficiency and academic measures**

Proficiency total	Cloze total	GPA	ENGINA
<b>Less than 70</b> <i>N</i> (15) % 20.8	<b>10 - 12</b> <i>N</i> (14) % 17.9	<b>1.19 - 1.93</b> <i>N</i> (6) % 7.8	<b>.00 - 1.33</b> <i>N</i> (13) % 17.1
<b>70 - 75</b> <i>N</i> (12) % 17	<b>13 - 14</b> <i>N</i> (17) % 21.8	<b>2.05 - 2.30</b> <i>N</i> (16) % 20.8	<b>2.00 - 2.32</b> <i>N</i> (29) % 48.7
<b>76 - 79.5</b> <i>N</i> (19) % 24,8	<b>15 - 16</b> <i>N</i> (22) % 28,2	<b>2.31 - 2.66</b> <i>N</i> (22) % 28,6	<b>2.33 - 2.67</b> <i>N</i> (13) % 15,8
<b>80 - 83.70</b> <i>N</i> (12) % 15.6	<b>17 - 18</b> <i>N</i> (17) % 21.8	<b>2.67 - 2.99</b> <i>N</i> (7) % 9	<b>3.00 - 3.33</b> <i>N</i> (15) % 14.4
<b>85 - 97</b> <i>N</i> (17) % 22.2	<b>19 - 20</b> <i>N</i> (8) % 10.2	<b>3.00 - 4.00</b> <i>N</i> (26) % 33.8	<b>3.67 - 4.00</b> <i>N</i> (6) % 3.9

## Discussion

Results of this study show that the students' composite GPA and their GPA in English courses are highly correlated with their scores on the cloze and proficiency tests. This means that their academic success at the University is highly influenced by their proficiency attainment. In other words, it is the adoption of cognitive strategies in learning the language, which accounts for success in the subject matter. The possession and adoption of affective variables, i.e. motivations for learning the language, have not been found to be influential here. These may act as a driving force by which cognitive skills can be triggered off. Although the subjects as a group are very highly motivated to learn the language, this great degree of motivation apparently does not account for high attainment. The conclusion that might be drawn is that motivation exerts a significant influence on the level of attainment only with averagely gifted learners up to about the intermediate level (Al-Ansari, 1985 and 1993) and that thereafter its importance diminishes, particularly when English is being studied primarily for academic purposes. It appears that at upper levels of language learning, students' success in language learning is determined by their lexical and syntactic knowledge in comprehending the language together with their ability to understand and produce correct grammatical sentences.

The affective variables studied here have no role to play in determining success in the language. In other words, the more proficient in the language components, the higher performance in the proficiency examinations. This is found to be true for students approaching graduation year at the University. At this stage, they reach a proficiency stage at which they can be easily identified as being bilinguals in terms of being capable of learning English as a medium of instruction.

In attempting to interpret the present findings, it needs to be borne in mind that beyond a certain level, progressively higher amounts of motivational outlooks are needed to achieve progressively smaller amounts of improvement in proficiency. If this is so, then the present findings with regard to the subjects studied here may be partly explained by the fact that the amount of motivation, whatever type, is not sufficient enough to account for the difference in attainment on the kind of test that was administered. Although, as was indicated in the introductory remarks, Bahrain approximates in many respects to an ESL environment, integration and acculturation are not significant factors influencing

the level of attainment among graduate students. It is true they may be in possession of certain motivational reasons for learning English, but as long as their motivation is not fulfilled outside the institutional setting, its influence on their performance is almost nonexistent, for they generally lack opportunities to come into contact with the language for actual communicative functions. Even if opportunities exist, learners might not be able to make use of such opportunities, either because of the existence of social barriers between the two groups or because of the learners' unwillingness to accept social integration.

Opportunities to become communicatively engaged in the language are difficult to come by, particularly since social integration between members of the same group can take place through the vernacular language and this obviously inhibits learners from manipulating the target language in its contextual functions. Social integration with speakers of the foreign language is less easily achieved when learners themselves are mono-lingually and mono-culturally oriented and tend to live within their mono-lingual and mono-cultural community. The learning of French as a second language in a country such as Canada constitutes an entirely different socio-linguistic phenomenon. Second language learners there might be undergoing both socio-cultural and economic pressures, if not political to acquire the second language. Acquisition of the second language becomes a necessity for such learners and probably becomes a much easier task than the acquisition of English in Bahrain since opportunities for becoming engaged in social interaction with the speakers of French are readily available and so can be linguistically exploited.

Bahraini learners of English may well be aware of the instrumental reasons or values for learning the language, but such awareness is probably less evident in the earlier stages of learning when it is treated merely as a compulsory school subject. The economic and educational fulfilment of this motivational variable is probably more evident at the tertiary learning levels where learners have become mature enough to perceive the influential role the language can play in their future career prospects. By this time, however, the level of proficiency in the language will have already been established, since learners in Bahrain will already have been exposed to English instruction for a period of not less than ten years.

It appears that Gardner and Lambert's motivational theory "(1959) seems to be workable only in situations where learners directly experience the socio-psy-

chological benefits of living in a bilingual and bicultural type of environment. Such a theory does not have any significant value in a mono-cultural setting such as that of Bahrain in which the mother tongue and the culture of the learners impose no social constraints or social inhibitions. The findings, however, do not, of course, in any way challenge the view that motivations can be major factors influencing the level of success in foreign or second language learning. It is clear, however, that for motivational variables to act as predictors of attainment, students need to develop motivation to a much greater extent than they appear to do in Bahrain and at an early stage.

Learning a foreign language such as English with natural and world-wide recognition is of vital importance for young Bahrainis, and their motivational approaches to the learning task must be developed. The fascinating challenge for these students, however, is to keep their own cultural and linguistic identity while mastering a foreign language. Whether, with the proper motivational orientation and outlooks, one can become bilingual without losing one's identity, however, is a question left for the time being unanswered.

### Concluding remarks

The pedagogical implication from this study is that learners of English certainly need to approach the language with positive motivational attitudes and should be encouraged to do so in order to reach a reasonable level of success. This certainly leads us to a methodological debate in the field of foreign language teaching that focuses on both ways of promoting and managing motivation and furthermore on instructional techniques and classroom management. Teachers must break their daily routine techniques of favouring a particular method and must develop an approach to teaching, which they find more responsive to the needs of their students. Moreover, teachers need to broaden their views of teaching the language in order to allow the students to experience some success in learning the language. Motivation, of course, is notoriously difficult to control, and it may therefore prove necessary to incorporate the right type of learning conditions by which learners' rate of motivation is enhanced and their success is further challenged. There must be appropriate pedagogical conditions which provide the framework for such enhancement. This is something for pedagogical practitioners to bear in mind when exploiting language teaching materials that both promote students' motivation further and develop cognitive learning strategies at the same time.

In conclusion, the discussion of methodological issues of English language learning and their inter-relationship with motivation can go on endlessly. Once there are dedicated and professional teachers who are well motivated themselves, assorted teaching techniques will be incorporated creatively into the students' existing language materials. These will have an element of flexibility within them. The whole thinking of our methodological procedures leads to a focus on a student-centred approach to teaching that will eventually require us to take account of individual needs. Ideally here would be no fixed programme. Instead both teachers and students would negotiate the course content as the course progresses.

While we think of all the activities that motivate and increase student output, we have to consider a learner's motivation, together with his intelligence and disciplined application to the task. This leads to differentiation between those who fail and those who succeed in learning the language. It is motivation that generates in an intelligent student a need for being disciplined in his application to the learning task.

## References

- Al-Ansari, S. H. (1985). **Environmental factors influencing students' achievement in English as a foreign language**. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wales.
- . (1993). Integrative and instrumental motivation as factors influencing attained levels of proficiency in English. **Journal of King Saud University**, 5, (2) 71-83
- Coleman, J. A. (1995). **Progress, proficiency and motivation among british university language learners**. CLCS Occasional Paper No 40.
- Feenstra, H. J. (1968). **Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language learning**. Ph D thesis, The University of Western Ontario, London Ontario.
- Gardner, R. C. (1960). **Motivational variables in second language acquisition**. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, McGill University.
- . (1983). Learning another language. A true social psychological experiment. **Journal of Language and Social Psychology**, 2,3 and 4, 219-239.
- . (1985). **Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivations**. Baltimore, Maryland: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R., & Lambert, W. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. **Canadian Journal of Psychology**, 13, 266-272
- Gardner, R., & Lambert, W. (1972). **Attitudes and motivation in second language learning** Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second. **Language Learning Language Learning** 43, (2). 157-194
- Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1975). Motivation and second language acquisition. **Canadian Modern Language Review**, 21, 218-230
- Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P.C., Clement, R. & Glikzman, L. (1976). Second language learning: A social psychological perspective. **Canadian Modern Language Review**. 32 198-213
- Giota, J. (1995). Why do all children in Swedish schools learn English as a foreign language? An analysis of an open question in the national evaluation programme of the Swedish compulsory comprehensive school. **System**, 23, 307-324.

Gradman, H. L., & Hanania, E. (1991). Language learning background factors and ESL proficiency. **The Modern Language Journal**, **75**, 39-51.

Hermann, G. 1980. Attitudes and success in children's learning of English as a second language: the motivational versus the resultative hypothesis. **English Language Teaching Journal** 34: 247-54

Jayatilaka, T. D. (1982). **Motivational and attitudinal variables in the learning of English as a second language: A study of Malaysian university students**. Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University.

Kang, Dong-Ho. (1999). **Motivational constructs and changes in EFL classroom (pilot study)** ERIC DOCUMENT NO 432142

Kellermann, M. (1981). **The forgotten third skill**. NY: Pergamon Press.

Kember, D., & Others. (1996). An examination of the interrelationship between workload, study time, learning approaches, and academic outcomes. **Studies in Higher Education**. **21** (3), 347-58

Kim, H., & Krashen, S. (1997). Why don't language acquirers take advantage of the power of reading? **TESOL Journal**, **6**, (3) 26-29

Krashen, S. (1981). **Second language acquisition and second language learning**. Oxford Pergamon Press

Lang, Harry G; and Others. (1996). Motivational and attitudinal orientations in learning American sign language. **Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education**. **2**, 137-44

Lee, L. (1997). Using Internet tools as an enhancement of L2 teaching and learning. **Foreign Language Annals**. **30**, (3), 410-27

Lukmani, Y. M. (1972). Motivation to learn and language proficiency. **Language Learning**, **22**, 261-273.

Oller, J, 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.

Oller, J., Baca, L., & Vigil, F. (1977). Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: a sociolinguistic study of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. **TESOL Quarterly** 11 173-83

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

Savignon, S. J. (1972). **Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign language teaching, language teaching, language and the teachers: A series in applied linguistics**, Philadelphia, the Centre for Curriculum Development Inc.

Schumann, J. H. (1978). Social and psychological factors in second language acquisition in **Understanding Second and Foreign Language Learning: Issues and Approaches**, ed. Jack Richards, Rowley, Mass: Newbury House, 163-77

Smythe, P. C., Stennett, R., & Feenstra, H. (1972). Attitude, aptitude and type of instructional programme in second language acquisition. **Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science** 4, 307-321.

Spezzini, S., & Oxford, R. (1998). Perspectives of preservice foreign language teachers. **System**. 26, (1), 65-76

Strong, M. (1984). Integrative motivation: Cause or result of successful second language acquisition? **Language Learning** 34, (3), 1-14

Svanes, B. (1987). Motivation and cultural distance in second language acquisition. **Language Learning**. 37, (3), 341-59

Teweles, B. (1995). Motivation as a two-sided coin: Motivational differences between college-level Chinese and Japanese learners of English. **Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education**. 2 (1).

Wigzell, R., & Al-Ansari, S. (1993). The pedagogical needs of low achievers. **The Canadian Modern Language Review**. 49 (2), 302-315

Yager, K. (1998). Learning Spanish in Mexico: The effect of informal contact and student attitudes on language gain. **Hispania**, 81 (4), 898-913

## APPENDIX 1

1. Before the English language lesson, I ... my homework (Cronbach a = .27)
2. Before the English language lesson, I ... read through the previous lesson.
3. I find the subject of English very interesting. (Cronbach a = .27)
4. I think English should be taught to all students at all levels.
5. If I knew enough English, I would read foreign books. (Cronbach a = .07)
6. During English classes, I find myself absorbed in the subject matter.
7. Whenever I have homework in English, (Cronbach a = .46)  
I do it before other homework.
8. I prefer English much more than most of other school subjects.
9. In comparison with other school subjects, (Cronbach a = .40)  
I work harder for English.
10. After my secondary education, I will continue to improve my English.
11. On average, the time I spend each (Cronbach a = .40)  
week studying English is about.... hours
12. If English was not taught at my school, I would attend a course.
13. I prefer to sit at the back of the classroom (Cronbach a = .55)  
during my English classes. (*negatively worded*)
14. I study English without accomplishing much (*negatively worded*)
15. I learn grammatical rules and structural items (Cronbach a = .41)  
without really understanding them (*negatively worded*)
16. Whether I like English or not, I work hard to get a good grade.  
(Guttman - Split-half = .62)

APPENDIX 2

**I am learning English because**

1. I do not consider one to be really educated (Cronbach a = .40)  
unless he has the capability to communicate in English
2. it will be useful in getting a good job
3. it is socially desirable that a person should know (Cronbach a = .25)  
at least one foreign language besides his own language
4. it is one of the major school subjects
5. the language used nowadays in science (Cronbach a = .60)  
and technology is English
6. I need it in order to pursue my higher studies. (Cronbach a = .52)
7. It is the principal language of communication among most countries of the world.

*Degree of Instrumentality (total)* (Guttman Split-half = .51)

**I am learning English because**

1. It will make me able to think and behave (Cronbach a = .38)  
as foreign language learners do.
2. It will enable me to meet and converse with those who speak English.
3. It will enable me to understand foreign (Cronbach a = .44)  
language speakers more and get to know their social habits
4. It makes it easier for me to make friends among those who speak the language.

*Degree of integrativeness (total)* (Guttman split-half = .58)

*Motivational orientation* Guttman split-half = .58

*(both instrumentality and integrativeness)*