

Motivation Type and Level of Language Proficiency: Two Crucial Factors in Self-Assessment

Ibrahim S. Al-Fallay

Associate Professor,
English Dept., College of Arts,
King Saud University, Riyadh, KSA.

Abstract

The aim of this study is two-fold: to investigate whether learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) have similar motivation types to those of learners of English as a Second Language (ESL), and to explore the effect of motivation type and level of proficiency in the foreign language on the accuracy of self-assessment. To answer the questions of the study, an eight-item questionnaire geared to identify the motivation type and a version of the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency were used. The subjects were also asked to assess their performance on each item of the proficiency test by selecting a value from a five-point scale. The sample of this study consisted of seven hundred and three (703) students of English as a foreign language enrolled at the Intensive English Program in the Institute of Public Administration, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Two hundred and nine (209) students of the sample were in the preparatory level, one hundred and sixty-seven (167) students in the elementary level, one hundred and forty-five (145) students in the intermediate level, and one hundred and eighty-two (182) students in the advanced level. The findings of this study indicated that learners of EFL learn the language with two types of motivation: integrative and instrumental orientations. These two types of motivation are similar to those that drive second language learners to learn the language. Furthermore, the study found that the correlations between self-assessment and the scores on the proficiency test were affected by the level of student proficiency in the foreign language and the motivation type of the subjects.

I. Introduction

Self-assessment is one of the main issues that have recently received much attention in language testing research. Whether it is called self-assessment, self-rating, or self-report, the process refers to "Assessment in the form of self-report or self-assessment, that is, assessment seen in the learner's own perspective; assessment seen as an internal or self-directed activity".¹ This definition clearly distinguishes self-assessment from another related process of assessment that Oskarsson defined as "Assessment in the form of examinations and administration of tests, that is assessment seen in the perspective of an 'outside agent', typically a teacher or a trained examiner; assessment seen as an external or 'other directed' activity".² The comparison of the two definitions reveals the reason behind the much attention given to the research investigating self-assessment. Assessment of language proficiency is no longer construed as a passive process in which a learner's language ability is rated by means of rigid testing techniques and by external observers. According to self-assessment, the test-taker or the language learner in general has a share in evaluating his proficiency in the first, second, or even the foreign language. This state of affairs may indicate to the test-taker that test-constructors and teachers trust his just evaluation of his performance.

Much of the research investigating self-assessment has focused on the reliability and validity of this process. Other studies have sought to reach an optimum way of writing self-assessment items. However, fewer studies have explored the relationship between self-assessment behavior and some background variables such as testees' age, sex, nationality, or level of education. Though such studies are valuable in shedding light on factors other than language proficiency that may influence accurate self-assessment, most of them have looked at external variables. Hence, the present study attends to focus on two variables that are internally related to test-takers. These two variables are motivation type to learn the foreign language and level of proficiency in that foreign language. It is worth mentioning that the present study is limited to the setting of learning English as a foreign language, though the generalization of its findings to similar situations seems acceptable.

Since the publication of John Upshur's work of 1975 on self-assessment, the topic has received great attention in language testing research.³ In that work, Upshur contended that self-assessment is a valuable tool in assessing and measuring second language proficiency since, according to him, language learners are the best persons who could evaluate their success or failure in learning and using the second language.

Unlike language tests that are mere samples of what should be assessed and which could be or could not be good representative of various language ability, language learners could accurately assess their ability in dealing with a wide range of language tasks.

Oskarsson believed that self-assessment could be used for purposes of selection and certification.⁴ Self-assessment could also be utilized for placing second language learners in adequate language classrooms. He also stated that self-assessment could be used, especially in postgraduate programs, where a teacher and a learner could positively negotiate the score of the learner. He added "candidates tend to estimate their own performance in much the same way as tutors do and they do not use self-assessment scheme as a chance of inflating their grades".⁵ Another advantage of the use of self-assessment was stated by Barrow et al. 1981, LeBlanc and Painchaud 1985, and von Elek 1989.⁶ Von Elek, for example, believed that a test, no matter how well it is developed, would only consist of a limited sample of language behavior a teacher is interested in investigating.⁷ However, the use of self-assessment widens the scope of the assessment of possible language behavior without being restricted by the time allotted or the cost allocated. Dickinson claimed that the use of self-assessment increases learners' involvement in evaluating his performance, which in turn increases their sense of security.⁸ Furthermore, some researchers, for example Hilton et al., 1985 and von Elek 1985, claimed that self-assessment gives information about the learners' ability that is very close to information obtained from objective measures and tests.⁹

Bachman and Palmer investigated the optimum way of presenting self-assessment items to test-takers.¹⁰ They concluded that using difficulty questions was more effective than using questions in the form of can/cannot or can/do. In addition, the can/cannot or can/do item may be written as a yes/no question and subjects have to respond to it. However, Heileman reported contrasting findings.¹¹ To investigate the impact of item wording on students' response in self-assessment items, she presented matched items of both types to 232 students of French as a second language and measured the difference between their means. She concluded that "Students ranked themselves significantly higher on 'can/do' than on 'difficulty'".¹² Heileman also found a high positive correlation, $r = .80$, between the two types of items.¹³ She ascribed her findings to the observation that students, in fact, paid attention to both content and form of the self-assessment item which she called the effect of 'acquiescence'.¹⁴ However, Wall et al. used a direct measure of self-assessment.¹⁵ They first administered a test to subjects, then asked

them to rate their performance either on each individual item of the test or on the whole test using a 1-5 or 1-7 scale. Students, in that study, choose a number that truly represented their performance from their own perspective. Shameem compared delayed and instant rating.¹⁶ She found out that delayed rating affected self-assessment on oral tasks more than its effect on tests of aural performance.

Although self-assessment has always been criticized for its subjectivity, some studies reported in the literature have proven the contrary. Bachman and Palmer, for example, reported high alpha reliabilities ranging from .877 to .917.¹⁷ In their 1989 study, Bachman and Palmer reported alpha reliabilities of self-assessment on tests of grammar, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic competence ranging from .540 to .886.¹⁸

The validity of self-assessment has also been explored. Wall et al. used Spearman Rank-Order Correlation to investigate the correspondence between subjects' actual performance on a placement test of English as a second language and their assessment of their performance.¹⁹ The coefficients of the correlations between the sub-tests of writing, reading, and listening and self-assessment were .30, .41, and .51, respectively. Shameem also used Spearman correlation to investigate the relationship between self-assessment and actual obtained scores on tests of listening and speaking.²⁰ Her coefficients were higher than those reported by Wall et al. ranging from .635 to .703. Furthermore, Bachman and Palmer investigated the validity of self-assessment using a multitrait multimethod technique. They reported coefficients ranging from .526 to .780. They concluded that "The results of this study indicate that self-rating can be reliable and valid measures of communicative language abilities".²¹

Ross analyzed data collected from 60 published studies on self-assessment that have used different testing techniques and geared to assess various language skills.²² He found out that the average overall correlation between self-assessment and the various sixty measures was high, $r = .6337$. He also investigated the correlation between self-assessment and correlations reported in 23 studies. He found a high correlation coefficient of .6139. The correlation between tests of listening skills in 18 studies and self-assessment was also high, $r = .6505$. The investigation of 29 self-assessment speaking tests gave a correlation of .5542. The correlation between tests of writing in 15 studies and self-assessment was also high, $r = .5249$.

Self-assessment, however, has some limitations. Davidson and Henning observed "a tendency on the part of the respondent to exaggerate estimation of personal ability".²³ Similar observation was stated by Heilenman (1990) who detected an effect of overestimation, particularly

among low experienced test-takers.²⁴ She concluded that "Although, overall, more experienced students do, as would be expected, rate themselves higher than less experienced ones, there is nevertheless a substantial amount of overestimation occurring among the latter".²⁵ Similar findings of the effect of overestimation were also reported by Ferguson, 1978, Anderson, 1982, Davidson and Henning, 1985, and Janssen-van Dieten, 1989.²⁶ Moreover, some studies, for example Blue, 1988, and Wesche et al., 1990, reported low and nonsignificant correlations between self-assessment and various measures of language proficiency.²⁷ Furthermore, it has been reported in the literature (see for example, Cannell et al., 1981, DeLameter, 1982, and Tourangeau, 1987) that the task of self-assessment requires subjects to perform complex cognitive operations which load students' cognitive capacity, and consequently has negative impact on learners' performance.²⁸

With the invaluable various uses of self-assessment in second/foreign language testing and its importance as a strategy, comprehensive research into self-assessment becomes necessary. Some studies reviewed above claimed that self-assessment could be used for placement and certification purposes. In fact, it could be deduced from such studies that self-assessment, when administered properly, may replace traditional objective testing. Other studies looked at the use of self-assessment in the classroom from the psychological point of view. They contended that its utilization may give the learner a secure feeling that the evaluation of his performance is not done behind closed doors or by means of rigid measures. Moreover, it was also claimed that self-assessment is superior to currently used testing system, since the latter is usually composed of a limited sample of what is supposed to be known. Through self-assessment, however, the learner can access all of his inventory; and hence the sampling domain is enlarged with no accompanying increase in time or cost. Oskarsson strongly advocated the use of self-assessment and proposed six reasons for the rationale of its use; they were: "(1) promotion of learning, (2) raised level of awareness, (3) improved good-orientation, (4) expansion of range of measurement, (5) shared assessment burden, and (6) beneficial postcourse effect".²⁸

Despite its great importance, it seems that there is a shortage in research into factors that may affect responses to self-assessment items. This study aims at investigating the impact of the two types of motivation, integrative and instrumental, on accurate self-assessment. It seeks to answer the following questions:

- 1- Are EFL learners able to determine their motivation types for learning the foreign language and are their motivation types similar to those of ESL learners?

- 2- Is there a difference in foreign language proficiency between integratively and instrumentally motivated students?
- 3- Does foreign language proficiency affect accurate self-rating on tests of the skills of English as a foreign language?
- 4- Do the two types of motivation affect the accuracy of self-assessment?

II. Method

The subjects of this study were seven hundred and three (703) students of English as a foreign language, who enrolled in the Intensive English Program in the Institute of Public Administration, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. When the study was conducted, the students were at four different levels of proficiency in English. Two hundred and nine (209) students were at the preparatory level (level 1); one hundred and sixty-seven (167) in the elementary level (level 2); one hundred and forty-five (145) in the intermediate level (level 3); and one hundred and eighty-two (182) in the advanced level (level 4). Al-Fallay (1998) reported that the average equivalent TOEFL score for a student in the preparatory level would be 233; 296 for an elementary level student; 324 for an intermediate level student; and 388 for an advanced level student.²⁹ Usually, students who enroll in the Intensive English Program study 24 hours a week; six hours are allotted to grammar; three hours to listening; and five hours to reading, writing, and speaking. By the end of each session which usually lasts for 8 weeks, students' achievement in grammar, reading, writing, speaking, and listening is assessed by teacher-made achievement tests that usually contain different language testing techniques. Those who obtain an average of 60% or more on these tests are advanced to next levels. All subjects were male, and all of them were high school graduates.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) distinguished two types of motivation for learning a second/foreign language, namely integrative and instrumental motivation.³⁰ An integratively motivated learner "wishes to learn more about the other cultural community" (3). Learning the language for instrumental purposes "reflect(s) the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement" (3). In short, integratively motivated students would like to learn not only the language but also its culture. On the contrary, instrumentally motivated learners believe that learning the language would enable them to improve their current situation, such as getting a better job or being promoted to a higher position. Learning the language for the integrative purposes is a goal; but instrumentally motivated learners view language as a means through which they could satisfy some of their needs. Gardner and Lambert constructed a long questionnaire geared to assess 41 variables, the types of motivation being only two of them (3). Eight questionnaire items, four for

each motivation type, are pertinent to the measurement of motivation type. They were constructed as statements and a student had to rate the applicability of the statement to his situation on a 7-point scale with 7 being the highest score (see Appendix 1). The eight items were not translated into Arabic, the native language of subjects, but the wordings of the items were orally explained to learners in Arabic to ensure that all words were familiar to them.

To assess students' proficiency in English as a foreign language, Form G of the Michigan Test of English as a Foreign Language was used. The test consists of four options, 100 multiple-choice items. It is geared to assess mastery of English grammar (Part I), vocabulary (Part II) and competency in the reading skill (Part III). Part I and Part II consist of 40 items each, and part III has an average of 10-line four reading passages and 20 multiple-choice items.

The study was conducted in February 1999. Though it may seem that the arrangement of administration of the tests and the questionnaire was irrelevant, almost half of the subjects in each level answered the test then had the questionnaire, the other half had the questionnaire first, then the test. Such arrangement will balance out any extraneous factors such as the inability to answer some items of the test. Subjects were allotted 120 minutes to finish the test. Students were asked to rate their performance on a five-point scale for each item. Answer sheets were provided, and a punched card was used in scoring. Values of responses on the questionnaire were directly tabulated into a computer's spread sheet for further statistical analyses.

III. Results and Discussion

To answer the first question raised by this study, subjects' responses to the motivation type questionnaire should be considered. To determine subject's motivation type, subjects were categorized as integratively or instrumentally motivated learners, according to their scores on each item and their mean total of the questionnaire of motivation types. For example, a subject was assigned to the integratively motivated group if he scores four points or more on an integrative item or three or less on an instrument item. Naturally, those who were classified as integratively motivated subjects should score higher than subjects labeled as instrumentally motivated students on integrative motivation items and lower than them on instrumental motivation items, and *vice versa*. Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 give the means, standard deviations, and reliability indices (R2) of integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects in the four levels of proficiency on the questionnaire items, respectively.

Table 1
Means, standard deviations, and reliability indices of the integrative and instrumental motivation items of the preparatory subjects

Item/Group	Integrative			Instrumental		
	X	SD	R ²	X	SD	R ²
Integ/Item 1	6.5454	1.3038	.88	5.4431	2.1806	.81
Integ/Item 2	4.3884	2.5211	.79	3.0795	2.2955	.90
Integ/Item 3	2.7521	2.2850	.83	1.8750	1.6870	.87
Integ/Item 4	6.8760	.3779	.89	6.000	1.9826	.87
Integ/Total	20.5619	3.7480	.77	16.3977	5.5222	.83
Instru/Item 1	4.8925	2.203	.81	5.2159	2.1995	.87
Instru/Item 2	2.9752	2.1540	.88	4.4659	2.5095	.85
Instru/Item 3	2.2314	1.7642	.85	4.5681	2.0997	.83
Instru/Item 4	3.3719	2.5888	.76	5.7613	1.6329	.84
Instru/Total	13.4711	5.3589	.80	20.0113	3.9985	.82

Integ = Integrative

Instru = Instrumental

Table 2
Means, standard deviations, and reliability indices of the integrative and instrumental motivation items of the elementary subjects

Item/Group	Integrative			Instrumental		
	X	SD	R ²	X	SD	R ²
Integ/Item 1	6.2526	1.4944	.81	5.3750	2.2103	.89
Integ/Item 2	3.7263	2.4773	.76	2.7083	2.4056	.76
Integ/Item 3	1.9684	1.9485	.85	1.5833	1.6678	.85
Integ/Item 4	6.0421	1.7919	.87	5.000	2.2517	.84
Integ/Total	17.9894	4.0013	.81	14.6667	5.5284	.88
Instru/Item 1	5.4210	2.1956	.80	6.1667	2.0070	.89
Instru/Item 2	2.9263	2.2561	.81	4.1250	2.7007	.81
Instru/Item 3	1.9473	1.3555	.84	3.8333	2.6270	.80
Instru/Item 4	2.2736	2.0235	.79	4.2500	2.4709	.88
Instru/Total	12.5684	4.3164	.88	18.3750	5.4757	.84

Integ = Integrative

Instru = Instrumental

Table 3
Means, standard deviations, and reliability indices of the integrative and instrumental motivation items of the intermediate subjects

Item/Group	Integrative			Instrumental		
	X	SD	R ²	X	SD	R ²
Integ/Item 1	6.7065	0.7779	.78	6.4339	0.9709	.78
Integ/Item 2	4.0978	2.3017	.90	2.7547	1.9894	.79
Integ/Item 3	2.6739	2.1231	.85	2.2452	1.7086	.85
Integ/Item 4	6.5434	0.8440	.88	5.3773	1.7345	.86
Integ/Total	20.0217	3.6883	.88	16.8113	4.0050	.88
Instru/Item 1	5.5978	1.6108	.82	6.3207	1.3974	.83
Instru/Item 2	3.3804	1.9658	.80	4.5660	1.6699	.84
Instru/Item 3	2.2065	1.5444	.85	3.7169	2.2986	.84
Instru/Item 4	3.4239	2.0820	.69	5.6981	1.9960	.80
Instru/Total	14.6087	3.8400	.80	20.3018	4.2903	.89

Integ = Integrative

Instru = Instrumental

Table 4
Means, standard deviations, and reliability indices of the integrative and instrumental motivation items of the preparatory subjects

Item/Group	Integrative			Instrumental		
	X	SD	R ²	X	SD	R ²
Integ/Item 1	6.3064	1.1535	.89	5.9000	1.6160	.89
Integ/Item 2	4.3870	2.3142	.88	3.4166	1.8176	.89
Integ/Item 3	2.4193	1.8602	.83	1.4655	1.2117	.69
Integ/Item 4	6.2258	0.9986	.77	5.3833	1.7641	.79
Integ/Total	19.3387	4.5770	.71	16.1166	3.8352	.87
Instru/Item 1	6.2903	1.1648	.75	6.3833	1.3232	.80
Instru/Item 2	3.8387	2.0421	.89	3.7666	1.5916	.90
Instru/Item 3	2.4032	1.4310	.83	2.9166	1.6118	.85
Instru/Item 4	3.8064	2.5788	.80	6.1416	1.7213	.85
Instru/Total	16.3387	4.3942	.82	19.2083	3.7794	.88

Integ = Integrative

Instru = Instrumental

Subjects labeled as integratively motivated students had higher means than instrumentally motivated students on items giving the reasons for learning English as a foreign language for integrative purposes. When items are more related to instrumental motivation, the instrumentally motivated students had higher means than the integratively motivated subjects. With the information presented in tables 1-4 in mind, it seems that EFL learners were able to determine their motivation type to learn the foreign language.

The next step was to investigate whether the observed differences in the motivation type were statistically significant. To test the significance of the differences between subjects' scores in each motivation group to ensure the accuracy of classification, independent-sample t-test was conducted. t-values of the differences among means of integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects in the various proficiency levels on the questionnaire items are given in tables 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Table 5
t-values of the difference among the means of integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects in the preparatory level on the questionnaire items

Item	Mean diff.	df	t	p<
Integ/Item 1	1.1023	207	4.5545	.0001
Integ/Item 2	1.3089	207	3.8464	.0001
Integ/Item 3	0.8771	207	3.0463	.0026
Integ/Item 4	.8760	207	4.7471	.0001
Integ/Total	4.1642	207	6.4922	.0001
Instru/Item 1	-0.3234	207	-1.0435	.2979
Instru/Item 2	-1.4907	207	-4.6098	.0001
Instru/Item 3	-2.3367	207	-8.7213	.0001
Instru/Item 4	-2.3894	207	-7.6227	.0001
Instru/Total	-6.5402	207	-9.6571	.0001

Integ = Integrative
Instru = Instrumental

Table 6
t-values of the difference among the means of integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects in the elementary level on the questionnaire items

Item	Mean diff.	df	t	p<
Integ/Item 1	0.9026	165	3.0575	.0026
Integ/Item 2	0.9433	165	2.6627	.0085
Integ/Item 3	0.3851	165	1.3444	.1806
Integ/Item 4	1.0421	165	3.3300	.0010
Integ/Total	3.3227	165	4.5059	.0001
Instru/Item 1	-0.7457	165	-2.2545	.0254
Instru/Item 2	-1.1987	165	-3.1218	.0021
Instru/Item 3	-1.8860	165	-6.0224	.0001
Instru/Item 4	-1.9764	165	-5.6792	.0001
Instru/Total	-5.8066	165	-7.6631	.0001

Integ = Integrative
Instru = Instrumental

Table 7
t-values of the difference among the means of integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects in the intermediate level on the questionnaire items

Item	Mean diff.	df	t	p<
Integ/Item 1	0.2726	143	1.8525	.0660
Integ/Item 2	1.3431	143	3.5510	.0005
Integ/Item 3	0.4287	143	1.2537	.2119
Integ/Item 4	1.1661	143	5.4361	.0001
Integ/Total	3.2104	143	4.8907	.0001
Instru/Item 1	-0.7229	143	-2.7281	.0071
Instru/Item 2	-1.1856	143	-3.6889	.0003
Instru/Item 3	-1.5104	143	-4.7229	.001
Instru/Item 4	-2.2742	143	-6.4295	.0001
Instru/Total	-5.6931	143	-8.2336	.001

Integ = Integrative
Instru = Instrumental

Table 8
t-values of the difference among the means of integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects in the advanced level on the questionnaire items

Item	Mean diff.	df	t	p<
Integ/Item 1	0.4064	180	1.7610	.0799
Integ/Item 2	0.9704	180	3.1025	.0022
Integ/Item 3	0.9538	180	4.1265	.0001
Integ/Item 4	0.8425	180	3.4801	.0006
Integ/Total	3.2221	180	5.0225	.0001
Instru/Item 1	-0.0930	180	-4.775	.6406
Instru/Item 2	0.07210	180	0.2621	.7935
Instru/Item 3	-0.5134	180	-2.1139	.3580
Instru/Item 4	-2.3352	180	-7.2744	.0001
Instru/Total	-2.8696	180	-4.5887	.0001

Integ = Integrative
Instru = Instrumental

The t-values in Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 indicate that the differences between the integrative and instrumental groups on the questionnaire items were statistically significant, with the exception of Instrumental item (1) for preparatory subjects, Integrative item (3) for elementary subjects, Integrative item (1) and Instrumental item (2) for intermediate subjects, and Integrative item (1) and Instrumental items (1) and (2) for the advanced subjects. However, the differences between the items' total were

statistically significant. This indicates that the classification of subjects was accurate. It is worth noting here that no subject in all the four levels was unable to determine his motivation to learn English. In other words, according to the data no subject was labeled as both integratively and instrumentally motivated student. In the light of the reasons subjects chose to learn English for, they were capable of selecting the reason that best described their motivation to learn English. This means that EFL learners have similar motivation types to learn the foreign language similar to those of ESL learners and that they are aware of their motivation type.

After ensuring that the classification was accurate and the measure was reliable and valid, investing subjects performance on the MTELP followed in order to answer the second question of the study. Table 9 gives means, standard deviations, and Cronbach (reliability indices) for integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects on the three parts of the MTELP.

Table 9
Means, standard deviations, and Cronbach (reliability indices)
of the integratively and instrumentally motivated students
on the three parts of the MTELP

Level/Part	Integrative group			Instrumental group		
	X	SD	α	X	SD	α
Preparatory						
Part I	17.2562	6.8038	.89	17.4659	5.8779	.90
Part II	12.7190	3.9753	.91	13.0340	3.9463	.88
Part III	5.2000	2.1981	.93	6.4545	1.9763	.87
Total	35.1818	10.6731	.90	36.9545	10.0334	.88
Elementary						
Part I	21.9684	6.3739	.88	22.6667	5.2621	.90
Part II	15.5684	5.95131	.87	15.2916	3.4332	.89
Part III	6.9368	2.0670	.89	6.6667	2.7527	.92
Total	44.4736	11.3436	.88	44.6250	8.2161	.90
Intermediate						
Part I	22.1847	6.3746	.88	24.6415	3.8083	.90
Part II	16.7500	6.3930	.89	15.8490	4.8413	.93
Part III	7.1956	2.2592	.79	7.2452	2.3362	.88
Total	46.1304	13.1326	.85	47.7358	6.7912	.90
Advanced						
Part I	25.5161	6.6424	.88	25.4833	4.1867	.90
Part II	20.1774	6.8437	.85	19.6000	6.3648	.89
Part III	8.8225	3.7874	.89	8.8833	2.6192	.83
Total	54.5161	14.0487	.90	53.9667	10.2628	.87

The integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects have almost the same level of English proficiency. This is indicated by their means on the various parts of the MTELP. The only exception to the above mentioned observation is the means of subjects on the Part III (reading comprehension) at some levels. To test the significance of the differences among the integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects' means, independent sample t-test was conducted; t-values are given in Table 10.

Table 10
t-values of the difference among the means of integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects on the three parts of the MTELP

Level/Part	Mean diff.	df	t	p<
Preparatory				
Part I	-0.2097	207	-.2327	.8161
Part II	-0.3150	207	-.5674	.5710
Part III	-1.2545	207	-4.2259	.0001
Total	-1.7727	207	-1.2151	.2257
Elementary				
Part I	-0.6983	165	-.7546	.4515
Part II	0.2768	165	.3524	.7249
Part III	0.2701	165	.7245	.4697
Total	-0.1514	165	-.0957	.9238
Intermediate				
Part I	-2.4568	143	-2.5532	.0117
Part II	0.9010	143	.8890	.3754
Part III	-0.0496	143	-.1258	.9000
Total	-1.6054	143	-.8276	.4092
Advanced				
Part I	0.0328	180	.0407	.9675
Part II	0.5774	180	.5652	.5725
Part III	-0.0608	180	-.1267	.8993
Total	0.5494	180	.3006	.7640

The t-values shown in Table 10 indicate that integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects have almost the same level of proficiency in English. The comparisons of the means of subjects in the elementary and advanced levels showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups in each level on the three parts and the total of the MTELP. the comparisons between the two groups in the preparatory level showed also no statistically significant differences, with the exception of the difference between the two groups' means on Part I (grammar). The only other significant difference was between the means of the instrumentally and the integratively motivated students in the intermediate level on Part III (reading

comprehension). The mean of the instrumentally motivated students was 24.6415, whereas the mean of the integratively motivated students was 22.1847. However, reconsideration of Table 10 reveals that there was no statistically significant differences between the mean total of the two groups in all proficiency levels. In other words, two out of the sixteen comparisons turned out to be significant. They could be overlooked since they were not consistent across the four levels and they were not related to the totals on the MTELP. The two significant differences could be ascribed, for example, to guessing effect or measurement error. Hence, a conclusion that might be drawn from Table 10 is that integratively and instrumentally motivated students in all various proficiency levels have almost the same level of proficiency in English as a foreign language and that the motivation type did not lead a certain group to perform better than the other group.

As subjects were answering the MTELP's items, they were asked immediately to rate their performance on each item by selecting a value from a five-point-scale. The self-assessment values were averaged. The means, standard derivations, and reliability indices as measured by Cronbach are given in Table 11.

Table 11
Means, standard deviations, and Cronbach (reliability indices)
of the integratively and instrumentally motivated students'
self-assessment on the MTELP

Level/Part	Integrative group			Instrumental group		
	X	SD	α	X	SD	α
Preparatory	2.8842	.7766	.90	2.4659	.7103	.89
Elementary	3.0000	.4111	.88	2.7158	.6789	.86
Intermediate	3.0489	.5340	.83	2.7717	.499	.88
Advanced	3.0806	.2745	.94	2.9166	.4013	.90

The integratively motivated subject rated their performance higher than the rating of the instrumentally motivated students. In addition, Table 11 displays a gradual increase in self-assessment as subjects' proficiency in English increases. The high reliability indices reflects the high reliability of the measure of self-assessment.

To investigate the strength of the relationship between self-assessment and the students' performance of the MTELP, Spearman Rank-Ordered Correlation was conducted; Correlation coefficients are given in Table 12.

Table 12
Spearman rank-order correlations between subjects' self-assessment
and their scores on the three parts and total of the MTELP

Level/Part	Integrative group			Instrumental group		
	n	r	p<	n	r	p<
Preparatory						
Part I	121	.3152	.0003	88	.2680	.0036
Part II	121	.2431	.0009	88	.2144	.0464
Part III	121	.2276	.0095	88	.1465	.1743
Total	121	.2490	.0065	88	.2453	.0221
Elementary						
Part I	95	.5281	.0001	72	.1733	.0933
Part II	95	.4085	.006	72	.1942	.0653
Part III	95	.4197	.0004	72	.3512	.0007
Total	95	.4743	.0001	72	.2685	.0094
Intermediate						
Part I	92	.5524	.0001	53	.2921	.0352
Part II	92	.5392	.0001	53	.4312	.0019
Part III	92	.4164	.0001	53	.1639	.2396
Total	92	.5911	.0001	53	.2895	.0390
Advanced						
Part I	62	.6211	.0001	120	.5234	.0001
Part II	62	.6160	.0001	120	.39576	.0001
Part III	62	.5132	.0001	120	.2943	.0013
Total	62	.6196	.0001	120	.5091	.0001

The integratively motivated subjects were more accurate than the instrumentally motivated subjects in rating their performance on the MTELP test of proficiency in English as a foreign language. This observation is true for subjects in all levels. Moreover, more proficient subjects were more accurate than less proficient subjects in estimating their performance as reflected by Spearman correlation coefficients. Both integratively and instrumentally motivated groups showed an increase in correlation values as the proficiency of the subjects increases. By reconsidering Table 11 which displayed the means of subjects on self-assessment, it is obvious that the means of the integratively motivated subjects are higher than those of the instrumentally motivated students. To test whether these differences are significant, an independent sample t-test was conducted; t-values are given in Table 13.

Table 13
t-values of difference among the means of integratively and instrumentally motivated subjects on self-assessment

Level/Part	Mean diff.	df	t	p<
Preparatory	0.4183	207	3.9845	.0001
Elementary	0.2842	165	3.1411	.0019
Intermediate	0.2772	143	1.9759	.0424
Advanced	0.1640	180	2.8854	.0043

Subjects who claimed to learn the language for integrative reasons had significantly higher means on self-assessment than those who believed that they were learning English as a foreign language for instrumental purposes. The difference between the means of subjects of the motivation types in the preparatory level was statistically significant, ($t = 3.9845$, $p < .0001$.) The same observation is true for the other three proficiency levels. It could be concluded from the above mentioned tables that integratively motivated subjects, regardless of their proficiency levels, rated their performance as higher and more accurate than the rating of instrumental motivated students. This demonstrates clearly that motivation type is an affecting factor in the accuracy of self-assessment. The subjects in the integrative motivation group did not show signs of overestimation of foreign language proficiency. However, instrumentally motivated subjects, especially less proficient ones, were less accurate and showed a tendency to overestimate their proficiency; through subjects of each proficiency level, regardless of their motivation type, had almost the same level of proficiency in English as a foreign language.

IV. Conclusions

This study had two main objectives. First, it sought to answer the following question: do EFL learners have the same types of motivation that lead them to learn the language as those of ESL learners. The other objective was to find out whether the type of motivation subjects have and their level of proficiency play a crucial role in giving accurate self-assessment for their performance on a proficiency test of English as a Foreign Language. With the recent increasing importance given to self-assessment and the call of specialists to adopt self-assessment in many testing situation and for various purposes, the significance of the topic of this study becomes clear.

The findings of this study indicated that EFL learners have the motivation to learn the foreign language for integrative and instrumental purposes. Such motivation types are similar to those found among learners

of ESL. In fact, low proficient subjects, those who were in the preparatory level, were as good as high proficient subjects (advanced students) in determining their orientation. In addition, the high values integratively motivated students had on integrative motivation items of the questionnaire and their low scores on instrumental orientation items reflect the reliability and validity of the measure, which in turn ensures the accuracy of the study's remarks and observations that could be ascribed to motivation type. It is clear from the data that the motivation type has no effect on the proficiency level of EFL learners since each group had different resources to learn the foreign language, but yet those reasons had similar impact. reconsidering the number of integratively and instrumentally motivated learners in each proficiency level showed that the percentage of learners who claimed to be of an integrative orientation decreases as the proficiency level increases; the opposite of this observation is true in the case of instrumentally motivated learners. The percentage of the integrative orientation students in the preparatory level was 57.89%; and the percentage of the integratively motivated learners in the advanced level was only 34.07%. By the same token, the percentage of the instrumentally motivated learners in the preparatory level was 42.11% that percentage increases to 65.93% in the advanced level. This pattern could be ascribed to either the nature of the sample in each proficiency level or to the increase awareness of the setting of learning a foreign language. Since the study is cross-sectional, these explanations are mere speculation; thorough longitudinal studies are needed.

Another major finding of this study was the presence of an effect of both motivation type and language proficiency level on self-assessment. Students low in their proficiency level in EFL were less accurate in estimating their performance on a standardized, proficiency test. The correlation coefficients between self-assessment and performance increases as the students' level of proficiency increases too. This observation is in harmony with previous research findings into self-assessment. The type of motivation also played a crucial role in accurate self-assessment. In general, the integratively motivated students had higher means than their instrumentally motivated counterparts. By simultaneous consideration of the two factors, that is motivation type and proficiency level, it is clear that the integratively motivated, high proficient learners had the highest mean on self-assessment and the most accurate estimation of their ability. The instrumentally motivated subjects in the preparatory level had the lowest mean and the less accurate estimation on self-assessment question. In fact, some of the correlations of this group was not statistically significant at all. An explanation of the effect of

proficiency level on self-assessment could be that knowledge and mastery of the language by high proficient learners are more than those of other less proficient groups; hence they were capable of determining which item they answered correctly or incorrectly. Though the findings of this study is in accord with previous research regarding the tendency of low proficient learners to overestimate their performance, it is, in fact, in contrast with them when motivation type is taken into consideration. The low proficient, integratively motivated subjects, those in the preparatory and elementary levels, did not show the effect of overestimation on their judgement. However, it seems hard to explain the effect of motivation type at this stage. Further and thorough investigation is a must.

NOTES

1. M. Oskarsson (1989). "Self-assessment of language proficiency: rationale and applications." *Language Testing*, 6, 1-13, p. 1.
2. Oskarsson, p. 1.
3. J. Upshur (1975). "Objective evaluation of oral proficiency in the ESOL classroom." In L. Palmer and B. Spolsky (Eds.), *Papers on Language Testing 1967-1974*. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
4. Oskarsson (1989).
5. Oskarsson, p. 2.
6. T. Barrow et al (1981). *College Students' Knowledge and Beliefs: A Survey of Global Understanding. The Final Report of Global Understanding Project*. ERIC ED 215563; R. LeBlanc, and G. Painchaud (1985) "Self-assessment as a second language placement instrument." *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 673-87; and von Elek, T. (1989) "A test of Swedish as a second language: An experiment in self-assessment." In Y. Lee, A. Fok, R. Lord, and G. Low, (Eds.), *New Directions in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Von Elek (1989).
8. L. Dickinson (1987). *Self-instruction in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. T. Hilton et al (1985). *Final Report: The Oral Proficiency of Teachers in the United States in the 1980 - An Empirical Study*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service; and Von Elek (1989).
10. L. Bachman, A. Palmer (1989). "The construct validation of self-rating of communicative language ability." *Language Testing*, 6, 14-29.
11. L. Heileman (1990). "Self-assessment of second language ability: The role of response effects." *Language Testing*, 7, 174-201.
12. Heileman 180.
13. Heileman (1990).

14. D. Wall, C. Clapham and C. Alderson (1994). "Evaluating a placement test." *Language Testing*, 11, 321-344.
15. N. Shameem (1998). "Validating self-report language proficiency by testing performance in an immigrant community, the Wellington Indo-Fijian. *Language Testing*, 15, 86-108.
16. L. Bachman and A. Palmer (1982). "The construct validity of some components of communicative proficiency". *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 449-65.
17. Bachman and Palmer (1989).
18. D. Wall, C. Clapham and C. Alderson (1994).
19. N. N. Shameem (1998).
20. Bachman and Palmer (1989), p. 22.
21. S. Ross (1998). "Self-assessment in second language testing: A meta-analysis and analysis of experiential factors." *Language Testing*, 15, 1-20.
22. F. Davidson and G. Henning (1985). "A self-rating scale of English difficulty: Rasch scalar analysis of item and rating categories." *Language Testing*, 2, 164-79, p. 176.
23. Heileman (1990).
24. Heileman, p. 188.
25. N. Ferguson (1978). "Self-assessment of listening comprehension." *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 16, 149-56; P. Anderson (1982) "Self-esteem in the foreign language: A preliminary investigation." *Foreign Language Annals*, 15, 109-15; Davidson and Henning (1985); and A. Janssen-van Dielen (1989). "The development of a test of Dutch as a second language: The validity of self-assessment by inexperienced subjects." *Language Testing*, 6, 30-46.
26. G. Blue (1988). "Self-assessment: The limits of learner independence." *ELT*, 131, 100-18; and M. Wesche, F. Morrison, D. Ready and C. Pawley (1990). "French immersion: Postsecondary consequence for individuals and universities." *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 46, 430-51.
27. C. Cannell, P. Miller and L. Oskenberg (1981). "Research on interviewing techniques." In S. Leinhardt (ed.), *Sociological Methodology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; J. DeLameter (1982). "Response-effects on question content." In W. Dijkstra and J. van der Zouwen (Eds.), *Response Behaviour in Survey-Interview*. New York: Academic Press; and R. Tourangeau (1987). "Attitude measurement: A cognitive perspective." In H. Hippler, N. Schwarz, and S. Sudman, (Eds), *Social Information Processing and Survey Methodology*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
28. Oskarsson, pp. 3-5.
29. I. Al-Fallay (1998). *Telling the Rest of the Story: Examining Two Competing Mutually Exclusive Hypotheses of the Proficiency in English as a Foreign Language*. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: King Saud University, College of Arts, Research Center. Research no. 75.
30. R. Gardner and W. Lambert (1972). *Attitude and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Appendix (1)

A modified version of Gardner and Lambert's (1972) questionnaire.

Read the following eight statements, then indicate the extent to which they were descriptive of your reasons for studying English.

- 1- English will help me to understand better the English people and their way of life.

agree — : — : — : — : — : — : disagree

- 2- English will enable me to gain good friends more easily among English-speaking people.

agree — : — : — : — : — : — : disagree

- 3- English should enable me to begin think and behave as the English do.

agree — : — : — : — : — : — : disagree

- 4- English will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.

agree — : — : — : — : — : — : disagree

- 5- I think English will some day be useful in getting a job.

agree — : — : — : — : — : — : disagree

- 6- One needs a good knowledge of at least a foreign language to merit social recognition.

agree — : — : — : — : — : — : disagree

- 7- I feel that no one is really educated unless he is fluent in the English language.

agree — : — : — : — : — : — : disagree

- 8- I need English in order to graduate from my college or my institute.

agree — : — : — : — : — : — : disagree

* * *