

Interrelationship between Motivation, Autonomy, and Proficiency Level of Iranian Elementary/Intermediate EFL Learners

Elaheh Salehi

MA Student, Department of English, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

Mehdi Vaez-Dalili *

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

Abstract

This study aimed at examining the interrelationship between motivation, autonomy, and language proficiency of Iranian elementary and intermediate EFL learners. To this end, an initial population of 72 EFL learners studying Translation Studies at Islamic Azad University of Isfahan took the Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT). Based on the results of the test, the participants were divided into elementary, intermediate, and advanced proficiency levels, but for the purpose of the study, only the elementary (n=30) and intermediate (n=30) learners were included, and the advanced learners were excluded from the study. The elementary and intermediate learners completed an autonomy and a motivation questionnaire. The degree of relationship between autonomy, motivation, and language proficiency level of the participants of the two groups were calculated by using a set of Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients. The findings of the data analysis for both groups revealed that the more proficient the EFL learners were, the more autonomous they were. Moreover, it was found that there was a significant and positive relationship between the motivation and the proficiency level of the learners in both elementary and intermediate groups. Most importantly, a significant relationship was found between the motivation and autonomy level of the learners in the two groups. The results of the present study could have implications for effective language teaching and learning.

Keywords: motivation, autonomy, language proficiency, EFL learner

INTRODUCTION

In general education, research into motivation suggests that motivation to learn and learning effectiveness can be increased in learners who take responsibility for their own learning, who understand and accept that their learning success is a result of effort, and that failure can be overtaken with greater effort and better use of strategies (Wang & Palincsar, 1989). Recently, second or foreign language researchers have also paired the importance of autonomy with motivation. Dickinson (1994) pointed out that

autonomous learners become more highly motivated and work more effectively. Cotterall (1999) asserted that learning motivation contributes to the development of learner autonomy by exploring self-efficacy. Xu, Peng, and Wu (2004) claimed that learner autonomy is influenced by learning motivation, which provides motive and direction for autonomous learning. Yu (2006) emphasized the role of motivation as an influential factor for autonomy. Nakata (2011) maintained that success is the extent to which personal autonomy is achieved because it is the key to motivation, and motivation is a grand driving force for creative performance.

Learner autonomy is a goal seen as linked to motivation (Brown, 2001; Dornyei, 2001; Garcia & Pintrich, 1996), to materials selection (Nunan, 1997; Tomlinson, 1998) and task motivation (Farrel & Lee, 2003). The goal of language teaching is to get students to adopt “legitimate procedures of language within social groups both inside and outside the classroom” (Hall & Beggs, 1998, p. 37), which points to the primacy of autonomy. Autonomy is found to be “more closely related to motivational factors than to performance and ... seem(s) to foster intrinsic goal orientation, task value, and self-efficiency, all of which are critical components of continuing motivation” (Garcia & Pintrich, 1996, p. 477). Finally, motivation and autonomy are seen as interwoven, with both intrinsic and extrinsic factors playing a significant role (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

Although there have been many studies on the interrelationship between motivation, autonomy, and language proficiency, there is paucity of research on the relationship between these factors across different proficiency levels. Taking this as the point of departure from previous studies, the purpose of the present study is to investigate the interrelationship between motivation, autonomy, and language proficiency of Iranian elementary and intermediate EFL learners.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Motivation and second language learning

The area of motivation in language learning over the past 30 years or so has been dominated by the social-psychological approach of Gardner and his associates (e.g. Gardner, 1985; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993). According to Gardner (1985), motivation is “the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes toward learning the language” (p. 10). Crooks and Schmidt (1991) define motivation in terms of choice, engagement, and persistence, as determined by interest, relevance, expectancy, and outcome. According to MacIntyre, MacMaster, & Baker (2001), motivation is “an attribute of the individual describing the psychological qualities underlying behavior with respect to a particular task”. This is clearly stated in the following:

“The motivated individual expends effort, is persistent and attentive to task at hand, has goals, desires and aspirations, enjoys the activity, experiences reinforcement from success and disappointment from failure, makes attributions concerning success and or failure, is aroused, and makes use of strategies to aid in achieving goals.” (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003, p. 123).

There are many studies which show the importance/role of motivation generally and in language learning specifically. Whitely (2002) pointed out that motivation involves the encouragement of people and helps them act in a particular way. According to Cook (2000), motivation, age, and personality are the principal factors affecting second language acquisition. He claims that, among the above the factors, motivation has the most effective role. In another study, Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) maintained that motivation plays a primary role in L2 learning, while other attributes such as the context play supporting roles on various levels. Motivation is also an important contributor to language achievement in terms of linguistic outcomes, which traditionally embrace learning the components of language (i.e. vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation) and the four basic skills of language, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Gardner, 1985). Apart from the role that intellectual capacity and language aptitude play in a second or foreign language learning (Gardner & Lambert, 1972), motivation is a major factor in the successful study of language acquisition. Similarly, Ehrman (1996) stressed the affective dimension of students, emphasizing that strong motivation helps students organize their skills, whereas low motivation and high anxiety interferes with their ability to utilize their skills and abilities.

Cognitive psychologists have suggested three major types of motivation. 'Intrinsic motivation', which is the desire to engage in activities characterized by enjoyment (Deci & Ryan, 1985). In other words, it is an internal desire to engage in an activity because the activity itself is interesting and satisfying. The second one is 'extrinsic motivation', which can be triggered only by external cues that include gaining and maintaining peer, sibling, or adult approval, avoiding peer or sibling or adult disapproval, and gaining or losing specific tangible rewards. In fact, extrinsic motivation is associated with lower levels of self-esteem and higher levels of anxiety compared to intrinsic motivation. Finally, 'achievement motivation' refers to the motivation and commitment to excel.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) also made a distinction between integrative and 'instrumental motivation'. 'Integrative motivation' refers to an interest in learning an L2 in order to socio-culturally integrate with members of the target language community, while 'instrumental motivation' refers to an interest in learning an L2 for functional purposes such as getting a job or passing an examination. In several studies, Gardner, Lambert, and colleagues (e.g. Gardner, 1985) reported that integrative motivation is far superior to instrumental motivation.

In Dornyei's (1998) taxonomy, motivation is comprised of three levels: the *language level*, the *learner level*, and the *learning situation level*. The motivation processes at the 'language' level can be described by using the traditional concepts of integrative and instrumental motivation. At the 'learner' level, motivation involves the influence of various individual traits of language learners such as the need for achievement and self-confidence. The 'learning situation' level is also influenced by a number of intrinsic and extrinsic motives.

Motivation is dynamic in nature and can vary from moment to moment depending on a variety of factors, including how students perceive their own achievement, what

materials they use, what tasks they do in and out of the classroom, how autonomous they feel, classroom methodology, students' relationship to the classroom groups as well as to the society at large, how they view their teacher and power relationships with the educational institution, the culture they bring to the classroom, and their own anxiety, especially in classroom activities such as speaking and test taking. The importance of the teacher factor in having a high level of motivation in second language acquisition cannot be neglected. The choice of the teaching strategy has an effect upon the motivation and interest of the students so that an enthusiastic approach is more likely to motivate students than a dull approach. It is undoubtedly correct to state that students themselves control their motivation in language learning. Matsumoto (2011) claimed that although learners' motivation is influenced by the teachers, students are still the primary individuals who motivate themselves in learning a language.

Masgoret and Gardner (2003) believed that both 'educational context' and 'cultural context' play an important role in the formation of motivation. The *educational context* refers generally to educational system in which the students are registered, and the *cultural context* refers to one's attitudes, beliefs, personality characteristics, ideas, and expectations. Based on findings of Hussin, Maarof, and D'Cruz (2001) six factors influence motivation in language learning: attitudes, beliefs about self, goals, involvement, environmental support, and personal attributes.

Autonomy and second language learning

The concept of autonomy has recently assumed a central role in the field of language learning. The conceptual parameters of the term are defined by the capacity for detachment, critical reflection, decision making, and independent action; it also encompasses varied constructs like making an informed choice, independent ability, and responsible decision-making and execution (Crabe, 1999; Dickinson, 1993). Perhaps, the most often quoted definition of autonomy is proposed by Holec, who defines it as 'the ability to take charge of one's own learning'. In his view, to take charge of one's own learning is to have and hold the responsibility for all the decisions concerning all aspects of this learning, including "determining the objectives, defining the contents and progressions, selecting methods and techniques to be used, monitoring the procedures of acquisition, and evaluating what has been acquired" (Holec, 1981, p. 3).

Little (1991, p. 4) argues that autonomy in learners can "take numerous different forms, depending on their age, how far they have progressed with their learning, what they perceive their immediate learning needs to be, and so on". Benson (2001) defined and described learner autonomy as the capacity to take control of one's own learning, largely because the construct of "control" appears to be more open to investigation than the construct of "charge" or "responsibility". He argued that an adequate description of autonomy in language learning should at least recognize the importance of three levels at which learner control may be exercised: *control over learning management*, *control over cognitive process*, and *control over learning content* (Benson, 2001).

In the particular case of second and foreign languages, effective communication depends on a complex set of procedural skills that develop only through use. If language learning depends crucially on language use, learners who enjoy a high degree of social autonomy in their learning environment should find it easier than others to master the full range of discourse roles on which effective spontaneous communication depends (Little, 2002). Little and Dam (1998) pointed out that the pedagogical justification for fostering the development of learner autonomy in language learning relies on the claim that in formal educational contexts, reflection and self-awareness produce better learning. Similarly, Rebenius (2003) considered learner autonomy as a means to enhance efficiency in language learning. Kohonen (2003) also attributed learner autonomy to learner development, arguing that the learner should be developed both as a language user and as a student. Umeda (2000) specified three reasons for considering autonomy as significant in the general education perspective: (1) fostering a survival capacity to cope with rapid social changes, (2) developing the learner's individuality, and (3) improving the diversity of learner's cultural and educational background.

Researchers maintain that learning does not take place in a vacuum and 'autonomy' does not necessarily imply learning on one's own. Interaction, negotiation, collaboration, etc., are important factors in promoting learner autonomy. Candy (1991) believes that autonomy is a necessary way of effective learning. Dickinson (1987) proposed five reasons for the promotion of learner autonomy in language learning: motivation, practical reasons, individual differences, educational aims, and learning how to learn foreign languages.

Autonomy is not a natural talent, and certain conditions need to be set up for achieving autonomous language learning (Thanasoulas, 2000). These are learner training in cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies, active learner involvement in defining and attaining goals, participation in monitoring progress, use of authentic materials, improvement in motivation, developing positive beliefs and attitudes towards learning and knowledge about the nature of language learning (Lamb, 2003; Lee, 1998; Little & Dam, 1998). Dornyei (2001) claimed that learner autonomy can be fostered using these types of practices: *resource-based approaches*, which emphasize independent interaction with learning materials, *technology-based approaches*, which emphasize independent interaction with educational technologies, *learner-based approaches*, which emphasize the direct production of behavioral and psychological changes in the learner, *classroom-based approaches*, which emphasize changes in the relationship between learners and teachers in the classroom, and *curriculum-based approaches*, which extend the idea of learner control over the planning and evaluation of learning to the curriculum as a whole.

Studies on motivation, autonomy, and second language learning

Among the empirical studies which have indicated the relationship between motivation and language learning, Gardner and Lambert (1959) stated that motivation is the most compelling factor when a language learner or user is tasked to learn an L2. Based on their study, Canadian learners of French, who found themselves interested to be part of

the French-speaking community, became better learners of French. Moreover, they asserted that those subjects who considered learning an L2 as a tedious task, which demands so many variables and considerations, tended not to be good learners.

Masgoret and Gardner's (2003) meta-analysis of the studies undertaken by Gardner and associates, in which 75 independent samples and more than 10,000 participants were analyzed, revealed that the correlation between language and achievement was largely positive. In another study, Taguchi (2006) found that motivation and academic gains are not significantly correlated, and this may be due to the complex mixture of factors described by different motivational theories and language learning processes. Furthermore, Salem (2006) in her study revealed that motivation in general does not correlate with EFL proficiency.

Regarding the effect of motivation on academic performance, Hashemian and Heidari-Soureshjani (2011) studied the interrelationship of autonomy, motivation, and the academic performance of Persian L2 learners in distance education contexts. Their study indicated a positive and significant relationship between motivation and grade point average (GPA). Similarly, Ghanea, Zeraat-Pishe, & Ghanea (2011) studied the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' (integrative and instrumental) motivation and English proficiency. They concluded that there was a significant relationship between the motivation and proficiency of the learners in their study.

Some researchers have also studied the relationship between learner autonomy and language proficiency empirically. Corno and Mandinach (1983) initially proposed that learner autonomy could help to improve the language proficiency of learners and concluded that autonomous learners were learners of high language proficiency. Risemberg and Zimmerman (1992) further pointed out that those with a high degree of learner autonomy showed high scores and those with low degrees of learner autonomy exhibited low scores. Ablard and Lipschutz (1998) argued that the high-achievement students exploited different autonomy strategies. Additionally, Zhang and Li (2004) concluded that learners' autonomy was closely related to their proficiency level.

In another study, Dafei (2007) investigated the relationship between autonomy and English language proficiency of learners. One hundred and twenty nine non-English Chinese students participated in his study. The data were collected through a questionnaire and an interview. The results showed a significant and positive relationship between the two variables, suggesting that when learners had similar proficiency levels, the degree of their autonomy was also the same, and when they lay in different levels of proficiency, their autonomy also differed significantly.

Lowe (2009) investigated the correlation between learner autonomy as measured by the Learner Autonomy Profile-Short Form (LAP-SF), constituting desire, resourcefulness, initiative, and persistence in learning and academic performance as measured by the GPA. The results of the study revealed that there was a positive and significant correlation between the LAP-SF total score and total GPA, indicating a significant relationship between learner autonomy and academic performance. Xhaferi

and Khaferi (2011) analyzed learners' diary on their capacity to monitor their own learning. They reported that autonomy is a key factor in learners' participation and achievements. Similarly, Qi (2011) reported that learners with a high degree of learner autonomy achieved higher language proficiency.

Some studies have also been conducted to explore the relationship between motivation and autonomy. Ushioda (1996) stated that autonomous learners are motivated learners by definition. Benson (2007) and Spratt, Humphreys, and Chan (2002) believed that to learn autonomously, motivation played a considerable role in learners and took priority over autonomy. Contrary to Spratt, Humphreys, and Chan (2002), Vandergrift (2005) found that autonomy precedes motivation. Zarei and Elekaie (2012) reported a low but positive relationship between motivation and autonomy.

METHOD

Research design

This study used a descriptive method and a correlational design to demonstrate if there was any significant interrelationship between motivation, autonomy, and proficiency level of Iranian elementary and intermediate EFL learners. For collecting the required data, a placement test and two questionnaires were given to the participants.

Research questions

The present study sought to investigate the following research questions:

1. Is there any significant relationship between autonomy and language proficiency of Iranian elementary EFL learners?
2. Is there any significant relationship between motivation and language proficiency of Iranian elementary EFL learners?
3. Is there any significant relationship between autonomy and motivation of Iranian elementary EFL learners?
4. Is there any significant relationship between autonomy and language proficiency of Iranian intermediate EFL learners?
5. Is there any significant relationship between motivation and language proficiency of Iranian intermediate EFL learners?
6. Is there any significant relationship between autonomy and motivation of Iranian intermediate EFL learners?

Participants

An initial cohort of 72 Iranian male/female freshmen and sophomores majoring in Translation Studies at Azad University of Isfahan were asked to take part in the present study. They were Persian speakers of English within the 18-23 age range, who were selected based on a convenience sampling procedure. They were all required to take the Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) in the first phase of the study. Based on the results of the test, the participants were divided into three groups of elementary, intermediate,

and advanced learners, but for the purpose of the study, only the elementary (n= 30) and intermediate (n= 30) learners were included, and the advanced learners (n= 11) were excluded from the study. The elementary and intermediate learners were then required to fill out a motivation and an autonomy questionnaire in the second phase of the study.

Data collection instruments

The following three instruments were utilized to gather the required data according to the purpose of this study.

Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT)

The first version of the Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) was used to assign the participants to different proficiency levels before the main phase of the study. This test contains 60 multiple-choice items of vocabulary, structure, and cloze test. The participants are required to complete the test in 30 minutes.

Motivation questionnaire

An 18-item questionnaire, adopted from Noels, Pelletier, Clement, and Valler (2000), was used to measure the motivation of the respondents for learning a second language (Appendix A). The items of the questionnaire are all structured so that they are semantically positive. The questionnaire uses a five-point Likert scale, from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*, whereby the students answer the statements based on their own perception about motivation and language learning. The validity of the questionnaire had already been established by Noels et al. (2000). The questionnaire had also good internal reliability, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.87 (i.e. Cronbach's alpha= 0.87), suggesting that the reliability of the questionnaire was high enough.

Autonomy questionnaire

The participants' autonomy was measured by an 11-item questionnaire developed by Zhang and Li (2004) (Appendix B). It involved 11 statements with a five-point Likert scale (i.e. *never, rarely, sometimes, often, always*). The validity of the questionnaire had already been established by Zhang and Li (2004). The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the reliability of the questionnaire was 0.83, showing that the reliability of the questionnaire was high enough for the purpose of the study.

Procedure

In the first session of the study, the Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) was administered to 72 BA students of Translation Studies at Azad University of Isfahan. Based on the results of this test, the participants were divided into three groups of elementary, intermediate, and advanced EFL learners. As the population included freshman and sophomore, most of the students in the population already turned out to be at the elementary and intermediate levels. In fact, according to the scoring rubric of

the OQPT, few students were at the advanced levels, and they were all excluded from the study. In the second session of the study, the participants in the elementary (n=30) and intermediate (n=30) groups filled out the motivation and autonomy questionnaires in around 7 minutes.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics

The Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) as well as the motivation and autonomy questionnaires were administered to the elementary and intermediate participants of the study. The OQPT consisted of 60 items overall. According to the scoring rubric of OQPT, participants whose scores fell between 19 to 26 were elementary learners, and those with scores between 28 to 42 were categorized as intermediate-level learners. As shown in Table 1, the mean scores of the elementary and intermediate groups were respectively 23.80 and 32.30.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for the OQPT Scores of both Groups

Group	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Elementary	30	19	26	23.80	2.07	4.30
Intermediate	30	28	42	32.30	4.07	16.56

The descriptive statistics related to the autonomy and motivation questionnaires of the two groups of participants are given in Table 2. Comparing the mean scores of the autonomy questionnaire across the elementary and intermediate groups indicates that the intermediate group evinced a relatively higher level of autonomy. As for the motivation questionnaire, the mean scores of the elementary and intermediate groups were respectively 63.90 and 67.83, suggesting that the intermediate group had a relatively higher level of motivation.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for the Autonomy and Motivation Questionnaires of both Groups

Questionnaire	Group	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Autonomy	Elementary	30	23	46	33.90	5.66	32.09
	Intermediate	30	22	48	37.33	6.34	40.29
Motivation	Elementary	30	31	80	63.90	10.99	120.92
	Intermediate	30	33	87	67.83	10.22	104.48

Inferential statistics

In order to investigate the interrelationships between the autonomy, motivation, and proficiency level of the learners in the two groups, a set of Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation were run, the details of which are given in the following sections. The first, the second, and the third research questions investigated if there were significant correlations between the autonomy, motivation and proficiency level of

the Iranian elementary EFL learners. Table 3 in the following illustrates the summary of the correlations between these three variables:

Table 3. Pearson Product-Moment Coefficients of Correlation between Autonomy, Motivation and Proficiency Level of the Iranian Elementary EFL Learners

Scale	OQPT Score	Autonomy Score	Motivation Score
OQPT Score	-	.56	.62
Autonomy Score		-	.69
Motivation Score			-

** $p < .05$ (2-tailed)

According to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988), a correlation is weak if it falls between 0 and $\pm .29$, moderate if ranges from $\pm .30$ to $\pm .49$, and strong if it is larger than $\pm .50$. Based on this guideline, there were positive and strong correlations between the autonomy and language proficiency of the elementary EFL learners (i.e. $r = .56$), between their motivation and their proficiency level ($r = .62$), and between their autonomy and motivation level ($r = .69$).

The fourth, the fifth, and the sixth research questions explored if there were significant correlations between Iranian intermediate EFL learners' autonomy, motivation and proficiency level. Table 4 in the following summarizes the relevant data for the intermediate learners:

Table 4. Pearson Product-Moment Coefficients of Correlation between Autonomy, Motivation and Proficiency Level of the Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners

Scale	OQPT Score	Autonomy Score	Motivation Score
OQPT Score	-	.61	.69
Autonomy Score		-	.76
Motivation Score			-

** $p < .05$ (2-tailed)

Based on Cohen's (1988) guideline, there were positive and high correlations between the autonomy and language proficiency of the intermediate EFL learners (i.e. $r = .61$), between their motivation and their proficiency level ($r = .69$), and between their autonomy and motivation level ($r = .76$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The present study aimed at investigating the interrelationship between autonomy, motivation, and proficiency level of Iranian elementary and intermediate EFL learners. The finding of data analysis revealed that there was a positive and strong relationship between the degree of the autonomy and language proficiency level of both elementary and intermediate learners. This finding is in line with Qi (2011), who concluded that learners with a high degree of learner autonomy achieve high scores in language proficiency and vice versa.

Additionally, the present study proved that there was a positive and significant relationship between motivation and language proficiency of the elementary and intermediate learners. This finding is compatible with the results of the studies conducted by Hashemian and Heidari-Soureshjani (2011) and Ghanea, Zeraat-Pishe, and Ghanea (2011) in which they found a significant correlation between Iranian EFL learners' motivation and their proficiency level. The result, however, was in contradiction with the findings of Salem (2006) and Taguchi (2006), who revealed in their studies that EFL learners' motivation in general does not significantly correlate with their level of proficiency.

The last relationship which was explored in this research was the high and significant relationship between motivation and autonomy of the learners. This finding was consistent with the findings of Zarei and Elekaie (2012) who studied the relationship between motivation and autonomy and found a significant but low positive relationship between these two variables. In addition, the findings of the present study were in line with Ushioda (1996), Masgoret and Gardner (2003), Corno and Mandinach (1983), Ablard and Lipschutz (1998), and Zhang and Li (2004).

Considering the vital role of motivation, autonomy, and level of language proficiency in L2 learning studies, the results of this study recommend that these factors should receive attention in L2 learning and teaching, as they can lead to more effective teaching and learning. Based on the findings of the present study, language teachers should consider L2 learners' motivation, their autonomy in learning, and find these factors important in second/foreign language gain. Taking account of the interrelationship between autonomy, motivation, and language proficiency is not only a considerable issue for teachers in selecting appropriate teaching methods, strategies, and materials, but also for students to improve their motivation and autonomy in order to overcome their learning problems and being more successful learners in varied contexts.

This study had some limitations that should be pointed out. A limitation of this study was the small sample size of the participants, which restricts its generalizability to other samples and contexts. The other limitation was the fact that the questionnaires used in this study had few items for identifying the learners' motivation and autonomy. Moreover, learners with advanced proficiency level were not included in this study.

Considering the above-mentioned limitations of the study, some suggestions are put forward in this section. Other researchers can have more respondents or larger samples to draw a more generalizable conclusion as regards the interrelationship of motivation, autonomy, and language learning. Furthermore, future studies can be conducted by using questionnaires with more items and by using other data collection instruments such as interview and keeping learner's diaries in addition to questionnaires. It is also possible to replicate this research by including advanced learners. Besides, future studies can find the relationship between motivation and autonomy with other factors such as gender, self-esteem, anxiety, the four skills involved in second language learning, and so on, rather than with language proficiency.

References

- Ablard, K. E., & Lipschultz, R. E. (1998). Self-regulated learning in high-achieving students: Relationships to advanced reasoning, achievement goals, and gender. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*, 94-101.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Benson, P. (2007). Autonomy in language teaching and learning: State-of-the-art article. *Language Teaching, 40*(1), 21-40.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles*. New York: Longman.
- Candy, P. C. (1991). *Self-direction for lifelong learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd edn). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cook, V. (2000). *Second language learning and language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Corno, L., & Mandinach, E. B. (1983). The role of cognitive engagement in classroom learning and motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 18*, 88-108.
- Cotterall, S. (1999). Key variables in language learning: What the learners believe about them. *System, 27*(4), 493-513.
- Crabbe, D. (1999). Defining the field: introduction. In S. Cotterall & D. Crabbe (Eds.), *Learner autonomy in language learning: Defining the field and effecting change* (pp. 3-9). Frankfurt: Bayreuth.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning, 41*, 469-512.
- Dafei, D. (2007). An exploration of the relationship between learner autonomy and English proficiency. *Asian EFL Journal, 9*(1), 1-23.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dickinson, L. (1993). Talking shop: aspects of autonomous learning. *ELT Journal, 47*(4), 330-336.
- Dickinson, L. (1994). Learner autonomy: What, why, and how? In V. J. Leffa (Ed.), *Autonomy in language learning* (pp. 2-12). Porto Alegre: Universidade/UFRGS.
- Dornyei, Z. (1998). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning, 40*, 46-78.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Ehraman, M. E. (1996). *Understanding second language learning difficulties*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Farrel, T. S. C., & Lee, F. T. (2003). Bridging the gap between words and action. In G. Hadely (Ed.), *Action research in action* (pp. 9-15). Singapore: SEAMO Regional Language Centre.

- Garcia, T., & Pintrich, P. R. (1996). The effects of autonomy on motivation and performance in the college classroom. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 21*, 477-486.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13*, 27-266.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitude and motivation in second language learning*. Rowely, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychological and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). The students' contribution to second language learning: affective variables. *Language Teaching, 26*, 1-11.
- Ghanea, M., Zeraat-Pishe, H. R., & Ghanea, M. H. (2011). The Relationship between Learners' Motivation (Integrative and Instrumental) and English Proficiency among Iranian EFL Learners. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering, 5*(11), 1368-1374.
- Hall, O., & Beggs, E. (1998). Defining learner autonomy. In Renandya, W. & Jacobs, G. M. (Eds.), *Learners and language learning* (pp. 26-39). Singapore: SEAMO Regional Language Centre.
- Hashmian, M., & Heidari-Soureshjani, K. H. (2011). The interrelationship of autonomy, motivation, and academic performance of Persian L2 learners in distance education contexts. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1*(4), 319-326.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Hussin, S., Maarof, N., & D'cruz, J. (2001). Sustaining interest in learning English and increasing the motivation to learn English: An enrichment program. *TESOL Journal, 7*(5).
- Kohonen, V. (2003). Student autonomy and the teachers' professional growth: Fostering a collegial school culture in language teacher education. In Inozu, J. (Ed.), *Developing learner autonomy in the language class in Turkey: voices from the classroom*. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 12*, 523-531.
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Little, D. (2002). Learner autonomy and second/foreign language learning. In *The guide to good practice for learning and teaching in languages, linguistics and area studies*. LTSN Subject Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies, University of Southampton.
- Little, D., & Dam, L. (1998). Learner autonomy: What and why? *The Language Teacher Online, 22*(10), 7-15.
- Lowe, C. (2009). *A correlational study of the relationship between learner-autonomy and academic performance*. Doctoral Dissertation. The George Washington University, Washington, D. C., USA.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Mackmaster, K., & Baker, S. C. (2001). The convergence of multiple models of motivation for second language learning: Gardner, Pintrich, Khul, and McCroskey. In Z. Dornyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language*

- acquisition*. (Technical report_# 23, pp. 461-492). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Centre.
- Masgoret, A. M., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language Learning*, 53(1), 123-167.
- Matsumoto, M. (2011). Second language learners' motivation and their perception of their teachers as an affecting factor. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 17(2), 37-52.
- Nakata, Y. (2011). Teachers' readiness for promoting learner autonomy: A study of Japanese EFL high school teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 900-910.
- Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clement, R., & Valler, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 57-85.
- Nunan, D. (1997). Designing and adapting materials to encourage learner autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Vollert (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning*, (pp. 192-203). Longman: London.
- Qi, A. (2011). On the relationships between learner autonomy and language proficiency: An investigation of Chinese English majors. *Energy Procedia*, 13, 9976-9982.
- Rebenius, I. (2003). *Discussing learner autonomy*. Paper presented at the Canadian conference on developing autonomy in the FL classroom. Tenerife, Spain: The University of La Laguna.
- Risemberg, R., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1992). Self-regulated in gifted students. *Roper Rivise*, 15(2), 98-101.
- Salem, N. (2006). *The role of motivation, gender, and language learning strategies in EFL proficiency*. Master's Thesis. The American University of Beirut, Lebanon.
- Spratt, M., Humphreys, G., & Chan, V. (2002). Autonomy and motivation: Which comes first? *Language Teaching Research*, 6(3), 245-266.
- Taguchi, K. (2006). Is motivation a predictor of foreign language learning? *International Education Journal*, 7, 560-569.
- Thanasoulas, D. (2000). What is learner autonomy and how can it be fostered? *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11(1). Retrieved September, 2016 from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Thanasoulas-Autonomy.html>.
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). Conclusion. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching*, (pp. 340-344). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Umeda, Y. (2000). The teacher's role in Japanese language attaching importance to learner autonomy. Searching for the possibility of autonomous learning toward foreign college students. *Aichi University language and culture*, 12. Retrieved September, 19, 2016, from http://leo.aichi-u.ac.jp/%7Egoken/bulletin/pdfs/NO12/04_Umeda.pdf
- Ushioda, E. (1996) *Learner autonomy 5: The role of motivation*. Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Vandergrift, L. (2005). Relationships among motivations, orientations, meta-cognitive awareness and proficiency in L2 listening. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(1), 70-89.

- Wang, M. C., & Palincsar, A. S. (1989). Teaching students to assume an active role in their learning. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 71-84). London: Pergamon Press.
- Whitely, P. (2002). *Motivation*. United Kingdom: Capstone Publishing.
- Xhaferi, B., & Xhaferi, G. (2011). Developing learner autonomy in higher education in Macedonia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 11, 150-154.
- Xu, J., Peng, R., & Wu, W. (2004). An investigation and analysis on non-English major college students' autonomous learning ability. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 36(1), 64-68.
- Yu, P. (2006). On the factors influencing learner autonomy in Chinese EFL contexts. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 3(5), 5-9.
- Zarei, A. A., & Elekaei, A. (2012). *Learner autonomy and language learning strategies: An empirical analysis*. Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Zhang, L. X., & Li, X. X. (2004). A comparative study on learner autonomy between Chinese students and west European students. *Foreign Language World*, 4, 15-23.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Survey questionnaire for language learning motivation

Directions:

Read carefully the sentences on the left portion of the survey questionnaire and tick (√) the corresponding box that tells the degree of your motivation in studying and learning English. Please be honest with all your responses. Use the scale enumerated as your guide in answering.

- 1- Strongly Disagree
- 2- Moderately Disagree
- 3- Agree
- 4- Moderately Agree
- 5- Strongly Agree

Questions	1	2	3	4	5
1. My time is productively spent in studying English.					
2. I fully know why I am studying the English language.					
3. Studying English is expected of me.					
4. I study English to get a more prestigious job in the future.					
5. I study English to have a better salary in the future.					
6. Studying English makes me a good citizen.					
7. I am proud of myself for I can speak in English with the members of communities whose first language is my second.					
8. It is my choice to study English.					
9. I study English for personal development					
10. I study English, so I can be more knowledgeable about the literature of the second language group.					
11. English language makes me discover new things.					
12. I enjoy gaining knowledge about the users of the English language and their way of life.					

13. I have a pleasurable feeling if I surpass myself in second language studies.

14. I enjoy whenever I grasp a difficult construct in the second language.

15. I feel satisfied when I am in the process of accomplishing difficult tasks in the second language.

16. I feel accomplished when I understand people speaking in second language.

17. I feel proud of myself when I can speak in my second language.

18. I have a pleasurable feeling whenever I hear members of my community also speak our second language.

Appendix B. Learner autonomy questionnaire

Direction: Please, circle the one closest answer to the following questions according to your true cases. Thank you very much for your help and patience!

Questionnaire Statements	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1. I think I have the ability to learn English well.					
2. I make good use of my free time in English study.					
3. I preview before the class.					
4. I find I can finish my task in time					
5. I keep a record of my study, such as keeping a diary, writing review etc.					
6. I make self-exam with the exam papers chosen by myself					
7. I reward myself such as going shopping, playing etc. when I progress.					
8. I attend out-class activities to practice and learn the language.					
9. During the class, I try to catch chances to take part in activities such as pair/group discussion, role-play, etc.					
10. I know my strengths and weaknesses in my English study.					
11. I choose books, exercises which suit me, neither too difficult nor too easy.					