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The present study aimed to examine the potential relationship between willingness to communicate and intrinsic/extrinsic motivation among Iranian intermediate learners studying English as a foreign language. It also attempted to identify the motivational orientation which best predicted willingness to communicate. This study was based on a hybrid framework of the second language willingness to communicate model and the self-determination theory as the motivational framework. It followed a mixed-method design combined with quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis procedures. For the present study, 133 intermediate EFL learners, who were selected among 164 ones through administering a proficiency test, were required to fill out a questionnaire for measuring their L2 WTC and language learning motivation. All participants were interviewed immediately after delivering their questionnaires, and their attitudes regarding their L2 WTC, and motivation in learning English were surveyed. To explore the possible relationship between intrinsic/ extrinsic motivation and L2 WTC, Pearson correlation coefficient and multiple regression were conducted. Results indicated that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were positively and significantly related to L2 WTC. However, only intrinsic motivation made a statistically significant unique contribution to the prediction of L2 WTC in English. According to the results of the interview few of the learners were identified as amotivated ones, while most of them were motivated to learn English. Half of the the motivated learners were both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated, less than half of them were intrinsically motivated, and few of them were extrinsically motivated.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION
Chapter One
Introduction

1.1. Introduction

The past century of second and foreign language (FL) teaching has witnessed substantial changes in teaching methods (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In the past, the aim of teaching English was the mastery of structures but nowadays English is considered as an international language. So the purpose of language learning has been turned into promoting "the learners’ communicative competence in the target language" (Dörnyei, 2005, p.207) and as a result communicative language teaching has been developed.

As Yu (2009) asserts theoretical examination and empirical studies which have been conducted over the current decade have primarily promoted the important role of using language to communicate in second and FL learning and teaching. Therefore, it seems reasonable to claim that second language (L2) learners cannot become proficient unless they use language communicatively. In spite of the importance of communication in fostering L2, Asian L2 learners are regarded as reticent and passive learners (Cheng, 2000), and even when they have the opportunity to use L2, they show differences in speaking L2, for example, some of them seek every opportunity to speak in the classroom, while many others remain silent (Fallah, 2014).

Willingness to communicate (WTC) in L2 is the construct that explains such differences in learners’ intention to communicate in L2 and accounts for learners' communicative inclinations. It is considered as the ultimate goal of language learning; in fact higher WTC in a foreign language facilitates L2 use. Therefore, MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels (1998) proposed that the main objective of L2 learning should be to "engender in language students the willingness to seek out communication opportunities and the willingness actually to communicate in them" (p. 547).
WTC was originally conceptualized with reference to first or native language (L1) verbal communication. It was introduced to the communication literature by McCroskey and Richmond (1987) based on Burgoon’s (1976) work on unwillingness to communicate, Mortensen, Arnston, and Lustig’s (1977) work on predisposition toward verbal behavior, and McCroskey and Richmond’s (1982) work on shyness. WTC was initially referred to as individual’s general personality orientation towards talking by McCroskey and Richmond (1987). Considering WTC as a personality trait, McCroskey and his associates suggested that WTC reflected a stable predisposition to talk, which was relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts.

MacIntyre et al. (1998) believed that "it is highly unlikely that WTC in the second language is a simple manifestation of WTC in the L1" (p. 546). They developed a comprehensive model of L2 WTC by integrating linguistic, communicative, and social psychological variables to explain one’s WTC in L2. MacIntyre et al. defined L2 WTC as a "readiness to enter into discourse, at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using L2" (p.547). However, they did not treat WTC in L2 as a personality trait but as a situational variable that has both transient and enduring influences. Moreover, MacIntyre et al. theorized that WTC influences not only speaking mode but also listening, writing and reading modes.

To illustrate the WTC model, they resorted to a pyramid which explains the probable causes of WTC in L2. The top of the pyramid shows the moment of L2 communication, followed by WTC, which predicts actual communication behavior. The state communicative self-confidence and desire to communicate with a specific person are situational factors that follow WTC. At the bottom of the pyramid, intergroup climate and personality are placed as enduring influences.

Intermediate layers include motivational propensities and affective-cognitive context, which incorporate motivation, intergroup attitudes, communicative competence, L2 self-
confidence, and social situation. It is hypothesized that while the top layers of the pyramid have immediate influence the bottom layers have less influence on WTC.

L2 WTC has been recently studied in relation to different personality, affective, and social psychological variables (e.g., Cetinkaya, 2005; Clement, Baker, & MacIntyre, 2003; Hashimoto, 2002; Khajavy, Ghoonsooly & Hosseini Fatemi, 2016; Kim, 2004; MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, & Donovan, 2002; 2003; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Yashima, 2002; Yu, 2009). These studies have illustrated that perceived language competence (rather than actual competence) and lack of communication anxiety are the most immediate antecedents of L2 WTC and directly relate to learners’ WTC in L2 (e.g., Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; Hashimoto, 2002; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Yashima, 2002).

 Totally, several studies have been carried out to explore L2 WTC in relation to various individual difference (ID) factors such as motivation which has been included in the fourth layer of MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) heuristic model (e.g., MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Yashima, 2002). It has been recognized that students’ motivation is directly (e.g., Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; Hashimoto, 2002; MacIntyre et al., 2002; Yashima, 2002;) or indirectly (e.g., Cetinkaya, 2005; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996) related to their WTC. This type of inconsistency among the findings of previous studies suggests some further studies to shed more light on the issue.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

A look into previous studies demonstrates that most of L2 WTC studies, have been conducted in English as a second language (ESL) settings (e.g., Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; Clement et al., 2003; Hashimoto, 2002; MacIntyre, Babin & Clément, 1999; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément & Conrod, 2001; MacIntyre, Burns & Jessome, 2011; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; MacIntyre et al., 2002) rather than English as a foreign language (EFL) context (e.g., Cetinkaya, 2005; Fallah, 2014; Kim, 2004; Yashima, 2002). Besides, among EFL conducted research some have been done in Japanese (e.g., Yashima, 2002), Korean (e.g., Kim, 2004), Turkish (e.g.,
Cetinkaya, 2005) or Chinese EFL contexts (e.g., Yu, 2009) while few ones have examined the relationship between L2 WTC and motivation among Iranian EFL learners (e.g., Fallah, 2014; Ghonsooly, Khajavi & Asadpour, 2012). Furthermore, very few studies have explored the relationship between WTC and extrinsic/intrinsic motivation in EFL contexts especially in Iran.

Also most of the available questionnaires for measuring learners’ L2 WTC are more appropriate for ESL contexts in which participants are asked about situations that they experience in their everyday lives (e.g., talk with a friend while standing in line or in the elevator) (Cao & Philp, 2006; Peng & Woodrow, 2010). Since such experiences are very rare for FL learners, asking them to respond to such questionnaire would not be appropriate. The present study intends to employ a questionnaire which is more appropriate for EFL settings which focus on learner's L2 WTC in an EFL classroom context rather than their WTC in an L2 communication environment outside the boundaries of a class.

To date, several studies have examined the relationship between L2 WTC and motivation in ESL (e.g., MacIntyre et al., 2002; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Hashimoto, 2002) or EFL (e.g., Fallah, 2014; Khajavy et al., 2016; Peng, 2007; Yu, 2009) context. However, most of the studies which have been conducted in EFL setting (e.g., Cetinkaya, 2005; Fallah, 2014; Peng, 2007; Yu, 2009) have utilized Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model as the motivational framework, while this model is useful for multilingual settings and has little exploratory power for understanding motivational features in the EFL classroom (Dornyei, 2005). Contrary to the Gardner’s model, self-determination theory (SDT) focuses on cognitive and humanistic aspects of motivation and its theoretical principles relate to human beings' basic psychological needs to environmental factors (Peng & Woodrow, 2010), and unlike Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model, SDT can be applied in EFL classroom contexts (Khajavy et al., 2016). Therefore, the present study employs MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) model, as WTC framework, and SDT as the
motivational framework, in order to investigate the interrelation between WTC and extrinsic/intrinsic motivation in Iranian classroom context.

Last but not least concerned point is that most of the previous studies related to language learners’ L2 WTC have adopted only quantitative research methods (e.g., Hashimoto, 2002; Peng, 2007; Yu, 2009) while this study employs a mixed-method design that combines both quantitative as well as qualitative data collection and analysis methods to examine the L2 WTC model using multiple data collection techniques and make a comprehensive interpretation of the quantitative data. Moreover, the current study examines learners’ L2 WTC in both oral and written modes through running an interview where not only learners’ L2 WTC in speaking mode is measured but also, listening, writing, and reading modes are investigated.

1.3. Significance of the Study

MacIntyre et al. (1998) claimed that their heuristic model of WTC can be of practical and pedagogical use in explaining IDs in L2 WTC. Findings of the current study can indicate that how teachers, syllabus designers, and learners themselves must deal with motivational issues and which techniques (or materials) they should use in order to foster their motivation and in turn their L2 WTC. As Khajavy et al. (2016) asserted teachers play a significant role in promoting L2 WTC in the classroom, because they can provide a friendly and relaxed environment to facilitate proper contact with the students. Most of the classes in Iran are teacher-centered, where teachers are the authority in the class and a distance is kept between teachers and students. Teachers in Iran can remove this distance and make the classroom context more interesting by including jokes and humor.

Moreover, enhancing cooperation, collaboration, and support among students can create a helpful and encouraging classroom environment for learning English. Research has indicated that cooperation reduces the anxiety among learners and makes the classroom environment more relaxed and enjoyable (Price, 1991). Motivated learners feel more competent and are less
anxious about communicating in English in the classroom. Teachers can decrease language learners’ anxiety by creating a supportive and relaxing learning environment, setting goals that are not too easy or too difficult, and using anxiety-reducing techniques (Dornyei, 1994). Dornyei and Csizer (1998), in a survey of Hungarian teachers of English, proposed a taxonomy of factors such as developing a relationship with learners, building learners' self-confidence and autonomy, personalizing the learning process, and increasing learners' goal-orientation by which teachers could motivate their learners.

In addition, syllabus designers’ attention should be drawn to the fact that as asserted by Noora (2008) the dominant method for teaching English in Iranian schools is a combination of the grammar-translation method (GTM), and audiolingualism (ALM) and students mostly study English for academic purposes (EAP) at the university level where the emphasis is on reading skill and structure. University students do not have enough chance to speak English in their classrooms and therefore they do not develop necessary communicative competence. Noora (2008) concluded that the majority of Iranian non-English major students prefer a more traditional teaching method. In other words, they are not that much willing to communicate in English. They are mostly motivated to pass final examinations rather than to achieve communicative competence (Noora, 2008). Therefore, learner’ motivation may be more manifested in acquiring test-related skills such as vocabulary, reading, and writing than in speaking (Peng & Woodrow, 2010). Several studies (e.g., Fallah, 2014; Hashimoto, 2002; Kim, 2004; Peng, 2007; Yu, 2009) have indicated that motivation directly or indirectly affects learners' L2 WTC, so curriculum designers and Ministry of Education must set "being able to use English to communicate" as one of the major English teaching goals, in order to make learners more motivated and willing to communicate in English. Holding free discussion classes or including materials and group/pair working activities which could increase students’ interest are recommended to be employed in the course books and to be taught inside the classrooms. In
sum, communicative language teaching method should be emphasized and replaced by GTM or ALM methods in order to make learners more motivated to use English for communication, and improve their communicative abilities and skills.

When it comes to the learners’ role, outside the classroom activities which aim to enhance learners’ understanding and contact with English and English-related culture could be utilized by the learners. For instance, learners could use the Internet or other online tools to create opportunities to get in touch with people who speak English as a native language if a real-life contact is not available. Moreover, dealing with authentic English materials (e.g., reading newspapers, watching English movies, listening English music, being a member of English chat groups) and writing diary in English are some other ways of fostering (more self-determined types of) learners’ motivation, that can in turn lead to higher L2 WTC.

1.4. Purpose of the Study

As previously mentioned, Asian L2 learners are regarded as reticent and silent learners (Cheng, 2000), and Iranian EFL learners are not exceptions (Fallah, 2014). MacIntyre et al. (1998) postulated L2 WTC as the construct that accounts for learners' communicative issues. They advanced a multilayered pyramid model of communication to depict the concept of L2 WTC in L2 context and its potential causes and anticipants such as affective, situational, and cognitive variables. They proposed fostering language learners’ L2 WTC as the primary goal of language instruction, which can facilitate learners’ L2 use, and in turn promote their language proficiency.

As pointed out by Fallah (2014), affective variables are expected a priori to vary not only across individuals but also among societies. Therefore, this study aims to examine the applicability of MacIntyre et al. ’s (1998) heuristic model of L2 WTC to Iran as an EFL context. The primary goal of the current research is to investigate the effect of motivation, as an affective
variable included in the fourth layer of MacIntyre et al.’s model, on L2 WTC of Iranian EFL learners.

In sum, to deal with Iranian EFL learners’ unwillingness to communicate and with the hope of fostering their L2 WTC, this study aims to explore the influence of intrinsic/extrinsic motivation (as two types of motivation appropriate for EFL context developed based on SDT by Noels, Pelletier, Clement, and Vallerand, 2000) on the L2 WTC of Iranian EFL learners.

1.5. Research Questions

The current study intends to examine the relationship between L2 WTC and intrinsic/extrinsic motivation among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. To this end, the following research questions are formulated:

1. To what extent would Iranian EFL learners’ extrinsic and intrinsic orientations correlate with their reported WTC?
2. Which orientation is a better predictor of WTC: extrinsic orientation or intrinsic motivation?
3. Which type of motivation (extrinsic or intrinsic) is more frequent and the dominant one among Iranian EFL learners?
4. Which factors do influence Iranian intermediate learners’ motivation and L2 WTC?

1.6. Research Hypothesis

Alongside the above research questions, the following hypothesis is in order.

1. Iranian EFL learners' motivation does not correlate significantly with their reported WTC.

1.7. Definition of Terms

**Willingness to communicate.** It is defined as a "readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons using an L2" (McIntyre et al., 1998, p. 547).
The self-determination theory (SDT). It is one of the most salient educational psychology theories of the 1990s developed by Deci and Ryan (1985), which claims that human beings have three innate psychological needs including autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Autonomy refers to the sense of unpressured willingness to perform an action, competence is the need for showing one’s capacities, and relatedness is the need that a person feels he or she belongs to others and is connected with others. It is proposed that the degree of satisfaction of these needs leads to different types of motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Noels et al. (2000) applied SDT to L2 research, investigating the role of intrinsic and extrinsic motives.

Intrinsic motivation. It refers to the desire to do something because it is interesting and pleasing. When learning is a goal in itself, and students find the task interesting and challenging, they are intrinsically motivated.

Extrinsic motivation. It refers to regulations that are external to an individual’s control, in fact it comes from external factors, that is, learning for instrumental goals such as earning reward or avoiding punishment.

1. 8. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

Like any research study the present study is not free from limitations. Since the participants were a group of university learners, any generalization of the finding to other contexts such as private language institutes and high schools should be done with caution, so further research should be conducted in these settings. Due to the time and monetary constraints, and the limited accessibility to the target population, (i.e., college students in Iran), selecting students among all these colleges in Iran was not possible. Therefore, it may not be appropriate to generalize the results to all college students in Iran. Moreover, gender and age of the learners were not controlled in this study.
One of the delimitations of this study was selecting learners among college students and ignoring institute’s students. Moreover, the whole participants were English major college students and other majors were excluded.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between L2 WTC in English, and extrinsic/intrinsic motivation among Iranian English major students. This chapter have covered these categories: Motivation and its orientations, willingness to communicate, conceptualization of WTC in first language, a conceptual model of L2 WTC and relevant empirical studies related to L2 WTC and motivation.

2.2. Motivation and Its Orientations

Research in the field of L2 motivation began with the work of Gardner and Lambert (1972). The significance of motivation, as an ID which can affect learners’ L2 acquisition, has long been explored (e.g., Dörnyei, 1990, 1998, 2005; Dörnyei & Skehan 2003; Gardner, 1985). Gardner and Lambert (1972) refered to motivation as L2 learners’ overall goal and orientation towards learning an L2. Gardner (1985) defined motivation as "the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity" (p. 10). According to Dörnyei (2005), motivation works as a driving force for language learning, and it could compensate for some situational or personal deficiencies learners might come across. Considering motivation at a macro level, some scholars have divided motivational propensities into two classifications: integrative and instrumental orientations (e.g., Brown, 2007; Gardner & Lambert, 1972).

Gardner (1985) refers to integrative motivation as learners’ desire to communicate with a valued L2 group. In other words, integrative motivation is "a desire to be a representative member of the other language community" (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p.14). However, when an individual’s purpose of learning a language is primarily finding a job, being promoted, satisfying an academic requirement or other similar issues, they are coaxed
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into learning an L2 by instrumental motivation. Thus, instrumental motivation is "a desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages through knowledge of a foreign language" (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p.14). Brown (2007) provided additional insights into the way two dichotomies of motivation, that is, instrumental/integrative and intrinsic/extrinsic, could be differentiated. He stated that extrinsic motivation exists when someone else urges an L2 learner to learn the language for either integrative or instrumental reasons. On the contrary, intrinsic motivation refers to L2 learners’ desire to either integrate with the L2 culture or attain their personal goals utilizing an L2. Generally, Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model and Deci and Ryan’s (1985) Self Determination Theory (SDT) are most well known motivational theories that are explained in detail below.

2.2.1. Socio-educational model. Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model has been one of the most influential frameworks in motivation and second language acquisition (SLA) research. This model proposes that IDs in L2 learning can largely be explained by learners’ integrative motivation. Integrative motivation is empirically conceptualised to have three components: integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, and motivation. Integrativeness reflects an individual’s inclination to interact with the L2 community, which comprises three operational dimensions: integrative orientation, attitudes toward the L2 community, and interest in FLs. Attitudes toward the learning situation subsume the individual’s evaluation of the teacher and the L2 course. These former two components are perceived to influence the third one: motivation, which is measured by L2 learners’ desire to learn L2. This model suggests that learners who are attitudinally affiliated with the L2 community will be more motivated to persevere in learning the L2 in both formal and informal situations.
2.2.2. Self-determination theory. Although Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model was a dominant theory of motivation, it was not without its challenges, and limitations that one of them is its limited applicability in FL settings. In fact, this criticism of Gardner’s model concerns the role of integrativeness in the FL learning context, where learners do not interact with the target language community but learn the FL in an academic setting. Dornyei (1990) stated that "foreign language learners often have not had enough contact with the target language community to form attitudes about them" (p. 69). Thus, he argued that while integrative orientation is associated with achievement in the second language learning context, in the FL learning context, students learn the language for practical reasons and therefore, instrumental orientation would be associated with achievement in the FL learning context.

Considering these issues and following some other criticisms, motivational studies changed their focus on cognitive and humanistic aspects of motivation during the 1990s. One of the most salient educational psychology theories of this period is SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985) which claims that human beings have three innate psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Autonomy refers to the sense of unpressured willingness to perform an action, competence is the need for showing one’s capacities, and relatedness is the need that a person feels he or she is connected with others. It is proposed that the degree of satisfaction of these needs leads to different types of motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Noels et al. (2000) applied SDT to L2 research, and investigated the role of intrinsic and extrinsic motives in L2 learning. Intrinsic motivation refers to the desire to do something because it is interesting and pleasing. When learning is a goal in itself, and students find the task interesting and challenging, they are intrinsically motivated. Extrinsic motivation comes from external factors, that is, learning for instrumental goals (such as earning reward or
avoiding punishment). Intrinsic motivation is composed of three parts, namely knowledge, accomplishment, and stimulation. Knowledge refers to motivation to do an activity for exploring new ideas, accomplishment is the sensation of achieving a goal or a task, and stimulation is the fun and excitement involved in doing a task.

Consistent with Deci and Ryan’s (1985) SDT theory, Noels et al. (2000) also distinguished three types of extrinsic motivation: external, introjected, and identified regulation. External regulation, which is the least self-determined type of motivation, refers to activities that are external to the learner, such as getting better grade or job. The second type of motivation, which is more internal, is introjected regulation. It refers to doing an activity due to some kind of internal pressure, such as avoiding guilt or ego enhancement. The most self-regulated type of extrinsic motivation is identified regulation; this is where students carry out an action due to personally related reasons and a desire to attain a valued goal. Noels et al. also stated that, when students have neither an intrinsic nor extrinsic reason to do an action, they are unmotivated and they will leave the activity as soon as possible.

2.3. Willingness to Communicate

A human being is born with a few basic needs, one of which is the need to communicate. Communication (verbal or nonverbal) is required almost at every phase of life to help a human being fulfill other crucial needs. It can even determine the degree of his success or failure in different stages of life (Mohseni & Nikjejad, 2013). WTC was originally proposed as a construct referring to individuals’ tendencies to engage in communication in the L1, when given the free choice (McCroskey & Baer, 1985). McCroskey and Baer (1985) conceptualized WTC in first language "as the probability of engaging in communication when free to choose to do" (MacIntyre et al., 1998, P. 546). McCroskey and associates have shown that WTC is related to such attributes as communication apprehension, perceived
communication competence, introversion extraversion, self-esteem, and so forth. Although it is certain that the situation would influence a person's level of WTC, the construct developed by McCroskey and associates has been conceptualized explicitly as a personality trait rather than as a situation-based variable (MacIntyre et al., 1998).

McCroskey and Richmond (1987) advanced the construct of WTC in L1 and referred it as an individual’s general personality orientation towards talking. They pointed out that people were different considerably in the degree to which they actually do talk, to whom they talk, and in what situation they talk. A broad range of situational variables could affect people’s WTC with others. For instance, how people feel on a given day, the previous experience of communication with a certain person, what has happened before the communication, whether the topic is familiar or not, whether the communication is evaluated or not, could all impact communication willingness. Therefore, WTC to some degree, was viewed as situation dependent.

A distinction is, however, made between WTC in the native language and in the second language. According to MacIntyre et al. (1998) "it is highly unlikely that WTC in the L2 is a simple manifestation of WTC in the L1" (p. 546). They argued that the difference between L2 WTC and L1 WTC may be due to the inherently different natures of L1 and L2, as there is a level of uncertainty in L2 that interacts in a more complex manner than the variables influencing L1. For example, "among most adults, a much greater range in communicative competence would be found in the L2, as compared to the L1. By definition, L1 speakers have achieved a great deal of competence with that language. However, L2 competence level can range from almost no L2 competence (0%) to full L2 competence(100%). In addition, L2 use carries a number of intergroup issues, with social and political implications, that are usually irrelevant to L1 use" (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p.546).
مطالعه حاضر با هدف بررسی رابطه بالقوه بین "تماشای به ایجاد ارتباط" و "انگیزه درونی/برونی" در میان یادگیرندگان سطح متوسط ایرانی که در حال تحصیل زبان انگلیسی بعنوان زبان بیگانه و رشته تحصیلی شان میباشند، صورت گرفته است. چهارچوب این مطالعه بر اساس ترکیبی از دو ترکیبی میباشد، این مطالعه از طریقی متین ترکیبی بهره گرفته است که کلمه از هر دو روش کمی و کیفی گرداری داده و آنالیز آنها میباشد. در این مطالعه 133 زبان آموز سطح متوسط زبان خارجی انگلیسی که از میان 144 زبان آموز آمریکا و از طریق تست نیمی سطح انتخاب شده و بر اساس هایکی که برای سنجش سطح "تماشای به ایجاد ارتباط" به زبان انگلیسی و همچنین سنجش میزان انگیزه آنها برای یادگیری انگلیسی این زبان بود باش دادند. همه شرکت کنندهان بالاصله بعد از تحویل بررسی‌نامه هایشان مصاحبه شدند و دیدگاه انج مورد "تماشای به ایجاد ارتباط" به زبان انگلیسی و همچنین هدف و انگیزه ی یادگیری زبان انگلیسی مورد بررسی قرار گرفت. برای بررسی تأثیر احتمالی انگیزه ی درونی و برونی بر روی تماشای به شرکت، "سریع حساسیتگی پهن" و "رگسیون چندگانه" محاسبه شد. نتایج نشان داد که هر دو انگیزه ی درونی و برونی ارتباط منفی و معنی‌داری با تماشای به ایجاد ارتباط دارد. در این مطالعه فقط انگیزه ی درونی به نظر آمیز دراز مانده در فردی که به ایجاد ارتباط (در میان زبان آموزان) به زبان انگلیسی را داشته. بر اساس نتایج مصاحبه، تعداد کمی از زبان آموزان بعنوان زبان آموزان ی انگیزه شناسایی شدند، در حالی که بیشتر شرکت کنندگان انگیزه ی یادگیری انگلیسی را داشتند. در میان، نیمی از زبان آموزان هدفمند از هر دو انگیزه ی درونی و برونی پرخوردار بودند (و از میان نیمی ی دیگر) که از نصف آنها از "انگیزه ی درونی" و میزان کمی نیز از "انگیزه ی برونی" پرخوردار بودند.
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