CHAPTER- TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

Since the major studies pioneered by Robert Gardner and Wally Lambert in the late 1950s and early 1960s and published in their seminal collective report in 1972, voluminous work has been done in different ways and by various researchers to investigate the significance and influence of individual differences variables in second/foreign language learning. Much of it has focused on a relationship between attitudes, motivation and achievement of learners in various cultural contexts and languages in Asia, Europe and North America.

This chapter reviews the literature and research relevant to the present study. It consists of a discussion of the concepts of ‘attitude’ and ‘motivation’ and their relation to both social psychology and learning a second/foreign language, socio-psychological approach of language learning, the individual differences in L2/FL learning, focus on attitudes and motivation in L2/FL, Gardner’s socio-educational model of language learning, other perspectives on motivation and Language Learning, studies done in particular socio-cultural contexts and languages.
2.1 ATTITUDE

2.1.1 Introduction

Attitude has been defined and explored by a number of researchers from a variety of fields. However, Allport (1935, cited in Malim and Birch, 1998, p.649) referred to attitude as the most distinctive and indispensable concept in social psychology. Much has been written about attitude and research has been undertaken in the field of psychology and modern languages (Morgan, 1993, p.63). Attitude has contributed to the development of social psychology and second language learning and language attitude research is an extensive tradition rooted in different disciplines such as psychology, socio-linguistics and the sociology of language.

Cargile and Giles (1997, cited in Rashidi and Yarmohammadi, 2002, p.54) state that modern language attitude investigation can be traced back to the 1930s. Since then there have been a large number of studies and most of them have focused not only on subject’s evaluative reactions towards accents and languages but also on the cognitive and affective problems of language learning. It is for these reasons, as Williams and Burden (1997) point out that:

Social Psychology of Language has developed into an important discipline in its own right, mainly due to the work of sociolinguists such as Howard Giles. . . It is not surprising, therefore, to find a number of models of language learning that are social-psychological in nature. (pp.115-116)

They also state that Gardner’s model (1985a) has been the most influential model of language learning in the social psychology. It has since become as
Crookes and Schmidt (1991) point out, the established paradigm guiding the whole area of research as we shall explore later.

2.1.2. What is Attitude?

Before defining the concept of attitude and identifying its components and functions, it is useful to define psychology because attitude is related to psychology especially social psychology.

The word ‘psychology’ comes from Greek words ‘psych’ which can be freely translated as ‘mind’ or ‘soul’ and logos indicates ‘study’ or ‘line of teaching’, the psychologists have ‘study of the mind’. Essentially, this definition exemplifies what psychology was about up to the end of the nineteenth century. Recently, the most widely accepted definition of psychology is that it is “the scientific study of behavior and experience” (Malim and Birch, 1998, p.3). By this they mean that through systematic research and psychologists aim to explore questions about the way human beings, behave and how they experience the world around them.

The broadness of the concept permits various definitions reflecting theoretical viewpoints. Gardner (1985a) states that “the concept of attitude is complex” (p.8). Elsewhere, Gardner (1980) referring to Thurstone (1928) writes, the term ‘attitude’ can be conceptualized depending on the basis of the context in which it is used. He has identified attitude as “the sum total of a man’s instincts and feeling, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, fears, threats, and convictions
about any specified topic" (p.267). Here Gardner refers to Likert (1932) explains attitude as inference which is made on the basis of a complex of beliefs about the object.

Again, the term attitude originally used to refer to the disposition of the body, but now it is chiefly used for behaviour, feeling and thought “settled behaviour or manner of acting as representative of feeling; attitude of mind; deliberately adopted, or, habitual, made of regarding the object of thought” (see Margon, 1993, p.64). It is clear that this definition, as described by Morgan, is not only regarded as a matter of feeling but also of behaviour, and thought. Cognitive and conative types are automatically included in most social psychological texts. Morgan (1993, p.66) refers to Jaspers and Faser (1984, p.108) offer a useful table of different definitions of attitudes which occurs in the work of 17 different psychologists (taken from Allport’s original scale in Murchison, 1935). The eight definitions given: “mental, natural, general, readiness, afferent (receptive), efferent (response) evaluative and experience” This relative distribution reveals the basic of categories of definitions: The emotional on the one hand and the cognitive/ behavioural on the other. Most work by social psychologist seems to favour on or other of these two categories. However, the important components of all such definitions is the readiness to respond to a situation.
2. 1.3. The Concept of Attitude

Allport (1935) defines attitudes as a mental or natural condition of readiness that influences an individual’s response to certain objects or situation. According to him attitude is “a mental and natural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive and dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations with which it is related” (Allport, 1935, p.810; cited in Malim and Birch, 1998, p.648). This definition suggests that an individual’s experience creates ‘a state of mind’ which significantly influences behaviour in response to certain objects or situation (stimulia). The essential factor is experience which structures the response and perhaps the strength of the response, i.e. strong or weak attitudinal reactions.

Gardner (1985a) develops this definition further by stressing the relationship between attitude belief and opinion. Attitude, according to him is “an evaluative reaction to some referent or attitude object, inferred on the basis of the individual’s beliefs or opinion about the referent” (p.9). Consequently, he suggests that a belief and/or opinion may predetermine an individual’s attitude. Gardner is more specific than Allport (1935), identifying belief/opinion as the constituent element of experience i.e. positive or negative favourable or unfavourable. Attitude are classified as either educational or social. Educational attitudes are those which involve attitudes toward the teacher, the course, learning the language, whereas social attitudes are those which focus on the cultural
implication of target language community “both educational and social attitudes appear to play a role in the second language learning” (Gardner 1985a, p.42).

So far, we have seen that attitudes are emotional and evaluative reactions toward attitudinal objects. Such reactions refer to beliefs or opinions about the attitudinal objects. Attitudinal objects can be both animate (e.g., a teacher) and inanimate (e.g., a foreign language). Attitudes toward referent objects can be observed as feelings, beliefs, and behaviors or actions toward the attitudinal objects.

McGuire (1989, p. 40, cited in Malim and Birch, 1998, p. 649) has linked attitudes to a tripartive view of human experience which has ancient roots in philosophy. He identifies the following types of attitude and character. His quotation is worth mentioning:

The trichotomy of human experiences into thought, feeling and action, although not logically compelling, is so compelling in Indo-European thought (being found in Hellenic Zoroastrain and Hindu Philosophy) as to suggest that it corresponds to something basic in our way to conceptualization, perhaps ...reflecting three evolutionary layers of the brain, cerebral cortex, limbic system and old brain.

The above definition, however, is conceptualized in rather general terms and is not relevant to the context of language learning. Next we describe the components of attitudes in detail.
2.1.4 Components of Attitudes

Attitudes have three components: affective, cognition, and behavior (Fasio, 1986; Gardner, 1985a; Malim and Birch, 1998; Backer, 1992). The first component is an affective component which includes feelings toward and evaluation of an attitude object. The second is a cognitive component which refers to belief or knowledge which individual has about an attitudinal object. The third one, behavioral component, has to do with intentions or actions related to an attitudinal object.

Malim and Birch (1998, p. 649) also provides a variation on this definition, suggesting that attitudes are widely held to have three components:

- Cognitive, which includes perceptions of objects and events or reports or belief about them...
- Affective, which includes feeling about and emotional responses to objects and events...
- Behavioural or conative components. This concern intentions and predicts the way in which an individual may behave in relation to an object or event.

The three components are widely accepted by many researchers, as pointed out by Malim and Birch, but recently doubt has been cast upon the behavioural component. They say that it is hard to see how knowing someone’s attitude towards something may realistically help us to predict his/her behaviour. Ajzen (1988, quoted in Backer, 1992, p.11) hold the same view that people do not always behave in ways which are consistent with their attitudes. They may be faced with conflict between contradictory attitudes. However, for Ajzen, “Attitude is a disposition to respond to favourably or unfavourably to an object, person, institution, or event”.
Faizo (1986, p. 204) holds a similar view that attitudes consists of three components: “an affective component involving feelings about an evaluation of the attitude object, a cognitive component involving beliefs about the feelings and beliefs about the referent, plus the intention to act the referent, construct the concept of attitude”. He adds that one of the main functions of attitude is to facilitate evaluation of objects.

Backer (1992, p. 10) is of the view that attitude is “a hypothetical construct used to explain the direction and persistence of human behaviour”. He proposes that attitudes towards the language should be included in the concepts of attitudes in the language learning context, claiming that successful learners tend to acquire positive attitudes toward the target language.

Spolsky (1989, p. 150) claims that “a learner’s attitudes affect the development of motivation” and have more specific effects, so that attitudes appear to carry into particular motivation. This claim suggests that attitude can play a very important role in L2/FL language learning, as they would appear to influence students’ success or failure in their language learning.

Backer (1988, quoted in Ellis 1994, p.199) discusses the main characteristics of attitude as follows:

1. Attitudes are cognitive (i.e. are capable of being thought about) and affective (i.e. have feeling and emotions attached to them).
2. Attitudes are dimensional rather than bipolar—they vary in degree of favourability/unfavourably.
3. Attitudes predispose a person to act in a certain way, but the relationship attitudes and actions is not a strong one.

4. Attitudes are learnt, not inherited or genetically endowed.

5. Attitudes tend to persist but they can be modified by experiences.

2.2 MOTIVATION

2.2.1 Introduction

There is little agreement in literature with regard to the exact meaning of the concept of motivation but researchers seem to agree that motivation is responsible for determining human behaviour (Dörnyei, 1998). Researchers like Dörnyei believe that motivation concerns “the fundamental question of why people think and behave as they do, and we should never assume that we know the full answer” (Dörnyei, 2005, P.66). In fact, this is a major problem with the literature on motivations in L2/FL learning. One major problem with the literature on language learning motivation is a rather inconsistent use of terminology (Ellis, 1994). In this vein, McDonough (1981, cited in Crookes and Schmidt, 1991) points to tendency to exploit ‘motivation’ as a cover-all for a variety of cognitive, affective and behavioural considerations. Crookes and Schmidt (1991) have criticized Gardner’s socio-Educational model and consider that non-L2 approaches to motivation. They comment:

There has been no general agreement on definition on motivation and attitude or of their relations of one another.....consequently, the term motivation has been used as a general cover term -a dustbin-to include a
number of possible distinct concepts each of which may have different origins and different effects and required different classroom treatment.


In his review of motivation in both social psychology and language learning, Dornyei (1998) has come to conclude that “motivation is indeed a multifaceted rather than a uniform factor and no available theory has yet managed to represent it in its total complexity” (p. 131). However, in their review of L2/FL motivation, Gardner and MacIntyre (1993a) have identified ‘motivation’ as the key factor in cognitive and affective spheres and have shown the close interrelation of attitude and motivation.

2.2.2 What is motivation?

Motivation is very difficult to define in L2/FL field. There are many different definitions. Dornyei (1998) states that motivation energises human being and provides direction. Gardner (1985a) describes his socio-educational model of language learning. He has examined the issue on theoretical and empirical basis from the social psychological point of view (Gardner, 1979, 1985; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993a). The basic principle of Gardner's (1985a) view of motivation and second language acquisition is that attitude and motivation influence second language acquisition. A number of researchers have introduced broader concepts of motivation, based on a multiple number of factors, building on cognitive psychology and even on Gardner’s theoretical underpinning (Dornyei 1994a,

2.2.3 The concept of Motivation

Gardner (1985a, p.10) defines motivation to learn an L2/FL as “the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so, and the satisfaction experience in this activity”. He perceives motivation as consisting of three elements: as effort, a desire to achieve language learning goal, and favourable attitude toward the language of the degree of integrative motivation. Gardner argues that these three components can be assessed with the Motivational Intensity, Desire to learn the language and Attitudes toward Learning the Language scales of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB). Here, Gardner (1985a) relates motivation directly to actual behaviour. He provides a behaviourally based view of motivation “when the desire to achieve the goal and favourable attitudes towards the goal are linked with the effort and drive, then we have motivation organism”. (p.11). Thus, Gardner follows the general consensus that motivation is essentially a behavioural phenomenon during which latent influences contribute the emergence of learning directly activity. In other words he proposed the following equation which can be used to present the component of motivation. As Skehan, (1989, p. 45) puts it: Motivation= Effort + Desire to Achieve a Goal + Attitudes explaining that motivation is made up first of effort but there are several components of efforts such as “compulsiveness, desire to
please a teacher, or parent, a high need to achieve, good study habits, social pressures, including examinations or external rewards, which do not relate specifically to learning a language” (p.55). In other words, Gardner suggests that it is important to study what channels this effort. Moving to the right hand side of the equation, attitudes for Gardner, as mentioned earlier, are “an evaluative reaction to some referent or attitude object, inferred on the basis of the individual’s beliefs or opinions about the referent” (p.9). He goes on to say that the accumulated evidence in the area of second language learning indicates that attitudes are related to behaviour, though not necessarily directly. Gardner (1985a) also asserts this by saying that “the combination of effort plus desire to achieve of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language” (p.11).

Generally speaking, Gardner (1985, 2001, 2005a, 2005b) emphasizes the importance of all three elements, efforts, desire, and positive affect, arguing that in his socio-educational model, all these components belong together, are necessary to distinguish between individual, who is more motivated and that who is less motivated. The truly motivated individual displays effort, desire and affect. A ‘Motivated learner’ in Gardner’s model is, therefore, defined a one who (a) expends effort to learn the language, (b) wants to achieve the goal, and (c) willing to enjoy the task of learning the language (Gardner, 2001, p. 6). Moreover, in his current model, Gardner argues that motivation is a very complex phenomenon with many facets, claiming that it has been defined in many different ways by
different researchers and a single definition is not possible. However, he believes that most of the important characteristics of the motivated individual are alluded to in Keller’s definition of motivation (1983). “Motivation refers to the choice people make as to what experiences or goals, they will approach or avoid, and the degree of effort will exert in this respect. (Keller, 1983, p.389, cited in Gardner, 2005b, p.3).

Gardner, in other words, expands Keller’s (1983) concept of motivation suggesting that one can list many characteristics of the motivated individual. For example, he has listed tenth attributes that are characterizing of motivated learner. They are as follows:

i) Motivated individual is goal-directed. For example, many of use have goals things we would like to have, but many never achieve because we lack many characteristics of the motivated individual that would aid in or obtaining these goals.

ii) Motivated individual expends effort in attaining the goal of language learning.

iii) Motivated individual is persistent. He/she shows a persistence and consistent attempt to learn the material by doing homework by seeking one opportunity to learn more by doing extra work and so forth.

iv) Motivated individual is attentive. He/she attends to the tasks necessary to achieve the goals.
v) Motivated individual has a strong desire to attain his/her goal. Such individuals will express the desire to succeed and will strive to achieve success.

vi) Motivated individual exhibits positive affect. He/she enjoy the activities necessary to achieve his/her goal.

vii) Motivated individual is aroused in seeking his/her goal.

viii) Motivated individual has expectancies about his/her success and failure.

ix) Motivated individual demonstrates self-confidence (Self-efficacy). When he/she achieving some degree of success he/she is self-confidence about his/her achievement

x) Motivated individual has reasons (motives). He/she has reasons for his/her behaviour, and these reasons are often called motives. (see Gardner, 2005a, p. 6: 2005b, p. 4)

Elsewhere Gardner (2006) summarizes what has been discussed above by saying that motivation to learn an L2/LF is not a simple construct but it is a very broad-based construct. For him the motivated individual is “goal directed, expends effort, is persistent, is attentive, has desires (wants), exhibits positive affect, is aroused, has expectancies, demonstrates self-confidence (self-efficacy), and has reasons (motives)”(p.2). He believes that motivation has cognitive affective and conative characteristics and the motivated individual demonstrates all facets. Some
of these characteristics are cognitive in nature, some are affective, and some are
behavioural. He suggests that motivation can not be measured by one scale it
definitely can not be assessed by merely asking individual to give reasons for why
they think learning a language is important to them. He states that:

If one is motivated, he/she has reasons (motives) for engaging in the
relevant activities, persist in the activities, attend to the tasks, shows desire
to achieve the goal, enjoy the activities, etc... without the associate
motivated, a reason is just a reason, not motivation.

(Gardner, 2005b p.6)

Williams & Burden (1997) have suggested that motivation may be
constructed as “a state of cognitive and emotional arousal, which leads as a
conscious decision to act, and which gives rise to a period of sustained intellectual
and/or physical effort in order to attain a previously see goal (or goals).” (p, 120).
The writers believe that motivation occurs as a result of a combination of different
influences. Some of these are internal, that is they come from inside the learner,
such as a wish to succeed. Others are external, i.e., the influence of other people.
This internal external distinction is one that has played a significant part in many
current theories of motivation. (see Williams and Burden 1997, pp. 120-121).

These reviews on motivation offer interesting insights. It is thus reasonable
to include Keller’s determinants of motivation such as interest (attention),
relevance, expectancy (confidence), and outcomes (satisfaction) under Gardner’s
terms: efforts, desire and positive attitudes (effect). In the researcher’s view, this
suggestion might be helpful to enrich and/or expend Gardner’s (1985a) definition
that is to narrow the gap between the characteristics of the motivated individual
that might display in which they are allude to Keller's definition. In such cases, Gardner's current definition of motivation remains powerful and comprehensive. It must be kept in mind that the view of motivation taken in the present study is based on Gardner's definition. 'Effort', 'Desire', and 'Positive attitudes (affect) are the three elements which Gardner's identified as characterizing motivated learners. His criteria are appropriate and application in that it is fit well with the participants of this study.

One can conclude that motivation is what motivates us to act. It can be internal and/or external power which makes us as human beings to struggle to achieve our goals in life. Motivation is said to be like the food of the brain. It is inner psychological drive that impels learners to action (Brown, 2000). In the context to learn a language, say English or even Arabic, to learn to teach it. This simply statement reveals, however, the four elements it involves: the reason why we want to learn, the strength of our desire to learn, the kind of person we are, and the task, and our estimation of what requires of us (McDonough, 2007). Although motivation is a property of the learner, it is a transitive concept. Teachers can motivate their students. Though the learner who is not motivated is unlikely to learn because he/she will not exert the necessary effort to succeed. In contrast the learner who is strongly motivated to master a language is more likely to accomplish his/her learning goals. Furthermore, motivation is not easy thing to understand. It is a dynamic but it changes over time, especially in the usually long
drawn out process of language learning. Thus, motivation is remarkably complex.

2.3 SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH OF LANGUAGE LEARNING

The social psychologists Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert have chosen a social psychological orientation toward language learning motivation. They have been the pioneers in emphasizing the role of social psychological factors in L2/FL learning. They proposed a social psychological theory of language learning after conducting research for 12 years in Canada, USA and Philippines (Agnhotri et al., 1998). They carried out their best-known and historically significant studies of motivation as a factor of a number of different kinds of attitudes. The results of these studies indicate close interrelation of attitudes motivation and success in L2/FL learning. They have studied mainly English speaking learners of French in areas of North America where there is a community of French native speakers. They empirically found in all three American studies conducted in Louisiana Maine and Connecticut is that learners with higher integrative orientation are likely to achieve great proficiency. They (Gardner & Lambert (1972) concluded that “attitudes... influence and determine ones progress in mastering a foreign language” (p.143). However, they obtained different results when they examined the motivation of students of English in the Philippines. Here, they found the level of the learner’s
instrumental motivation correlated best with their success in second language learning (see Gardner and Lambert 1972, p. 141).

Gardner and Lambert, (1972) defined a social psychological theory of second language learning and motivation as:

...an individual successful acquiring a second language gradually adopts various features of behaviour which characterize another linguistic and, as is often the case, another cultural group the learner's ethnocentric disposition and his attitude toward the other group are believed to influence his successful in learning the new language. His motivation to acquire the language is considered to be determined by both his attitudes towards the other group and by his orientation toward learning a second language. The orientation takes as 'instrumental' form if the purposes of language study reflect the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement such as getting ahead in one's work, and an 'integrative' form if the student is oriented toward learning more about the other cultural community, as if he were eager to be a potential member of the other group.

(Gardner and Lambert, 1972, p.228).

According to them a learner will learn a language well depending on whether he is integratively or instrumentally motivated to do so. By integrative motivation is meant the students desire to be interact with members of other target language community. In such a case, the successful learner must be one who is psychologically to adapt various aspects of behaviour which characterize members of target language group. His motivation is determined by his attitude towards the target language and towards the target community and their culture in general. He learns more about the other cultural community because he might be interested in the cultural values of that community. On the other hand, instrumental motivation is based on the advantages of knowing a language for utilitarian or material aims.
It may occur where the language is, for example, being used to fulfill an education requirement, to get better job, to read materials in the language and do business with the other community, etc. Gardner and Lambert (1972) also hypothesized that an instrumental motive is less effective because it is not rooted in the personality of the learner but it depends on external influences. It seems that the importance of motivation has been treated as self-confident and language learning often involves strong positive or negative emotions but attitudes towards the language, the language community and the learning situation are very important. For Gardner and Lambert, motivation comes from attitude. They believe there are two significant kind of attitude: a) attitude towards the people who speak the target language which indicates an interest in learning the language in order to meet and communicate with the target language community and integrate with their culture; and b) attitude towards learning the language in which the learner assumes he or she can put the language being learned, i.e. instrumental or integrative reasons. Elsewhere Gardner (1985a) argues that attitudes towards learning the language is "fairly constantly related to achievement" whereas attitudes towards the other language community show "a more variable set of relationships" (p.39).

In their earlier studies in Canada, Gardner and Lambert (1972) have shown that the learners with an integrative motivation are more successful than those who are instrumental motivated. Lambert link this with O.H. Mowrer’s theory of first language acquisition which explains the motivation a child has to learn the language of the parents and child’s learning is motivated by a desire to become a
member of the environment. Mowrer (1950, cited in Garner 2005a) proposed that the small child learn his first language because of the reinforcements and drive reducing behaviour of his or her parents in early life, explaining that the child is motivated to adopt the features of the parents which serves as “rewarding and drive fulfilling substitutes when the parent is not present. One aspect of this is verbal behaviour” (p.10). Gardner goes on describing the process of child’s learning, that the child makes sounds similar to the parents in which he/she can gain some level of comfort when the parents are absent. He concludes “this leads to the gradual adaptation of many of the parental characteristics, resulting in the child’s identification with the parents” (p.10). In the same way Gardner and Lambert proposed that the similar type of process could be important for second language learning.

One might infer from the above the L2/FL learning is really social psychological phenomenon (Gardner, 1985a). The issue of individual differences like attitude/motivation is important because it addresses affective variables (in addition to cognitive variables) in learning an L2/FL Gardner and his colleagues have clearly indicated that learners’ attitudes determine how successful they will be in learning any language and that their motivation to learn it is determined by their attitudes. Gardner (1985a) states that “languages are unlike other subjects taught in a classroom in that they involve the acquisition of skills and behaviour patterns which are characteristics of another community” (p.146). Similarly,
Williams and Burden (1997) have expressed thoughts that are similar to the Canadian assertion:

There is no question that learning a foreign language is different to learning other subjects, mainly because of the social nature of such a venture language, after all, belongs to a person’s whole social being; it is a part of one’s identity and it is used to convey this identity to people. The learning of a foreign involves far more than simply learning skills, or a system of rules, or a grammar; it involves an alteration in self-image, the adoption of new social and cultural behaviour and ways of being, and therefore has a significant impact on the social nature of the learner. (p.115)

In his famous and landmark book (1985), Social Psychology in Second Language Acquisition: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation, Gardner provides a comprehensive historical review regarding the study of individual differences in L2/FL learning. In chapters 3 and 4 of this book goes into attitudes and motivation and their relation to the process of language learning at considerable depth. In addition to this, the Gardnerian model (socioeducational model) has had marked influence on theories of language learning. Gardner (1985a) presents a number of studies from a variety of socio-cultural contexts which support his theory that the significance of socio-psychological aspects of attitudes and motivation in language learning. As Backer & MacIntyre (2003, p. 73) claim “Gardner’s theory takes the position that students’ attitudes toward the target language group will affect their success in learning the language”.

Over the years, the studies of attitudes and motivation are largely inspired by the various works of Gardner & Lambert (1972), and Gardner (1985a). Gardner’s studies are based on his framework which he later developed
into his socio-educational model. This distinguishes psychologists (Gardner and Lambert), as indicated earlier, can be considered the pioneers of language learning motivation studies. They have worked so closely together since the late 1950s they have worked collaboratively as a team with many other researchers (e.g. Smythe, Richard, Clement, Genesee, Anisfild, Fillenbaum, Tucker, Peal, and Hodgson). However, Gardner (1979) says that Lambert was the first researcher to propose the social psychological theory of L2 acquisition in 1963. It is interesting to know that Gardner was a Ph.D. student of Lambert and obtained his Ph.D. degree from McGill University in 1960. “it seems a bit unfair to name Lambert as the sole mentor for research in this area” (Beebe, 1988, p.68). The early work generated by this group of researchers at McGill University in Montreal Quebec (Canada) is best described by Beebe (1988)

...started the line of inquiry that continues today and that has had a profound effect on our understanding of second language acquisition ... Consequently, nevertheless it would not seem proper to write about social factors in SLA which ignoring the very large an impressive body of research done in and around Montreal on achievement. (p. 68)

Similarly, Dornyei (1998) writes that until 1990s this research had been dominated by a social psychological approach inspired by the influential work of Robert Gardner, Richard Clement and their Canadian associates notably Peter MacIntyre and Kim Noels, pointing to the 1990s as a marked shift in thought on L2 motivation arguing that a number of researchers in different parts of the world attempted to reopen the research agenda as it will be explored in the next sections.
As was stated above, the study of L2 motivation remains constrained by original research question that first launched Gardner & Lambert (1972). Their empirical question is worth quoting: “How is it that some people can learn a second or a foreign language so easily and so well while others, given what seem to be the same opportunities to learn, find it almost impossible?” (p.131). This question seems to be the fundamental question that has stimulated numerous investigations of the role of individual differences in L2/FL learning (Ellis, 1994; Skehan, 1989). Above all, similar questions come to mind: what motivates people to learn another language? Why there are differences in the level of proficiency attained in L2/FL among students who study in the same learning environment. What makes good second or foreign language learning? What keep them active towards this goal? (Sayed, 2001). Why people learn or fail to learn second languages effectively. Such questions have attracted attention from several scholarly quarters over the past decades and well definitely continue to do so and it is essential to find out why given more or less the same opportunities, do individual differ in linguistics performance (McGroarty, 2001).

2.3.1 Individual Differences in L2/FL Learning

As indicated earlier, motivation has been widely accepted by researchers as the key factor in affective and cognitive spheres that affect the rate and success of L2/FL learning (Dörnyei, 1998). As a result of this a considerable amount of research has been carried out of motivation to study language since Gardner and
Lambert (1959) first shed light on the role of attitude and motivation in L2/FL learning. The issue of individual differences variables like motivation, attitude, aptitude, intelligence, anxiety language, strategies, age, gender,...etc contribute to variability in the proficiency level of the learner learning L2/FL. These variables play an important role determining individual differences and how successful a learner will be in learning a language because they directly related to the learner and his/her success and help researchers to account for variance in L2/FL learning (Agnihotri, et al. 1998). Mitchell and Myles (1998) state that psychologist (especially social psychologists) have argued consistently that “these differences in learning outcomes must be due to individual differences between learners” (p.18). They claim that in real life observation or even in learning L2/FL, people differ greatly in the degree of ultimate success which they achieve with the result of this many proposals have been made to account the characteristics which cause these differences.

It can be noted that individual differences in L2/FL learning have been attributed to both cognitive and affective (emotional) factors. In their two-part review (1992, 1993a), Gardner and MacIntyre, refer to affective factors as those emotional relevance characteristics of the individual learners that influence how she/he will respond to any situation (p.1).

The issue of individual differences is important because it addresses affective variance (in addition to cognitive variables) in learning an L2/FL, and the

As noted above individual differences have prompted in an investigating a variety of factors that can play a role in accounting for the diversity in learners’ L2 attainment (Gardner, 1997, Skehan, 1989; Oxford & Ehrman, 1993, Gardner, Trembly & Masgoret, 1997; Trembly & Gardner, 1995). The individual differences that have investigated as important include general factors such as age (e.g. Elis, 2004; Krashen, 1973); gender (e.g. Eisenstein, 1982); self-confidence (e.g. Clement, Gardner & Smythe 1977; Clement, Dornyei & Noels, 1994) and factors that are more directly related to L2 learning such as language aptitude (e.g. Ehrman & Oxford, 1995; language anxiety (e.g. Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986; MacIntyre, Noels & Clement, 1997), language learning strategies (e.g. Oxford, 1993, 1996; Ellis, 1994); learning styles (e.g. Oxford & Ehrman, 1993; Skehan, 1989, 1998) learner beliefs (e.g. Horwitz, 1988). These general factors are extraneous to this study and will therefore not be addressed.

Among these individual differences, attitudes and motivations have been the most widely studied in the L2/FL literature. They have been considered to be the most important affective factors in language learning. Based on Gardner’s et
al. (1997) meta-analysis of 1247 published articles on individual differences since 1985, the most frequently investigated topics was “attitudes” (40.8%) followed by “motivation” (22.1%) and “learning strategies” (18.2%).

It seems that much research on attitudes and motivation prior to the 1980s came from the field of social psychology (see, e.g., Gardner & MacIntyre, 1992, 1993a; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner & Smythe, 1975; Dornyei, 1998). Studies of learners’ attitudes and motivation have revealed the significant contribution to increased achievement L2/FL (Dornyei, 2001a). In his review of Gardner’s research, elsewhere Dornyei, (1998) pointed out that a basic assumption in a social psychological approach to learning L2/FL is the students’ attitudes towards the target language influence their success and that L2/FL are not like other school subjects. Amount of considerable researches have been conducted to investigate the significance and influence of socio-psychological variables like attitudes and motivation in L2/FL. Among the factors that could influence the outcome of L2/FL learning, motivation has been widely embraced by both practitioners and researchers as a critical determinant of success in language learning, and this belief is strongly supported by a wide range of studies on L2 motivation in the past four decades (Cl’ement, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977; Cl’ement & Kruidenier, 1985; Csiz’er & D’ormye, 2005; D’ormye & Csiz’er, 2002; Gardner, 1985a; Lukmani, 1972; Noels,2001 Schmidt & Watanabe, 2001; Agnihitori, Khanna & Mukharjee,1998; Sawhney & Agnihitori,1998; Tremblay &

2.3.1.1 Focuses on attitudes and Motivation

In reviewing the literature on L2/FL motivation, it seems that there are two main streams in this regard. One comprises a series of studies conducted based on Gardner's Socio-educational model of language learning in which the role of integrative motivation, comprised of integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, and motivation, was empirically investigated as a determinant of L2/FL attainment. The other stream calls for the implementation of new "agenda" for L2/FL learning motivation, proposing a number of alternative models with an attempt to gain a more in-depth understanding of L2/FL learning motivation within mainstream education. Crookes & Schmidt (1991), for example, claim research into motivation has been exclusively Social-Psychology in approach, and it has not given full consideration to current research into education and learning. The relation between attitude and motivation, classroom methodology, the role of feedback and the effect of classroom materials on the learner are areas which Crookes & Schmidt review in their analysis of current trends in motivation research at that time. In the meantime, Gardner (2005b) comments on the Crookes and Schmidt (1991) article, saying that "it was useful in that it urged individual researcher to seek other ways of conceptualizing motivation, it did a disservice" (p.2). In fact, Gardner acknowledges that he is all in favour of new approaches and
research agendas, and he was at the time. He agreed with the notion of opening up the research agenda, but he did not see how the concept of integrative motivation was as narrow as Crookes and Schmidt suggested, (see Gardner, 2005, p.2)

As stated above, the literature on L2/FL motivation has two main streams. While the former studies which based on Gardner theory of motivation investigated casual relationship among possible individual differences variable with various L2/FL achievement measure the latter attempts to identify possible variables that could be influence learners’ motivation within the immediate L2/F1 learning context. The following sections attempt to review each of these approaches.

2.3.1.2 Gardner’s (1985) Socio-educational Model of SLA

The role of L2/FL motivation has been studied intensively over the last forty years, primarily by Gardner and his colleagues in Canada, where French and English are the two official languages. Gardner (1985a) has hypothesized that L2 learners with positive attitudes towards the target culture and people will learn the target language more effectively than those who do not have such positive attitudes. In their early studies, Gardner and Lambert (1959) found that aptitude and motivation were the two factors most a strongly associated with learner’s L2 achievement.
The early work of Gardner and Lambert in Canada has two major influences on L2/FL research related to motivation. The first comes from the development of a battery Attitude Motivation battery Test (AMTB) to access various individual differences variables based on the socio-educational model (Gardner, 1985a). This has let to a large number of empirical studies in this area. The AMTB consist of a battery of both direct and indirect measures of aspects of attitude, and motivation connected to learning other languages. The indirect measures apply to attitudes towards the other language and its speakers and exploit techniques such as semantic differential. The direct measures apply across the range from beliefs about the importance of learning another language, through attitudes towards native Speakers to various aspects of motivational intensity. These measures make use of Likert Scales, which employ statement about the constructs under investigation in order to elicit responses from the learners regarding their level of agreement or disagreement. Data gathered from the use of AMTB is subjected to correlational or factor analysis to detect underlying relationship between various aspects of the scales.

The second major contribution of Gardner to language motivation is his synthesis of the results of many studies into his socio-educational model second/foreign language learning (See Gardner, 1985a).
Figure 1 Representation of the Socio-Educational Model (Gardner, 1985)

In his defence of the socio-educational model, Gardner (1985a: figure-1) presents a number of studies from a variety of socio-culture contexts, which support his contention that L2/FL proficiency depends upon two independent factors. This first of these is language attitudes. The second is a socially based motivation. The latter is the concept of “integrativeness” that lies at the center of the socio-educational model which has been the focus of so much research effort over the last three decades of the 20th Century. There is still wide spread support of Gardner’s model to the present study. In this model (figure-1) Gardner (1985a) identifies a number of factors which are interrelated when learning an L2/FL. Gardner’s model looks specifically at L2/FL acquisition (learning) in a structural classroom setting rather than a natural environment. His work focuses on the foreign language classroom. The model attempts to interrelated four features of L2/FL learning.

These four stages, namely include, (1) Social Milieu. Here, Gardner stresses the overriding importance of socio-cultural influences by integrating
cultural beliefs deriving from the Social Milieu, (2) Individual Differences, motivation as a source of individual differences between learners, (3) Language Acquisition Contexts, the setting or the context in which learning takes place, the exploitation of both formal and informal learning opportunities, and (4) Linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes. The clear intention is to present these elements as casually linked with “integrativeness” a major determinant of success (Gardner, 1988).

The model has been highly influenced in studies motivation in L2/FL learning. It stresses the language learning is different from other subjects in that learning are required to learn and take on the behaviour type of another culture. The model also claims that culture beliefs also influence the development of the integrative motivation. It is this emphasis on positive attitude towards the other cultural groups that characterises Gardner’s explanation of language learning motivation.

The socio-educational model has undergone a number of changes but there is a considerable similarities between the earlier version and the most recent one (Gardner, 2001; 2005a). Generally speaking, Gardner’s work is more unique, more universal in that it has clear direct link to empirical research (Baker, 1992; Spolsky, 1989).

In his current model (fundamental model), Gardner (2005a) focuses on ability (intelligence and language aptitude) and motivation as the two most
important (independent) factors of language learning and achievement of language achievement. He shows how they involve in both formal and informal language learning context and motivation would be more involved than ability in informal contexts. Both contexts are shown to lead to both linguistics and non-linguistics outcomes (reproduced in figure 2). Moreover, this model predicts that educational settings and cultural contexts could influence on motivation, but not ability.

Figure-2: Representation of the Fundamental Model of Language Learning

(Gardner, 2005a, b).

Again, in his current model (the socio-educational model in figure 3) Gardner (2005a) has proposed that the individual’s motivation to learn a L2/FL is related to two classes of variables, attitudes towards the Learning Situation and Integrativeness which in turn affect a student’s level of motivation. In some situations, the other variables instrumentality could also support motivation and implicate in language achievement. This is indicated in figure by the broken line linking Instrumentality to motivation. The bidirectional arrows linking
Integrativeness to Attitude Learning Situation and Instrumentality are indicated that the two pairs of constructs are expected to be positively correlated with one another. Learners who are high integrativeness would view the learning situation positively, other being equal and vice versa.

The model shows the relationship among ability, attitude, motivation, language anxiety and language achievement variables. As indicated in the figure, Ability and Motivation are linked directly to language achievement. It is assumed that individual differences in ability account for some of the differences in achievement which the learner can achieve high levels of achievement based on ability and/or motivation, but since these two factors are independent, the learner who is really high in both situations will be even more successful in language learning, other things being equal and vice versa.

The model also predicts that language anxiety could influence language achievement. This negative relationship as Gardner explains, can be interpreted as indicating that the high level of language anxiety interfere with the language achievement, or that low level of achievement cause individuals to be anxious where they are to use their language. And learners with high integrativeness would be high in instrumentality, there tend to be positive relationship between the integrative and instrumental orientation. There is no reason to expect them to be independent of one another (see Gardner, 2005a, pp.7-8).
In their research, Gardner and his colleagues have developed a series of measures to assess aspects of these constructs called The Attitude Motivation Test Battery. The AMTB was developed to measure the various components of the socio-educational model. The five major constructs with corresponding scales reproduced in Table 2.

Figure 3: Representation of the Socio-Educational Model (Gardner, 2005 a,b)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes toward the Target Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest in Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward the Learning Situation</td>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Motivational Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire to Learn the Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes toward Learning the Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Anxiety</td>
<td>Language Class Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language Use Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in this figure 4, there are eleven scales in the AMTB. The model shows the connection between the constructs and the measures. In this current investigation, the intent of the present study was to examine the learning of Arabic language from an Indian Muslim psychosocial prospective, via a modified version of the AMTB that would convey a more detail profile of the attitudinal motivational attributes in the learning of Arabic among Indian Muslim adult students.

**Integrativeness**

One of the major variables in Gardner’s (2005a, 2005b) socio-educational model is integrativeness, reflects a genuine interest in learning the language in order to come closer psychologically to other language community. The concept
involves the individual's orientation to language learning that focuses on communication with members of other language group, a general interest in foreign group, especially through their language and favourable attitude towards the target language groups. That is, it reflects emotional identification, an openness or willingness to other cultures in general and interest in the target culture in particular. That is, the norms of the community when the second or foreign language is derived. As Gardner (2005a, 2005b) posits, individuals who are high integrativeness do not focus on their own ethno-linguistic community as part of their own identity, but instead are willing and able to take one features of another language group (if only just the language) as part of their own behavioral repertoire. According to him, individual differences in integrativeness probably formed from the interplay of cultural factors, family beliefs and attitude and even genetic predispositions. The concept is considered essential in influencing second language acquisition because the words, pronunciations, grammar, behavioural and cognitive features and the like are silent characteristic of another cultural community and thus the individual's open to the cultural norms will influence his/her motivation to learn the language. Given these considerations, integrativeness is then measured in AMTB by three scales. The three measures (with abbreviations used in Figure 4 in brackets) are: (a) Integrative Orientation (IO) an interest in learning the language in order to communicate, identify, socialize, etc. With the target language community and their culture; (b) Attitude
toward the Language Community (ALC) which can either facilitate or hinder the learning of the language; (c) Interest in Foreign Languages (IFL).

**Attitudes towards the Learning Situation:**

The second key construct in Gardner’s socio-educational model is attitudes towards the learning situation. This concept refers in general to affective reactions to the language learning experience, it could involve attitude toward the teacher, the class, the text books or the text material and so forth. That is, the individual’s reaction to anything associated with the immediate context in which the language is taught. There are two scales in the AMTB that provide an assessment of the language teacher and the course, though is recognized that other factors could be included (Gardner, 2005a, 2005b).

The two measures are: (a) Language Teacher Evaluation (TEACH); (b) Language Course Evaluation (COURSE). From a broader perspective integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situations can be categorized as “language attitudes” (Gardner et al. 1987, Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). In addition, attitudes related to the learning of a second or a foreign language are different from those found in studying any other subject in the curriculum. For instance, in learning a second language, not only we learn the language itself, but we also have to gain knowledge of the language and the culture it is associated with, and “take it in, as it were, and make it a part of [our] behavioral repertoire” (Gardner, 1985a, p. 5). Gardner emphasizes the linguistic elements such as
morphology, phonology and principles of grammar are consider integral parts that are associated with a specific culture. Those attitudes that an individual hold towards the target language and the target language community are considered to have a very significance influence on motivation. It is generally agreed that positive attitude facilitate rather than hinder learning. Brown (2001) argues that second or foreign language learners necessarily become learners of the second culture because a language cannot be learned without an understanding of the cultural context in which it is used. Brown suggested that a language is a part of a culture and a culture is a part of a language; the two are intricately interwoven such that one cannot separate the two without losing the significance of either language or culture. The acquisition of a second language is also the acquisition of a second culture and the teaching a language without teaching culture is like teaching the language in a vaccum and it becomes rather meaningless because language is the world view and not just words (Brown, 2001).

**Motivation:**

The third major construct in the socio-educational model is motivation. Second or foreign language achievement is evaluated based on a student's overall language performance, including comprehensive skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing. There are many facets of motivation that can be examined. In their studies, Gardner and associates have focused on three major components, effort and persistence expended in learning the language (or motivation intensity),
the desire to learn the language, and attitudes toward learning the language. These three components in the model are necessary in capturing a learner’s sense of motivation. That is, to distinguish between individuals who are more motivated and those who are less motivated. The three attributes assess important behavioural, cognitive and affective components as discussed earlier. In addition to his remarks, Gardner (2005a, 2005b) confirms that the motivational intensity (effort) is an important component of motivation but it might well be elevated in a classroom with an authoritarian teacher. Similarly, the two components, attitudes towards learning the language or desire to learn the language might well be elevated in classes with exciting, dynamic and socially warm teachers. All these represent reactions to the classroom and they do not necessarily reflect motivation in the true sense. In Gardner’s view, the three components of motivation are necessary to define the truly motivated learner. He also demonstrates that integrativeness and the attitudes towards the learning situation serve as the major support of motivation and the same instrumentality could also serve under some circumstances.

Elsewhere Gardner (2001) clearly states that integrativeness and attitudes towards the learning situation are seen as two correlated supports for motivation but it is motivation that is responsible for achievement in the second or foreign language. Someone may demonstrate high levels of integrativeness and/or very positive attitudes towards the learning situation, but if these are not linked with motivation to learn the language, they will not be particularly highly related to
achievement. Similarly, someone who exhibits high levels of motivation that are not supported by high levels of integrativeness and/or favourable attitudes towards the learning situation may not exhibit these high levels of motivation consistently. The three scales in the AMTB used to assess motivation are: (a) Motivational intensity (MI); (b) desire to learn the language (DESIRE); (c) Attitudes towards Learning the Language (ALL).

**Language Anxiety:**

The fourth construct in the Gardner’s model of motivation is language anxiety. This concept refers to the individual’s apprehensive in the language class or setting, it could be aroused in many situations, such as interpersonal communication, language drills, examination etc. (Gardner, 2005a). From a broader perspective anxiety is the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic system (Horwitz, et al. 1986). Most discrete problems caused by anxiety in the language learning classroom are related to listening and speaking such as difficulties with free speaking tasks or communication apprehension and fear of negative evaluation (Horwitz, et al. pp. 125-127). Gardner’s (2005a) model asserts that language anxiety can deleterious effects on learning and inadequate skill can give rise to feelings of language anxiety. Two measures are employed: (a) Language Class Anxiety (CLASS); (b) Language Use Anxiety (USE).
Instrumentality:

The fifth construct in the socio-educational model is instrumentality. This notion refers to conditions where the language is being studied for practical and utilitarian reasons. To date the only measure is used: Instrumental Orientation (INST).

Gardner’s studies on motivation focus on investigating the cause of L2 achievement. Gardner and his associates developed that self-report questionnaire that called the Attitude Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) as a tool to measure a number of attributes that are associate with L2 learning. Gardner’s studies use the AMTB to measure individual differences variables. The casual relationship among the collected variables is investigated using quantitative analysis such as Factor Analysis or Structural Equation Modeling (Gardner, 2000; Gardner, 2005a). Gardner’s model is useful and applicable as research paradigm because it is parsimonious “it has been impetus for many pervious studies, it suggests many testable hypotheses and it provides clear interpretations of previous research” (Gardner, 2005a, p.12).

Many studies have used versions of the AMTB to conduct research into the role of motivation in second or foreign language learning within Gardner socio-educational framework in L2/FL learning contexts outside of Canada. Due to differences in their measurement tools, methods of analysis and socio-cultural context, the reported results have varied widely. The following factors have been
identified as contributors of L2 proficiency. Language aptitude motivation and attitudes (Kraemer, 1993; Dörnyei, Csizér, & Németh, 2006); Self-confidence (Clement, Gardner & Smyth, 1977, 1980; Clement, Major, Gardner & Smythe, 1977), attitudes towards the language course (Donitsa-Schmidt, Inbar, & Shohamy, 2004); classroom anxiety (Muchnick & Wolfe, 1982); attitudes, motivation and language anxiety (Gardner 2005a; Gardner, 2006); exposure, education, stereotypes of the language and motivation (Agnihotri, Khanna & Sachdev, 1998).

Gardner and Masgoret (2003) Gardner (2005b; 2006) investigated the relationship of second language achievement to five attitude/motivation variables from Gardner’s socio-educational model. They used Gardner’s Attitude/Motivation Test Battery and other measures of second language achievement. They found out that integrativeness, attitudes toward the learner situation, motivation, integrative orientation, and instrumental orientation are positively related to achievement in a second language. They also found that motivation has an important role in the achievement of mastery of a second language. It found high correlation to achievement compared to other variable. Motivation was also found to be influenced by other variables, like attitudes toward the learning situation and integrativeness (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003). The authors did a meta-analysis of 75 independent samples, involving 10489 individuals, confirmed the relationship of these three components of Gardner's socio-educational model to second language achievement.
2.3.1.3 Other Perspectives on Motivation and Language Learning

In 1991, Crookes and Schmidt called for a reopening of the research agenda for study L2/FL learning motivation as mentioned earlier. They criticized studied conducted based on Gardner’s (1985a) socio-educational model because of the lack attention to classroom learning and a shortage of long term studies. This agenda influenced Dornyei, (1994a) in developing his framework which focuses on investigating motivational sources related to the learner’s immediate learning situation. They have pointed out that there are limits to how Gardner’s (1985a) socio-educational model could be applied; these limitations stem primarily from differences in motivation between L2 learners and FL learners (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Oxford & Ehrman, 1993). That is, most of Gardner’s studies have used English-speaking Canadian students who are learning French in Canada where French is accepted as the lingua within their native culture, while most language learners in the U.S. are learning foreign languages (e.g. Spanish, French, German) where students have few immediate opportunities to use the language outside the classroom. Crookes and Schmidt, as Gardner (2005b) reported, they misrepresented and referred to the initial article Gardner and Lambert (1959), implying that they distinguished between integrative and instrumental motivation. But they (Gardner and Lambert) did not even use those terms. Crookes and Schmidt (1991; pp. 471-472) stated “Motivation is identified primarily with the learner’s orientation toward the goal of learning a second language. Integrative motivation is identified with positive attitudes towards the target language group.
and the potential for integrating into that group, or at least an interest in meeting and interacting with members of the target language groups". Gardner noted that this is their definition, not his “In fact, they [Crookes & Schmidt] even noted that it was not mine”, he said. They state “what is not noticed or commented upon, however, is that the “integrative motive” in Gardner’s more recent model (Gardner, 1985a; 1988) is not longer equivalent to attitude toward the target language community and is not equivalent to a score on the integrative orientation subscale of the AMTB or any other subscale of the AMTB” (p. 475). “But the simple truth is, it never any one of these”, Gardner said. (See, Gardner, 2005b, pp.2-3).

Generally speaking, Crookes and Schmidt proposed new research agenda which attempted to expand the definition of L2/FL learning motivation, broading the concept of motivation. (Dornyei, 1996, 1998, 2001a; Oxford & Shearin, 1996). Dornyei & Otto (1998), for example, define L2motivation in their model as:

....dynamically changing cumulative arousal in person that initiates, directs, coordinates, amplifies, and evaluates the cognitive and motor processes whereby initial wishes and desires are selected, prioritized, operationalised and (successfully or un successfully acted out. P. 65.)

The reformists criticize Gardner’s studies for being too limited in two ways: (1) despite the large sample of subjects with whom he usually works, his research is always based on one-shot questionnaires (i.e. data collected at one point in time) that are examined in relation to the final achievement measure; and (2) the integrativeness is not … important for L2 achievement in classroom-based
‘foreign’ language instruction outside Canada. They claim that motivation is more complex and cannot be measured by a one-shot questionnaire as it changes due to a number of environmental factors in addition to integrativeness. Dornyei (2001a) claims that a more “educational orientation in L2 motivation research is needed” (p. 105). The common belief underlying such as an educational movement seems to be focus on motivational sources closely related to the learner’s immediate learning situation rather than their overall attitudes toward the target culture (i.e. integrativeness). In contrast to Gardner’s claim that “the source of the motivating impetus is relatively unimportant to provide that motivation is aroused” (1985a, p. 169), these reformists value the learning situation to find ways to motivate students (Oxford & Shearin, 1994).

In fact, Gardner’s socio-educational model does include learners’ attitude towards the learning situation (teacher and the course) as a part of integrative motivation. The language acquisition context also include as one of the elements that influences learners’ motivation (Gardner 2001). However, Dornyei (2001a) still argues:

……the main emphasis in Gardner’s socio-educational model has not been on elaborating on the range of possible motivational antecedents….but on determining whether motivation has been aroused and specifying the learning consequences of this arousal in relation to the impact of other non-motivational factors as intelligence (p.106).

In fact, Gardner’s socio-educational model presents the importance of the L2/FL learning context on students’ attitudes and motivation in contributing to better L2/FL learning. With the new perspectives, several alternative motivation
approaches, models, and framework have been proposed. These new models are focused on the classroom-based L2 acquisition context, and have attempted to illustrate various factors that may influence L2/FL motivation.

Crookes and Schmidt (1991) adopted Keller’s motivation system (1983) and identified four levels of motivation and motivated learning, namely the micro level, the classroom level, the syllabus or curriculum level and the extra curricular levels. Oxford and Shearin (1994) suggested broadening L2 motivation theories by introducing emerging new concept in motivation psychology such as Need theories and Instrumentality (Expectancy, value) theories. Need theories related to their varying needs, and they instigate, direct and sustain actively to satisfy these needs. Also, L2 learners feel the need to achieve believing that doing the specified tasks will produce positive results that can increase personal values. Similarly, expectancy value theories claim that L2 learners engage in tasks to achieve some valued outcomes, determining the degree of effort that they expend. Furthermore, Spolsky (2000) suggest that motivation research should incorporate the methodology of using sociolinguistic data and psycholinguistic data because language learning is dynamic social phenomenon.

Dornyei (1994a) claims that L2 motivation is eclectic, multifaceted construct, thus it needs to introduce different levels to integrate the various competent. Adopting Crookes and Schmidt’s approach (1991), he found it is useful to separate L2 motivation into three motivational components (i.e. motive
and motivational Conditions). Language level, learner level and learning situation level. Language level focused on orientations and motives related to various aspects of L2 such as the target culture and the potential usefulness of L2 proficiency. Learner level concerns affected cognitions underlying the motivational processes. Learning situation level consists of both intrinsic motives, and motivational conditions concerning three areas; (1) course-specific, (2) teacher-specific, and (3) group-specific.

Similarly, Williams and Burden (1997) proposed an "interactive model" providing a comprehensive framework for L2 motivation rooted in social constructivist tradition. In their model, motivation is seen as a choice about action and behaviours that L2 learners make depending on a complex interplay between internal factors (e.g. personality, confidence) and external factors (i.e. socio-cultural contexts).

To sum up, McGroarty (2001) in a paper entitled "Situating Second Language Motivation" has clearly highlighted the study of second language motivation with concomitant development in the field of educational psychology and L2 learning. He remarks "the study of L2 motivation amidst some the developments in cognitive and social psychology as a whole contribute to renewed appreciation of the complexity and particularity of the factors affecting L2 learning" (p.69). He goes on to describe the seven papers which presented at the AAAL 2000 colloquium on motivation and second language motivation-the
papers later published as technical report # 23 in 2001- (see Dornyei and Schmidt, 2001). In McGroarty’s view, the papers in the AAAL colloquium have contributed to better understanding the multifaceted nature of motivation and they reflect new information on the personal, social, and situational aspects of L2 motivation (p.70).

Existing research on L2 motivation. Like much research in education psychology, has begun to discover the multiple and mutually influential connection between individuals and their many social contexts, contexts that can play a facilitative, neutral or inhibitory role with respect to further learning, including L2 motivation.

(McGroarty, 2001, p.86)

2.4 Studies conducted in Particular Sociocultural Contexts and Languages

2.4.1 Studies Done in India

Several studies have been conducted in India especially in English as a second language (Lukamani, 1972; Khanna & Agnihotri, 1998; Sawhney & Agnihotri, 1998; Agnihotri, Khanna & Mukherjee, (1998). These studies partly used Gardner and Lambert’s social psychological framework and/or Gardner’s model of SLA in investigated the role of attitudes and motivation in learning English as a second language and French as a foreign language Sawhney, (1998) and acquisition of Hindi by Tamil in Delhi (Sawhney & Agnihotri, 1998). These studies have found negative correlations between attitudes and language
proficiency and/or achievement, only the one by Sawhney & Agnihotri, (1998) found positive correlation (in this case Hindi). The results from these studies show that it is the social variables like exposure, schooling, educational background, patterns of language use or frequently and intensity of contact, etc. rather than psychological variables (attitudes and motivation) which are responsible for determining success in second or foreign language learning in India.

The psychological variables were found to correlate to language proficiency and/or achievement indirectly by being related to social variables (i.e. the family background, learner’s educational background and exposure). Furthermore, it has also been found the overriding importance of instrumental motivation over integrative motivation. The attitudinal configurations are particularly complex in multilingual countries such as India, as Agnihotri, et al. (1998) point out, attitudes have no direct relationship with achievement. The authors attributed such findings to the fact that there is not identifiable native English speaking community in India.

In his study Khanna found that Indian undergraduate’s achievement in English was influenced more by schooling, control of English, exposure to English, use of English among friends, etc. than by attitudes and motivation. Attitudes were found to have significant correlation only with the variables of exposure and language use and best predictor of achievement were proficiency in English and schooling. These social variables are more important in determining
proficiency/achievement in English in India. He concluded that “...different sets of individual and social variables are likely to cluster with different linguistics skills in different social settings” (p.262). Agnihotri, Khanna and Mukherjee (1998) found similar results showing that Indian undergraduate’s achievement in the use of English tenses correlated significantly with their schooling, patterns of English use and stereotypes of the English language.

Agnihotri, & Khanna (1998) provided that Indian students are not integratively motivated. They are always instrumentally motivated to learn English “...the motivation for learning English has never been integrative, it is, and has always instrumental” (1998, p.142). Here, Agnihotri & Khanna studied first year Indian undergraduates of the University of Delhi (61 males and 25 females), found that all the achievement of the students in the oral skills of English correlated with social variables and the psychological variables such attitudes and motivation were found to have no predicative value of the speech skills of the students. The variables that turn out to be highly significant are schooling, English marks in the previous examination, patterns of English use and the stereotypes of the English language, etc. Khanna & Agnihotri (1998) believed that the Gardner and Lambert’s distinction between instrumental and integrative motivation was not able to capture the complexity of motivation in India. This led them to modify Gardner and Lambert’s term of motivation, arguing that the participant’s reasons for learning English were largely instrumental in nature not integrative and
classified the responses of students into complementary and supplementary reasons. The former included reason to learn English to get a job, higher education and the latter to read foreign culture, to watch films or feel superior.

Lukmani (1972) found the same that instrumentally motivated Indians were successful at learning English and that instrumental motivation scores correlated best with their success when she studies Marathi-Speaking high school students (60 all female) learning English in Bombay. Lukmani concluded that “English proficiency arises from the desire to use English not as a means of entry into a reference group, but as a tool with to understand and cope with the demands of modern life”. (p. 271). Lukmani’s study ignored the social variables as Khanna and Agnihotri (1998) pointed out ... she accepted Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) distinction between integrative and instrumental motivation.

Mathur (1991, reported in Sawhney, 1998), examined the role of social psychological variable in the proficiency/achievement levels of Indian students learning German in Delhi, found that social variables like learner’s educational background exposure and self-image were the most important predictor of success in learning German. Education alone accounted for 33 per cent in German scores. Another important finding was the overriding of instrumental motivation over the integrative motivation. Sawhney & Agnihotri (1998) remarked that the attitudes were not found to account for any variance “perhaps psychological variables like
attitudes and motivation would have a great role to play in foreign language learning if a native German community has been present in Indian” (p. 128).

Agnihotri & Khanna (1997, cited in Sheorey & Nayak, 2002) provide empirical evidence indicating that Indian students have positive attitudes towards the learning of English. After surveying over 1100 participants, they concluded that the urban Indian students “appreciate the association of English with higher education employment opportunities, social mobility career and advancement and access to knowledge” (quoted in Sheorey & Nayak, 2002, p. 17). Elsewhere Khanna & Agnihotri describe the role of English in India. They state:

> English in India is taught as a major second language in schools and colleges for historical, political, social and cultural reasons which are radically different from those underlying the introduction of French in U.S.A. or Canada, or English in the Philippines.

(Agnihotri & Khanna, 1998, p. 82)

The status and importance of English in India today is also described in terms of its use as a link language for a medium of communication in a variety of domains like education, administration and commerce among educated people and the mastery of it becomes a symbol of social and educational accomplishment (see Sheorey & Nayar, 2002, p. 16). English becomes an integral part of Indian’s linguistic repertoire (Kachru, 1986, cited in Sheorey & Nayar, 2002).

One can remark that English in India is learnt as international language rather than with reference to a community of English native speakers, i.e. British
or American, so that it is not surprising if integrative attitudes are not so significant as the learner’s instrumental reasons for studying the second language.

One might ask why in India the motivation for learning English is instrumental. Many reasons can be given to explain why instrumental motivation is significant. Dornyei (1990) argues that instrumentally motivated learners who are unfamiliar with the culture and people from the target language community, cannot construct strong integrative motivation because of the cultural distance. He claims that the greater the cultural distance between the learner and the target language community, the greater the instrumental motivation. This argument suggests that instrumental motivation can be only influential than integrative motivation in certain educational contexts as such India.

2.4.2 Studies done in the Arab World (Middle East)

2.4.2.1 Studies in Palestine/Israel

A number of research studies have been conducted in the Middle East particularly Palestine/Israel (Kraemer, 1993; Abu-Rabia, 1998; Inbar, Shohamy and Donitisa-Schmidt &., 1999; Inbar, Donitsa-Schmidt & Shohamy, 2001; Donitsa-Schmidt, Inbar & Shohamy, 2004) investigated the attitudes and motivation of Jewish students learning Arabic and Arab students learning Hebrew.

Most of these studies have shown that Israeli Jewish students hold negative perceptions, stereotype, and prejudices toward Arabic speaking people and their
language and culture. Similar results were revealed in the same context in which Arab students were generally found to possess negative attitudes to Hebrew language and Israeli Society. The reason has been fundamentally attributed to the Israeli-Arab conflict. The conflict effects on the learning and teaching of Arabic by Jews, also affects Arab students learning Hebrew. However, the studies of Inbar & associates (1999, 2001, 2004) have shown that the educational context is as meaningful and significant as the social milieu in affecting students motivation and attitudes. The findings of these three studies indicate that changes the educational context in which Arabic language is taught is Israeli Schools, in terms of starting the age of Israeli Jewish students and the choice of spoken Arabic (Palestine dialect) rather than the Modern Standard Arabic brought about positive changes in learner attitudes and motivation towards the target language and its speaker and culture. As we shall turn to them later.

Abu Rabia (1998) investigated the attitudes of Israeli Jewish students learning Arabic and coexistence with Arabs within the problematic Israeli-Arab social contexts. He found that the students attitudes towards Arabic and Arabic society were negative and their attitudes towards the Arabic learning situation were positive, a finding that Abu-Rabia indicated to the teacher in charge of designing the class learning situation, not the social context had a strong impact on the Arabic learning of the Jewish 7th grade children. Beside this study, Abu-Rabia also found the young Israelis possessed low instrumental and indoors integrative motivation but their army service motivation and out doors integrative motivation
was high. He suggested that the indoors integrative motivation “where learners feel emotionally identified with the language and culture and allow this new ‘foreign’ language to enter their home” (p.155). While the outdoors integrative motivation referred to the learners willing to “interact with the language and its culture but outside their private domain” (P. 155). The researcher in this study defined that operational definition as a multicultural orientation in which the minority prefers in order to prefect its ethnic uniqueness from acculturation and assimilation in the foreign culture, claming that the Jewish learners were willing to live with Arabs mixed cities and neighborhoods but not to blend in. Further, they were interested in reading the familiar text and their understanding of it was higher than their understanding in the unfamiliar text. They evaluated the Prophet Mohammed significantly more positively than the British character.

Abu-Rabia reported a surprising result where Jewish children in Northern Israel studying Arabic as a third Language for four hours a week, evinced positive evaluation of the prophet Mohammed compared to with the British character, a finding that Abu Rabia indicated might be due to the objectivity of the written language which not influenced by the macro problematic Israeli- Arab social context. He writes:

...the character of the Prophet was depicted as unrelated to the Jews but as a Prophet who made historic efforts to spread his religion all over the world. Islam in Israel is associated with fundamentalism inside Israel and the Hammas Movement in the west Bank and Gaza, while the British government has positive relations with Israel.

The author concluded that the Israeli Jewish students studied Arabic for army purposes and not for daily life interest or emotional identification. Their army purposes orientation was strong and their emotional support for the Arabic language and culture was low. They did not see themselves socializing and interacting with Arabs at the emotional intimate level of life.

Here it should be mentioned that the researcher has used the related/familiar and unrelated/familiar texts based on questionnaire in order to evaluate the feelings of Jewish students toward the class room situation. For him there was a reason to suppose that the students would evaluate the character of the Prophet Mohammed negatively and the British Character positively. According to him, both texts conveyed historical facts. The unrelated or unfamiliar text outlined the life of the prophet and some Islamic principles. It described in brief the history of Islam and “why the prophet fought against the enemies of God and successfully expanded the Islamic empire” (p. 156). He chose the character of the prophet for evaluation in order to disclose the students feeling toward Islam and the Arabs in Israel “the prophet would be a symbol of Islam and the Arabs”. In Abu-Arabia’s term, a “symbol of conflict”, for the Jewish students. While the related or unrelated text outlined the acquisition of creation by the state of Israel, the text describes the tension among Arabs, British and Jews. The text also presented historical facts of Israel’s war against the Arabs and the Arab countries and against the British to establish the Jewish state (see Abu-Rabia, 1998, p. 156).
The teaching of Arabic in Jewish schools is regarded by some Israeli scholars as one of the valuable goals of the Israeli educational policy (Donitsa-schmidt, et al. 2004). Arabic is a compulsory language for three years in grades 7 to 9. About 60% of Israeli schools Arabic is a compulsory and 30% of Students are given the choice either Arabic or another foreign language (most commonly French or English). The rest 10% study randomly assigned by the school to study Arabic or another foreign languages (Inbar, et al. 2001).

Despite the effort of Israelis to prompt the teaching of Arabic as a second language in Jewish schools, the teaching of Arabic to Hebrew speaking students is considered to be suffering from many problems such as negative attitudes and stereotypes by Jewish students and their parents, low motivation and resistance to studying the language and low level of proficiency and a high dropout (Donitsa-schmidt, et al. 2004).

In her study Kraemer (1993) investigated the role of attitudes and motivation of Israel Jewish students studying Arabic as a foreign language in Tel-Aviv. She found that motivation to learn Arabic among Israeli high school students was related to needs for national security. The integrative attitudes were not a significant contributor to motivation among the Jewish student. Kraemer successfully tested Gardner’s motivation model. She demonstrated that it also works in environments that are considerably different from the Canadian context where it originated. She obtained similar causal model for the Jewish students of Arabic and demonstrated that a socially relevant construct, identified as social
political attitudes had an indirect effects on motivation. Gardner (2005b) remarks, the study of Kraemer “reflect close social distance equal civil rights and optimism about peace in the future” (p. 8) but exaggeration remarks!. Elsewhere Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) describe Kraemer’s study as a particular informative, arguing that it shows other factors such as social political attitudes, political optimism, national security orientation that are considered necessary to reflect the socio-cultural setting inside Israel. Gardner and MacIntyre recommend that it is necessary to consider the factors that could contribute to the motivation to learn a second or foreign language in different socio-cultural contexts.

According to Inbar et al. (2001), an attempt was made in 1996 to change Israeli Jewish student’s attitudes and motivation by changing the educational context. The project was imitated in Tel- Aviv, where 4000 Hebrew-speaking students are participating in a programme or Palestinian dialect. The Israeli Jewish educators decide to start the teaching of spoken Arabic (Palestinian dialect) before the literary form (Modern standard Arabic) earlier in grade 4 instead of grade 7 (a change from 12 to 9 years old). A goal that Inbar et al. (2001), and Donitsa-Schmidt et al. (2004) suggested might improve the Jewish students motivation and attitudes towards the Arabic language and its culture. The authors claim that attitudes like all aspects of the development of cognitive and affect developed early in childhood even children developed negative or positive attitudes towards a particular language and its target speech community as a result of their socialization process (Aboud, 1994, as cited in Donitsa-Schmidt et al., 2004).
In all three studies investigating the attitudes, and motivation of Israel Jewish students studying Arabic in Jewish elementary Schools, Inbar et al. (1999); (2000) and Donitisa-Schmid et al. (2004) reported a surprising result where Jewish students in Tel-Aviv revealed positive attitudes towards the Arabic language, its culture and speakers. Their studies show that the students who studied Arabic were found to have higher motivations for political, instrumental, cultural and parental reasons and higher motivation to study the language in the future in comparison to those who didn't study Arabic. In spite of pervasive negative attitudes towards the target language and target language community, students who studied Arabic had a more positive attitude towards the language, its people and its culture than those who did not study it. While initially they did not choose to study Arabic, their attitudes towards the language and culture were found to be significant predictors of their desire to continue studying the language. Other variables that affected the generation of positive attitudes were age at which they began to study Arabic and parental attitudes. They also found that students rated Arabic as more pragmatically important and contributory to peace between Arabs and Israel than those who did not study Arabic.

The findings of these studies that Inbar and associates reported be related to the motivational change and/or the motivational effects of the bicultural excursion programme. This area of research, as Dörnyei (2002) pointed out, related to the question of how to motivate learners so the Israeli researchers as mentioned above examined how the teaching of spoken Arabic affect in attitudinal / motivational
disposition of Israeli school children. The results of these studies, as Inbar and associates claim, the teaching of language help to improve attitudes towards the other group, its languages, culture and speakers. In short, attitudes and motivation are enhanced by the L2 learning experience in itself, a finding corroborated by Dörnyei et al. (2006). His finding suggests that, in Hungary, students studying an L2 were more motivated and had more positive attitudes towards the target language and target language community than students who were not learning the language. Motivation was not affected by whether the language courses were obligatory or elective. Similar results were found in a study conducted by Dörnyei (1998). Contact with speakers of the target language is also significant in promoting positive language attitudes but Dörnyei et al. (2006) note that this encouraging effect loses momentum at a certain stage beyond which it ‘backfires’, especially in places where contact with the target language community is high. The novelty seems to wear off with ‘cosmopolitan saturation level’ (149).

It must be pointed out that the data of Inbar & associates (2001, 2004) have been collected before the Palestinian Intifada (Al-Aqsa fire Anti‘fada) in 2000 and Israel has been in state for war with Arabs since 1948. The findings of these studies were taken as a proof that Israeli Jewish students’ attitudes were related to positive outlook toward Arabic and its speaker and culture but the result of these studies is that it is not known whether Israeli children chose to learn the language (in this case Arabic) or the learn of the language that created motivation. The connection between foreign languages developing high motivation to learn is not
really clear. The question that arises here whether the results for those studies are only specific to Palestinian/Israeli context or would be replaced in studies conducted on learners different ages, other languages and other contexts is in fact unknown (Inbar et al. (2001). It does not seem to matter whether the students hold integrative or instrumental orientations. Their positive attitude will not remain the same when they grow up because of the nature of attitude change and the conflict between Israelis and Arabs in the region. The conflict can be traced to the end of 19th century when the Zionist immigrants started to come to Palestine in order to search a national home for Jews. The massive immigrative of Jews and the occupation of Palestine escalated the conflict. The Zionist State of Israel has been set up in the heart of the Arab World since the establishment of the state in 1948 (Bakalla, 1984). In actually fact the Israeli/Arab conflict has generated several wars and permeates every aspects of people life in the region particularly the Gasa Stripe and Beirut. Many attempts have made to put an end of the conflict and to initiate and maintain progress in resolving core problems such as the establishment of a future Palestinian state and it boarders and the status of Jerusalem (Al-Quads) and the refugees and the Jewish settlement activity in occupied Palestinian land but it is very difficult to resolve a deeply rooted conflict that has lasted for generations.

2.4.2.2 Studies in the Arabian Gulf Countries

Research in the Arab world has also shown that the Arab students have positive attitudes towards the Western languages, mainly English and they learn it
primarily for its utilitarian value. They are instrumentally motivated and are not integratively motivated.

The study of Fahmy & Bilton (1992) has indicated that Omani university TEFL students are secure in their identity as Omanis. They are not alienated from their cultural heritage and they are actively encouraged to feel pride in their identity as Omanis and members of the Arab world Community. The authors in this study point out that the TEFL students teachers exhibited a very positive orientation towards the use of study of English in Oman and did not appear to be overly fearful of becoming Westernized and apparent lack of hostility towards the English language and culture.

El-Sayed (1988, in Fahmy & Bilton, 1992) argues that even if one may accept the culture of the west, it could be difficult to separate the Western policies in the Arab World which can be accounted for suspicion and sometimes hostility on the part of the Arab learners of EFL.

... the hostility and suspicion one notice in the Arab World students' attitudes towards Western languages and cultures is natural, since it stems from the fact that west (Britain, France, and Italy) colonized the Arab world. Since English is a Western language, it is viewed by Arab students as a product of imperialism. Yet it is a language they have to learn (whether they like it or not) ... they feel that they are compelled to acquire English and they resign themselves to a status of subordination ideological dominance of the native speakers of English on Britain and America. Our students more through a stressful episodes of western accultaration and, as a result, it becomes difficult, according to Lambert for truly successful EFL learning situations to occur in Arab classes.

It seems that El-Sayed’s observation reflects the hostility that sometimes hinders the English language development of Arab students. This is might be not true because his observation is based on intuition and subjective rather than on data based studies. It is might be true that some Arab learners have negative attitudes towards learning the foreign language.

Indeed, the study of Arab students’ motivation and attitudes towards foreign language varies from one level to another. When learning the language based curriculum in higher education (i.e. Medical colleges), the students hold more positive attitudes and more motivated to study than when learning the language as compulsory/ obligatory course (i.e. school). In other words language status and its importance is a fundamental factor in formulating attitudes and motivation towards language study.

The research by Abu-Rabia & Feuerverger (1996) found that male Arab students in Canada showed only instrumental motivation in learning the English while Arab female students hold a strong integrative motivation. The research concluded that male Arab students viewed the Canadian context as one that clashes with their own cultural values, while females revealed a positive attitude toward Canadian society and a higher integrative motivation.

Abu-Rabia & Feuerverger have attributed the Arab female student’s strong integrative motivation to the personal and professional freedom that women in Canada and the West generally have.
The above studies indicated the favourable attitudes of Arab students towards the foreign language and also reveal the importance of the language in the region as the language of the world, commerce, higher education and to an extent for communicative purposes.