LES

From Motivation to Learn to Motivation to Speak

[1]Morteza Montazeri, [2]Hadi Hamidi*[3]Neda Fekri,

[1&2] Department of English Language, Khazar Institute of Higher Education, Mahmoudabad, Iran

[3]Department of English Language, Aliabad Katoul Branch, Islamic Azad University, Aliabad Katoul, Iran

Corresponding email address
hamidi_tefl@yahoo.com

Abstract: Motivation is the inner driving force that conduces to action taken in a specific situation. The degree or intensity of this force has a direct impact on a successful fulfillment of the action. While orientation refers to a class of reasons for learning a language, motivation refers to a combination of the learner's attitudes, desires, and willingness to expend effort in order to learn the second language. This paper first discusses the motivation of the language learners to learn the language as a whole (combination of skills) and then discusses that there is a narrowed down type of motivation which shows the willingness to the language learners to orally express themselves. The authors concluded that this type of narrowed down motivation should be named motivation to speak rather than willingness to communicate. The authors believe that there is a necessity to develop an instrument which technically measures the motivation to speak on the part of the language learners.

Key words: language acquisition, motivation to learn, motivation to speak, orientation

Motivation is the inner driving force that conduces to action taken in a specific situation. The degree or intensity of this force has a direct impact on a successful fulfillment of the action. Liu (2010) defines motivation as "an internal state that initiates and maintains goal-directed behavior" (p.38). In the field of language teaching motivation refers to a combination of the learner's attitudes, desires, and willingness to expend effort to learn the second language. In this field, however, there has been made a distinction between orientation and motivation. According to Mayer (as cited in Liu, 2012), when learners are motivated to learn, they make greater effort to understand the materials and, hence, learn more deeply, conducive to better ability to transfer what they have acquired to new situation.

Motivation and Orientation

Orientation, according to Richards and Schmidt (1985), refers to a class of reasons for learning a language whereas motivation refers to "a combination of the learner's attitudes, desires, and willingness to expend effort in order to learn the second language" (p. 343). Orientations encompass an integrative motivation, defined as the tendency to become like the members of the target language society, and instrumental orientation, defined as foreign language learning aimed at a more practical result such as passing an examination or obtaining a job. The construct of integrative motivation, hence, includes the integrative orientation, positive attitudes towards both the target language community and a commitment to learning the language (Richards & Schmidt, 1985).

Extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation.

Richards and Schmidt (1985) make another distinction between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation is learning the language for the joy beyond learning it and extrinsic motivation refers to language learning which is caused by such external factors as parental pressure, academic requirements, or other sources of punishments and

rewards.

Based on both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction, Littlejohn (2001) identifies several sources of motivation. He maintains that perception of failure in language class might mean that language learners build a negative image of themselves as learners of the target language that augments as they make progress. Littlejohn (2001) further describes a downward spiral where perception of low ability conduces to low motivation, thereby resulting in low effort and low achievement. He also suggests the following strategies for language teachers to maintain motivation:

- Ø   Teachers should vary and experiment classroom activities to see which activities learners do the best.
- Ø   Teachers should choose tasks that provide learners with the opportunity to make decisions on what to do.
- Ø   Teachers should choose open-ended tasks with a range of possible responses giving the learners the choice on deciding what to do.

Motivation and success.

Atkinson (as cited in Gardner, 1972) is the person associated with achievement motivation whose theory integrates need for achievement, expectancy and value. According to this theory that dominated a couple of decades, expectancy is determined by cognitive motivational processes. According to Atkinson's (as cited in Gardner, 1972) theory, the following determine achievement behaviors:

- Ø   expectations of success
- Ø   incentive values
- Ø   need for achievement
- Ø   and fear of failure

The factors mentioned above appear to be incorporated in expectancy-value theory which purports that people are motivated to do something when they feel that this thing is worth doing and expect success in doing it. In this regard, Dornyei (2001) mentions two key factors: individual expectations of success and value individuals give to success. He contends that if individuals have positive feelings on these two factors, they are attributed as the ones who have a high extent of motivation, and if one of these factors is missing, they are will be motivated less. Dornyei (2001) further argues that such factors as past experience (attribution theory), maintaining self-esteem (self-worth theory), and judging individual abilities (self-efficacy) have their considerable bearings on the expectancy of success.

Motivation and second language acquisition.

Motivation accounts for slightly less of the variance in learners' achievement scores than language aptitude (Ellis, 2005). Here, Ellis (2005) refers to two types of motivation in second language acquisition: the motivation that language learners bring to classroom (extrinsic motivation) and the motivation that is generated inside the classroom (intrinsic motivation). Besides, according to Gardner and MacIntyre (as cited in Mitchell & Myles, 2004), the motivated individual is the one who seeks to achieve a particular goal, devotes a considerable amount of effort to achieve this goal, and experiences satisfaction in conducting the activities associated with achieving this goal, hence making motivation a complex construct. Motivation is, thereby, claimed by Mitchell and Myles (2004) to be defined by three main components: desire to achieve a goal, effort made in this direction, and satisfaction with the task.

According to Ellis (2005), regarding recent developments in theories of second language motivation two proposals are particularly interesting. The first pertains to an attempt to make a theory that acknowledges the dynamic, multidimensional nature of motivation, and the second concerns the distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. Likewise, Field (2006), for example, discusses about motivation in the realm of reading programs. She contends that motivation for fluent reading must be modeled, nurtured, and reinforced by the teacher, but the motivation must arise from within the learner. Motivation is the energy which is transformed into constructive, methodologically appropriate, efficient and productive activities (Field, 2006). Motivation needs to be reinforced by work with peer's recognition of progress and rewards. Field (2006) further refers to team goals, a buddy system, posting of goals, posting of timed reading scores, posting of books and

materials read, individual record keeping, reading logs, as the main contributors to a high level of motivation in reading.

Speech Production and its Models

Models of both speech perception and speech production are claimed by Hickok (2001) to typically postulate a processing that pertains to some form of phonological encoding. However, he distinguishes language perception and language production regarding the locality. Speech perception systems involve several superior temporal regions bilaterally, whereas speech production systems involve a network of left hemisphere region (Hickok, 2001).

De Angelis (2007) introduces two most prominent models of speech production proposed by Dell (1986) and Levelt (1989). As he maintains these two models differ in their assumption of the way feedback between levels of encoding operates, and in their view towards the way the process of speech production takes place. From interactionist perspective, Dell (as cited in De Angelis, 2007) argues that encoding occurs through interaction spreading from node to node between levels of encoding, activation is the driving force behind the process of production and various levels of encoding interact with one another passing on feedback from higher to lower levels of encoding (feedforward) and from lower to higher levels of encoding (feedback). Among various models of speech production, De Angelis (2007) introduces Levelt's (1989) model of speech production. As he maintains, in this model, processing is considered to be strictly modular where no feedback between levels of processing occurs. "Due to this inflexibility with respect to the flow of information, models of this kind are sometimes called feedforward models, in that they only allow input to be passed on to the level of encoding that is next in line" (De Angelis, 2007, p. 64).

Levelt's (1989) speech production model is the predecessor to input processing models and cognitive representation models (Rast, 2008). In this model, the output of an item becomes input for the following item. Ellis (2005) identifies three stages in Levelt's model of speech production:

Ø   Conceptualization, when the purpose and semantic content of a message is determined.

Ø   Formulation, when the language learner or speaker maps phonological and grammatical features onto the preverbal message.

Ø   Articulation, when the phonetic plan produced by formulation is converted into actual speech.

Besides, Rast (2008) contends that Levelt's model of speech production comprises four main components:

1. Conceptualising: according to Levelt (as cited in Rast, 2008), at the level of conceptualizing, which is the first stage of production, at which point preverbal messages are generated. To arrive at the preverbal message, two types of knowledge, namely declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge must be accessed by the speaker (Rast, 2008). The declarative knowledge, which is stored in language speaker's long-term memory, refers to the encyclopaedic knowledge which is developed over years of experience, while the procedural knowledge refers to processing mechanisms which are involved in the act of the act of speech production. This knowledge, which belongs to working memory, consists of information that is attended by the speaker (Levelt, as cited in Rast, 2008).

2. Formulating: The preverbal message contains the necessary information for the following stage, formulating, where the conceptual structure is transformed into a linguistic structure. To transform the preverbal message into a phonetic plan, the lexical items are selected, and the corresponding grammatical and phonological rules are applied (Levelt, 1992; Rast, 2008). During this operation, as Levelt (1992) and Rast (2008) contend, activation and encoding of morphophonological information of lexical items is realized, not yet constituting overt speech but rather, the internal representation referred to as internal speech. According to Rast (2008), "a more precise way to put things would be to say that internal speech is the phonetic plan as far as it is attended to and interpreted by speaker" (p.25).

3. Articulating: this stage brings phonetic plan to life, conducing to overt speech.

4. Monitoring: Rast (2008) maintains that self-monitoring is essential during all these operations. He states that speakers must systematically control the link between their intentions their internal and overt speech. Besides, Levelt (1983) argues that making a self-repair is conducted in three phases. The first phase involves the monitoring done on one's own speech and the interruption of the flow of speech when trouble is detected. The second phase is "characterized by hesitation,

pausing, but especially the use of so-called editing terms" (p. 41). As Levelt (1983) maintains, which editing term is used is contingent upon the nature of speech trouble in a fairly regular fashion. The third phase comprises making the repair proper. The linguistic appropriacy of a repair "is not dependent on the speaker's respecting the integrity of constituents, but on the structural relations to a corresponding relation between the conjuncts of coordination" (p.41).

Drawing on Levelt's (1989) work on speech production, Pienemann (as cited in Ellis et al., 2009), proposes that language production whether in L2 or L1 can only be explained with references to the following basic set of premises:

- Ø   Speakers process specialized components that function autonomously in parallel,
- Ø   Processing in incremental,
- Ø   In order to cope with nonlinearity, language speakers need to store grammatical information in memory,

And thereby grammatical processing must have access to grammatical memory store, which Pienemann (as cited in Ellis et al., 2009) considers as task-specific and as involving procedural rather that declarative memory.

Willingness to Communicate (WTC) and Motivation to Speak

The willingness to communicate (WTC) can be conceptualized as a readiness to enter into discourse or as a readiness to speak (MacIntyre & Doucette, 2010) in the L2 at a particular time with a specific person. However, Ellis (2008) considers WTC as the extent to which learners are prepared to initiate communication (not just speaking) when they have a choice. It constitutes a factor believed to lead to individual differences in language teaching (Ellis, 2008). Both state and trait variables, including self-confidence, intergroup motivation, intergroup attitudes, and personality, were shown to affect one's WTC in second language learning (Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004). As it can be understood, willingness to communicate shows how much a person is interested to communicate with others in a language or express himself (through verbal or even body language). But care should be taken that WTC does not solely refer to the oral communication; it includes both written and oral communication as well as reading and comprehension (Hamidi & Montazeri, 2014). The desire which seems to exist behind speaking in particular should be named *motivation to speak* (MTS) rather that WTC.

Speaking

Byrne (1991) views speaking as a bilateral process where both interlocutors are engaged. As he suggests, in every conversation, we have a speaker and a listener; the speaker engages in the act of encoding his information and the listeners engage in the act of decoding. Byrne severely denounces the act of attributing listening to a passive act and believes that the listeners have the role of deciphering the codes elicited by the speaker.

Chastain (1998) gives the highest priority to speaking competency among four main competencies in a foreign language to be mastered. He argues that a good level of proficiency in speaking can guarantee the rise in other level of proficiency such as reading, writing, and listening. He purports that speaking can play two main roles of augmenting the retention and activating the current proficiency level of EFL learners.

Fluency, accuracy, and complexity.

Richards and Schmidt (1985) define fluency as the features giving speech naturalness and normality, "including native-like use of pausing, rhythm, intonation, stress, rate of speaking, and use of interjections and interruptions" (p. 204). In second language teaching, as they state, fluency accounts for a level of proficiency in communication including the ability to easily produce spoken or written language, the ability to speak with a decent but not essentially a perfect command of grammar, vocabulary, and intonation, the ability to convey ideas in an effective way, and the ability to formulate continuous speech without failing to run speech without difficulty or communication breakdown. They further contrast fluency with accuracy by contending that accuracy refers to the ability of the speaker to produce sentence which are grammatically correct but do not have to be fluent.

Kormos and Denes (2004) argue that speaking the language fluently is the ultimate goal to be attained in gaining a command over the target language and that there is no consensus over what variables underlie listeners' perception of fluency. However it appears that what is of importance is establishing reliable measures of fluency for researchers in applied linguistics**.**

In a study done by Kormos and Denes (2004) it was seen that fluency is not only a temporal phenomenon but some variables such as accuracy and fluency are also taken into consideration. It was seen that those who were fluent regarding high degree of speed in their speech also depicted more accuracy in speaking. The criteria they proposed for accuracy includes such factors as speed, pace, smoothness, and grammatical accuracy.

Complexity is, according to Richards and Schmidt (1985), "a composite measure of language use, normally reflecting the length of utterances and the amount of subordination used" (p.96). Richards and Schmidt (1985) also state that in the study of second language, learners' interlanguage or discourse complexity is a measure of second language development.

Of the challenges in dealing with second language acquisition is identifying the ongoing emergence of fluency, complexity, and accuracy in the EFL learner's language (Larsen-Freeman, 1997). She proposes the assumptions underlying the complex and dynamic view towards language learning to be language's being not fixed but a dynamic system, and language's evolving and changing in the dynamics of language use between and among individuals for both native speakers and L2 learners. Since language is complex, progress cannot be totally accounted for by performance in any one subsystem. What is clear at any one time is the interaction existing among multiple complex dynamic systems, which work on multiple timescales and levels. Moreover, there are many dimensions to language proficiency—accuracy, fluency, and complexity. The same components are under attention when dealing with the oral proficiency; they should be properly assessed.

Assessing oral proficiency.

Carter (2002) holds favor towards output-based assessment. As he states, there has come a trend of output-based assessment in higher education and many colleges have exerted this kind of assessment in their programs. Outcome-based assessment invites us to view our courses and curricula from a different perspective. He believes that outcome-based assessment can close educational feedback loopholes and can use the result of program assessment to improve the program. He also concludes that an outcomes-based model for writing can be applied in different situations. It can, for example, be used in a highly focused way with a single college or can be used for broader, campus-wide writing, and speaking. Outcomes-based assessment can ignite the impetus for continuous improvement of programs.

Elder et al. (2002) investigated the impact of performance condition on perception of task difficulty. By the shift from the grammatical ability of learners to their real performance, the instruments of measuring this ability have really changed. They state that more complex tasks distract students' attention from the form and direct it towards context.

Breiner-sanders, Lowe, Miles, and Swender (1999) proposed ACTFL guidelines for oral proficiency testing. They call this oral proficiency "functional competence". In its guidelines, ACTFL uses the top-down approach which has the advantages of: 1) emphasizing that high levels are closely related to low levels above, not below, and representing a considerable step towards accomplishing the functions at the level above, not just excellence in the functions of the level itself and 2) allowing for fewer negatives and less redundancy in the description when they refer, as they must, to the incapability of a speaker to function consistently to a higher level. They state that another change in ACTFL guidelines is that it has divided the advanced level into three levels of high, mid, and low sublevels. This new categorization means that a better care should be taken in delineating a speaker's progression through the advanced level of proficiency.

Clark and Hooshmand (1992) state that in many oral testing situations a direct meeting consists of an examiner and an examinee; and a face to face testing requires presence of both participants at the same time. Since this prerequisite cannot be always met; there can the tendency towards indirect testing which includes audio recordings. Qualitative evaluation seems to indicate that the screen to screen modality is acceptable, although there is a general preference for face-to-face modality (Clark & Hooshmand, 1992).

According to Mackey (2006), feedback provided during conversational interaction facilitates second language (L2) acquisition. A substantial number of studies have been done regarding this issue. Their study tried to confirm the veracity of this claim and in case of its veracity what kind of corrective feedback would end in the best result. The type of correction sequence was determined through answering four questions:

1. Is the correct form provided immediately by the teacher or, in rare cases, by another learner or is the learner invited to correct himself?

2. Does the learner succeed in correcting his error or is the correction, in the end, provided by the teacher or another learner?

3. If he can not correct himself, does the learner repeat the correct version?

4. If the correct form is provided immediately by the teacher, is the correction made more salient by explicit rejection of the incorrect forms? The questions concerning the learners' contribution are most crucial followed by the saliency of the correction.

As it can be inferred from the questions posed above, there seems to be the necessity for teachers to give learners the opportunity to make correction. But the question is how they can do this. Lumley and O'Sullivan (2005) believe that there are effects on performance attributable to an interaction of such variables as task topic and the gender of person presenting the topic and gender of candidates. In the test they gave to graduate students' language proficiency assessment (GSLPA), Lumley and O'Sullivan (2005) included two tasks. In the first task, test takers listened to a radio interview on a topic related to popular culture, entertainment, or leisure activities which were to be summarized by them for the benefit of a friend. In the final task, the students were required to join a conversation between a colleague and a visitor to their country, and to give advice, opinion or suggestion about living in their country (Hong Kong). They believed their samples to be more or less specifically related to business environment and to cover a wide range of situations. Tasks are more likely to impact on individuals differentially, rather than at the level of groups defined at this level (Lumley & O'Sillivan, 2005). O'Sullivan (2002) explored the effect on pair-task performance of test taker's familiarity with partner. He argues that familiarity with one's partner affects the performance in pair- work elicitation, a kind of oral proficiency test, tasks.

Final Remarks

As it was discussed earlier, studies conducted in the realm of second or foreign language acquisition have had their utmost focus on motivation as a general approach to learning. All of them have taken motivation into a layman account by assuming one motivation all four skills to be learnt in a language. However, it can be argued that motivation can be dealt with for each of the skills separately, regarding the plethora of factors having latent or overt contributions to them. Adverting attention to the importance of speaking skill, we can put an unquestionable emphasis on the attempt to be made aimed at improving motivation of learners towards this skill in a specific sense. In so doing, we can accost the solution to the ever-concerning obsession of improving language learners' speaking skill or, in a more technical term, oral proficiency. The need to the development of a questionnaire solely measuring language learners' motivation to speak than their motivation to learn, as a general approach to motivation, has, accordingly, been felt, providing ELT scholars and practitioners with more accurate information on the loopholes to be averted and steps to be taken in the process of improving these learners' oral proficiency.

References

Breiner-Sanders, K. E., Lowe, P., Miles, J., & Swender, E. (1999). ACTFL proficiency guidelines- Speaking. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*(1), 13-18.

Byrne, D. (1991). *Teaching oral English*. London: Longman.

Carter, M. (2002). A process for establishing outcome-based plans for writing and speaking in the disciplines. *North Carolina State University*, 4-29.

Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills: Theory to practice*. New York: Harcourt Brace: Jovanich, Inc.

Clark, J. L. D., & Hooshmand, D. (1992). Screen-to-screen testing: An explanatory study of oral proficiency interview using video teleconferencing. *System, 20* (3), 293-304.

De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation.* London: Pearson Education.

Elder, C., Iwashita, N., & McNamara, T. (2002). Authenticity in an embedded assessment task. *Language Testing, 19* (10), 347-368.

Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review.* Aukland: Research Division.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Elder, C., Erlam, R., Philp, J., & Reinders, H. (2009).*Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Field, M. L. (2006). Finding a path to fluent academic and workplace reading. In E. Uso-Juan & A. Martinez-Flor (Eds.), *Current trends in the development and teaching of the four language skills* (pp. 329-354). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hamidi, H., & Montazeri, M. (2014). *Dictionary of second language acquisition*. Retrieved from http://www.iranelt.com/index.php/introduction-to-sla.

Hickok, G. (2001). Speech production: Psycholinguistic implications. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 30* (3), 225-235.

Kormos, J., & Denes, M. (2004). Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. *System, 32,*145-164.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written production of five Chinese learners of English. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(4)*,* 590-619.

Levelt, W. J. M. (1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition, 14*, 41- 104.

Levelt, W. J. M. (1992). Accessing words in speech production: Stages, processes, and representations. *Max-Planck-Institute fur Psycholinguistik, 1*, 1-22.

Littlejohn, A. (2001). Motivation. Where does it come from? Where does it go? *English Teaching Professional, 19*, 5-8.

Liu, X. (2010). Arousing the college students' motivation in speaking English through role-play. *International Education Studies, 3* (1), 136-144.

Lumley, I. & O'Sullivan, B. (2005). The effect of test-taker gender, audience and topic on task performance in tape-mediated assessment of speaking. *Language Testing, 22*(10), 415-437.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Doucette, J. (2010). Willingness to communicate and action control. *System, 38,* 161-171.

Mackey, R. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(3), 405-430.

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (2004).*Second language learning theories* (2nded). London: Hodder Arnold.

Rast, R. (2008). *Foreign language input: Initial processing*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (1985). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics.* London: Pearson Education.

Yashima, T., Zenuk-Nishide, L., & Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and affect on WTC and second language communication. *Language Learning, 54* (1), 119–152.