

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Raisa Canete Blazquez for the degree of Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies in Education, Ethnic Studies, and Foreign Languages and Literatures presented on March 22, 2017.

Title: The Impact of Motivation in the University Spanish Classroom.

Abstract approved: _____

Shelley I. Dubkin-Lee

The study of motivation in second language acquisition has been a matter of interest for many years. The research objective of this project was to conduct a study that would determine the motivation level of students of Spanish 113 during Spring term 2016 at Oregon State University, and how their motivation was reflected on their final grades. This project used a survey as the research method to provide an analysis on the students' motivation, first determining what types of motivation were more common, and to what degree the students were motivated in each type. The analysis was based both on the amount of positive vs. negative responses for each motivation type, and on a comparison of their final grades among all motivation types, using the general mean as a reference. A quantitative approach was used to assess the potential impact that motivation, determined by the questions in the survey, had on the students' performance and success in the Spanish classroom. The results of this research demonstrate that generally students with a higher level of motivation scored higher than students with a lower level of motivation. It was also proved that students who were taking the class as part of a major requirement scored lower than students who were taking the class by choice. However, the relation between the students' motivation level and their final grades was not always a decisive factor on the impact of motivation. Recommendations for future research on motivation in the university Spanish classroom are discussed within the study.

©Copyright by Raisa Canete Blazquez
March 22, 2017
All Rights Reserved

The Impact of Motivation in the University Spanish Classroom

by
Raisa Canete Blazquez

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies

Presented March 22, 2017
Commencement June 2017

Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies thesis of Raisa Canete Blazquez presented on March 22, 2017

APPROVED:

Major Professor, representing Education

Director of the Interdisciplinary Studies Program

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

Raisa Canete Blazquez, Author

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to express sincere appreciation to all the people who have accompanied me through my graduate education and through the process of writing a thesis. A special thank you to my Thesis Committee for trusting my decisions and constantly supporting me, especially to Dr. Shelley Dubkin-Lee, my Thesis Chair and Advisor, who has helped me navigate the steps for completing my degree and has supported me along the way. Thanks to my family and friends for the moral support and for believing in me, encouraging me to keep going no matter what. To everyone whom I have met during this meaningful experience, thank you. Each stage has been very important and I have learned from all my professors and classmates, who always helped me move in the right direction. Thanks to the beautiful people with whom I shared “la Cueva” at some point; my experience as a graduate student would not have been the same without you. Thank you all for being there and supporting me on my way to this final stage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	4
Motivation in Learning	4
Defining motivation	4
How motivation affects learning	5
The complexity of measuring motivation	6
The instructor's responsibility	7
Second Language Acquisition	9
The theory behind SLA	9
Individual differences	11
Acquisition differences	12
Foreign language vs. Second language	13
Acquisition vs. Learning	14
Motivation in Second Language Learning	15
How does motivation affect SLA?	15
What constitutes motivation?	18
Different types of motivation	24
Chapter 3: Methodology	28
Materials	28
Participants	29
Procedures	30

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Data collection	30
Data analysis	31
Chapter 4: Research and Results	33
Language requirement	33
Motivational Analysis	35
Integrative motivation	36
Instrumental motivation	37
Resultative motivation	37
Intrinsic motivation	38
In-class motivation	39
Discussion	40
Chapter 5: Conclusion	43
References	47
Appendix A	49

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Language requirement	35
2	Integrative motivation	36
3	Instrumental motivation	37
4	Resultative motivation	38
5	Intrinsic motivation	39
6	In-class motivation	40

Chapter 1: Introduction

The purpose of this research was to get insight into the interests and motivation of students in Spanish 113, the third in a lower-division Spanish course series taught at Oregon State University. The design of the research was based on a survey that was presented to the students, and the data collected from that survey served as foundation to a study on the students' motivation in learning Spanish during Spring term, 2016. Looking into the impact of motivation in the context of college language learning, especially during the first levels, can provide important information that may shape future considerations, such as course planning.

The research question that guided this study was: How does motivation impact the students' success in the classroom? To answer that, and to determine what direction the study was going to take, other questions were identified:

- 1) How do we measure motivation in the students?
- 2) What types of motivation are present in the classroom?
- 3) How do we compare results to reach general and reliable conclusions?

There was also an initial hypothesis that the more motivated students do better in class than the less motivated ones, supporting the presumption that the results would show that motivation has a positive impact on the students' final grades.

When reviewing the literature, existing data were found in the study of foreign languages as a whole, as well as studies with a focus on specific languages other than Spanish, and the identification of specific motivation types. Considering the lack of research about motivation in this specific context, there was a necessity of conducting a study that would specifically benefit the teaching of Spanish as a second language at a university level, hoping to find a pattern that could be used for future lesson planning in the lower-division Spanish courses at OSU.

This current study ties in well with earlier studies in that while they have a broader focus on motivation in language acquisition, this study focuses specifically on a university classroom and Spanish as the language being learned. This study also complements current literature with information about Spanish learners that will be useful for the study of motivation in other groups of students. The results of this study can also guide teachers in the choices they make when choosing teaching strategies, and bringing motivation into the classroom from the first day, as well as to manage it throughout the duration of the course. For that, the information presented in this study can be used by future researchers or instructors to increase motivation in Spanish students, both from early stages of lesson planning and during instruction. More specifically, it will support other instructors with information about current trends on motivation in the Spanish classroom that might be taken into consideration when planning lessons and choosing activities.

In the case of the sample for the current study, some students at Oregon State University had a second language requirement in their major, which was the main reason why they signed up for lower-division Spanish classes. Others, on the other hand, were more interested in learning the language for personal reasons. Those, among many other facts, can determine the students' attitudes and participation in the classroom, which will also be reflected in their final grades. So, when studying about the students' motivation, one of the main goals is for all the students to achieve a similar level of participation in class, and engage in the learning of a new language and culture that will provide them the necessary tools for personal, academic and professional growth.

Learning more about the students' interests and motivations and how these variables affect their participation and success in the class provides information that can be used to create new strategies that will ensure future students' engagement and success in the class. With that,

the goal is to adapt the lessons to capture the students' interest and keep their motivation throughout the whole course, both to help them finish it successfully, and to engage them in the learning of the language for future courses. As Mahadi and Jafari (2012) discuss, "Paying attention to the role of motivation in teaching process and developing, enforcing, and strengthening it, can be some effective and helpful factor in the process of learning language."

The limitations in this study include a low representation of certain types of motivation in the survey. With unequal representation of all motivation types, one wonders if the results are accurate and reflect the students' truly motivation in the class. With that in mind, proposed future research should try and eliminate those limitations in order to get the same amount of information about each motivation type and reach more reliable conclusions. Another aspect to consider for future studies is to take a closer look at the students' individual backgrounds and analyze how they can also have a different impact in their motivation and, with it, their success in the class. In addition to that, it would be interesting to do research with a focus in motivation from the teachers' perspective, paying attention to their motivation in teaching Spanish, instead of the students' motivation in learning. That could complement studies like this one and be considered together to better assess the best ways to motivate the students.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The literature in this section covers broad areas that affect the foundations of this study and help locate it within that literature, demonstrating its importance in the area of motivation in adult second language acquisition. After gathering information from multiple articles on learning motivation and second/foreign language acquisition, it is easy to see how this study can benefit from them and also fits current and past research.

The literature that constitutes this section are divided into three main themes. The first theme focuses on the definition of motivation within the context of learning, followed by a second theme that talks about second language acquisition in general. Finally, the last theme includes discussions on both the aforementioned topics. In other words, the second group collects research on motivation in second language learning or acquisition. These distinctions will help identify the importance of this study in different –although related– areas, whether or not it agrees with other researchers’ opinions, and what possible future research can be done after it. That being said, this study best fits in the last theme, as it gets more specific and combines ideas from the first two themes.

Motivation in Learning

Motivation has been an important focus of study for many decades in the context of learning. For this study, the sources used talk specifically about adult learning, since it is the type of learning analyzed in the present study.

Defining motivation. To address learning motivation and all its characteristics, a definition of the term “motivation” is commonly sought among the literature as a first approach, supported by the factors by which motivation is determined. Most scholars talk about its attachment to a specific individual, which will in fact determine what motivation is. Henry

(1942) states that “the individual’s needs, his interests, his attitudes, and their relation to the situation must be taken into account” (p. 289). He also identifies several terms that are commonly used in describing motivation, such as *set*, *incentive*, *drive*, *motive*, *purpose*, *goals*, among others. Furthermore, he points out that there are different ways to approach motivation, “Many definitions of learning explicitly include the concept of motivation. Others recognize motivation as a factor in learning” (Henry, 1942, p. 298).

Wlodkowski (2008) first addresses motivation by saying that “most social scientists see motivation as a concept that explains why people think and behave as they do (Weiner, 1992)” (p. 1). He also acknowledges the importance of understanding people’s behavior from an educator perspective, “We also know that culture, the deeply learned mix of language, beliefs, values, and behaviors that pervades every aspect of our lives, significantly influences our motivation” (Wlodkowski, 2008, p. 2). To that, he adds that motivation makes one purposeful and that there are certain processes involved in a person’s path to pursue a goals, such as attention, passion, concentration, or imagination. Those are bound to every person’s culture and to what they have learned in their communities and families (Wlodkowski, 2008). Thus “seeing human motivation as purposeful allows us to create a knowledge base about effective ways to help adults begin learning, make choices about and give direction to their learning, sustain learning, and complete learning” (Wlodkowski, 2008, p. 3).

How motivation affects learning. After a first attempt to define motivation in the learning setting, authors like Henry (1942) discuss the different ways in which motivation affects learning, “few persons deny that motivation can and does have an effect upon much learning” (p.298). Two types of effects that motivation has upon learning are then identified: a *directing effect*, and a *reinforcing effect* (Henry, 1942, p. 298). Along with those, *motives* are to be

considered, since “they set the stage for learning by facilitating certain activities, and, on the other hand, activities which lead to the satisfaction of motives tend to recur” (Henry, 1942, p. 298). Henry (1942) later adds that “motivation applied to learning involves the advantageous manipulation of incentives and use of drives so as to maximize the facilitating and to minimize the inhibiting effects with respect to specific learnings” (p. 307). It is then clearly stated that there are a number of components that affect motivation and, consequently, learning, and they can be strategically used to achieve higher results.

On that note, Wlodkowski (2008) highlights the importance of motivation by saying that “throughout our lives we have all seen the motivated person surpass the less-motivated person in performance and outcome even though both have similar capability and the same opportunity” (p. 4). So, according to Wlodkowski, motivation enhances the chances of a person’s participation and success in a learning process. It is not only important because it seems to improve learning, “but also because it mediates learning and is a consequence of learning as well” (p. 6).

Wlodkowski (2008) also identifies *effort* as one of the indicators of motivation that instructors mostly rely on, as previously stated by Plaut and Markus (2005). When people are motivated, they are willing to work longer and with more intensity; “Motivated learners care more and concentrate better while they expend effort, and they are more cooperative. They are therefore more psychologically open to the learning material and better able to process information” (Wlodkowski, 2008, p. 7).

The complexity of measuring motivation. However, motivation is hard to measure, as it is not directly observable, but rather inferred (Henry, 1942). This has been one of the main impediments in the study of motivation in learning. As stated by Henry (1942), “The matter of determining when an organism is motivated or the extent of its motivation, therefore, is not

simple” (p. 301). He further explains this idea by listing the situations in which the operation of motives or drives may be inferred during the learning process: (1) when other things are equal, the efficiency of learning is increased; (2) when the learning activity is characterized by persistence; and (3) when the individual expresses interest, satisfaction, desire, etc. (Henry, 1942). “Thus, the extent to which an individual will exert himself to attain a goal, as revealed in greater efficiency in learning when certain presumed motivational situations are introduced, may be taken as criterion of motivation” (Henry, 1942, p. 302).

The instructor’s responsibility. Another common focus of attention within the literature is that motivation has to be brought into the classroom. In other words, it is the teacher’s job to increase the students’ motivation.

Classroom motivation may in some instances be relatively easy to provide and apply. On the other hand, in the vast majority of cases the complexity of the individual’s background of experience and the interrelationship of motivational factors make it apparent that intelligent attention on the part of the teacher to this important aspect of human behavior comprises a major task (Henry, 1942, p. 321).

Although initiated by the teacher, motivation needs to reach the individual in order to be effective. For that, one must come up with strategies of motivation so that the teacher reaches a variety of students. Different strategies might need to be used in different settings, with different groups of students. It is important then to know the students before trying to apply one method or another. However, some forms may be more generally applicable to any student.

The most acceptable form is undoubtedly self-competition, in which the individual strives to better his own previous record. In such a case individual initiative is at a premium and the motivational effects of competition may be taken advantage of without, at the same

time, introducing the social problem involved in competition with one's fellows" (Henry, 1942, p. 323).

With this in mind, it is important to know the students in order to apply techniques that will ignite their inner competitive motivated learner.

As for the interests, attitudes, and purposes that comprise one's motivation, the teacher might need to either develop them or create a need for them in the classroom, as it is the first step in learning (Henry, 1942). "It is a teacher's responsibility not only to take advantage of present motives, but also to direct the development of others which may serve useful and desirable purposes" (Henry, 1942, p. 324). The students' interests are important sources of motivation (Henry, 1942), so it is essential to find out about them before trying to apply motivational strategies to lesson plans. Henry (1942) explains that "it is advantageous for learning to employ existing interests and attitudes in promoting learning. If none exist that can be used, attention should be given to their development" (p. 325). Along with that, participation in activities that align with their interests provides a background for the development of interests (Henry, 1942), which supports the previous point.

The teacher plays an important part in the motivation picture. Attention should be given by the teacher to personality traits which pupils generally like and others which they generally dislike in teachers. Teachers who are liked and respected themselves contribute directly to the pupil's learning as the pupil seeks to obtain the teacher's approval and to identify himself with the teacher" (Henry, 1942, p. 326).

Teachers cannot expect the students to get self-motivated; they need to actively participate in the process and generate a motivational and inspiring environment in the classroom.

Wlodkowski (2008) also addresses this issue by noting the importance and influence of motivating instructors and points out that motivating instructors help learners to be self-aware about their learning and “realize they have the power to employ their own motivational skills” (p. 434). He then acknowledges the limit between the motivational framework and how adults guide their learning.

With the framework instructors can give opportunity, support, modeling, and a compelling lesson compassionately and creatively conceived. Yet much of learning occurs while we're alone –the studying, the reading, the writing, and the practicing. And, to be realistic, such times anyone can bog down. In such moments, going forward is often a matter of the wisdom of knowing what to tell ourselves (Wlodkowski, 2008, p. 434).

And that tells us that the same way instructors need to help initiate motivation, they must also accompany their students along the way and offer support, especially in times when the students seem to lose motivation.

Second Language Acquisition

Research on second language acquisition (SLA) has been done in different ways, based on different languages and with different foci. Topics addressed include, but are not limited to, pronunciation, age significance, teaching strategies, or social aspects. For this study, research has been collected based on the main purpose, so the sources were selected on a relevance basis, giving special interest to those that covered aspects of motivation. Four main authors and their work have been selected to comprise this section.

The theory behind SLA. One aspect of SLA that seems to be of general interest is the theories behind it. Ortega (2011) analyzes the focus of the study of SLA and describes the epistemologies that take part in it.

For other researchers, linguistic theory alone has not been epistemologically sufficient. The need for SLA to explain differential success and, often, failure among second (particularly adult) language learners forested a two-fold focus on linguistic and non-linguistic (social, affective, and cognitive) variables that influence the second language (L2) acquisition process. From such research concerns stemmed a second theoretical strand that has gained prominence since the early 1980s: that of interactionist SLA (or interactionist SLA; see Chapelle, 1998). Interactionist approaches to SLA focus on the relationship between learner-internal and external process in L2 acquisition. Input, interaction, and output were the essential external variables identified within initial social interactionist research agendas (see Krashen's, 1981, 1995, output hypothesis). More sociolinguistically oriented research has investigated the influence of social context on acquisition, as in IL variation theories [...] (p. 298-299)

To the two theoretical perspectives that initially comprised the SLA literature, Ortega (2011) explains that two new types of theories came out during the 1990s: emergentism and sociocultural theory. The latter maintains that learning is a social process, and rejects the idea that it is generated within the individual (Ortega, 2011, p. 300). The former views second language learning as “the outcome of a neurobiological tendency of the brain to attune itself to primary sensory experience through the strengthening and weakening of connections among the billions of neurons that it typically develops” (Ortega, 2011, p. 300). Referencing N. Ellis (1998, 1999), Ortega (2011) adds that “linguistic knowledge (or the phenomenological experience thereof) emerges as a by-product of the establishment of networked connections upon exposure to probabilistic patterns underlying the (L1 or L2) linguistic input” (p. 300).

In a more comparative way, Ortega (2011) talks about the older theories and the more recent ones in her work:

Emergentism is radically different from both generativist and interactionist epistemologies. On the one hand, it is incompatible with generative SLA because it denies symbolism, modularity, and innatism, and it removes linguistics from the center of the research domain, replacing it with cognitive architecture. On the other, in spite of the shared interest in functionalist explanations and cognitive constructs, emergentist theory resonates little with interactionist SLA. The highly specialized neurobiological treatment of cognitive processes, the lack of a traditional dichotomy between representation and access, and the absence of interest in non-cognitive variables (social, affective, educational, etc.) all differentiate emergentist from interactionist perspectives. (p. 300)

Cristina Sanz (2005), in alignment with Ortega's work, stated that "the motivation behind adult SLA research is in large part theoretical" (p. 4). At the same time, she identifies the need for a more practical approach, "Practical applications of adult SLA research are not always necessary, but most SLA research can inform language teachers, language learners, and administrators involved in language policy and language program direction" (Sanz, 2005, p. 4).

Individual differences. Sanz (2005) discusses the interaction between external and internal factors, because "all knowledge [...] is the result of learners' interaction with their social context, and acquisition is thus both social and cognitive" (p. 4). Furthermore, because their cognitive development is basically complete, "adult language learners need to make the most of their cognitive resources in order to compensate for the limitations that have been imposed both externally [...] and internally [...]" (Sanz, 2005, p. 4).

She identifies as well individual differences (IDs) that play an important role in adult SLA. “IDs such as motivation, aptitude, and attitude account for differences among learners in the same contexts” (Sanz, 2005, p. 3). She follows up by saying that the interaction between internal factors and IDs, and external factors, explain why some adults learn languages faster and get further ahead in the acquisition process (Sanz, 2005). Just like the previous section explains about motivation, Sanz (2005) identifies another difficulty on this topic:

From a methodological standpoint, research on IDs is difficult to conduct. As in other areas, constructs are not precise enough for clear operationalization, and designs are often correlational in that relationships between the ID and outcome are established, but a cause-effect or even directionality cannot be identified (p.14).

Acquisition differences. One of the most referenced authors in SLA is Klein (1986). His work in SLA defines the distinction between *spontaneous* and *guided* language acquisition, as well as the main difference between *foreign* language and *second* language. These distinctions seem to be very important in the study of SLA.

The term ‘spontaneous learning’ is used to denote the acquisition of a second language in everyday communication, in a natural fashion, free from systematic guidance,” whereas ‘guided language learning’ “ought to be seen as a derivative, rather like the domestication of a natural process. Its practical importance cannot, however, be overestimated, although many people would doubt the validity of second language acquisition research except with regard to its significance for language teaching. (Klein, 1986, p. 19)

He later explains the “two ways in which the various methods seem to differ substantially: (a) the way in which the material of the target language is presented to the learner,

and (b) the opportunities offered for an application of the repertoire available to the learner” (Klein, 1986, p. 20). When it comes to presentation of the material, the main difference is that

In spontaneous language acquisition, the learner has access to the target language in the course of everyday communication with the environment; the sounds of the language are embedded in a relevant situational context and the learner’s task is to extract from this material the rules for the use of the language. In guided learning, such material is supplied in ‘digested’ form (Klein, 1986, p. 20).

Lastly, from a comprehension and production point of view, Klein (1986) states that “the spontaneous learner is invariably under pressure to utilize his entire language potential in order to communicate successfully,” but that “there is no such pressure in guided language acquisition” (p. 21).

The following point made by Klein (1986) is related to the idea presented in the previous section both by Henry (1942) and Wlodkowski (2008) and implies that, even when talking about the students’ perspective, the teacher plays an important role in their learning.

Guided and spontaneous learning differ not only in the manner but also in the order in which material is presented. The selection and order of presentation in guided acquisition depends mainly on such criteria as the degree of difficulty and relevance of various portions of the material (Klein, 1986, p. 21).

Foreign language vs. Second language. In an attempt to connect it to the distinction mentioned above, Klein (1986) states that “the distinction between foreign and second language tends to coincide with that between guided and spontaneous acquisition” (p. 19). He then explains that “the term ‘foreign language’ is used to denote a language acquired in a milieu where it is normally not in use [...] and is not used by the learner in routine situations” (Klein,

1986, p. 19). On the other hand, a ‘second language’ “is one that becomes another tool of communication alongside the first language; it is typically acquired in a social environment in which it is actually spoken” (Klein, 1986, p. 19).

Acquisition vs. Learning. Another distinction commonly referenced in SLA research is the one between *acquisition* and *learning*.

The most important and useful theoretical point is the **acquisition-learning** distinction, the hypothesis that adult language students have two distinct ways of developing skills and knowledge in a second language. Simply, **acquiring** a language is “picking it up,” i.e. developing ability in a language by using it in natural, communicative situations. Language **learning** is different from acquisition. Language learning is “knowing the rules,” having a conscious knowledge about grammar. According to additional research, it appears that formal language learning is not nearly as important in developing communicative ability in second languages as previously thought. Many researchers now believe that language acquisition is responsible for the ability to understand and speak second languages easily and well (Krashen & Terrell, 1988, p. 19).

In their work, Krashen and Terrell (1988) introduce the acquisition-learning hypothesis as the basis of the organization of the second language course.

This hypothesis claims that adults have two distinct ways of developing the language for real communication. Language acquisition is the ‘natural’ way to develop linguistic ability, and is a subconscious process. “The second way to develop competence in a second language is by language **learning**. Language learning is “knowing about” language, or “formal knowledge” of a language. While acquisition is subconscious, learning is conscious. Learning refers to “explicit” knowledge of rules, being aware of

them and being able to talk about them. This kind of knowledge is quite different from language acquisition, which could be termed “implicit” (p.26).

This gives way to the next and last section of the literature review, in which both motivation in learning and SLA get combined to become a new and more specific focus of research.

Motivation in Second Language Learning

For this last theme, special attention has been given to sources that covered both SLA and foreign language acquisition. Authors like Rode Ellis (1997) or Vivian Cook (2001), whose main focus of study is second language acquisition, discuss on motivation.

How does motivation affect SLA? Ellis (1997) acknowledges the individual differences in L2 acquisition, and identifies motivation as one of the main factors by saying that “motivation involves the attitudes and affective states that influence the degree of effort that learners make to learn a L2” (p. 75).

Another way to address the effect that motivation has on SLA is by talking about its importance. Oxford (1996) states, “Motivation is important to language learning because it helps determine the extent of involvement in learning. High motivation spurs learners to interact with native speakers of the language, which in turn increases the amount of input learners receive (Krashen, 1982; Scarcella and Oxford, 1992)” (p. 106). One key element for success in language learning is consistency and practice in and outside the classroom, and “motivation helps students maintain their language ability after students leave the classroom (Gardner, Lalonde, Moorcroft, and Evers, 1985)” (Oxford, 1996, p. 106).

After carrying out a comparative study between learners of Japanese and learners of Spanish, Oxford (1996) concluded that “learners who are more motivated tend to use a wider

range of strategies more frequently. This suggests that learning strategies are an important element in the learning process and that teachers and students might benefit from an explicit discussion of strategies” (p. 118). It is important to keep in mind that “the relationship between motivation and language performance is not identical for all languages,” (Oxford, 1996, p. 106) therefore the creation and application of learning strategies has to address the specific needs of each language. Oxford (1996) suggests that “to maximize language learning in the classroom, it is desirable to employ activities that enhance the learners’ motivation,” (p. 118) because “the more motivated the learner is, the more he or she is likely to use a range of learning strategies at a high frequency level” (p. 116).

Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) also dedicate their work to talk about motivation in SLA and state that “motivation is a complex phenomenon, and though the reasons or the goals are part of it, it is the motivation that is responsible for the success” (p.16). As mentioned before, motivation has to be brought into the classroom and followed up along the way.

Motivation does not only affect the selection and conceptualization of a specific goal in the beginning of an activity. Its main role is in controlling and directing an activity. In directing and coordinating various operations towards an object or goal, motivation transforms a number of separate reactions into significant action. Learners build object-directed means-end structures, such as tasks, plans, projects, intentions, and interests (Klausmeier, 1979; Nuttin, 1976; see also Crookes & Schmidt, 1991) (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p. 29).

Along the lines of motivation in the classroom, Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) address task motivation and quote Boekarts (1993), “Task motivation depends partly on general motivation and partly on the unique way the student perceives the task” (Dörnyei and Schmidt, 2001, p. 33).

In order to better study and develop task level motivation, one must pay attention to the three stages discussed by Boekarts (1988), Julkunen (1989), Nuttin (1985), Wine (1987), and Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001). These stages are: the initial stage, the actual performance stage, and the evaluation stage. “The research design should also include the interaction of task types and learning situation” (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2011, p. 37).

Gardner and Lambert (1959) study the motivational variables in SLA, and state that “variables other than linguistic aptitude are involved. Researchers have mentioned that motivation and interest probably play important roles in second-language acquisition, but perhaps because of difficulties in measuring them, these aspects have not been given systematic attention” (p. 266). Relating this statement with other research, one can say that it is hard to generalize on motivation and its variables; there needs to be a specific focus of study in order to reach relevant conclusions. For that reason, this study is framed by a specific group of students that fall into the same categories of language, level, age, etc.

Cook (2001) focuses on both the instructor and the learner perspective and explains that the absence of motivation will make students “find it difficult to learn a second language in the classroom” (p. 117). Therefore, if students seem to be unmotivated, the teacher can “try to compensate for this lack by stressing the career benefits that knowledge of a second language may bring, or by building up interest in the foreign culture” (Cook, 2001, p. 117). But again, each individual –and each group of students– might be different and have different interests, so the teacher should always “at least be sufficiently aware of the students’ motivation so that any problems can be smoothed over” (Cook, 2001, p. 117).

In an ideal teacher’s world, students would enter the classrooms admiring the target culture and language, wanting to get something out of the L2 learning for themselves,

eager to experience the benefits of bilingualism and thirsting for knowledge. In practice, teachers have to be aware of the reservations and preconceptions of their students. What they think of the teacher, the course and L2 users in general can seriously affect their success. These are the factors that teachers can influence rather than the learners' more deep-seated motivations (Cook, 2001, p. 118).

To conclude with this idea, Cook (2001) states, "Motivation also works in both directions. High motivation is one factor that causes successful learning; in reverse, successful learning causes high motivation. The process of creating successful learning which can spur high motivation may be under the teacher's control, if not the original motivation" (p. 118). Thus the teacher will always have to either initiate, enhance, or maintain the level of motivation in the classroom, since he or she will have control over the students and the tools to adapt the class materials to the students' interests and needs.

What constitutes motivation? After compiling what others have said regarding the importance of motivation and its effect on SLA, it seems relevant to address other related aspects, such as determining what motivation is by describing the elements that affect it. Both references seem to work well together to provide a more refined definition of motivation. It helps create a big picture where motivation can be seen as a passive element that is affected by others, and at the same time an active element that will affect –together with the factors that affect it– students' learning in SLA.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) use a theoretical point of view to conclude that the student's "motivation to learn is thought to be determined by his attitudes toward the other group in particular and toward foreign people in general and by his orientation toward the learning task itself" (p.3) They identify the student's attitudes and readiness to identify, and the orientation to

the process of learning a foreign language as determining factors of a learner's motivation (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). The relationship between these factors –which trigger motivation– and the learner's learning experience is further explained from a social psychology perspective.

Social psychologists would expect that success in mastering a foreign language would depend not only on intellectual capacity and language aptitude but also on the learner's perceptions of the other ethnolinguistic group involved, his attitudes towards representatives of that group, and his willingness to identify enough to adopt distinctive aspects of behavior, linguistic and nonlinguistic, that characterize that other group (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 132).

The same way “motivation” is hard to measure, its connection with “attitudes” related to language achievement (leaving aptitude and intelligence out) makes it difficult “to argue that achievement determines attitudes or motivation” (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 143) since the question about what determines the level of achievement is often raised.

Oxford (1996) suggests that there are three basic dimensions to motivation for learning foreign languages: affect, goal orientation, and expectancy (p. 9). She states, “Motivation is also related to learning strategies and preferences for certain kinds of classes and learning tasks. Those who scored high on the affective dimension of motivation preferred communicatively oriented language classes” (Oxford, 1996, p. 9). This can be linked to what was explained above and imply that teachers, again, are the leaders of the students' motivation. Preference needs to be given to learning tasks that increase motivation in the classroom, and sometimes that can also mean a motivation introductory activity to guarantee an equal level of motivation in all the students. Some students do not like group work for several reasons, so more work will need to be done with those students and ensure that they are not left out during the activities performance.

Oxford (1996), in alignment with other researchers, also dedicates part of her work to providing a solid explanation of motivation and what constitutes it. “Keller (1983) identified ability and motivation as the major sources of variation in educational success. Ability refers to what a person can do; motivation, to what a person will do” (Oxford, 1996, p. 11). In her study with learners of Japanese and learners of Spanish, Oxford (1996) found that different strategies are used to learn different languages.

The use of particular strategies or sets of strategies seems tied in a complex way to levels of motivation, kinds of motivation, nature of the language being learned, amount of cultural and linguistic stimulation available, and classroom instructional design. It is crucial to understand how these factors fit together. A major model of language learning needs to be developed that includes these factors. In most of the previous models, the nature of the target language –which is so important in the current study– has unfortunately been omitted (Oxford, 1996, p.119).

The work done by Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) compiles some of the definitions of motivation from the past, as they give their point of view and extend the topic according to their purpose. They start by referencing Gardner and Lambert (1959), saying that motivation is “described as ‘characterized by a willingness to be like valued members of the language community’” (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p. 3). They soon get into deeper analysis and generally define motivation as a variable that refers to the driving force before they locate it within the study of a second language.

In the socio-educational model, motivation to learn the second language is viewed as comprising three elements. First, the motivated individual expends effort to learn the language. That is, there is a persistent and consistent attempt to learn the material, by

doing homework, by seeking out opportunities to learn more, by doing extra work, and so forth. Second, the motivated individual wants to achieve the goal. Such an individual will express a strong desire to learn the language, and will strive to achieve success. Third, the motivated individual will enjoy the task of learning the language. Such an individual will say that it is fun, a challenge, and enjoyable, even though at times enthusiasm may be less than at other times. In the socio-educational model, all three elements, effort, desire, and positive affect, are seen as necessary to distinguish between individuals who are more motivated and those who are less motivated. Each element, by itself, is seen as insufficient to reflect motivation (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p. 6).

Their point is that motivated students display effort, desire and affect. They apply this to the role that motivation plays in the classroom and reference Nuttin (1985) saying that “motivation can be seen as a continuous interaction process between the learner and the environment. It can be conceptualized either as an impulse arising from the organism or as an attraction arising from an object outside the individual” (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p. 29).

Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) identify the research need for an appropriate classification of situations in which motivational effects vary. “For instance, cooperative, competitive, and individualistic situations have been found to affect motivation differently (e.g., Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Julkunen, 1989; Slavin, 1990; Stipek, 1996). Situation specific motivation refers to the motivational state in a given situation” (p. 30) Then again, bringing motivation to different situations is important to make the students feel comfortable in the classroom and achieve better results. Sometimes, “foreign language learning offers threatening and anxiety-provoking situations, especially to low-achieving students” (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p. 31), and those are the times where the teachers most need to bring the motivation themselves.

There is also a need to address specific task motivation. Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) state, “Learning tasks and activities decisively influence how and what students learn from instruction; they organize student experience (Bennett, 1987; Brophy & Alleman, 1991; Doyle, 1983; Winne, 1987). Different tasks affect motivation and learning in different ways” (p. 33). The term *task motivation*, as they go on, can be used when the focus of attention in motivation is task characteristics, or task design. “Maehr (1984) points out that certain tasks are more interesting, more attractive, and more motivating than others. Tasks that include an optimal amount of uncertainty and unpredictability attract the learner” (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p. 33).

While following Gardner’s (1985) definition, Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) describe L2 motivation as a complex of constructs that involve a combination of effort and desire and whose goal is to learn the language along with favorable attitudes towards the act of learning it (p. 43). When entering the classroom, students bring some expectations derived from their past learning experiences (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001) and those are directly linked to their level of motivation in that first contact with the class and the teacher.

Still addressing study needs on motivation, “Dörnyei (in press) explains that ‘motivation as a psychological construct lies between the personal and social dimensions’ and thus demands an analytical framework synthesizing these; he sees developments in sociocultural approaches to motivation as major relevant contributions in other work (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p. 77). Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) then state that “the study of motivational thinking might best be pursued in the context of research on learner anatomy” (p. 93), which aligns with previous thoughts that see the importance of addressing individual differences.

Motivation is thus viewed not simply as cause or product of particular learning experiences, but as process –in effect, the ongoing process of how the learner thinks

about and interprets events in relevant L2-learning and L2-related experience and how such cognitions and beliefs then shape subsequent involvement in learning” (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p. 122).

As mentioned before, “Motivation, or the desire and investment, in learning a language is far more complex than the static constructs usually used to measure it” (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p. 143). Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) deduce from their study that “there are sociocultural and psychological factors operating at the individual level that can ‘motivate’ individuals toward learning languages” (p. 143). For that reason, the study of learner motivation asks for a more detailed and descriptive analysis, unattached from the common cognitive and perceptual patterns that have predominated the literature for so long (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001).

When focusing on the individual, social and familial expectations are an important consideration. The idea of identity is also to be considered, as well as personal development and maturation. Finally, heritage community and gender roles can be determining in this process (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p. 143).

As Gardner and Lambert (1959) have indicated in their work, “Ervin (6) has extended this view, suggesting that emotional dependence or respect for another individual may account for some instances of marked success in second-language achievement” (p. 266). Gardner and Lambert (1959) also argue that

an individual acquiring a second language adopts certain behaviour patterns which are characteristic of another cultural group and that his attitudes towards that group will at least partly determine his success in learning the new language. Our use of attitude as a motivational construct presupposes an intention on the part of students to learn the

language with various aims in mind, and to pursue these aims with varying degrees of drive strength (p. 266).

And they support the idea that “a strong motivation to learn a second language follows from a desire to be accepted as a member to the new linguistic community” (Gardner and Lambert, 2001, p. 271).

Different types of motivation. When defining motivation, researchers in the past came up with different classifications that will make it easier to understand and study the concept of motivation. Although not all agree on one final classification, some aspects are repeated in the literature.

Gardner and Lambert’s (1959, 1972) classification consists of two types of motivation: instrumental and integrative. Integrative motivation is “where the aim in language study is to learn more about the language group, or to meet more and *different* people;” and instrumental motivation is “where the reasons reflect the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement” (Gardner & Lambert, 1959, p. 267).

The orientation is said to be *instrumental* in form if the purposes of language study reflect the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement, such as getting ahead in one’s occupation. In contrast, the orientation is *integrative* if the student wishes to learn more about the other cultural community because he is interested in it in an open-minded way, to the point of eventually being accepted as a member of that other group (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 3).

Ellis (1997) identifies four types of motivation; the two proposed by Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972), and two additional ones. First, *instrumental motivation*, where the learning is done for a functional reason, “seems to be the major force determining success in L2

learning. For example, in settings where learners are motivated to learn an L2 because it opens up educational and economic opportunities for them” (p. 75). Second, *integrative* motivation happens “because they are interested in the people and culture represented by the target-language group” (p. 75). Third, *resultative motivation*, where motivation is the result of learning, can be seen when “learners who experience success in learning may become more, or in some contexts, less motivated to learn” (p. 75). Finally, *intrinsic motivation* states that what determines the learner’s motivation may not be their general reasons for learning an L2. “According to this view, motivation involves the arousal and maintenance of curiosity and can ebb and flow as a result of such factors as learners’ particular interests and the extent to which they feel personally involved in learning activities” (Ellis, 1997, p. 76). Ellis (1997) found the need to add new types, stating that “it is possible that many learners do not hold distinct attitudes, positive or negative, towards the target-language group” (p. 76).

These four types of motivation proposed by Ellis (1997) are meant to be complementary rather than oppositional.

Motivation can result from learning as well as cause it. Furthermore, motivation is dynamic in nature; it is not something that a learner has or does not have but rather something that varies from one moment to the next depending on the learning context or task (Ellis, 1997, p. 76)

Commenting on Gardner and Lambert’s (1959, 1972) and Ellis’ (1997) classifications, Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) state”

There is often a distinction made between integrative and instrumental motives in second language learning, and it is interesting to find that one of the stronger arguments for an

integrative orientation in language study was proposed in the context of industrial relations, which would be typically viewed as an instrumental context (p. 3).

They also talk about specific uses of the concept integrative motivation, such as SLA in formal contexts, and state that “second language acquisition involves the development of bilingual skills in the language, and that this requires considerable time, effort, and persistence” (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p. 4).

Further analyzing Gardner and Lambert’s early work, Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) discuss the theory that the integrative orientation would be a better proficiency predictor than the instrumental orientation because of its relation to positive attitudes towards the L2 community (p. 44).

Research over the past forty years suggests that there are at least two limitations to this hypothesis. First, the relative predictive power of each orientation was found to be inconsistent (for review see Au, 1988). Although some studies indicated that the integrative orientation was a good predictor of L2 variables (e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1959), others found that the instrumental orientation was an equivalent or a better predictor than the integrative orientation (e.g., Chihara & Oller, 1978; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Lukmani, 1972; Oller, Hudson, & Liu, 1977). It has more recently been argued (cf. Gardner, 1985) that these two orientations are not mutually exclusive, and that both orientations could sustain effort. Not only might both orientations support effort, the integrative orientation may not be relevant to many learners. In a study of learners in different contexts, Clément and Kruidenier (1983; Kruidenier & Clément, 1986) found that the integrative orientation was only evident in particular contexts and that four other

orientations, including the instrumental orientation, had cross-contextual relevance (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p.44).

They identify the necessity of bringing new aspects into question to continue with the study of motivation. They suggest that there is a need for considering “the integrative orientation as determinant of other motivational proficiency variables,” (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p.44) and “that there may be additional orientations besides the integrative and instrumental orientations” (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001, p.44).

Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to describe in detail the research methods utilized in this study to address the research questions stated in the introduction. This research was done to analyze how motivation in Spanish 113 students at OSU may impact their success in the class. For that, I present data collected in a survey designed to determine the level of motivation and main interests of the participants. The results were used to classify the students by motivational levels –determined by the different questions about motivation– that were later used to assess the impact of motivation on their final grades. These motivational levels guided the way the study was done, and the responses for each one of them were analyzed using a comparative analysis. Additionally, I present a supplemental analysis that takes the focus away from the types of motivation extracted from the survey questions and puts it on whether the participant was enrolled in the class to fulfill a major requirement. Those two comparative analyses provide results that determine what types of motivation seem to be more effective for the students.

This study relies on a language instructor research perspective –in this particular case, Spanish– and positions language learning and motivation as the categorical centers of inquiry and the research process. By using a quantitative research method, I focused on students’ common motivation when learning a foreign language, a focus that can be applied to other groups of students.

Materials

For this study, a survey (see appendix A) was created in Qualtrics. The way the survey was composed was shaped by the research question: How does motivation affect students’ performance in the university Spanish classroom? With that question in mind, and after researching other surveys to identify common trends, I developed the survey for this study. The

first part of the survey was formed by questions regarding the participants' personal information, such as name, age, gender, academic year and major. This was used to get a general understanding of the sample and to be able to assign the responses to the correspondent final grades and generate the results. The second part of the survey consisted of several sets of questions about their motivation and interests in the language, culture, class participation and individual involvement in the learning of the language. Those questions were elaborated based on past lesson plans and activities performed in the classroom, as well as ideas and concepts previously presented to the students. This was done to guarantee a more centered survey with questions that the students could relate to and therefore collect responses that would reflect their motivation specifically to that class.

Participants

The target population was Spanish learners at a university level. The sample used in this study to generalize the target population consisted of students at OSU enrolled in Spanish 113 during Spring term 2016. The main reason for that selection was availability, since the researcher was also the instructor of the class and would have direct contact with the students to present the survey first and later collect their final grades. The selection was also based on the fact that, at this level, students in the Spanish classroom have a more similar level of knowledge in comparison to Span 111 or 112. During those courses, there is a variety of past experiences with the language and different levels can be identified among the students. In Span 113, students have typically acquired the same skills and those who started at a lower level usually catch up with students who brought some previous knowledge to the classroom. That consideration was made to help obtain results that derive from the material learned in the class rather than from previous knowledge.

The study was comprised of 24 students in Span 113, 22 of whom were of ages between 18-21 years old, and the other two were between 22-25 and over 25 years old, respectively. Seven of the participants identified themselves as males, while the other 17 identified as women. No race or ethnicity information was collected for this study. As far as academic status, 23 were students –17 freshmen, 3 sophomores, 2 juniors and 1 graduate student– and 1 was a faculty member. Their majors were varied, but predominantly consisted of English, Communications, and Anthropology.

Procedures

The main data collection instrument for this study was a one-time survey presented to the students during the third week of the term. The data collection process, during which students could participate in the survey, was open for a three week period. After that time, the survey was closed and the results were held by the Principal Investigator (PI) until the end of the term. Once final grades had been submitted, the researcher was given access to the surveys and the analysis of the results started. The analysis was based on comparing the survey results with the students' final grades to reach conclusions about the types of motivation present in the classroom and their impact on the students' grades. To protect their identity and confidentiality, students were assigned a number at the beginning of the study that was referred to when using and comparing the results.

Data collection. During the third week of the 10-week term, the study was presented to the students, including information such as the title of the study, the name of the PI, contact information and a clear statement that it is research. In order to permit students to self-identify outside of the classroom and to maintain confidentiality and avoid peer pressure, their participation in the survey was made available by online access through their OSU ONID

account. Participation was completely voluntary and their decision did not reflect on their grade. To guarantee that, the results were held by the PI and were not revealed to the instructor (the researcher) until the end of the term, eliminating any risk of partiality in the grading process. For transparency purposes, students were informed from the beginning that no benefits were to be obtained directly by them, but that the results may benefit future students, and that no compensation would be offered.

Information about procedures, compensation, risks and purpose of the study was provided orally and was also stated on the survey's first page, as well as consent of information use and confidentiality of data (such as grades). The students who agreed to participate took a Qualtrics survey, which they accessed with their ONID account. Once students accessed the survey on Qualtrics using their ONID log in, the first page of the survey explained the research, how their data would be used, how their confidentiality would be protected and explained any risks.

Data analysis. After receiving the surveys at the end of the term, the researcher proceeded to analyze the results and compare them with the students' final grades to complete the study. For that, only the second set of questions described above was used to identify the different types and levels of motivation. The questions were clustered in themes, corresponding to the motivation types extracted from the literature: integrative, instrumental, resultative, and intrinsic (Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972; Ellis, 1997). In addition to those, and due to the nature of the questions that comprised the survey, a fifth type –motivation in the classroom– was added to the categorization upon which the analysis of the questions was based. After identifying the types of motivation that would be used to analyze the data, the questions of the survey were categorized based on those types. This categorization allowed for a more applicable and

comparative analysis of the responses, helping to extract the level of motivation existing in the class for each type and to determine to what degree they impacted the students' final grades, separately. To achieve that, the questions pertaining to each theme were analyzed together, with the main purpose of obtaining detailed information about the percentage of the students that, by their responses, proved to be motivated at that level, and a new grade mean specific to that theme. During the last stage of the analysis, each theme's grade mean was compared with the general grade mean of the students to generalize the results and determine the overall impact each motivational type had on the students' success in the class. The types of motivation that obtained better results were intrinsic and instrumental, based on participation and on final grades, respectively. On the other hand, the types in which motivation related to success was less reflected were integrative and resultative, again, based on participation and on final grades, respectively.

A separate, more generalist analysis was based on whether the students were taking the class as part of a language requirement in their major or not. In this case, all their responses were considered when comparing the results. In alignment with the expectations, the group of students that were required to take the class scored lower than the other group. In general, the results verified the previous expectations that motivation does have a positive impact on students and their performance in the Spanish classroom.

Chapter 4: Research and results

The analysis of the results was done by looking at the survey from two different perspectives, from broader to narrower. The purpose of this was to get a deeper insight of the results and reach relevant conclusions on whether motivation has an impact on the students' performance in the Spanish classroom and what types of motivation are more common/effective than others. The two separate analyses focused on: 1) students with a language requirement vs. students with no language requirement; and 2) an in-depth analysis on motivation by themes.

Language Requirement

This analysis was performed to compare the students that were taking the class because of a language requirement for their major and the students that were taking the class with no language requirement. The focus was on educational information and a general overview of their responses on the survey about their interest in taking Spanish 113. At the end, those responses led to a general categorization of each group in a motivational theme, looking for any significant differences between those two groups of students based on their final grades.

The first group, students with a language requirement, was composed of 17 students. Most of them were Freshman, concretely 14 students, 2 were Sophomore, 1 was a Junior and 1 a graduate student. This is not surprising, as most majors have a 2-year language requirement and it is common to see students fulfill this requirement during their first two years. In addition to having a language requirement in their major, students in this group selected other reasons why they were taking Spanish 113. The two top responses were "I am interested in learning the language," and "It increases the chances of getting a job." The two least popular choices were "I am interested in Hispanic cultures," and "I took Span 111 and/or 112 and I wanted to continue." This shows a higher instrumental motivation in this group, as they cared for functional reasons of

their linguistic achievement (Gardner & Lambert, 1979, p. 267). As we will see in the comparison of the grade means between these two groups, as well as in the following analysis about motivational themes, this type of motivation is not as impactful as others.

The second group, students with no language requirement, was composed of 7 students. Among those, 3 were Freshman, 1 was a Sophomore, 1 a Junior, and the last one was a faculty member. Since no one in this group selected “major requirement” as one of the reasons why they were taking the class, the results for this question were divided among the other four options. The most selected answer was “I am interested in learning the language,” followed closely by “I am interested in Hispanic cultures.” On the other hand, “It increases the chances of getting a job” and “I took Span 111 and/or 112 and I wanted to continue” were not selected by as many respondents. This shows an integrative motivation in this group, as they were interested in learning more about the language group and the culture (Gardner and Lambert, 1959, p. 267). As we can see below, students in this group who tended to select this type of motivation had a more positive impact on their final grades than the previous group (see Table 1).

The grade mean of the whole class was 94.55 (out of 100), which is the number that served as a comparison here and in other parts of the analysis. In alignment with the expectations, the group of students that were required to take the class scored lower (94.15) than the group that was not required to take the class (95.73). Not only did the latter score higher than the former, but their grade mean also exceeded the general mean by over one point. This implies an external motivation by the students who did not have a language requirement, since they freely decided to take the class. The following analysis studies the impact of each motivational theme among all the students who took the survey.

Table 1

	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Final grade mean
Language requirement	14	2	1	0	1	0	94.15
No language requirement	3	1	1	0	0	1	95.73

Motivational Analysis

This analysis was based on the questions that comprise the second part of the survey; questions that address motivational attitudes and beliefs. Those questions were analyzed in clusters –based on motivation types– to provide specific distinctions among each type. The types of motivation were determined based on what Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972) and later Ellis (2001) had stated in their respective works: 1) integrative; 2) instrumental; 3) resultative; and 4) intrinsic. Due to the nature of the survey and the participants, a fifth theme was added to the list –motivation in the classroom– which analyzes motivational factors that affect the student’s performance, participation and interest in the classroom. The purpose of this classification was to reach a conclusion that would demonstrate what type of motivation was more conducive to getting a higher score.

Unlike in the first analysis, the key for the comparison was not only the students’ final grades. Helping to provide a more reliable answer to which motivation type –determined by the questions in the survey– affected their success in the class, the number of responses on each theme was also a decisive factor to determine in which areas the students were more motivated. For that, the analysis was carried out by extracting the responses that showed different levels of motivation and comparing them. To determine the answers that showed a higher level of motivation (referred to as the “more motivated” group), responses that ranged between “Strongly

agree” and “Somewhat agree” were taken into account. To determine the “less motivated” group, the responses that ranged between “Somewhat disagree” and “Strongly disagree” were considered.

Integrative motivation. Gardner and Lambert (1959) define integrative motivation as “where the aim in language study is to learn more about the language group, or to meet more and different people” (p. 267). Eight questions from the survey referred to integrative motivation: Q17-2; Q17-3; Q20-1; Q20-2; Q20-3; Q21-2; Q21-3; and Q23-6 (see Appendix A).

When looking at participation, the number of responses in the “more motivated” group added to a total of 124 (mean of 15.5). On the other hand, the responses in the “less motivated” group were comprised by 28 (mean¹ of 3.5). There is an evident lack of participants in the “less motivated” group compared to “more motivated” one, which tells us that students in this sample were highly motivated when it comes to integrative motivation.

The grade mean for the “more motivated” group was 94.5 (out of 100), showing no significant impact on the students that demonstrated a high level of integrative motivation after comparing it to the general mean of 94.55. The responses in the “less motivated” group had a grade mean of 94.21, lower than the general mean.

Table 2

INTEGRATIVE MOTIVATION (8 questions)	More motivated group	Less motivated group
Participation (24 students)	124 (mean of 15.5)	28 (mean of 3.5)
Final grades (general mean 94.55)	94.5	94.21

¹ The mean reflects the participation degree of the 24 students who took the survey.

Instrumental motivation. This type of motivation is found “where the reasons reflect the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement” (Gardner & Lambert, 1979, p. 267). Only one question of the survey was specifically about instrumental motivation: Q23-7 (see Appendix A). Its relevance was not as significant as other themes, but it was included anyway to have at least some representation of each theme.

The results were composed of 22 responses in the “more motivated” group and only 2 answers in the “less motivated” group. This clearly reflects a high presence of instrumental motivation among the participants.

The “more motivated” group had a grade mean of 94.78, which compared to the general mean (94.55) shows a slightly positive impact on the students. As for the “less motivated” group, their grade mean (97.1) was higher than the general mean (94.55), but the number of responses is so low that we cannot come to reliable conclusions.

Table 3

INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVATION (1 question)	More motivated group	Less motivated group
Participation (24 students)	22	2
Final grades (general mean 94.55)	94.78	97.1

Resultative motivation. Resultative motivation can be seen when “learners who experience success in learning may become more, or in some contexts, less motivated to learn” (Ellis, 1997, p. 75), and presents motivation as the result of learning. Like with experimental motivation, resultative motivation was extracted from just one question in the survey: Q20-4 (see Appendix A).

The results extracted from the responses to that question are very satisfactory, as 22 participants' responses were in the "more motivated" group, and none in the "less motivated" one. Therefore, the students' participation demonstrates a high level of resultative motivation in the classroom.

The final grade mean of this theme (89.7) is significantly lower than the general grade mean (94.55), which could imply that, although a popular type of motivation, it does not have a huge impact on the students' performance in the classroom.

Table 4

RESULTATIVE MOTIVATION (1 question)	More motivated group	Less motivated group
Participation (24 students)	22	0
Final grades (general mean 94.55)	89.7	-

Intrinsic motivation. In this case, "motivation involves the arousal and maintenance of curiosity and can ebb and flow as a result of such factors as learners' particular interests and the extent to which they feel personally involved in learning activities" (Ellis, 1997, p. 76). Seven questions extracted from the survey collected information regarding intrinsic motivation: Q17-1; Q17-4; Q18-1; Q18-2; Q18-3; Q19-1; and Q19-2 (see Appendix A).

There was a considerable number of participants whose responses were included in the "more motivated" group in this theme, concretely 160 responses (mean of 22.86), which contrasts with only 2 responses (mean of 0.29) in the "less motivated group." This shows a high motivation among the participants in topics related to intrinsic motivation, which tells us we should continue/increase the activities that reinforce this type of motivation.

With regard to the impact this type of motivation has on the students' grades, the students from the "more motivated" group had a final grade mean of 93.93, which when compared to the general mean (94.55) does not necessarily show a significant impact. On the other hand, the "less motivated" group had a final grade mean of 99, which is greater than the general mean. However, as already stated in some of the above sections, the low participation in this group could be an impediment for reliable conclusions.

Table 5

INTRINSIC MOTIVATION (7 questions)	More motivated group	Less motivated group
Participation (24 students)	160 (mean of 22.86)	2 (mean of 0.29)
Final grades (general mean 94.55)	93.93	99

In-class motivation. Ellis (1997) expressed the need to add new types of motivation, stating that "it is possible that many learners do not hold distinct attitudes, positive or negative, towards the target-language group" (p. 76). Identifying that need, and based on the specific nature of the current study, in-class motivation was added as a type to consider in the analysis. Six questions from the survey comprised this theme: Q21-1; Q22-2; Q23-1; Q23-2; Q23-3; and Q23-4 (see Appendix A).

The results for this section showed a higher level of participation in the "more motivated" group (137 answers, mean of 22.83), compared to the only 2 responses (a mean of 0.33) in the "less motivated" group. With as big a participation difference as this, the comparison might not be very reliable in terms of final grade means. Unlike in the other themes, the "more motivated group" had a lower grade mean (93.33) than the "less motivated" group (94.05) –both lower than the general mean.

Table 6

IN-CLASS MOTIVATION (6 questions)	More motivated group	Less motivated group
Participation (24 students)	137 (mean of 22.83)	2 (mean of 0.33)
Final grades (general mean 94.55)	93.33	94.05

Discussion

In the case of integrative motivation, neither of the groups had a grade mean that differed significantly from the general mean to be able to conclude that, in regard to grades, it is positively reflected on their final grades. However, based on comparing participation between the more and less motivated groups of questions, students demonstrated having a high level of integrative motivation.

As for the intrinsic motivation analysis, future surveys may include a wider variety of questions to reach more precise conclusions. What we can conclude with the current results is that this sample was rather motivated when it comes to instrumental motivation, which was positively reflected on their final grades.

Likewise, future surveys may include more questions about resultative motivation to broaden a study of this particular type and reach a more precise conclusion about its effects. In this study, students showed a high interest in this type of motivation, although their final grades did not reflect a positive impact compared to the general mean.

Intrinsic motivation has proved to be the most prevalent among students and most of their responses were in the “more motivated” group. Even though the final grade mean did not exceed the general one, it was still very good, which tells us that this type of motivation does have a positive impact on the students’ performance in the class.

Lastly, the results for in-class motivation are not reliable in terms of final grade means, but provide useful information in terms of what activities students were most interested and motivated in. In this case, the sample was generally very motivated to participate in class-related activities. Being the researcher as well as the instructor of the class, knowing about motivation in the classroom seemed to be of significant relevance to analyze the structure of the course in which the study was done and the involvement and participation of the students. In addition to that, knowing what type of activities in which the students were engaging the most and what areas were most interesting to them will be useful to adapt the instructor's teaching style, and the curriculum of the classroom. It will also be beneficial for future researchers/instructors who might be interested in finding out about their students' motivation in the classroom for similar (or maybe different) purposes.

After a careful analysis of the responses of each motivational theme, we can conclude that intrinsic motivation was where a larger number of students showed to be more motivated (based on the number of responses), while integrative motivation was where more students showed evidence of being less motivated. As far as final grades, the type of motivation that seemed to have a bigger impact on the students' performance was instrumental motivation, unlike resultative motivation, which proved to have a lower impact on the students. This does not necessarily mean that resultative motivation should not be present in the classroom; it is simply less impactful on the students' grades. However, priority should be given to the areas in which students seem to be more motivated and interested, such as topics regarding instrumental motivation.

The differences among the motivational themes presented above do not show significant differences when looking at the students' final grades. A better conclusion can be reached based

on the areas in which students seemed to show more interest in. Therefore, the study of individual areas of motivation is not as relevant as expected. It does, however, reinforce the previous expectations that in all cases motivation has a positive impact on the students and their performance in the Spanish classroom.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

The quantitative research approached applied in this study and the survey used for the analysis of motivation provided general results about a sample that represents university Spanish students, specifically, students in Span 113 at Oregon State University. Although the sample size of this study does not represent the particular interests and motivation of all university Spanish students, the results of this research demonstrated that increasing certain types of motivation among the students, inside and outside of the classroom, may have a positive impact on their performance in the class.

The results of comparing the students with and without a language requirement showed that those students who were fulfilling a major requirement were more interested in aspects regarding instrumental motivation. On the other hand, students with no language requirement showed an interest in aspects regarding integrative motivation. This is interesting when comparing these two groups and reaching conclusions on how to motivate students who are not so interested in the class but are required to take it. Their personal choices and interests play a demonstrable role in their motivation and, therefore, their participation and performance in the class.

The results of the study regarding motivational themes among the whole sample show that certain types of motivation (i.e. instrumental and intrinsic) have a bigger impact than others, providing guidance for which motivation types should be prioritized when preparing and teaching a Spanish class. However, the general grade mean of the sample was already high, and the comparisons made between each motivational type and the general mean did not show significant differences. Thus, the results of those comparisons were not as relevant as it was to consider the participation in each motivational theme. This helped to reach a more accurate

conclusion on what areas students were more interested and/or motivated in. Based on those results, a high level of intrinsic motivation was found, while the lowest level belonged to integrative motivation. Looking back at the analysis regarding language requirement, integrative motivation was the most popular among students who were taking the class because of their requirement. Since this group was the largest in the sample (almost three times larger in number than the group with no language requirement), it is not surprising that integrative motivation was indicated to be the lowest motivational theme present in the whole sample. Considering the fact that students are going to be taking language classes because of their major requirement, this study provides conclusions to which motivational types should be reinforced among those students. Increased motivation has to be encouraged by the instructor in the classroom, and the instructor has to make sure it stays at this level throughout the whole course, adapting it to the necessities of the students and using different strategies to enhance and maintain the level of motivation among the students (Henry, 1942, p. 321-323).

Because of that, the need of adding a fifth type of motivation (in-class motivation) to the analysis was identified by the researcher, based on Ellis' (1997) suggestions. The study suggested that the motivational factors by which the student is affected during the learning process go beyond their opinions and attitudes about the language. Their perspective of the classroom and participation in it can have a significant impact on those views and, therefore, their final grades. So, this is another way in which this study can complement the literature; future researchers might consider including this motivation type in their studies.

Identifying limitations in the current study and suggestions for future research, surveys should also include more questions that can assess students' motivation in all areas, especially the ones that were not highly represented in this survey (instrumental and resultative). That could

provide stronger and more relevant conclusions, allowing for a more accurate analysis among themes with a similar or equal level of representation in the survey and the study.

Another suggestion that might have been a limitation to the reliability of this study is to add one question on the initial survey asking how many credits the students are taking that term. It would be interesting to analyze and compare their different situations regarding course load and find out if those could also affect their performance in the class, or how that could affect their motivation. Maybe some students who are just fulfilling required classes have a heavier course load than those who are taking the course based on their own interests, and those facts could also affect the outcomes of this study.

Future research is needed in language learning to address issues of motivation, as explained earlier in this study. In order to reach relevant conclusions and to be able to compare studies and find the best way to conduct research on this area, future researchers may consider some of the following suggestions: larger sample sizes; bringing more background information into the analysis; repeating the survey in the middle and at the end of the term to observe possible changes in the students' motivation; and even considering having a control class where students are only asked to complete the survey at the end of the term to prevent them from confounding the results by their being too aware of their participation in the class.

Lastly, a recommendation for Spanish courses at a university level is to consider these findings when creating or modifying current lesson plans and bring motivation into the class on day one, as well as keeping the students motivated throughout the entirety of the course. It will also be useful to repeat a study like this one on a regular basis to determine what changes need to be made for the following year and how motivation changes between different groups of students. It is true that a big part of motivation is inherent to each student and their personal

interests, but studies like this help us understand where their motivation is higher and try to adapt the lessons to better address their needs and increase general success in the class.

References

- Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching*. London: Arnold.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Schmidt, R. (2001). *Motivation and second language acquisition*. Honolulu, HI: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii at Mānoa.
- Henry, N. B. (1942). *The Psychology of Learning. Forty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press Books.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue Canadienne De Psychologie*, 13(4), 266-272.
doi:10.1037/h0083787
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Klein, W. (1986). *Second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1988). *THE NATURAL APPROACH Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International (UK).
- Mahadi, T. S., & Jafari, S. M. (2012). Motivation, Its Types, and Its Impacts in Language Learning. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3 (24), 230-235.
- Ortega, L. (2011). *Second language acquisition*. London: Routledge.
- Oxford, R. L. (1996). *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century*. Mānoa: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii at Mānoa.
- Sanz, C. (2005). *Mind and context in adult second language acquisition: Methods, theory, and practice*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Wlodkowski, R. J. (2008). *Enhancing Adult Motivation to Learn: A Comprehensive Guide for Teaching All Adults*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A

Survey

The Impact of Motivation in the University Spanish Classroom

Q1 The Impact of Motivation in the University Spanish Classroom

PI: Shelley Dubkin-Lee

Researcher: Raisa Canete Blazquez

You are being invited to participate in this study as part of the research process for an M.A.I.S. thesis. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and confidential. No compensation will be offered and no direct benefits will be obtained by the participants, but possibly by future students. The results of this survey will be used and compared with the final grades of the participants to determine how motivation can impact a student's success in Spanish 113. The instructor will not have access to this survey until the end of the term, after grades have been released; therefore there is no risk on your participation and/or responses affecting your grades or the treatment received by the instructor. If you have any questions about this research project, please contact: Shelley Dubkin-Lee at (541)737-5963 or by email at shelley.dubkin-lee@oregonstate.edu. If you have questions about your rights or welfare as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Office, at (541) 737-8008 or by email at IRB@oregonstate.edu

Q4 Thanks for agreeing to participate in this study. The following survey will take you approximately 5-10 minutes.

__ By taking this survey I give consent to the use of my information for this research study. (1)

Q5 I. Please, answer the following questions:

1. Name

Q6 2. Age

1. 18-21 (1)
2. 22-25 (2)
3. >25 (3)

Q7 3. What is your current gender identity? (Check all that apply)

1. Male (1)
2. Female (2)
3. Trans male / Trans man (3)
4. Trans female / Trans woman (4)
5. Genderqueer / Gender non-conforming (5)
6. Different identity (please state): (6) _____

Q8 4. Year in college

- 7. Freshman (1)
- 8. Sophomore (2)
- 9. Junior (3)
- 10. Senior (4)
- 11. Graduate Student (5)
- 12. Other (6)

Q10 5. Major

Q12 6. Minor(s) --if apply

Q13 7. Does your major have a language requirement?

- 13. Yes. (If so, please describe the requirement): (1) _____
- 14. No (2)

Q14 8. What is the main reason why you are taking Spanish 113? Select all that apply.

- 15. Major requirement (1)
- 16. I am interested in learning the language (2)
- 17. I am interested in Hispanic cultures (3)
- 18. It increases the chances of getting a job (4)
- 19. I took Span 111 and/or 112 and I wanted to continue (5)
- 20. Other: (6) _____

Q15 9. Did you take Spanish in High School?

- 21. Yes. If so, for how long? (1) _____
- 22. No (2)

Q16 10. Do you have a Spanish speaking background?

- 23. Yes (1)
- 24. No (2)

Q17 II. Please, read the following statements and select to what extent you agree or disagree with them: 1.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat agree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat disagree (5)	Disagree (6)	Strongly disagree (7)
I want to be fluent in Spanish someday (1)	25.	26.	27.	28.	29.	30.	31.
I enjoy learning about Hispanic cultures (2)	32.	33.	34.	35.	36.	37.	38.
I want to be able to communicate with Spanish speakers who do not speak English (3)	39.	40.	41.	42.	43.	44.	45.
I wish to become bilingual in Spanish and English (4)	46.	47.	48.	49.	50.	51.	52.

Q18 2.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat agree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat disagree (5)	Disagree (6)	Strongly disagree (7)
I enjoy coming to class (1)	53.	54.	55.	56.	57.	58.	59.
I like that the teacher speaks Spanish in class (2)	60.	61.	62.	63.	64.	65.	66.
I like that we are forced to speak Spanish in class (3)	67.	68.	69.	70.	71.	72.	73.
I think it is important that the class is taught in Spanish (4)	74.	75.	76.	77.	78.	79.	80.

Q19 3.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat agree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat disagree (5)	Disagree (6)	Strongly disagree (7)
I like group activities that reinforce the practice of the language (1)	81.	82.	83.	84.	85.	86.	87.
I find activities we do interesting (2)	88.	89.	90.	91.	92.	93.	94.
I think the things we do help me to get better at Spanish (3)	95.	96.	97.	98.	99.	100.	101.
What I learn in this lass will be useful in my life (4)	102.	103.	104.	105.	106.	107.	108.

Q20 4.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat agree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat disagree (5)	Disagree (6)	Strongly disagree (7)
I think studying abroad is important to acquire a good level of Spanish (1)	109.	110.	111.	112.	113.	114.	115.
I already did a study abroad in the past (2)	116.	117.	118.	119.	120.	121.	122.
I am considering doing a study abroad (3)	123.	124.	125.	126.	127.	128.	129.
I will continue my education in Spanish after this class (4)	130.	131.	132.	133.	134.	135.	136.

Q21 5.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat agree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat disagree (5)	Disagree (6)	Strongly disagree (7)
I try to speak Spanish in the class most of the time (1)	137.	138.	139.	140.	141.	142.	143.
I try to use Spanish outside of the class (2)	144.	145.	146.	147.	148.	149.	150.
I am interested in getting involved with the Spanish-speaking community (3)	151.	152.	153.	154.	155.	156.	157.

Q22 6.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat agree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat disagree (5)	Disagree (6)	Strongly disagree (7)
I am capable of learning the material taught in this class (1)	158.	159.	160.	161.	162.	163.	164.
If I don't understand something I will ask the teacher to explain it to me (2)	165.	166.	167.	168.	169.	170.	171.
I feel that the teacher wants me to do well in this class (3)	172.	173.	174.	175.	176.	177.	178.
I feel that the teacher expects a lot of me (4)	179.	180.	181.	182.	183.	184.	185.

Q23 7.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat agree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat disagree (5)	Disagree (6)	Strongly disagree (7)
I want to get a good grade in this class (1)	186.	187.	188.	189.	190.	191.	192.
I always do my homework (2)	193.	194.	195.	196.	197.	198.	199.
I study for the quizzes and tests (3)	200.	201.	202.	203.	204.	205.	206.
I use external sources to improve my understanding of Spanish (4)	207.	208.	209.	210.	211.	212.	213.
Someone in my family wants me to learn Spanish (5)	214.	215.	216.	217.	218.	219.	220.
I have Spanish speaking friends and I want to communicate with them in their language (6)	221.	222.	223.	224.	225.	226.	227.
Knowing Spanish will help me in grad school and/or job applications (7)	228.	229.	230.	231.	232.	233.	234.

