

## On the Relationship between Language Learning Strategy Use and Motivation

MASOUD RAHIMI DOMAKANI

*Department of English  
Shahrekord University, Iran*

ALI ROOHANI

*Department of English  
Shahrekord University, Iran  
roohani.ali@gmail.com*

ROGHAYEH AKBARI

*Department of English  
Shahrekord University, Iran*

### ABSTRACT

*A shift of attention has taken place in second/foreign language (L2) learning research from the products of learning to the processes through which learning takes place. Thus, L2 researchers have turned their attention to the role that language learning strategies play in L2 learning/teaching. Given that L2 learning and teaching is difficult and needs motivation, this study investigates second language (L2) learning strategy use as well as instrumental and integrative types of motivation. Besides, it explores the relationship between L2 learning strategy use and motivation in a sample of 152 EFL learners at two Iranian universities. To collect data, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and a motivational questionnaire were used. The collected data were analyzed descriptively and inferentially using correlation. Results showed that, first, Iranian EFL participants, in general, had a moderately high level of motivation toward learning English. Second, they were more integratively motivated. Third, compensation strategies were the leading strategy type and social strategies were the least common reported type of strategy. Fourth, motivation correlated positively with all types of language learning strategies. Finally, the implications of the findings for L2 research and pedagogy are presented.*

*Keywords: instrumental motivation; integrative motivation; language learning strategies use; L2 Learning; SILL*

### INTRODUCTION

Learning strategies are "behaviors or actions which learners use to make language learning more successful, self-directed and enjoyable" (Oxford 1989, p. 235). Oxford and Nyikos (1989) argue that learning strategies are important to language learning for several reasons. First, appropriate learning strategies are highly related to successful language achievement. If learners know how to use learning strategies appropriately, they can benefit greatly. Second, learners who use appropriate learning strategies take responsibility for their own learning by "enhancing learner autonomy, independence, and self-direction" (p. 291). Third, unlike most other learning characteristics (such as aptitude, attitude, and personality), learning strategies are teachable.

Despite agreement on the importance of learning strategies, there is not a consensus on the classification of learning strategies. The most well-known taxonomy of language learning strategies has been established by Oxford (1990a), which is "the most comprehensive classification of learning strategies to date" (Ellis 1994, p. 539). She divides

strategies into two major classes: direct strategies, which directly involve the target language, and indirect strategies which "do not directly involve the subject matter itself, but are essential to language learning nonetheless" (Oxford 1990b, p. 71). Direct strategies consist of memory strategies, cognitive strategies, and compensation strategies and indirect strategies consist of metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies.

Early research on language learning strategies (Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, & Todesco 1978, Rubin 1975) was mostly concerned with exploring the strategies used by good language learners. In fact, researchers were interested in determining what would distinguish "good" from "poor" language learners. More recent studies, however, have attempted to investigate how choice of language learning strategies is related to or affected by some individual variables such as gender (Aliakbari & Hayatzadeh 2008, Al-Otaibi 2004, Khamkhien 2010, Salem 2006), language proficiency (Hong-Nam & Leavell 2006, Tuncer 2009, Yilmaz 2010), culture (El-Dib 2004), learning styles (Rahimi, Riazi, & Saif 2008), and beliefs about language learning (Yin 2008). Among the affective variables, motivation was considered by some researchers (Oxford & Nyikos 1989, Oxford, Park-Oh, Ito & Sumrall 1993, Rahimi et al. 2008) as the one related to the learners' choice and frequency of learning strategy application.

Gardner (1985) defines language learning 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). Moreover, motivation determines "the extent of active, personal involvement in L2 learning" (Oxford & Shearin 1994, p. 12). That is, motivation provides "the primary impetus to initiate L2 learning and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process" (Dörnyei 1998b, p. 117). In a seminal work, after investigating the role of attitudes/motivation in learning French in various regions of Canada, Gardner and Lambert (1972, cited in Gardner 1985) classified learning motivation into two major groups: integrative and instrumental motivation. The former was defined as a desire to learn a language to integrate into the target language community and the latter was described as a desire to acquire a language for utilitarian or external reasons such as getting a better job or higher salary. In other words, as Gardner (2011) states, integrative orientation is a collection of reasons that reflect common or conceptually similar goals, indicating that the individual is learning the language because of a genuine interest in coming, or at least willingness to come, closer psychologically with individuals who speak the language whereas instrumental orientation is a goal that does not seem to involve any identification or feeling of closeness with the other language group. By combining motivation theory with social psychological theory, Gardner and Lambert introduced the model of L2 motivation that was "much more elaborate and advanced than many ... psychological models of motivation" (Dörnyei 1994, p. 519). According to them, success is a function of the learner's attitude toward the linguistic-cultural community of the target language; hence, they added a social dimension to the study of motivation to learn an L2.

In English as a foreign language (EFL) context such as that of Iran, learning and teaching English has long been a difficult task for both EFL students and teachers due to reasons such as little close contact with the target language and community. However, some Iranian EFL students learn English so well. Thus, it is worthwhile to investigate their motivational orientations towards learning English. The present study intends to explore the extent to which Iranian EFL learners are motivated to learn English as a foreign language and highlight their type of motivation in such a context. This study relies on Gardner's (1985, 1988, 2000) socio-educational model of L2 motivation, which is still influential. Two classes of orientations (i.e., reasons for studying an L2) are identified in this model: the integrative and instrumental orientation/motivation. Gardner (1985) hypothesizes that L2 learners with positive attitudes toward the target culture and people will learn the target language more

effectively than those who do not have such positive attitudes. According to this model, 'integrativeness' refers to an "individual's openness to taking on characteristics of another cultural/linguistic group" (Gardner 2005, p. 7) while 'instrumentality' refers to "conditions where the language is being studied for practical or utilitarian purposes" (Gardner 2005, p. 11). In Gardner's model of second language acquisition, learners who have the characteristic of 'integrativeness' are said to have an integrative orientation (or reason) towards learning the language, favorable attitudes towards the language community, and a general openness towards other groups. Unlike the integrative orientation, the instrumental orientation refers to the practical reasons for learning the language, without taking a close interest to the language community or culture. Moreover, in the socio-educational model, it is assumed that "attitudes toward the learning situation and integrativeness serve as the major supports for individual motivation to learn L2" (Gardner 2005, p.10).

In addition, since language learning outcomes and academic performance are mediated through the learners' application of the learning strategies, this study seeks to explore language learning strategy use in EFL contexts such as Iran where more studies on strategy use are required to have a clearer picture on learners' strategy use. In light of the above issues and given the scarcity of research on the relationship between L2 learning strategy use and integrative/instrumental types of motivation, this study attempts to investigate the relationship between the aforementioned variables in a sample of English majors in several universities. To this end, the following research questions are addressed:

1. To what extent are the EFL learners motivated? Are the EFL participants more integratively or instrumentally motivated?
2. What language learning strategies (i.e., memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, social, and affective) do EFL learners use more frequently in the process of learning English?
3. Is there any significant relationship between EFL learners' motivation and language learning strategy use?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

In the literature on motivation, seldom is one single definition of motivation included. Ellis (1994), in an overview of research on motivation, simply states that motivation affects the extent to which language learners persevere in learning, what kinds of behavior they exert, and their actual achievement. Ellis (2004) considers motivation as one of the affective factors that accounts for the variance in learners' achievement. Wlodowski (cited in Gardner 1985) considers motivation as "the processes that can (a) arouse and instigate behavior, (b) give direction or purpose to behavior, (c) continue to allow behavior to persist, and (d) lead to choosing or preferring a particular behavior" (p. 2). For Dörnyei (1998a), motivation is an inner source, desire, emotion, reason, need, impulse or purpose that moves a person to a particular action. Gardner (1985, p. 50) defines motivation by specifying four aspects of motivation: a goal, effortful behavior to reach the goal, a desire to attain the goal, and positive attitudes toward the goal. He focuses on classifying reasons for L2 study, which he then identifies as orientation(s) in his socio-educational model of motivation. As Brown (2007) states, the definitions of motivations are based on the schools of thought. In behaviorism, motivation is the anticipation of reward driven to acquire positive reinforcement. In cognitivism, motivation is related to the choices people make. In constructivism, the emphasis is on social context and each person is motivated differently.

As Chalak and Kassaian (2010) point out, in L2 studies, the two best-known classifications for motivation are intrinsic/extrinsic and integrative/instrumental motivation. Intrinsic/extrinsic motivation refers to whether the motivation is more inside a person or outside of him/her. Intrinsic motivation refers to the "inherent tendency to seek out novelty and challenges, to extend and exercise one's capacities, to explore, and to learn" (Ryan & Deci 2000b, p. 70) while extrinsic motivation is defined as "a construct that pertains whenever an activity is done in order to attain some separable outcome" (Ryan & Deci 2000a, p. 60). Integrative/instrumental classification focuses on the reasons for learning a language. The former includes "a favorable attitude toward the target language community; possibly a wish to integrate and adapt to a new target culture through use of the language" and the latter includes "a more functional reason for learning the target language, such as job promotion, or a language requirement" (Gardner 1985, p. 54).

The instrumental/integrative classification of motivation has provided impetus for L2 motivation research. For instance, Chalak and Kassaian (2010) investigated the various socio-psychological orientations of Iranian undergraduates towards learning English. They focused on the motivation orientations of the students and their attitudes towards the English language and its community in a group of 108 students majoring in English translation using the AMTB (Attitude, Motivation Test Battery). The results revealed that these Iranian nonnative speakers of English learned the language for both instrumental and integrative reasons and their attitudes towards the target language community and its members were generally found to be highly positive. However, Ming, Ling, and Jaafar (2011) state that Malaysian students tend to be more instrumentally motivated. This tendency is also evident in several other Asian communities. For instance, Liu's (2007) study conducted in mainland China showed similar tendency among the students. The Chinese students wanted to study English to get promoted, have a good job, search information on the Web and be better educated.

Looking for links between motivation and L2 learning strategies was stimulated by a concern with how motivation would work. Several studies exploring motivation and language learning strategy use have supported the argument that motivation can have a relationship with the learners' use of different types of strategies. For instance, Oxford and Nyikos (1989) examined variables affecting the choice of language learning strategies by more than 1200 university students learning foreign languages in a Midwestern American university. They found that motivation was the most significant factor influencing the use of learning strategies. Also, Oxford (1989) discovered that motivation was one of the most influential factors affecting learner's use of strategies. In their study, MacIntyre and Noels (1996) found that motivation was associated with five of the six categories of strategies, but motivation did not correlate with the use of affective strategies in their study. However, in Chun-huan's (2010) study on Chinese college students, just the correlation of motivation with cognitive, social and memory strategies was found to be meaningful. Unlike, the above two studies, Schmidt and Watanabe (2001), who investigated the factors which could affect the use of language learning strategies in a large sample of 2,089 learners of five different foreign languages at the University of Hawai'i, reported that the use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies was most affected by motivation. Furthermore, Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006) reported that in the context of intensive English programs (IEP) in the US, the metacognitive and social learning strategies were used more frequently since the ESL participants of the study had instrumental motivation; that is, they were learning English to advance their academic and professional lives. Also, Wharton (2000), in his study of students' language learning strategies, reported that motivation, in general, had a positive relationship with the language learning strategy use. Focusing on Gardner's instrumental and integrative types of motivation, Chang and Huang (1999) studied 46 Taiwanese EFL students in the United States. The findings of their study showed that motivational intensity, integrative motivation,

and instrumental motivation correlated significantly with the language learning strategy use. Contrary to the above results, Vossughi and Ebrahimi (2003) reported no significant relationship between learners' motivation and the language learning strategy use. They examined the difference between monolingual (i.e., Persian speakers) and bilingual learners (i.e., American-Persian speakers) in terms of language learning strategies use and motivation. They concluded that there would be no significant role for learners' motivation on the language learning strategy use.

According to Ushioda (2005), the literature on motivation has two main streams. One stream consists of the studies based on Gardner's socio-educational model and another includes the studies based on the alternative models of motivation such as self-determination model (Deci & Ryan 1985), process model (Dörnyei 2000, Hiromori 2009) or expectancy-value theory, which is a psychological model (Eccles 1983, Eccles & Wigfield 1995). Given that language learning is a social event that requires the incorporation of various elements of L2 culture, this present study endorses the inclusion of a social dimension in the construct of motivation in Gardner's socio-educational model (Gardner 1985, 1988, 2000) to investigate motivation/motivational orientations (i.e., instrumental and integrative ones) in a sample of Iranian university students. Considering the growth of international relations of Iran with other nations and the extended interest towards growing technology throughout the world, learning English as a foreign language has also found a greater importance in Iranian schools. Furthermore, whereas some researchers (Roohani 2001) have reported that EFL learners at the state universities are more integratively motivated, some others (Vaezi 2008) have reported that they are more instrumentally motivated. Therefore, there is a need to investigate the motivational orientations (i.e., instrumental and integrative types of motivation) in such a context to have a more vivid picture. Additionally, as indicated in the most aforementioned studies, the effect of motivation as one of the affective factors has been considered influential in L2 learning, but some researchers (Vossughi & Ebrahimi 2003) have undermined the relationship between motivation and strategy use. Therefore, this study tries to clarify the above issue, given that little research has explored instrumental and integrative types of motivation together with L2 learning strategy use in an EFL context.

## METHODOLOGY

### PARTICIPANTS

A total of 152 Iranian EFL students were selected randomly from several universities in Iran in 2010. Accessibility was the main reason for the choice of the universities. They included 52 male and 100 female EFL students majoring in Teaching of English and English Translation. Out of 152 EFL students, 34 were from freshmen, 46 were sophomores, 30 were juniors and 42 were seniors. The participants with the mean age of 20 had studied English as foreign language for 6-7 years at secondary and high schools before starting their university education.

### INSTRUMENTS

Two questionnaires were used to collect the data in this study: a motivational questionnaire developed by Roohani (2001) and Oxford's (1990a) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). The motivational questionnaire consisted of 22 items in the form of a five-point Likert type scale, ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. Eleven items measured instrumental motivation and 11 measured integrative motivation. In other words,

integrative motivation was defined in terms of agreeing with items like "I am learning English so that I can get in contact with English-speaking people." Instrumental motivation was defined in terms of agreeing with items like "I am learning English for its certificate because in my country a higher certificate is primary for marriage and future career prosperity."

Following Gardner's (1985) socio-educational based-model of motivation, Roohani (2001) developed the motivational questionnaire. The content validity was checked based on the experts' judgment and a careful and critical examination of the test items. Two assistant professors who had adequate knowledge of test construction and were teacher researchers in the area of motivation checked the suitability of the items. Regarding the construct validity, Roohani used Principle Components Analysis (PA2) with a varimax rotation on all the data collected from a large sample of EFL students in several state and Islamic Azad universities in Iran. The confirmatory factor analysis revealed the existence of two factors (i.e., instrumental and integrative motives). Cronbach alpha coefficient was also used to investigate the reliability of the test and the two parts. The alpha coefficient reliability of the test was found to be 0.78 and the alpha coefficients for the integrative and instrumental parts were found to be 0.90 and .94 respectively, which were high.

The other questionnaire, Oxford's (1990a) SILL, consisted of 50 items measuring six general categories of strategies: memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. The SILL was in the Likert type scale, ranging from (1) *never or almost never true of me* to (5) *always or almost always true of me*. The reported use of memory strategies (i.e., strategies which assist learners to store and retrieve information) was measured through items like "I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English." Cognitive strategies (i.e., strategies which relate to how learners think about their learning) were measured through items like "I say or write new English words several times." Compensation strategies (i.e., strategies which enable learners to make up for limited knowledge) were measured through items like "When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures." Metacognitive strategies (i.e., strategies which help learners to manage or regulate their learning) were measured through items like "I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better." Affective strategies (i.e., strategies which relate to learners' feelings) were measured through items like "I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake." Finally, Social strategies (i.e., strategies which involve learning by interaction with others) were measured through items like "I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk."

According to Oxford and Burry-Stock (1995), the SILL is valid using the predictive and correlative relationship with language performance measures like course grades and proficiency ratings. They have also stated that "the reliability of the SILL is very acceptable" (p. 6). According to Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006), several studies by researchers such as Yang in 1992 and Lee in 1998 have all revealed the reliability indices higher than 0.90 for the SILL.

#### PROCEDURES

Data were collected by one of the researchers during the fall semester of 2010-2011 academic years. Data collection was between the second and fourth weeks of a 16-week semester, that is, after class procedures had been established and students were beginning to get to know one another but before pressures started building in preparation for mid-term examinations. Before going into the classrooms, one of the researchers contacted the instructors of classes and set up a time to conduct the study in their classes. The surveys conducted with the presence of the researcher. She explained the purpose of the questionnaire to the EFL

participants, assuring them that the information would be used only for research purposes. The participants were asked to complete the questionnaires in class time. Meanwhile, seven participants were excluded from the study since they failed to complete the questionnaire.

## RESULTS

The first research question of the study was concerned with the participants' profile of language learning motivation and the extent to which they were integratively and instrumentally motivated. Descriptive analyses of the participants' responses to the motivational questionnaire were conducted to find out the degree of their language learning motivation as well as type of motivation. The results are reported in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 1. Descriptive statistics of motivation

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. dev.
Integrative motivation	152	1.91	5.00	3.74	.60
Instrumental motivation	152	1.55	4.64	3.37	.55
Motivation	152	1.73	4.64	3.56	.52

As shown in Table 1, the mean score of the motivation was 3.56 with the standard deviation of 0.52, indicating that there were not great individual differences with respect to motivation scores. In other words, there was little variation among motivation scores. However, the motivation mean score was greater than 2.5 (i.e. the middle on the 5-point Likert scale), indicating a moderately high degree of motivation among the participants. In addition, the variation was small with respect to integrative and instrumental motivation scores since the standard deviations of motives were small. However, the mean scores of integrative and instrumental motives (3.74 and 3.37 respectively) were found to be above 2.5, indicating that the participants had a relatively high level of integrative and instrumental orientations. Besides, once the mean scores of two types of motivation were compared, the mean of integrative motivation (3.74) was higher than that of instrumental motivation (3.37).

TABLE 2. Percentage of students' motivational orientation

Motivation	N	Percent	Percent
Integrative	107	70.4	70.9
Instrumental	32	21.1	21.2
Integrative & Instrumental	13	7.9	7.9
Total	152	99.3	100.0

As reported in Table 2, about 71% of the EFL participants (N = 107) were more integratively motivated since their integrative mean scores were higher than their instrumental mean scores. About 21% of the participants (N = 32) were more instrumentally motivated since their instrumental mean scores were higher than their integrative mean scores. The integrative and instrumental scores of about 8% of the participants (N= 13) were the same; they demonstrated equal degree of both orientations.

The second research question was concerned with the participants' profile of language learning strategy use. Descriptive analyses of the participants' responses to the SILL

questionnaire were carried out to find out the profile of their L2 learning strategy use. The results are reported in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Descriptive statistics of strategy use and six strategy categories

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. dev.
Memory strategy	152	1.44	4.89	3.47	.59
Cognitive strategy	152	1.57	4.71	3.24	.53
Compensation strategy	152	1.83	5.00	3.56	.66
Metacognitive strategy	152	1.11	6.89	3.42	.65
Affective strategy	152	1.17	4.67	3.25	.64
Social strategy	152	1.67	5.00	3.22	.73
Overall strategy use	152	1.70	4.48	3.36	.47

According to Table 3, the strategy scores ranged from 1.17 to 5 and the mean strategy scores ranged from 3.22 to 3.56, indicating that the performance of the participants on the categories of strategies varied little, given that the standard deviations were all below one. All mean scores of the categories as well as overall mean of strategy use were found to be above 2.5 on a 5-point scale. Oxford (1990a), the developer of SILL questionnaire, has stated that a mean score in the range of 3.5 to 4.4 (i.e., always or almost always used) and 4.5 to 5.0 (i.e., usually used) on a SILL item reflects the high use of that strategy; a mean score in the range of 2.5 to 3.4 (i.e., sometimes used) reflects the medium use, and a mean score in the range of 1.5 to 2.4 (i.e., usually not used) and 1.0 to 1.4 (i.e., never or almost never used) show the low use of that strategy. The mean score of overall strategy use was 3.36. Following Oxford's (1990a) guidelines, the above mean score indicates the medium strategy use. In addition, the most frequently reported strategies were the compensation strategies, which were at the high range of strategy use. Other five strategy categories were in the medium-use range. The mean of memory strategies was 3.47, so close to the higher end of medium-use range. Moreover, among the six strategy types, social strategy received the lowest mean score (3.22).

To address the third research question concerning the relationship between motivation and language learning strategy use, the scores on the motivation and strategy use were obtained through Pearson product moment correlation coefficients. The results are reported in Table 4. Meanwhile, the assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity were checked before obtaining Pearson correlation coefficients. Results showed that there were not many outliers in the two sets of scores. Besides, there was a linear relationship between the two sets of scores. Thus, the basic assumptions were met.

TABLE 4. Correlation between motivation and strategy use

	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Meta-cognitive	Affective	Social	Total
Motivation	** .48	** .42	** .49	** .38	** .31	** .33	** .52
	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)

As displayed in Table 4, the overall use of strategies correlated significantly and positively with motivation ( $r = 0.52$ ). The correlation coefficient was significant at 0.01, indicating that the higher use of L2 learning strategies was associated with the higher levels of motivation; the more motivated the learners were, the more frequently the strategy use was reported. In addition, motivation, in general, correlated positively and significantly with memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies. All coefficients were found to be positive and significant, though not very high. Thus, the higher



levels of motivation were associated with the more frequent use of all types of strategies. Meanwhile, the correlation between the compensation strategies and motivation was found to be the highest ( $r = 0.49$ ,  $**p < 0.01$ ), but the correlation between the affective strategies and motivation was found to be the lowest ( $r = 0.31$ ,  $**p < 0.01$ ).

## DISCUSSION

One of the purposes of this study was to provide information on Iranian motivation toward learning English as a foreign language in two relevant areas: integrative and instrumental. Vaezi (2008) states that studies have not consistently shown either form of motivation to be more effective than the other, and the role of each is probably conditioned by various variables such as context, culture or personality. This is partly true; however, the present data-based research, accompanied with other lines of ongoing research, can take motivation research to a better level of maturity.

The results demonstrate that Iranian EFL participants were motivated toward learning English. The overall mean score was above average, indicating a high degree of motivation among EFL learners. This finding is promising. In Iran, very few native English speakers are permitted to teach EFL courses. Therefore, Iranian EFL students do not have the opportunity to benefit from native speakers of English; there are not many English speaking tourists or foreigners in Iran. Moreover, the places one can find tourists are limited to certain places and hotels. Therefore, Iranian EFL students do not have much personal contact with English speaking foreigners. In spite of all these, as the results have indicated, Iranian EFL university students can show high motivation towards learning English. This might be because of their attitudes, beliefs, demands and expectations. According to Gardner (1996), attitudes are related to motivation and can be changed. Attitudes towards learning English as a foreign language was generally positive in the universities where data were collected. However, this study does not rule out the idea that there might be some negative stereotypes towards some English speaking communities in other parts of the Iranian society.

Furthermore, the learner participants exhibited a higher level of integrative motivation than instrumental one. This result can serve as an important reminder for L2 teachers regarding the role that the classroom plays in encouraging motivation in students. The above finding contradicts the common view that in a foreign language context students are more instrumentally motivated since there is little desire to integrate. According to Lamb (2004), some researchers (Warden & Lin 2000) believe that in many EFL contexts around the world, where learners have limited contact with L2 speakers or their culture, an instrumental orientation may be more helpful in promoting successful learning. However, as Dörnyei (2011) states, in the extreme case, integrative orientation might concern assimilation or identification with the target community or withdrawal from ones' original group. In the absence of an L2 community in the learners' environment, as it is the case in Iran where English is learnt as a school subject, the identification can be generalized to the cultural and intellectual values associated with the L2 itself. Perhaps, that is the reason why powerful integrative motives were found among the Iranian L2 participants, who might have not met a single native speaker of English in their lives. Chalak and Kassaian (2012) also reported that the Iranian students of English translation showed a highly positive attitude towards English, its culture and people. In addition, we should not underestimate the role of technological advancements (e.g., internet and satellite) in demonstrating openness to other ways of life and commending respect for other cultural groups.

Moreover, the above result can partially support the findings of Chalak and Kassaian (2012), who reported that university students of English translation in Iran were both

intrinsically and extrinsically motivated. However, the aforementioned result contradicts the idea that EFL learners are more instrumentally oriented (Al-Tamimi & Munir 2009). Also, it is not consistent with the findings of Vaezi (2008), who concluded that Iranian L2 learners would have a higher degree of instrumental motivation than the integrative one since they might preserve their identity by unconsciously selecting to be motivated instrumentally. She argues that "aspiration related to integrative motivation might affect their identity and fear of identifying with English (western) culture" (p. 58). However, integrative motivational orientation, as Dörnyei (2011) argues, can involve the affective and interpersonal disposition and the desire to interact, not necessarily complete identification with the target culture. One reason for the inconsistency in findings might be due to type of instrument used in two studies. To collect data, she used a motivational questionnaire, developed by non-native speakers of Persian. But, the present study used a questionnaire developed by an Iranian nonnative speaker of English to investigate integrative and instrumental orientations of Persian EFL learners in an Iranian context. While the former one included integrative items like "The American are kind and cheerful" or "The British are kind and cheerful", the latter did not since, as Roohani (2001) has stated, such items can be misleading in an Iranian context; the students might mistake American or British politicians for American or British people, given the recent sanction against Iran by the West.

One of the findings of this study has been that L2 participants reported using language learning strategies at a relatively moderate level, following Oxford's (1990a) guidelines. This finding is consistent with the results of most researchers in Asian countries, such as Wharton (2000) in Singapore, and Park (2005) in Korea, and Zhou (2010) in China. They found that the EFL learners used language learning strategies at a medium level. Furthermore, the frequent use of compensation strategies reported by the L2 participants of the study can be considered as negative. These strategies include strategies such as using gestures and guessing that learners utilize to imply their meaning. As Canale and Swain (1980) state, they are part of 'strategic competence', called into action "due to performance variables or due to insufficient competence" (pp. 40-41). Perhaps, the participants were not proficient enough in English and reported the high use of compensatory strategies to demonstrate the gaps in their knowledge of English. As Hua, Mohd Nor, and Jaradat (2012) argue, "if participants are fully equipped with linguistic resources, they make less use of compensation strategy than those who have less linguistic access" (p. 841). They also reported high use of this type of strategy in oral communication by the low proficient postgraduate Arabic students of English in Malaysia. Moreover, MoBedell and Oxford (1996, cited in Chen 2009) claim that the frequent use of compensation strategies may be typical of Asian students. It seems that further research in other contexts in Asia is required to make a strong generalization about the compensation strategy use by EFL Asian learners. In addition, social strategies reported less by the participants. Perhaps, the participants had not had opportunities for cooperating with a proficient user of the new language. This finding is logical since the traditional methods of teaching a foreign language still prevails in most L2 classes in Iran. As Hosseini (2007) maintains, the majority of EFL classes "are mostly run through a hybrid of grammar-translation method and audio-lingual methods, entails translation, repetition, memorization, recitation, and reproduction" (p. 2); interactive learning is not promoted and student-oriented philosophy does not underpin the L2 curriculum. Furthermore, the use of memory strategies was favored more than that of affective strategies by the participants. In terms of affect, the EFL learners frequently reported that despite efforts to relax when they were uncertain about speaking English, their fears of making a mistake often kept them from trying. Perhaps, as Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006) argue, "Asian cultural mores encourage listening to others and discourage public discussion of feelings" (p. 409). Memory strategies are mainly in keeping with instructional systems which are typically didactic and emphasize rote memorization. It is

possible that Iranian EFL teachers may be encouraging their students, perhaps implicitly, to use memory-related strategies more than affective or social strategies in the classroom.

The above findings are consistent with the results obtained by Lee and Oxford (2008), who found the compensation strategy type as the most frequently used strategy and social strategy as the least frequently one in a large sample of Korean students. The picture is not so disappointing, but the language learning strategy use should be fostered more in L2 classes in Asian countries such as Iran. An increased awareness of realities uncovered by aforementioned research should draw our attention to the characteristics of L2 teachers since they can have significant bearings on students' language learning strategy use, leading to L2 learning achievement. As Root (1999) points out, teachers need to be aware of how difficult it may be for L2 learners to find authentic language use situations outside classrooms. Thus, L2 learners need better models to learn how to implement effective learning strategies.

The more motivated the L2 learners are, the more frequently they use language learning strategies. As MacIntyre and Noels (1996) point out, there might be two plausible explanations. First, L2 learners who are more motivated might be more likely to invest time and effort needed to engage in strategy use, since strategies are defined as effortful behaviors. Second, L2 learners who are aware of strategies and consider them to be more effective and experience less difficulty in their use might become more motivated to learn the L2. Therefore, as MacIntyre and Noels (1996) assert, "not only does high motivation lead to significant use of language learning strategies, but high strategy use probably leads to high motivation as well" (p. 295).

The above finding of the present study supports the results reported by several other researchers (Oxford & Nyikos 1989, Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy 1996, Schmidt & Watanabe 2001). Schmidt et al. (1996), for example, found that Egyptian EFL learners with strong motivation (i.e., instrumental motivation) reported using strategies such as cognitive ones. Also, Schmidt and Watanabe (2001) reported that the use of cognitive strategies and a liking for challenge in the classroom are highly related to motivation. As they argue, if one believes that learning an L2 is important (for either instrumental or integrative reasons), "one would reasonably be expected to use a variety of cognitive, metacognitive, and study skills strategies in order to achieve that valued goal" (p. 346). Moreover, Oxford and Nyikos found that highly motivated learners used four general groups of strategies (i.e., formal rule-related practice, functional practice, general study, and conversational input elicitation strategies) more than less motivated learners. The reported relationship between language learning motivation and strategy use imply that, to compensate for the lower use of some language learning strategies, we can invest on motivation, particularly integrative motives. In so doing, the motivational characteristics of L2 teachers can be an important factor since teachers have bearings on students' motivational disposition, hence developing their strategy use. This claim is supported by the results achieved by Behroozizad, Nambiar, and Amir (2012), who investigated the mediating role of the teacher in the development of language learning strategies in Iran. They reported that, being stimulated by the opportunities provided by their language teachers, the EFL learners "could successfully develop a variety of strategies to improve their knowledge in terms of vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, listening comprehension and speaking" (p. 47). Unfortunately, there has not been much attempt to list ways to motivate L2 teachers to foster L2 students' learning strategy use, which suggests further investigations.

## CONCLUSION

Motivation and language learning strategies have both been shown to play a role in L2 learning. Different motivational factors are at work in different contexts. The results of this

study have presented a picture demonstrating that the Iranian EFL participants had a moderately high level of motivation toward learning English. Their integrative and instrumental motives were both relatively high. However, they were found to be more integratively motivated. The findings confirm the idea that in a foreign language context, L2 students can be integratively oriented. Thus, the availability of the target group in the immediate environment is not the only important determinant in the choice of motivational orientation. Results also give a picture that integrative motives such as interest in the English culture, getting more entertainment through English media, communicating with target language people and understanding how they behave can be important for Iranian students. In addition, the reported use language learning strategies by the participants were at a medium level with the compensation strategies as the most frequently used strategies and social strategies as the least frequently used ones. Perhaps, the high use of the compensatory strategies demonstrates the gap in the learners' knowledge of English as they are part of 'strategic competence', called into action due to insufficient competence in English. Furthermore, the motivation correlated positively and significantly with the language learning strategy use, suggesting that the more motivated L2 learners would use more language learning strategies. Perhaps, more motivated L2 learners in classrooms are more willing to invest time and effort required to engage in strategy use conducive to L2 learning success. Finally, this study was just a step in exploring motivational orientations, language learning strategy use and their relationships. It was exploratory in nature and the small sample size dictates caution in interpreting the results and making strong generalizations. There are drawbacks, too, to the use of two self-report questionnaires to assess EFL learners' use of language learning strategies and motivation. There might be inaccuracies or the other strategies or motivational reasons which do not appear on the questionnaires. To overcome the problem, think aloud protocol method can be used. This is sufficient to suggest further research with different types of data collection procedures such as introspective think-aloud protocols.

#### REFERENCES

- Aliakbari, M. & Hayatzadeh, A. (2008). Variation of language strategies among Iranian English students: The effect of gender. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*. Vol. 4. No. 3, 72-87.
- Al-Otaibi, G. N. (2004). Language learning strategy use among Saudi EFL students and its relationship to language proficiency level, gender and motivation. Unpublished PhD thesis, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, USA.
- Al-Tamimi, A. & Munir Shuib (2009). Motivation and attitudes towards learning English: A study of petroleum engineering undergraduates at Hadhramout University of sciences and technology. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies*. Vol. 9. No. 2, 29-55.
- Behroozizad, S., Nambiar, R. M. K., & Amir, Z. (2012). The relationship between language learning strategies and teacher's mediating role. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*. Vol. 18, No.2, 35- 48.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education Inc.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approach to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 1, 1-47.
- Chalak, A. & Kassaian, Z. (2010). Motivation and attitudes of Iranian undergraduate EFL students towards learning English. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies*. Vol. 10. No. 2, 37-56.
- Chang, S. F. & Huang, S. C. (1999). *Language learning motivation and language strategies of Taiwanese EFL students*. Retrieved March 15, 2011 from <http://www.mdu.edu.tw/~ged/other%20download/bulletin/20070319/11.pdf>
- Chen, M. L. (2009). Influence of grade level on perceptual learning style preferences and language learning strategies of Taiwanese English as a foreign language learners. *Learning and Individual Differences*. Vol. 19, 304-308.

- Chun-huan, F. (2010). A correlational study of language learning motivation and strategies of Chinese undergraduate. *Canadian Social Science*. Vol. 6. No.4, 202-209.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. NY: Plenum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge. *The Modern Language Journal*. Vol. 78. No. 4, 515-523.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998a). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*. Vol. 31, 117-35.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998b). Survey article: Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*. Vol. 31, 117-135.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualization of student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. Vol. 70, 519-538.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2011). *Attitudes, orientations and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications*. Retrieved November 15, 2011 from <http://www.udveksling.com/MenSpr2010/DörnyeiMotiv.pdf>
- Eccles, J. (1983). Expectancies, values and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and Achievement Motives* (pp. 75-146). San Francisco: Freeman.
- Eccles, S. & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the actor: The structure of adolescents' achievement task values and expectancy-related beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. Vol. 21, 215-225.
- El-Dib, M. A. B. (2004). Language learning strategies in Kuwait: Links to gender, language level, and culture in a hybrid context. *Foreign Language Annals*. Vol. 37, 85-95.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2004). Individual differences in second language learning. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 525-551). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitude and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (1988). The socio-educational model of second-language learning: assumptions, findings, and issues. *Language Learning*. Vol. 38, 101-126.
- Gardner, R. (1996). Motivation and second language acquisition: Perspectives. *Journal of CAAL*. Vol. 18, 19-42.
- Gardner, R. C. (2000). Correlation, causation, motivation and second language acquisition. *Canadian Psychology*. Vol. 41, 1-24.
- Gardner, R. C. (2005). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. *Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics/Canadian Linguistics Association Joint Plenary Talk, London, Ontario*. Retrieved 2011, from the World Wide Web: <http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/caaltalk5final.pdf>
- Gardner, R. (2011). *Integrative Motivation: Past, Present and Future*. Retrieved November 10, 2011 from <http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/GardnerPublicLecture1.pdf>
- Hirromori, T. (2009). A process model of L2 learners' motivation: From the perspectives of general tendency and individual differences. *System*. Vol. 37, 313-321.
- Hong-Nam, K. & Leavell, A. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System*. Vol. 34, 399-415.
- Hosseini, S. M. H. (2007). ELT in higher education in Iran and India: Critical view. *Language in India*. Vol. 7, 1-11.
- Hua, T. K., Mohd Nor, N. F., & Jaradat, M. N. (2012). Communication strategies among EFL students: An examination of frequency of use and types of strategies used. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies*. Vol. 12. No. 3, 831-848.
- Khamkhien, A. (2010). Factors affecting language learning strategy reported usage by Thai and Vietnamese EFL learners. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*. Vol. 7, 66-85.
- Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System*. Vol. 32, 3-19.
- Lee, K. R. & Oxford, R. L. (2008). Understanding EFL Learners' strategy use and strategy awareness. *Asian EFL Journal*. Vol. 10, 1-19.
- Liu, M. (2007). Chinese students' motivation to learn English at the tertiary level. *Asian EFL Journal*. Vol. 9, 126-146.
- MacIntyre, P. D. & Noels, K. A. (1996). Using social-psychological variables to predict the use of language learning strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*, Vol. 29. No. 3, 373-386.
- Ming, T. S., Ling, T. S., & Jafaar, N. M. (2011). Attitudes and motivation of Malaysian secondary students towards learning English as a second Language: A case study. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*. Vol. 17, 40-54.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Oxford, R. L. (1989). Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System*. Vol. 17. No. 2, 235-247.

- Oxford, R. L. (1990a). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990b). Styles, strategies, and aptitude: connections for language learning. In T. S. Parry & C. W. Stansfield (Eds.). *Language aptitude reconsidered* (pp. 67-125). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Oxford, R. L. & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System*. Vol. 23, 1-23.
- Oxford, R. L. & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal*. Vol. 73. No. 3, 291-300.
- Oxford, R. L., Park-Oh, Y., Ito, S., & Sumrall, M. (1993). Learning a language by satellite television: What influences student achievement? *System*. Vol. 21, 31-48.
- Oxford, R. L. & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*. Vol. 78, 12-28.
- Park, S. H. (2005). Language learning strategies and the relationship of these strategies to motivation and English proficiency among Korean EFL students. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Kansas, Kansas, USA.
- Rahimi, M., Riazi, A., & Saif, S. (2008). An investigation into the factors affecting the use of language learning strategies by Persian EFL learners. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 11. No. 2, 31-54.
- Roohani, A. (2001). An investigation into EFL students motivation in Shiraz state and Islamic Azad University. Unpublished MA thesis, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.
- Root, E. (1999). Motivation and learning strategies in a foreign language setting: A look at a learner of Korean. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Minnesota, Minnesota, USA.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What 'good language learners' can tell us? *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 9, 41-51.
- Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*. Vol. 25, 54-67.
- Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*. Vol. 55, 68-78.
- Salem, N. M. (2006). The Role of motivation, gender, and language learning strategies in EFL proficiency. Unpublished MA thesis, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon.
- Schmidt, R., Boraie, D., & Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign language motivation: Internal structure and external connections. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 9–70). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum.
- Schmidt, R. & Watanabe, Y. (2001). Motivation, strategy use, and pedagogical preferences in foreign language learning. In Z. Dörnyei & R. (Eds.). *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 313-359). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Tuncer, U. (2009). How do monolingual and bilingual language learners differ in use of learning strategies while learning a foreign language? Evidences from Mersin University. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 1, 852-856.
- Ushioda, E. (2005). The role of students' attitudes and motivation in second language learning in online language courses. *CALICO Journal*. Vol. 23, 49-78.
- Vaezi, Z. (2008). Language learning motivation among Iranian undergraduate students. *World Applied Sciences Journal*. Vol. 5, 54-61.
- Vossughi, H. & Ebrahimi, A. (2003). A comparative study of language learning strategies employed by bilinguals and monolinguals with reference to attitude and motivation. *IJAL*. Vol. 6. No. 2, 117-132.
- Warden, C. A. & Lin, H. J. (2000). Existence of integrative motivation in an Asian EFL setting. *Foreign Language Annals*. Vol. 33, 535-547.
- Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*. Vol. 50. No. 2, 203-243.
- Yilmaz, C. (2010). The relationship between language learning strategies, gender, proficiency and self-efficacy beliefs: a study of ELT learners in Turkey. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 2, 682-87.
- Yin, C. (2008). Language learning strategies in relation to attitudes, motivations, and learner beliefs: investigating learner variables in the context of English as a foreign language in China. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Maryland, Maryland, USA.
- Zhou, J. (2010). English language learning strategy use by Chinese senior high school students. *English Language Teaching*. Vol. 3. No. 4, 152-158.