

---

## Public Schools and Private Language Institutes: Any Differences in Students' L2 Motivational Self System?

---

Maryam Azarnoosh\*

Department of English, College of Humanities, Semnan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Semnan, Iran

---

Received: 5 February, 2013

Accepted: 13 January, 2014

---

### Abstract

To enrich our understanding of the attitudinal/motivational basis of foreign language learning at junior high school level, this study investigated the students' status of L2 motivation, the relationship between motivational factors, and the possibility of predicting their motivated learning behavior in light of Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) theory of L2 Motivational Self System. To this end, 1462 junior high school students classified as private language institute-goers and non-goers filled in the Persian version of L2 Motivational Self System questionnaire. After applying independent samples t-test, correlation, and regression analyses, it was found that all students enjoyed positive attitudinal and motivational dispositions although to a different extent, attitude toward learning English was the main predictor of their motivated learning behavior, and Ideal L2 Self was particularly stronger in the institute goers, while Ought-to L2 Self was rather the same for both groups.

**Keywords:** motivation, L2 Motivational Self System, ideal L2 Self, ought-to L2 Self, attitudes toward L2 learning, junior high school.

---

### INTRODUCTION

The investigation of motivational basis of language learning has been the concern of much research for many years (Kormos & Dörnyei, 2004). Integrativeness (Gardner, 1985, 2001), the second language motivation of specific learners such as Hungarians (e.g., Dörnyei, Csizér, & Németh, 2006), self-determination theory (Noels, 2001), attribution theory (Ushioda, 2001) the process model of motivation (Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998) are some of the motivational research spotlights which have led to the evolution of new conceptual themes and motivational theories such as the L2 Motivational Self System. One of the many controversial issues related to teaching English for Specific Purposes (TESP) is whether the English language instructor or the subject-matter specialist should teach ESP (L2MSS) (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). Being based on Higgins' (1987) psychological theory of self-discrepancy and in line with the theory of possi-

ble selves (Markus & Nurius, 1986), L2MSS addresses the Gardnerian concept of integrativeness (Gardner, 1985, 2001), and the conceptualization of learners' identity (e.g., Lamb, 2009; Yashima, 2009). Furthermore, it has been put into practice in different linguistic and cultural contexts (e.g., Al-Shehri, 2009; Ryan, 2009; Taguchi, Magid, & Papi, 2009; Yang & Kim, 2011) and found to be related to other SLA theoretical concepts and frameworks (e.g., Kim, 2009, 2010; Waninge, 2010).

Dörnyei's theory has significantly contributed to advancing our understanding of L2 motivation; however, some aspects require further elaboration and empirical investigation. For instance, the ambiguous relationship of instrumentality and Ought-to L2 Self needs more exploration (Kormos & Csizér, 2008). Models of motivation might also differ during the language learning process, regarding gender (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005; Kissau, 2006), across age groups (Ghenghesh, 2010; Kormos & Csizér, 2008), in different geographical settings, and in relation to changes in peers and learning environments

---

\*Corresponding Author's Email: azarnoosh.86@gmail.com

(Matsubara, 2006); thus, potentially very different conclusions might be drawn. Therefore, exploring language learning motivation in a foreign language context like Iran is necessary since students experience little contact with English speakers and their culture, and research on motivation in this context is not as extensive as it is in other places around the world.

### The development of L2MSS

It is not possible to conceive second language learning without motivation; in fact, “no single individual difference factor in language learning has received as much attention as MOTIVATION” (Ellis, 2008, p. 677). The literature on L2 motivation shows that research in this field has strongly been influenced by Gardner’s motivation theory with integrativeness/integrative motivation, as its key construct. As a latent construct integrativeness includes the three variables of interest in foreign languages, integrative orientation, and attitudes toward the learning situation (Gardner, 1985, 2001). In many studies, this construct turned to a key factor in predicting motivated behavior and success in language learning (e.g., Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1994; Dörnyei, 1990), and central in most models of L2 motivation (e.g., Dörnyei, 1994; MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998).

In spite of the centrality of integrativeness integrative motivation in L2 motivation research for several decades, Gardner’s theory met a number of criticisms following the cognitive-situated phase in L2 motivation research (Dörnyei, 2005). Issues such as applicability in the immediate learning situation (McGroarty, 2001), incorporating cognitive theories of learning motivation (Dörnyei, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994), investment (Norton, 1995, 2000), world English identity (Dörnyei, 2005), international posture (Yashima, 2002), distinguishing instrumentality from integrativeness at the age of globalization (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002; Lamb, 2004), and ownership of Global English (Dörnyei, 2010) have brought Gardner’s theory of L2 motivation into question.

To respond to the challenges raised, Dörnyei (2005, 2009) developed his L2MSS based on his large scale research on motivation in Hungary (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002; Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005), the application of integrativeness in contexts different from those studied by Gardner, and a whole-person perspective toward motivation. This new conceptualization of L2 motiva-

tion is a major reformation of previous motivational thinking with its roots firmly set in L2 motivation research (Noels, 2003; Ushioda, 2001), and significant theoretical developments in psychology which include possible selves (Markus & Nurius, 1986) and discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987).

The L2MSS has three main dimensions: the Ideal L2 Self, Ought-to L2 Self, and English learning experience. The Ideal L2 Self is “the representation of the attributes that someone would ideally like to possess” (Dörnyei, 2010, p. 257); in fact, it is the ideal image of the L2 user one wishes to make of himself in the future. The vision of being a fluent L2 user interacting with L2 speakers is an example of a powerful motivator which helps the person learn the language and reduce the discrepancy between one’s actual self and ideal image (Papi, 2010). As some studies have indicated (e.g., Kormos & Csizér, 2008; Taguchi et al., 2009), Ideal L2 Self and integrativeness “tap into the same underlying construct domain” (Dörnyei, 2010, p. 80). Moreover, learners’ visual style preference, and overall visual/imaginative capacity, significantly, correlate with their ideal language selves (Al-Shehri, 2009; Yang & Kim, 2011) as does their ‘global concerns’ (Yashima, 2009).

The Ought-to L2 Self refers to “the attributes that one believes one *ought to* possess” (Dörnyei, 2005, p.105). This less internalized and more extrinsic aspect of the L2 self, which corresponds to Higgins’ (1987) ought self and the extrinsic constituents in Noels (2003) and Ushioda (2001) taxonomies (see Dörnyei, 2005, 2009), includes attributes such as various duties, obligations, or expectations one ought to fulfill to avoid possible negative outcomes. For instance, in the case of learning an L2 to fulfill one’s family or teacher’s expectations, the Ought-to L2 Self can act as the major motivator. In three countries, Japan, China, and Iran, family influence and the prevention-focused aspects of instrumentality were found to have influences on this variable, but the effect on learners motivated behavior was far less than that of the ideal L2 self (Taguchi et al., 2009). Also in Hungary, a similar relationship between parental encouragement and the Ought-to L2 Self was found (Csizér & Kormos, 2009).

The third aspect of L2MSS, the L2 learning experience, “concerns situation-specific motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience” (Dörnyei, 2005, p.106). This

dimension is related to the actional phase of Dörnyei's process oriented model (Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998) and Noels' (2003) and Ushioda's (2001) intrinsic categories (see Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). In the studies of Csizér and Kormos (2009) and Taguchi et al. (2009), this dimension illustrated the strongest influence on motivated behavior. A 'situated' approach and contextual factors, such as, classroom environment, cultural setting, curriculum, teacher, peer group, teaching materials, and task design, are influential in motivating students since initial motivation to learn is not always drawn from "internally or externally generated self images but rather from successful engagement with the actual language learning process" (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 29).

### English language learning in Iran

In the Iranian educational system, English encompasses a pivotal role; henceforth, an increasing demand for teaching and learning English is witnessed in the society. In the country's school system where the curriculum is mostly top-down and product-oriented in all aspects, and the Ministry of Education directs everything through the educational groups' monitoring (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008), teaching English formally starts from the first grade of junior high school and proceeds to the last year of high school, and includes the pre-university level. Accordingly, Iranian students have to study English for seven years; yet, due to different factors, such as the textbooks, the methodology applied, the evaluation system, the rarity of being exposed to the language outside classes (Rahimi, Riazi, & Saif, 2008) and lack of motivation (Moiinvaziri, 2007), the outcome is far from satisfactory and most students neither achieve full competence in using the English language nor interact with confidence (Dahmardeh, 2009).

Considering the guidelines of Ministry of Education and the content of present textbooks, EFL teaching in Iran seems to be based on future needs of students to read, and sometimes to translate English books, and journals (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008). Nevertheless, what gives impetus to students to learn English varies from passing their English exam at school to entering prestigious universities, proceeding to the highest social and education levels, studying and living abroad, and accessing the latest information. With regard to these factors and youth's extended interest in the growing technology, science and international

communication which are far beyond reading and translation, learning English is taken to be much more important than ever before. Consequently, families who are not satisfied with the results of language learning at schools or those who have high ambitions find private English language institutes as further opportunities for their children to pursue their language education.

Although English is taught as a required subject at schools, the private sector of English teaching is extensive and is growing rapidly in the country. According to Talebinezhad and Sadeghi (2005), 42% of the total number of the 4678 educational institutes running in Iran under the authority of the Ministry of Education and 68% of the 186 educational institutes issued by the Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance are language institutes. In private language institutes, prominence is mostly given to communicative skills and functional aspects of language. Unlike school textbooks which are designed by the Ministry of Education, the books used at institutes are written by native speakers. In addition, teachers seem to be more proficient, active, and motivating, and the class sizes are relatively small.

### Research on motivation in Iran

Research on English language attitudes and motivation in the context of Iran mainly rests on the Gardnerian concepts of instrumentality and integrativeness (e.g., Chalak & Kassaian, 2010; Moiiinvaziri, 2007; Vaezi, 2008) and usually includes university students, and institute goers of various levels (e.g., Bemani Naeini & Pandian, 2010; Birjandi & Hadidi Tamjid, 2010; Ghavamnia, Kassaian, & Dabaghi, 2011; Kassaian & Ghadiri, 2011). In these studies, essentially the relationship between motivation and some other aspects such as various types of strategies (Sadighi & Zarafshan, 2006), proficiency level (Sadighi & Maghsudi, 2000), language learning preferences (Noora, 2008), and attitudes toward learning English (Dastgheib, 1996; Vaezi, 2008) are explored. On the other hand, L2MSS has been relatively less explored. The few studies of Papi (2010), Roohbakhshfar, Rajab and Etemadzadeh (2011), and Taguchi et al. (2009) are some examples exploring the relationship between the constituents of L2MSS and various motivational/emotional factors.

Since research into the L2MSS is still in its early years, and studies based on this theory are specifically rare in Iran, this study intends to pic-

ture the motivational status of junior high school students' L2MSS who start learning English as a mandatory school subject in comparison to those who join private language institutes to learn more. Moreover, it examines the relationship between motivational/attitudinal variables; and also, it investigates the possibility of predicting students' motivated learning behavior from the motivational factors.

## METHOD

### Participants

In this study, the participants were selected based on quota sampling method (Dörnyei, 2007). The sampling frame consisted of junior high school students; the main proportions of the subgroups defined by parameters were gender, and residential status. A total of 1462 Iranian junior high school students participated in the study; 843 stu-

dents stated not to have ever joined any other English classes except their regular school classes while 619 students had experienced learning English in private language institutes (henceforth PLI) besides their school classes. With regard to the highest percentage of learners' self-reported proficiency level, 59.2% of the former group considered themselves as beginners while 37.3% of the latter reported to be post-beginners in English; in addition, most of the students in the second group (57.4%) claimed to have studied 1-6 terms at language institutes (Table 1). In order to minimize any school bias the sample was selected from schools from all over Semnan province. Participants were selected from cities, towns, and rural areas of the province: 1185 urban students from four cities and 277 rural students from six remote areas. Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics of the participants.

**Table 1**  
**The sample's statistics for the two junior high school groups**

Category	Sub-category	PLI non-goers N=843		PLI goers N=619	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Gender	Female	386	45.8	322	52
	Male	457	54.2	297	48
Age	12	97	11.5	101	16.3
	13	191	22.7	147	23.7
	14	289	34.3	214	34.6
	15	237	28.1	148	23.9
	16	29	3.4	9	1.5
Year of study	First	187	22.2	157	25.4
	Second	186	22.1	141	22.8
	Third	470	55.8	321	51.9
Self-reported proficiency level	Beginner	499	59.2	134	21.6
	Post-beginner	206	24.4	231	37.3
	Lower -intermediate	69	8.2	96	15.5
	Intermediate	48	5.7	91	14.7
Number of terms spent at private language institutes	Upper-intermediate	2	0.2	47	7.6
	Missing	19	2.3	20	3.2
	1-6	-	-	355	57.4
	7-12	-	-	142	22.9
	13-18	-	-	75	12.1
Residency	19 and above	-	-	47	7.6
	Urban	653	44.66	532	36.39
	rural	190	12.99	87	5.95

### Instrument

For the data collection, we used the Persian version of Taguchi et al. (2009) questionnaire which is originally based on Dörnyei et al.'s (2006) Hungarian studies, the L2MSS, and other established questionnaires such as Dörnyei (2001) and Gardner (1985) (see Taguchi et al., 2009). It was piloted

with 120 students who filled out the questionnaire and some of the participants who joined the follow up interviews to ensure the comprehensibility of the items. As a result, minor modifications concerning the wording of some of the statements were incorporated. The questionnaire contained two main parts: one part measured the learners' attitudes and

motivation toward learning English, and the other questioned the learners' background. The items were of statement and question types; a six-point Likert scale was used to measure the former type while a six-point rating scale was used for the latter with "not at all" anchoring at one end and "very much" anchoring at the other end. The questionnaire comprised 10 scales with acceptable reliability coefficient for both groups (see Appendix).

### Procedure

To collect the data, the schools were chosen and personally approached. Then information about the survey and details of administration were provided first for school principals and after their permission for teachers. With the cooperation of teachers and after a brief explanation about the study, the subjects filled in the questionnaires during their regular class time which took 15 minutes on average.

### RESULTS

To analyze the data, they were submitted to SPSS 16. In order to determine the difference between the two groups of junior high school students on the motivational/attitudinal scales an independent-samples t-test was run after checking the normality of the data. Considering the probability associated with the Levene F for each factor ( $p > .05$ ), the two groups enjoyed homogeneity for

the following 6 factors: Ideal L2 Self, criterion measures, instrumentality- promotion, family influence, attitudes to learning English, attitudes to L2 community, and cultural interest.

The results of the t-test (Table 2) reveals that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups on all the factors except Ought-to L2 self and instrumentality-prevention. In other words, all junior high school students rather share the same level of Ought-to L2 self and instrumentality-prevention but the motivational dispositions of those students who participate in private English classes is higher in all other cases. In addition to statistical significance, the effect sizes of all the factors indicate a moderate level of meaningfulness according to Cohen's (1988) guidelines. Moreover, the descriptive statistics (Table 2) shows that for the PLI non-goers, the two types of instrumentality have the highest mean values followed by Ideal L2 Self and integrativeness, whereas the mean values of these two factors take precedence over the two aspects of instrumentality for the junior high school PLI goers. In addition, for both groups, Ideal L2 Self and integrativeness almost share the same means which indicates the similarity of the two constructs. Since all scales have mean values above 3, it can be concluded that students of both groups hold positive attitudinal and motivational dispositions.

**Table 2**  
**Results of independent-samples t-test**

Scales	PLI going condition	Mean	Sd	T	Df	Sig level	Effect size <sup>a</sup>
Ideal L2 self	No	4.18	1.21	7.882	1346	.000	.04
	Yes	4.67	1.11				
Ought-to L2 self	No	3.66	1.05	0.736	1227	.462	-
	Yes	3.70	1.14				
Criterion measures	No	4.08	1.17	6.114	1412	.000	.03
	Yes	4.46	1.15				
Instrumentality- promotion	No	4.44	1.00	6.078	1416	.000	.02
	Yes	4.76	0.95				
Instrumentality- prevention	No	4.41	0.93	-1.156	1168	.248	-
	Yes	4.35	1.04				
Family influence	No	3.71	0.99	5.493	1396	.000	.02
	Yes	4.00	0.99				
Attitudes to learning English	No	3.88	1.29	5.212	1396	.000	.02
	Yes	4.25	1.28				
Attitudes to L2 community	No	3.85	1.35	5.877	1401	.000	.02
	Yes	4.28	1.35				
Cultural interest	No	3.42	1.34	7.115	1422	.000	.03
	Yes	3.94	1.41				
Integrativeness	No	4.13	1.37	7.741	1351	.000	.04
	Yes	4.68	1.27				

a. Eta squared

In the second step, in order to identify the relationship among the motivational factors the researcher conducted correlational analyses after ensuring no violation of the assumptions of normality and linearity. The correlation between the Ideal L2 Self and integrativeness (Table 3) indicates that these two dimensions tap into similar domains sharing 38.44% variance for PLI non-goers and 42.25% for PLI goers. Concerning the relationship between the constituents of L2MSS and criterion measures, for both groups, attitudes to learning English and criterion measures have the strongest association, Ideal L2 Self is next, and Ought-to L2 Self has the weakest relationship.

Ought-to L2 Self and criterion measures

share 25% variance for PLI non-goers; however, it is 11.56% for PLI goers. While attitudes to L2 community and cultural interest are highly associated in both groups (.63 for non-goers and .69 for PLI goers), lower correlations are observed for PLI goers concerning the relationship of each of these two factors with Ought-to L2 Self, instrumentality-prevention, and family influence. Among the correlated factors, instrumentality-promotion and Ideal L2 Self, and family influence and Ought-to L2 Self also show a remarkably high correlation for both groups. While instrumentality-promotion and Ideal L2 Self share more variance in the PLI group, the correlation of family influence and Ought-to L2 Self is relatively the same for both groups.

**Table 3**  
Correlations among the attitudinal and motivational scales for both groups

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>PLI non-goers</b>										
1. Ideal L2 self	----									
2. Ought-to L2 self	.54	----								
3. Attitudes to learning English	.62	.48	----							
4. Instrumentality- promotion	.70	.55	.58	----						
5. Instrumentality-prevention	.41	.62	.33	.50	----					
6. Integrativeness	.62	.44	.72	.57	.35	----				
7. Family influence	.47	.75	.40	.48	.54	.34	----			
8. Criterion measures	.66	.50	.77	.66	.38	.65	.41	----		
9. Cultural interest	.45	.29	.42	.37	.11	.47	.26	.37	----	
10. Attitudes to L2 community	.58	.36	.48	.47	.24	.51	.28	.46	.63	----
<b>PLI goers</b>										
1. Ideal L2 self	----									
2. Ought-to L2 self	.44	----								
3. Attitudes to learning English	.60	.29	----							
4. Instrumentality- promotion	.75	.51	.56	----						
5. Instrumentality-prevention	.36	.69	.22	.49	----					
6. Integrativeness	.65	.31	.71	.58	.25	----				
7. Family influence	.35	.74	.22	.45	.59	.2	----			
8. Criterion measures	.63	.34	.78	.59	.24	.63	.27	----		
9. Cultural interest	.41	.12	.43	.36	.03	.44	.07	.3	----	
10. Attitudes to L2 community	.55	.16	.46	.45	.18	.52	.12	.37	.69	----

All the correlations are significant at the  $p < 0.01$  level

Finally, to specify the scales that act as predictors of students' criterion measures, their motivated learning behavior, the researcher ran mul

iple regression analyses with a stepwise approach. As Table 4 displays, out of the 10 factors examined, the best predictor for both groups is

attitudes to learning English which is assumed to belong to the component of L2 learning experience in Dörnyei's (2005) model.

While instrumentality-promotion is the second best predictor for PLI non-goers, it comes last for PLI goers. In addition, Ideal L2 Self is a predictor of both groups' learning behavior; however, its predictive power is more for PLI goers. For the

non-goers, integrativeness is the least motivating factor with a power close to that of Ideal L2 Self; however, it is not a predictor of PLI goers' motivated learning. Finally, sharing a predictive value close to that of instrumentality-promotion, attitudes toward L2 community negatively influences junior high school PLI goers' motivated learning behavior.

**Table 4**  
**The final models of regression analyses predicting the criterion measures**

Groups	Predictors	R <sup>2</sup>	F	B	SEM	Beta(β)
PLI non-goers		.71	9.31**			
	Attitudes to learning English			.44	.03	.50**
	Instrumentality-promotion			.25	.04	.21**
	Ideal L2 Self			.16	.03	.16**
PLI goers	Integrativeness			.09	.03	.10**
		.65	8.74**			
	Attitudes to learning English			.59	.03	.64**
	Instrumentality-promotion			.15	.05	.12**
	Ideal L2 Self			.23	.05	.29**
	Attitudes to L2 community			-.13	.03	-.15**

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study examined the status, relationship, and predictive power of the main components of Dörnyei's L2MSS and some related motivational/attitudinal factors for two groups of junior high school students, those who only learn English as a mandatory school subject and those who, in addition, go to private language classes. In general, the results showed that both groups enjoyed positive attitudinal and motivational dispositions and the main predictor of students' motivated learning behavior was their attitudes toward learning English which also had a high correlation with students' intended efforts (i.e., criterion measures). This is similar to the results of studies such as Csizér and Kormos (2009) which denotes the importance of immediate learning environment in shaping learners' attitudes (Dörnyei, 2009). As Nikolov (1999) states younger learners are more influenced by their language learning experiences rather than integrative or instrumental reasons. Therefore, classroom factors (e.g., the learning context, teacher, materials, activities, etc.) have a leading impact on students' attitudes and learning experiences and affect the extent to which learners are ready to invest in language learning (Csizér & Kormos, 2009).

In addition, Ideal L2 Self and integrativeness which were highly correlated proved to share similar constructs and empirically validated the legitimacy of Dörnyei's L2MSS. The replace

ment of integrativeness with the Ideal L2 Self is justifiable as our results are similar to the findings of others (e.g., Kormos & Csizér, 2008; Taguchi et al., 2009). In addition, this scale has a higher mean value (Table 2) and shows a higher correlation with the criterion measures and has a better predictive power toward learners' motivated learning behavior than integrativeness does. This is specifically true for PLI goers who seem to have developed a clearer vision of their Ideal L2 Self.

Considering instrumentality, we found that for both groups of students instrumentality-prevention closely associated with the Ought-to L2 Self, a result which corroborates the findings of Taguchi et al. (2009); however, in contrast to their results, instrumentality-promotion highly correlated with the Ideal L2 Self, and the two aspects of instrumentality shared more variance. The t-test results also revealed no difference in instrumentality-prevention and Ought-to L2 Self for the two groups of learners. Similarly, Ought-to L2 Self and family influence were strongly correlated for both groups. These findings which are interpretable in the socio-educational context of Iran can be explained with reference to parental influence and expectations and junior high school students' age. It makes no difference whether students study the language at public schools or private language classes, being young, junior high school students seem to be more dependent on and influenced by others. According to the policy fami-

lies pursue towards learning English (Haddad Narafshan & Yamini, 2011), parental influence in its various forms may include situations where parents set personal examples or demonstrate high expectations and provide support and encouragement (Elliott, Hufton, Willis, & Illushin, 2005). In fact, "Asian children are socialized to be sensitive and responsive to the needs of their family and community" (Stigler et al., 1985, cited in Elliott et al., 2005, p.188), and the encouragement and pressure from culture at large, peers and significant others within one's social circle partly lead to the growth and change of one's identity and motivational dispositions (Brophy, 2009). Additionally, the degree of internalization of the two aspects of instrumentality may be a possible explanation of the findings; depending on the level of internalization, instrumentality can merge into Ideal L2 Self and Ought-to L2 Self (Dörnyei et al., 2006). This can be the case of learners merging what others want them to become with what they themselves want to become. In fact, pleasing others turns to be part of pleasing selves (Xie, 2011).

With regard to students' attitudes to L2 community and cultural interest, strong association was observed for both groups. However, for PLI goers, each of these factors were weakly correlated with Ought-to L2 Self, instrumentality-prevention, and family influence. In addition, attitudes to L2 community was a weak and negative predictor of PLI goers' motivated learning behavior. These findings can be explained with reference to the difference in the learning environment, books, and information gained at schools and PLIs. In a country where there is meager contact with L2 speakers, familiarity with the L2 cultural values occurs through reading books, watching films, and using other cultural products. As Dehmardeh and Wray (2011) state "introducing new cultural values could give pupils a better understanding of their own identity, promoting cross-cultural understanding" (p.277) and broadening their world view; however, when there is negative attitude towards the L2 countries as well as chaotic political relations between the countries, there are concerns with regard to cultural issues. Our results in this respect suggest that, the discrepancy between the type of materials studied at school and PLIs, for example, the localized English textbooks which are rather deprived of L2 cultural information at schools (Aliakbari, 2004) in contrast to the materials em-

ployed at PLIs, and above all, the social, economic, and political situation of the country might be decisive factors affecting students' attitudes toward L2 community.

In conclusion, comparing junior high school PLI goers and non-goers revealed that in general both groups enjoyed positive attitudinal and motivational dispositions, attitude toward learning English was the main predictor of their motivated learning behavior, Ideal L2 Self was more prominent for PLI goers, Ought-to L2 Self and family influence had relatively similar status for both groups, the two types of instrumentality correlated highly with components of L2MSS, Ideal L2 Self was closely related to integrativeness, and cultural interest and attitudes to L2 community were more associated with Ideal L2 Self and integrativeness. These findings are interpretable in light of the current socio-educational status of the country, specifically the differences in language learning environments, and the impacts of age, family, significant others, and society at large which develop junior high school students' visualization of their future L2 self and lead to their motivated L2 learning. However, further studies are required to picture the actual efforts and motivational state of junior high school students in learning English. Conducting an experimental study is recommended to scrutinize the effects of applying visualization training and imagery techniques in enhancing learners' motivation and actual leaning. Moreover, including observation sessions and interviews can be beneficial in tracking not only the elements that affect learners' attitude toward learning English, but also the actual motivational strategies teachers administer in their classes.

## References

- Aliakbari, M. (2004). *The Place of culture in the Iranian ELT textbooks in high school level*. Paper presented at the 9th Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics Conference, Namseoul University, Korea. Retrieved 1 March 2012 from <http://www.paaljapan.org/resources/proceedings/PAAL9/pdf/Aliakbari.pdf>
- Al-Shehri, A.S. (2009). Motivation and vision: The relation between the ideal L2 self, imagination and visual style. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda. (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp.164-171). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.



- Bemani Naeini, M. & Pandian, A. (2010). On the possible relationships between multiple intelligences and listening proficiency and motivation orientation among Iranian TEFL university students. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 6(2), 75-99.
- Birjandi, P. & Hadidi Tamjid, N. (2010). The role of self-assessment in promoting Iranian EFL learners' motivation. *English Language Teaching*, 3(3), 211-220.
- Brophy, J. (2009). Connecting with the big picture. *Educational Psychologist*, 44 (2), 147-157.
- Chalak, A. & Kassaian, Z. (2010). Motivation and attitudes of Iranian undergraduate EFL students towards learning English. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies*, 10(2), 37-56.
- Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44, 417-448.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. *Modern Language Journal*, 89(1), 19-36.
- Csizér, K., & Kormos, J. (2009). Learning experiences, selves and motivated learning behavior: A comparative analysis of structural models for Hungarian secondary and university learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda. (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp.98-119). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dahmardeh, M. (2009). Communicative textbooks: English language textbooks in Iranian secondary school. *Linguistik online*, 40(4), 45-61.
- Dehmardeh, M. & Wray, D. (2011). Culture and English language teaching in Iran. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 7( 5), 264-281.
- Dastgheib, A. (1996). *The role attitudes and motivation in second/foreign language learning*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Islamic Azad University, Science & Research Branch.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning*, 40, 45-78.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Understanding second language motivation: on with the challenge! *Modern Language Journal* 79, 505-518.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda. (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp.9-42). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2010). Researching motivation: From integrativeness to the ideal L2 self. In S. Hunston & D. Oakey (Eds.), *Introducing applied linguistics: Concepts and skills* (pp. 74-83). London: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 421-462.
- Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., & Németh, N. (2006). *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation: A Hungarian perspective*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: a process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 4. Thames Valley University, London.
- Elliott, J. G. Hufton, N.R. Willis, W. & Illushin, L. (2005). Motivation, engagement and educational performance: International perspectives on the contexts for learning. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Oxford: OUP.
- Eslami, Z.R., & Fatahi, A. (2008). Teachers' sense of self-efficacy, English proficiency, and instructional strategies: A study of nonnative EFL teachers in Iran. *TESL-EJ*, 11(4), 1-19.
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (2001). Integrative motivation and

- second language acquisition. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 1–19). Technical Report 23, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Ghavamnia, M., Kassaian, Z., & Dabaghi, A. (2011). The relationship between language learning strategies, language learning beliefs, motivation, and proficiency: A study of EFL learners in Iran. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 2(5), 1156-1161, doi:10.4304/jltr.2.5.1156-1161.
- Ghengehesh, P. (2010). The motivation of 12 learners: Does it decrease with age? *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 128-141.
- Haddad Narafshan, M. & Yamini, M. (2011). Policy and English Language Teaching (ELT) in Iran. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 7(5), pp.179-189.
- Higgins, E.T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review* 94, 319-340.
- Kassaian, Z., & Ghadiri, M. (2011). An investigation of the relationship between motivation and metacognitive awareness strategies in listening comprehension: The case of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(5), 1069-1079. doi:10.4304/jltr.2.5.1069-1079.
- Kim, T. (2009). The sociocultural interface between ideal self and ought-to self: A case study of two Korean students' ESL motivation. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda. (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 274-294). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kim, T.Y. (2010). Reductionism, activity theory, and L2 motivation research: Toward new concepts and definitions. *The SNU Journal of Education Research*, 19, 1-32. Retrieved on October 26, 2011 from: <http://works.bepress.com/taeyoungkim/17>
- Kissau, S. (2006). Gender differences in second language motivation: An investigation of micro and macrolevel influences. *RCLA • CJAL*, 9(1), 73-96.
- Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2008). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behavior. *Language Learning*, 58 (2), 327–355.
- Kormos, J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2004). The interaction of linguistic and motivational variables in second language task performance. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht*, 9(2), 19 pp.
- Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System*, 32, 3-19.
- Lamb, M. (2009). Situating the L2 self: Two Indonesian school learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 229-247). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 545–562.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41, 954-969.
- Matsubara, K. (2006). Learning environments and their influences on learner motivation. In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, & M. Swanson (Eds.) *JALT2005 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.
- McGroarty, M. 2001. Situating second language motivation. In Z. Dörnyei, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 69- 90). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Moiinvaziri, M. (2007). Motivational orientation in English language learning: A study of Iranian undergraduate students. Retrieved on July 10, 2011 from: <http://www.usingenglish.com/articles/motivational-orientation-in-englishlanguage-learning.html>
- Nikolov, M. (1999). 'Why do you learn English?' 'Because the teacher is short.' A study of Hungarian children's foreign language learning motivation. *Language Teaching Research*, 3, 33–56.
- Noels, K.A. (2001). New orientations in language learning motivation: Toward a contextual model of intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations and motivation. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 43–68). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- Noels, K.A. (2003). Learning Spanish as a second language: learners' orientations and perceptions of their teachers' communication style. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda. (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and*

- the L2 self (pp. 97-136). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Noora, A. (2008). Iranian undergraduates non-English majors' language learning preferences. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 8(2), 33-44.
- Norton, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 9-31.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Oxford, R.L., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12-28.
- Papi, M. (2010) The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System*, 38, 467-479. doi:10.1016/j.system.2010.06.011.
- Rahimi, M., Riazi, A., & Saif, S. (2008). An investigation into the factors affecting the use of language learning strategies by Persian EFL learners. *RCLA • CJAL*, 11(2), 31-60.
- Roohbakhsh Far, H., Rajab, A. B., & Etemadzadeh, A. (2011). The relationship between L2Motivational Self System and L2 learning among TESL students in Iran. Paper presented at The 4th Biennial International Conference on the Teaching & Learning of English in Asia: Forging Ahead.
- Ryan, S., 2009. Self and identity in L2 motivation in Japan: The ideal L2 self and Japanese learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda. (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 120-143). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Sadighi, F., & Maghsudi, N. (2000). The relationship between motivation and English proficiency among Iranian EFL learners. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26 (1), 39-52.
- Sadighi, F., & Zarafshan, M. (2006). Effects of attitude and motivation on the use of language learning strategies by Iranian EFL University students. *Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities of Shiraz University*, 23(1), 71-80.
- Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self system amongst Chinese, Japanese, and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda. (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 66-97). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Talebinezhad, M.R., & Sadeghi Beniss, A.R. (2005). Non-academic L2 Users: A Neglected Research Pool in ELT in Iran. *Linguistik online*, 25 (4), 85-96.
- Ushioda, E., 2001. Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda. (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 91-124). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Vaezi, Z. (2008). Language learning motivation among Iranian undergraduate students. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 375(1), 54-61.
- Waninge, F. (2010). *The elusive motivation: The development of motivation in real time*. Master's thesis, University of Groningen.
- Xie, Y. (2011). Representations of L2 Motivational Self System with beginning Chinese language learners at college level in the United States: Heritage and nonheritage language learners. Doctoral dissertation.
- Yang, J., & Kim, T. (2011). The L2Motivational Self System and Perceptual Learning Styles of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Swedish Students. *English Teaching*, 66(1), 141-162.
- Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 54-66.
- Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the ideal L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda. (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 144-163). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

**Maryam Azarnoosh** is an assistant professor of TEFL at Semnan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Semnan, Iran. She is the Dean of Faculty of Humanities and Head of Department of English. She has taught at different universities and has published and presented papers. Her research interests include motivation, English language skills, materials development, ESP, language teaching, testing and assessment.

## Appendix

## Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the scales for both groups of junior high school students

Scales	Definition and number of items	PLI non- goers	PLI goers
Ideal L2 Self	The L2-specific facet of one's ideal self. (6 items)	.81	.80
Ought-to L2 Self	The attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e. duties, obligations, or responsibilities) to avoid possible negative outcomes. (6 items)	.71	.75
Instrumentality promotion	The regulation of personal goals to become successful. (6 items)	.71	.73
Instrumentality prevention	The regulation of duties and obligations. (8 items)	.71	.78
Integrativeness	The learners' positive attitude toward the second language, its culture and native speakers. (3 items)	.66	.69
Criterion measures	The learners' intended efforts toward learning English. (6 items)	.82	.84
Family influence	Active and passive parental roles. (6 items)	.65	.69
Attitudes to learning English	Situation-specific motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience. (6 items)	.83	.84
Cultural interest	The learner's interest in the cultural products of the L2 culture which can also be discovered via various types of media. (4 items)	.67	.74
Attitudes to L2 community	The learner's attitudes toward the community of the target language. (4 items)	.73	.77

## به نام یزدان پاک

ضمن تقدیر و تشکر از تمامی دوستانی که در این تحقیق قبول زحمت و شرکت نموده اند، به استحضار می‌رساند این تحقیق جهت ارزیابی نگرش و باورهای شما زبان آموزان عزیز ایرانی در رابطه با یادگیری زبان انگلیسی و در راستای توصیف کارنامه‌ی انگیزشی شما طراحی شده است.

توجه شود که این یک تست یا امتحان نیست و هیچ پاسخی "صحیح" و یا "غلط" نمی‌باشد. پاسخ‌های شما تنها توصیف‌کننده نگرش شما می‌باشند. نتایج این بررسی تنها جهت کاربردهای تحقیقاتی مورد استفاده قرار می‌گیرد و نیازی به نوشتن نام و مشخصات فردی شما نیز نمی‌باشد. لذا لطفاً با فراغ‌بال و با دقت کامل به تمامی سوالات پاسخ دهید. از همکاری شما نهایت تشکر را داریم.

## بخش اول

در این قسمت با کشیدن دایره دور اعداد ۱ تا ۶ میزان موافقت یا مخالفت خود را با عبارات‌های زیر مشخص نمایید. لطفاً به تمام گزینه‌ها پاسخ دهید.

۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱
کاملاً موافقم	موافقم	تا حدودی موافقم	تا حدودی مخالفم	مخالفم	کاملاً مخالفم
به عنوان مثال اگر با عبارت زیر کاملاً موافق هستید دور عدد ۶ خط بکشید.					
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱
من ورزش اسکی را دوست دارم.					

۱	می خواهم انگلیسی یاد بگیرم زیرا به نظر دوستان نزدیکم یادگیری زبان انگلیسی دارای اهمیت است.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۲	خانواده ام عقیده دارند که چنانچه بخوام شخص تحصیل کرده ای باشم می بایست زبان انگلیسی یاد بگیرم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۳	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا در آینده به کمک آن میتوانم شغل و درآمد مناسبی به دست بیاورم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۴	بایست زبان انگلیسی یاد بگیرم تا نمره بدی در این درس نگیرم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۵	دوست دارم وقت زیادی را صرف یادگیری زبان انگلیسی کنم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۶	روزی را تصور می کنم که انگلیسی را همچون یک انگلیسی زبان صحبت خواهم کرد.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۷	اگر زبان انگلیسی یاد نگیرم دیگران از من مایوس می شوند.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۸	باید انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا توسط آن افتخاری را نصیب خانواده ام خواهم کرد.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۹	یادگیری انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا پیشرفت و ترقی در آینده نیازمند مهارت بالا در این زبان است.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۱۰	باید انگلیسی یاد بگیرم زیرا اگر در درس انگلیسی قبول نشوم نمی توانم فارغ التحصیل شوم و مدرک بگیرم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۱۱	حاضرم برای یادگیری زبان نهایت سعی و تلاش خود را به کار گیرم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۱۲	روزی را تصور می کنم که در خارج از کشور زندگی می کنم و به زبان انگلیسی بحث، و نظراتم را به راحتی و درستی بیان می کنم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۱۳	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا افرادی را که برای آنها ارزش قابل هشتم چنین تصویری دارند.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۱۴	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا میتوانم از این طریق رضایت خانواده و اقوام را جلب کنم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۱۵	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا برای ادامه تحصیلات به آن نیاز دارم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۱۶	باید زبان انگلیسی یاد بگیرم در غیر اینصورت نخواهم توانست در شغل آینده ام موفق باشم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۱۷	دوست دارم که بیش از هر موضوع دیگری روی یادگیری زبان انگلیسی تمرکز کنم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۱۸	هر وقت در مورد شغل آینده ام فکر می کنم تصور می کنم که برای انجام آن از زبان انگلیسی استفاده خواهم کرد.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۱۹	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای من مهم است تا بتوانم رضایت دوستان/معلمان/ خانواده را بدست بیاورم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۲۰	خانواده ام برای یادگیری زبان انگلیسی فشار زیادی به من وارد می کنند.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۲۱	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای رسیدن به هدفی خاصی (مانند مدرک گرفتن) برای من دارای اهمیت است.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۲۲	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا اگر بلد نباشم دیگران فکر میکنند من یادگیرنده ضعیفی هستم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۲۳	اگر در آینده درس انگلیسی ارایه شود مایلم در آن کلاس شرکت کنم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۲۴	میتوانم روزی را تصور کنم که در دانشگاهی خارجی که دروس در آنجا به انگلیسی تدریس میشود تحصیل میکنم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۲۵	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا اطرافیانم چنین انتظاری از من دارند.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۲۶	خانواده همواره مرا به یادگیری و تمرین هر چه بیشتر زبان انگلیسی تشویق می کنند.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۲۷	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا دوست ندارم در آزمونهای مهارت زبان انگلیسی (مانند تافل-آیلتس و...) نمره بدی بگیرم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۲۸	می خواهم انگلیسی یاد بگیرم تا در جریان اخبار و اطلاعات روز دنیا قرار بگیرم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۲۹	اگر معلم انگلیسی ام بخواهد اضافه بر برنامه درس بدهد من حتما داوطلب می شوم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۳۰	تصور می کنم به راحتی به دیگران به زبان انگلیسی ای میل و نامه می نویسم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۳۱	برای اینکه از درس انگلیسی نمره رد نگیرم می بایست آن را یاد بگیرم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۳۲	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا با داشتن دانش زبان انگلیسی مردم بیشتر به من احترام میگذارند.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۳۳	من باید زبان انگلیسی یاد بگیرم در غیر این صورت خانواده از من قطع امید می کنند.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۳۴	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا قصد دارم در خارج از کشور به ادامه تحصیل بپردازم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۳۵	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای من مهم است زیرا اگر نمرات بدی از آن بگیرم احساس شرمندگی خواهم کرد.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۳۶	حتی اگر ضرورتی برای یادگیری زبان انگلیسی نبود باز هم تمایل به فراگیری آن داشتم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۳۷	تصور می کنم که خارج از کشور زندگی می کنم و از انگلیسی برای برقراری ارتباط با مردم آنجا استفاده می کنم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
۳۸	یادگیری زبان برای من مهم است زیرا نمی خواهم به عنوان یک فرد کم سواد تلقی شوم.	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶

### بخش دوم

لطفاً به سوال های زیر همانند دیگر سوال ها و با توجه به نمونه جدول زیر پاسخ دهید.

۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۶
نه/ به هیچ وجه	نه زیاد	احساس خاصی ندارم	تا حدودی بله	بله زیاد	بله بسیار زیاد
به عنوان مثال اگر فلفل سبز را زیاد دوست ندارید به صورت زیر دور عدد ۲ خط بکشید					
					۶
				۴	۵
			۲	۳	۱
					۱
					۶

۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۳۹	آیا حال و هوای کلاس زبان انگلیسی خود را دوست دارید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۴۰	آیا دوست دارید همانند انگلیسی زبان ها شوید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۴۱	آیا به موسیقی کشورهای انگلیسی زبان علاقه مندید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۴۲	آیا به مردم کشورهای انگلیسی زبان علاقه مندید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۴۳	آیا یادگیری زبان انگلیسی برای شما جالب است؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۴۴	آیا به فیلم های به زبان انگلیسی علاقه مندید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۴۵	آیا به ملاقات مردم انگلیسی زبان علاقه مند هستید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۴۶	آیا هنگامی که در حال یادگیری زبان انگلیسی هستید احساس می کنید زمان سریعتر می گذرد؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۴۷	آیا به برنامه های تلویزیونی کشورهای انگلیسی زبان علاقه مندید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۴۸	آیا به سفر به کشورهای انگلیسی زبان علاقه مندید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۴۹	آیا برای شرکت در کلاسهای زبان انگلیسی مشتاق هستید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۵۰	به نظر شما یادگیری زبان انگلیسی آیا در آشنایی با فرهنگ و هنر انگلیسی زبانان موثر است؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۵۱	آیا مایلید درباره مردمان کشورهای انگلیسی زبان بیشتر بدانید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۵۲	آیا دوست دارید درسهای انگلیسی بیشتری در مدرسه شما ارائه شود؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۵۳	آیا زبان انگلیسی علاقه مند هستید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۵۴	آیا به کتابها، مجلات، و روزنامه های انگلیسی زبان علاقه مند هستید؟
۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱	۵۵	آیا واقعا از یادگیری زبان انگلیسی لذت می برید؟

### بخش سوم

لطفا سوالات زیر را با تیک زدن و یا با نوشتن در فضای فراهم شده جواب دهید.

جنسیت: زن  مرد  سن:

سال تحصیلی: اول  دوم  سوم

آیا در زبانکده های خصوصی انگلیسی خوانده اید؟

خیر  ۱ تا ۶ ترم  ۷ تا ۱۲ ترم  ۱۳ تا ۱۸ ترم  ۱۹ ترم به بالا

لطفا سطح کنونی توانایی زبان انگلیسی خود را ارزیابی کنید.

مبتدی: دارای توانایی در سلام و احوال پرسی کردن با استفاده از عبارات ساده و مشخص. دارای توانایی خواندن جملات ساده و کوتاه و فهمیدن چکیده متن های کوتاه و ساده و همچنین نوشتن جملات ساده و کوتاه.

فرا مبتدی: دارای توانایی مکالمه های ساده (احوال پرسی و معرفی دیگران) و توانایی خواندن و نوشتن متون ساده و ابتدایی.

پیش متوسط: دارای توانایی گفتگو درباره مسائل روزانه خانوادگی. خواندن متون روزمره و آشنا و نوشتن نامه های ساده.

متوسط: دارای توانایی گفتگو در مورد موضوعات روزمره و توانایی خواندن متون عمومی روزانه و نوشتن متون ساده.

فرا متوسط: دارای توانایی گفتگو در مورد موضوعات عمومی روزمره و موضوعات مربوط به تخصص خود و فهمیدن چکیده سخنرانیها و خواندن متون سطح بالا مانند مجلات و روزنامه های انگلیسی.

از همکاری شما سپاسگزارم.