

**Motivation and the Perception of English Phonemic Contrasts:
Investigating the Role of Integrative and Instrumental Motivation**

by

Marian Marchal

5709717

BA Scriptie Engelse Taal en Cultuur,

Universiteit Utrecht 2016

6706 words

Supervisor:

Prof. dr. Aoju Chen

July 6, 2018

Abstract

The acquisition of the phonology of a second language (L2) often comes with challenges for L2 learners. Previous research has shown that integrative and instrumental motivation can affect second language proficiency. The current study investigates the effect of integrative and instrumental motivation on the perception of the English phonemic contrasts /æ-e/ and voiced vs. voiceless obstruents in word-final position in Dutch secondary-school students. It has also examined whether the effect of motivation differs per phoneme type. No main effect of integrative and instrumental motivation is found. However, there is an interaction between instrumental motivation and phoneme type, indicating that a rise in instrumental motivation increases the likelihood of the correct perception of the vowel /æ/ and voiceless word-final obstruents. The results of the current study are discussed in light of the controversial role of integrative and instrumental motivation in L2 acquisition due to globalization.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
 2. Theoretical Framework
 - 2.1 L2 Phonology
 - 2.2 Motivation
 - 2.3 Motivation and L2 Phonology
 3. The Current Study
 4. Method
 - 4.1 Participants
 - 4.2 Materials
 - 4.3 Procedure
 5. Results
 - 5.1 Analysis
 - 5.2 Perception of Vowels
 - 5.3 Perception of Consonants
 6. Discussion and Conclusion
 - 6.1 Integrative Motivation
 - 6.2 Instrumental Motivation
 - 6.3 Motivation and Phoneme Type
 - 6.4 Implications
 - 6.5 Limitations
 - 6.6 Future Research
- References
- Appendix A – Stimuli in the Perception Test
- Appendix B – Motivation Questionnaire

1. Introduction

Second language (L2) learners vary considerably in the degree of success with which they learn an L2. For example, some learners achieve entirely native-like pronunciation, while the speech of others is heavily accented. Motivation has been argued to explain some of the individual differences in the achievement of L2 acquisition. However, the role of integrative and instrumental motivation in L2 learning contexts is a topic of debate among motivation researchers. The current study will contribute to this discussion by investigating the relation between integrative and instrumental motivation and the perception of phonemic contrasts in Dutch learners of English.

In the section ‘theoretical framework’, previous research on the acquisition of L2 phonology and the relation between motivation and second language acquisition are reviewed. The research questions and hypothesis are formulated in section 3. In section 4, the method of the current study is described. It is followed by a report of the results in section 5. In the final section, we discuss the findings of the current study.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 L2 Phonology

As in all areas of L2 acquisition, learning the pronunciation of an L2 is not as easy as acquiring that of a first language. Several researchers argue that this is due to the fact that most L2 learners start to learn a second language after the critical period for language acquisition (Scovel, 1967; Flege, 1987a, p. 47, Flege, 1987b). Language learning before the critical period usually results in relatively effortless acquisition and consistent high levels of ultimate attainment (Bialystok & Hakuta, 1999). If a language is learned after the critical period, acquisition is more laborious. Many factors, like motivation and language aptitude, influence relative success and ultimate attainment in many areas of L2 acquisition. Flege

(1987b) states that this also applies to speech learning. Although Flege (1987b) and Scovel (1967) argue that successful acquisition of L2 phonology cannot be reached after the age of twelve due to changes in the brain, some studies have pointed out that some late learners cannot be distinguished from native speakers (Moyer, 1999; Bongaerts, Mennen & Van der Slik, 2000). However, this is not the case for all late L2 learners.

Flege (1987a) accounts for the difficulty of the acquisition of L2 phonemes by referring to equivalence classification. Since the actual realisations of phonemes are highly variable, equivalence classification allows the hearer to classify acoustic information in “constant categories” (1987a, p. 49). These categories consist of possible realisations of a phoneme in the speaker’s language. Acoustic input is categorized into these mental phonemic classifications. Although this mechanism is helpful in L1, established phonetic categories in L1 can interfere with learners’ L2 (p. 50). Older learners have been shown to rely more heavily on cognitive classification than sensory input and judge productions of L2 phonemes as belonging to an L1 category. According to the Speech Learning Model (hereafter SLM) (Flege, 1997, p. 12) L2 phonemes that are similar to L1 phonemes are more difficult to acquire, because they fall in established L1 phonemic categories. ‘New’ phonemes, on the other hand, are less difficult to learn as they differ significantly from L1 phonemes and are classified less quickly as belonging to one of the L1 phonemic categories. Learners usually do not have any problems with phonemes that are identical in both L1 and L2. Flege argues that learners can acquire both new and similar phonetic categories before the age of six, but can only establish additional phonetic categories for ‘new’ phonemes similar to L1 phonemes after that critical age. For example, Flege (1987b) found that the production of the new vowel /y/ by advanced English learners of French was indistinguishable from the production by native speakers. However, the learner’s and native speaker’s production of the similar vowel /u/ differed significantly.

Another theory about the acquisition of phonemes in an L2 is the Perceptual Assimilation Model (Best, McRoberts & Sithole, 1988; Best & Strange, 1992). According to both the SLM (Flege, 1997) and the PAM (Best, McRoberts & Sithole, 1988; Best & Strange, 1992), L2 phonemes are often perceived as belonging to an L1 category. The PAM more specifically targets problems with the perception of phonemic contrasts. The model distinguishes four types of L2 contrasts. The first type, which has been argued to be the most difficult to acquire, is the L2 phonemes that fall easily within a certain L1 category. The second type of contrasts are the L2 phonemes that differ in how well they fit in a L1 category, in which case there is a category goodness difference. These L2 contrasts are slightly less difficult to acquire. Thirdly, if the L2 phonemes are assimilated into different L1 categories, no difficulties are predicted. The fourth type of contrast includes L2 phonemes that are different from any L1 phoneme. These L2 contrasts can be easily acquired. For example, Best et al. (1988) have shown that English native speakers are able to distinguish Zulu clicks that are different from any English L1 phoneme.

In both SLM and PAM, perception plays a key role. However, experimental research has demonstrated that perception and pronunciation are closely related: the improvement of one can influence the improvement of the other positively. For example, Pieper (2017) showed that pronunciation teaching did not only improve secondary school pupils' production of certain difficult L2 phonemic contrasts but also improved their perception of some of these phonemic contrasts. The reversed effect was found in a similar study in which Japanese learners of English received training in the perception of the phonemes /r/ and /l/ (Bradlow et al., 1997). After the training, participants scored better on both the perception and production of the phonemic contrast than before the intervention.

Comparing Dutch to English, several phonemes have been argued to be difficult for Dutch learners of English to acquire. For example, Flege (1997, p. 20) states that the English

/æ/ vowel is ‘new’, since it is dissimilar to both Dutch vowels /ɛ/ and /a/. According to the SLM, this phoneme can be acquired after the critical period, albeit with difficulty. Koet (2007, p. 54) and Van den Doel (2006, p. 249) note that the English /æ/ and /e/ vowels are usually both realised as /ɛ/ by Dutch speakers of English. The PAM predicts that the contrast between /æ-e/ is hard for native speakers of Dutch to acquire, since both are perceived as belonging to the same L1 category. Experimental research has proven this assumption to be correct. For example, Broersma (2005) found that advanced Dutch learners of English were less sensitive to the /æ-e/ contrast than native speakers of English. Pieper (2017) found that learners failed to perceive and produce these two vowels correctly. However, after pronunciation training, the production of the vowel contrast improved significantly. This is in line with Flege’s assumption that new vowels pose problems for learners, but are not impossible to learn.

Dutch and English also differ in the voicing of voiced obstruents in word-final position. In Dutch, these obstruents are voiced in non-word final position but devoiced in word-final position. For example, the word /da:d/ (E: *deed*) is pronounced as [da:d̥], where the initial plosive is voiced, but the final plosive devoiced. This phenomenon is called ‘final devoicing’ (Grijzenhout & Krämer, 2000). In English, on the other hand, voiced obstruents in both word-initial and word-final position are voiced (e.g. *bed* → [bed]). Although the obstruent itself is not always fully voiced, the lengthening of the preceding vowel serves as a cue for the [±voiced] contrast (Chen, 1970; Crowther & Mann, 1992). The voicing of the word-final obstruents is an important feature in English as it distinguishes minimal pairs like *bat* – *bad* and *lag* – *lack* but has been found to be difficult for Dutch learners of English to learn. For example, Pieper (2017) showed that Dutch secondary-school students had difficulty with distinguishing the voicing contrast in word-final consonants. The participants in her study had problems with both perceiving and producing the difference between voiced and

unvoiced plosives in word-final position. Broersma (2005) found that advanced Dutch learners of English did not differ from native English speakers in the perception of voiced and voiceless word-final obstruents. However, they did use different cues to identify whether these obstruents were voiced or voiceless.

2.2 Motivation

Since language learning is not an individual enterprise but a social and cultural activity, the social context plays a key role in second language acquisition (Dörnyei, 2003, p. 4). Attitude and motivation have therefore often been argued to be essential for successful language learning (e.g. Dörnyei, 2003; Gardner, 2006). Many studies have investigated the influence of these factors on L2 proficiency (e.g. Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Atay & Kurt, 2010). Over the past decades, several theories have been developed about which aspects of motivation are important for the acquisition of an L2, like Gardner's socio-educational model and self-determination theory (see Dörnyei, 2003 for an overview).

Gardner's socio-educational model is one of the most researched theoretical frameworks of motivation in second language acquisition. This model assumes that language learning is intensive and that ability and motivation account for most variation in success (Gardner, 2006). Environmental factors, like experiences, can affect motivation. This causes differences in motivation between individuals. Ability is mostly determined by genetic characteristics. The socio-educational model acknowledges that language learning contexts differ, but argues that all language learning has both linguistic and non-linguistic consequences. Learners develop their skills in the foreign language (e.g. they improve their writing) but other aspects of language learning, like attitudes towards the target language community or anxiety to speak in a foreign language, also evolve. Within the socio-educational model, attitude and motivation can be tested using the Attitude/Motivation Test

Battery or AMTB (Gardner, 1985; 2006). It consists of eleven subtests, assessing a variety of aspects of motivation using statements and multiple choice questions.

Gardner (2006) distinguishes several types of motivation, like attitudes towards the learning situation, integrativeness and instrumentality. Integrativeness is a key concept in the socio-educational model and directly influences motivation (p. 246). It can be defined as the “openness to other cultures in general, and an interest in the target culture in particular” (p. 247). Gardner explains that integrativeness, also called integrative motivation, is closely related to identity. Integratively motivated language learners do not consider their own culture to be essential for their identity, but are willing to identify with the target language community. Integrative motivation can be influenced by attitudes and cultural circumstances. In the AMTB it consists of the scales “attitudes toward the target language group”, “interest in foreign languages” and “integrative orientation” (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003, p. 125). Instrumentality, or instrumental motivation, refers to the pragmatic value of the target language to the learner (Gardner, 1985). For example, a learner who learns a foreign language because it might advance his/her career could be said to be instrumentally motivated. In the AMTB it is assessed by the subtest “instrumental orientation”. Gardner argues that instrumentality only influences motivation in some learning situations. However, it is not specified when instrumentality might be important to language learning. According to the socio-educational model, instrumental and integrative motivation are interdependent constructs (2006, p. 245), but it is not stated clearly why this is the case. It could be argued that learners who want to acquire an L2 because they consider it to be useful for their career, do not necessarily want to identify with the target language community as well.

Gardner’s model has often been criticized for its generalizability. The AMTB was developed in Canada, where speakers of English and French often meet. English or French is a second language in this context, instead of a foreign language as it is for most learners

(Dörnyei, 2003, p. 5). Integrative reasons for learning a language might be of more importance when learners are in close contact with speakers of that language than when they do not know any native speakers. However, Dörnyei states that in those situations integrative motivation might be related to “the cultural and intellectual values associated with the language” (p. 6). Several researchers (Lamb, 2004; Kormos & Csizér, 2008) argue that integrativeness may not be as important for language learning anymore due to globalization. English in particular is often learned as a foreign language instead of an L2. Although the terms L2 and foreign language are sometimes used interchangeably, an L2 is often the dominant language of the country the learner lives in, while a foreign language is usually not widely spoken in that area. In the remainder of the paper, L2 will be used to refer to both of these concepts unless otherwise specified. Thus, most learners of English might not be learning the language to communicate with native English speakers, but with other non-native speakers of English. Lamb (2004) claims that the “bicultural identity” of learners of English does not consist of their L1 and L2 identity, but of a local and global identity. Thus, according to Lamb, integrative motivation or willingness to identify with native speakers of a language, does not apply to situations where English is learned as a foreign language.

However, Atay and Kurt (2010) argue that the socio-educational model is applicable to contexts where English is learnt as a foreign language. Similarly to previous studies by Gardner, integrativeness in their study correlated significantly to Turkish learners' grades for English. In a meta-analysis of several studies using the AMTB, Masgoret and Gardner (2003, p. 152) found that the effect of integrativeness is larger than the effect of instrumental motivation for both second and foreign language learners. Chalak and Kassaian (2010) researched the motivation of Iranian students of English. Investigating both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as well as instrumental and integrative motivation, they found that all these types were important to the students. Together, these studies suggest that despite

criticism regarding Gardner's socio-educational model, experimental research reveals that integrative and instrumental motivation are relevant to both learners of an L2 as well as learners of a foreign language.

2.3 Motivation and Acquisition of L2 phonology

The acquisition of L2 phonology seems to be an area for which motivation is especially relevant. For example, several studies (e.g. Moyer, 1999, 2004, 2007; Bongaerts et al., 2000) have demonstrated that ultimate attainment in L2 phonology, assessed as sounding like a native speaker, is partly dependent on the motivation of L2 learner. According to Piske, MacKay and Flege (2001), studies investigating the role of motivation in pronunciation achievement often investigate learner's evaluation of the importance of good pronunciation. Moyer (2004, p. 40) argues that motivation is not the same as the desire to sound like a native speaker, since some advanced learners who are very motivated, do not want to sound native-like. In terms of Gardner's model, this might be due to a difference in integrative and instrumental motivation. Learners with high integrative motivation want to identify with the target language community and thus be indistinguishable from a native speaker. Other learners find it more important to be able to communicate and could be said to be instrumentally motivated.

Besides an effect on ultimate attainment, motivation has also been shown to influence pronunciation of less advanced L2 learners. Based on a study with upper intermediate Iranian learners of English, Yousofi and Naderifarjad (2015) claim that motivation positively influences the achievement in pronunciation. Using Gardner's AMTB, they found that both instrumental and integrative orientations correlated positively with the L2 pronunciation of Iranian learners in both scripted and unscripted speech. In a study with English learners of L2 Spanish, Hernández (2006) found that only integrative motivation, but not instrumental motivation, influenced oral proficiency positively. A Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview in

which students had to respond to pictures and topics was used to measure oral proficiency. It is unclear what role pronunciation played in this study, although incorrect pronunciation might influence perceived fluency.

There has been very little research on the relation between motivation and perception of L2 phonology. Vandergrift (2005) compared several aspects of motivation to the proficiency in listening comprehension for Canadian French learners of English. Although amotivation, which is the absence of motivation, had a negative effect on listening proficiency, no relation was found between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and listening comprehension. Similarly to Hernández (2006), perception of L2 phonemes only indirectly influences listening proficiency, since the latter also assesses other aspects of L2 proficiency like vocabulary.

3. The Current Study

Many studies have investigated the effect of motivation on L2 proficiency in general (e.g. Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Atay and Kurt, 2010). However, the influence of integrative and instrumental motivation on the acquisition of the phonology of an L2 has been researched much less, except for a few studies on pronunciation (Yousofi & Naderifarjad, 2015), oral proficiency (Hernández, 2006) and listening comprehension (Vandergrift, 2005). The way in which foreign language production and perception were measured in these studies was mostly very broad, often assessing the learner's knowledge of vocabulary and grammar as well. Different from past work, the present research focuses on a specific aspect of L2 phonology, i.e., the vowel and consonant contrasts that have been shown to be notoriously difficult for Dutch learners of English, namely, the vowels /æ/ and /e/ and word-final [±voiced] obstruents. Such an approach will make possible a much more specific investigation of the relation between motivation and the learning of aspects of L2 phonology. Although motivation has been shown to positively affect the production of foreign language sounds in

one study (Yousofi & Naderifarjad, 2015), no previous research has directly investigated relation between motivation and the perception of non-native phonemes.

Specifically, we address three research questions.

RQ1: Does integrative motivation affect the perception of English phonemic contrasts in Dutch secondary-school students?

RQ2: Does instrumental motivation affect the perception of English phonemic contrasts in Dutch secondary-school students?

RQ3: Does the effect of motivation on the perception in English for Dutch secondary-school students differ in different types of phonemes?

Regarding RQ1, previous research has shown that integrative motivation has a positive effect on foreign language proficiency in general (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Atay & Kurt, 2010) and the production of phonology in particular (Yousofi & Naderifarjad, 2015; Hernández, 2006). Learners who are integratively motivated want to identify with the target language community. They might therefore pay closer attention to the sounds a native speaker produces in order to be able to produce them as well and become more native-like in production. Since perception and production have been shown to be closely related, the positive effect of integrative motivation might also hold for perception. Therefore, we propose the following hypothesis:

H1: Integrative motivation has a positive effect on the perception of English phonemic contrasts in Dutch secondary-school students.

Students with a higher integrative motivation are expected to be better at perceiving English phonemic contrasts.

Furthermore, learners with high instrumental motivation focus on the pragmatic value of learning a foreign language. The perception of phonemic contrasts is important in foreign language learning, since it helps avoid misunderstandings in communication. Instrumentally motivated learners might therefore be better at differentiating phonemes in perception than learners with low instrumental motivation. Earlier studies (Atay & Kurt, 2010; Hernández, 2006) have not always found a relation between instrumental motivation and foreign language proficiency. However, Masgoret and Gardner (2003) argue that both types of motivation influence L2 achievement positively. Similarly, Yousofi and Naderifarjad (2015) found that instrumental motivation has a positive effect on a foreign language learner's pronunciation. Although the present research investigates the relation between instrumental motivation and perception, these two aspects of phonology have been shown to be closely related. We thus propose the following hypothesis for RQ2:

H2: Instrumental motivation has a positive effect on Dutch L2 learners' perception of phonemic contrasts in English.

An increase in instrumental motivation is expected to lead to a better perception of English phonemic contrasts.

Finally, some phonemic contrasts can be harder to acquire than others. Flege (1997) argues that similar vowels are more difficult to acquire than new vowels. The English /e/ vowel might therefore be more difficult for Dutch learners of English than the vowel /æ/. Since voiced obstruents in word-final position do not exist in Dutch, they might be more difficult to perceive than word-final voiceless obstruents. Although motivation is hypothesized to affect the ability to perceive phonemic contrasts positively in general, this effect might be larger for phonemes that are more difficult to acquire than for others. As more effort is required in learning these phonemes, only highly motivated learners might be able to do so. We thus propose the following hypothesis.

H3: There is a difference in the assumed positive effect of motivation on the perception between types of phoneme.

It is expected that the effect of motivation is larger for more difficult phonemes. For the vowels, we expect that the effect of motivation will be larger for the perception of /e/ than of /æ/. For the consonants, it is expected that motivation will affect the perception of voiced obstruents more, compared to voiceless obstruents.

4. Method

4.1 Participants

Thirty-four participants (15 females, 19 males) participated in the experiment. They were all third-year pupils at a secondary school and were on average 14.2 years old (SD = 1.1). One pupil came from a *HAVO* class and the others were at the *VWO* level¹. Eight of the *VWO* pupils came from a regular *VWO* class and the others came from a *VWO* class with ‘tweetalig onderwijs’ (*TTO*; E: bilingual education. This means that at least half of their classes are given in English and that they participate in international activities (Rijksoverheid, n.d.). The participants had been learning English as a foreign language for 5 years on average (SD = 1.65), with no significant difference in the length of learning English between the participants from the *TTO* class and the other participants [$t(32) = 1.243, p = .22$]. All participants were raised monolingually in Dutch. One participant who indicated that he was raised bilingually in Dutch and English has been excluded from the analysis. All participants read an information letter and signed an informed consent either on paper or online before participating in the experiment.

¹ The Dutch secondary school system consists of three main levels: *VMBO*, *HAVO* and *VWO*. The last two levels are the highest levels and prepare pupils for higher professional education or university.

4.2 Materials

The materials for the experiment consisted of a perception experiment to measure participants' ability to distinguish the selected English phonemic contrasts in perception and a questionnaire to assess their motivation. In addition, the participants filled in a background questionnaire with questions about their age, gender, class, the length of instruction in English, first language, target accent (i.e. which accent they try to speak), and the variety of English used by their teachers.

The perception experiment in Pieper (2017) was adopted for the current purpose. The stimuli consisted of 68 (non-)words, representing two types of stimuli (32 vowel stimuli, 36 consonant stimuli). The vowel items focused on the contrast between /æ/ and /e/ and contained one of these vowels. The target vowel was preceded by one of the voiceless consonants /p, t, k, f/ and followed by the same or a different voiceless consonant. This resulted in a CVC word (e.g. /pef/). Sixteen words were created using the vowel /æ/ and sixteen items contained /e/, generating a total of 32 stimuli. The consonant items were concerned with the voiceless plosives /p, t, k/ and their voiced counterparts /b, d, g/. To create the stimuli, the target consonants was preceded by one of the English vowels /i, i:, ɒ, ɔ:, ʊ, u:/. The consonant stimuli thus had a structure of VC (e.g. /i:k/). In this way, six items were composed for each target consonant, resulting in 36 consonant stimuli in total. The full list of items can be found in appendix A. A male monolingual native speaker of British English recorded the 68 non-words (Pieper 2017). Each non-word was extracted from the recording and saved as individual .wav files using Praat (Boersma & Weenink, 2014). The items were uploaded to the online questionnaire LimeSurvey using the same randomized order as the one used in Pieper (2017).

The questionnaire to assess motivation was based on Gardner's AMTB (1985). The items were translated to Dutch and slightly adapted. The original version of the AMTB

consists of eleven subtests, but only those targeting integrative and instrumental motivation were used in this study. As mentioned earlier, integrative motivation in the AMTB consists of the scales “attitudes toward the target language group”, “interest in foreign languages” and “integrative orientation”. Instrumental motivation was measured with the subtest “instrumental orientation”. All subtests consisted of a number of statements. A seven point Likert scale was used to assess the participant’s opinion on each statement. Integrative and instrumental orientation each contained four statements. The other subtests consisted of ten statements each. Although the AMTB originally also assesses “attitude towards French Canadians”, a similar subtest was deemed inappropriate in the current context. Instead, the ten questions from the AMTB subtest “attitudes toward European French people” were adapted to assess attitudes toward speakers of English. They were reduplicated so that the statements targeted both American and British English speakers. An overview of the subtests with all statements can be found in appendix B.

4.3 Procedure

The participants completed both the perception test and the questionnaires using LimeSurvey. As in Pieper (2017), the participants listened to each of the 68 stimuli using headphones. The instructions were the same as in Pieper’s study and the subjects were given one practice item. The recording of the item was presented together with a multiple-choice question. The subject was asked to listen to the recording once and answer the question. The question for vowel items was: *What vowel do you hear in this word?* The answer options to this question were the English vowels /æ/ or /e/, each supplemented with examples of English words containing these vowels, as can be seen in (a).

(a) *What vowel do you hear in this word?*

a. The 'a' like in English 'can', 'bad', 'sad'

- b. The 'e' like in English 'leg', 'bed', 'men'

For consonant items, participants were asked: *What do you hear at the end of this word?* The answer options were the target consonant and its voiced or voiceless counterpart. An example question is given in (b):

- (b) What do you hear at the end of this word?
- a. A 'b' sound
 - b. A 'p' sound

After the participants had finished the perception experiment, they continued with the questionnaire on motivation. The procedure followed the guidelines in Gardner (1985). The instructions had been translated to Dutch by the author and one example statement was given. The participants received one of the pseudo-randomized orders to prevent the order of the subtests of the AMTB from influencing the responses. The motivation questionnaire was immediately followed by the background questions. Most of the participants did the experiment during one of their English classes with their teacher and/or the author present. The participants were told to fill out the questionnaire individually and talking or looking at each other's laptop was discouraged during the experiment. Participants who had finished the questionnaire earlier or did not want to participate were given a different in-class task. A few participants (N = 6) completed both the perception experiment and the questionnaire at home.

5. Results

5.1 Analysis

Although in this study the statements of the subtest "attitudes towards European French people" were adapted to target both American and British English speakers, the subtest "attitudes towards French Canadians" from the original version of the AMTB was excluded. Thus, both versions of the AMTB contained two subtests assessing attitudes toward the target

language groups. Following Gardner (1985), integrative motivation and instrumental motivation were analysed as the sum of the scores assigned to the statements of the corresponding subtests. The lowest and highest possible scores for integrative motivation were 34 and 238 respectively. The participants' scores for integrative motivation ranged from 112 to 199 ($M = 168.65$; $SD = 18.48$). For instrumental motivation, the lowest and highest possible scores were four and 28 respectively. The responses ranged from eight to 28 ($M = 20.44$, $SD = 4.31$). A comparison of the average scores per type of motivation revealed that there is no significant difference between the scores on instrumental ($M = 5.11$, $SD = 1.08$) and integrative ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.54$) motivation [$t(33) = 0.895$, $p = .38$]. An independent samples t-test showed that the TTO and non-TTO group did not differ significantly in instrumental [$t(32) = 0.448$, $p = .66$] and integrative motivation [$t(32) = -0.600$, $p = .55$]. Both groups were therefore analysed together.

Integrative and instrumental motivation scores and phoneme type were the independent variables in this study. The perception of the phonemic contrasts was the dependent variable and was coded as either correct or incorrect. The responses to the vowels and consonants were analysed separately. A mixed-model binary logistic regression analysis in SPSS was used to investigate the relation between the two types of motivation and the scores on the perception task. The predictors were integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, phoneme type, and the interactions between each type of motivation and phoneme type. The phoneme type for the vowels had two levels: /æ/ and /e/. For the consonants, the phoneme type for the consonants had also two levels: voiced obstruents and voiceless obstruents. The outcome variable was the judgements on the perception (correct vs. incorrect), with 'incorrect' as the reference category.

5.2 Perception of Vowels

The percentages of correct perception of the /æ/ and /e/ vowel can be found in Table 4.1. On average, the vowels were perceived correctly in 59.4% of the cases. The vowel /æ/ was mostly perceived correctly, while the responses to /e/ were almost equally often correct and incorrect.

Table 4.1. *Perception of the vowels /æ/ (N=551) and /e/ (N=549) in percentages*

	Incorrect	Correct
/æ/	29.4	70.6
/e/	51.9	48.1
Total	40.6	59.4

A mixed model linear regression analysis was carried out to examine whether instrumental and integrative motivation influence the perception of vowels and to investigate whether the effect of motivation depends on vowel type. As can be seen in Table 4.2, no significant main effect of integrative motivation ($p = .541$) and instrumental motivation ($p = .420$) on the perception of vowels was found. Also, the interaction between integrative

Table 4.2. *Summary of the results of the mixed model linear regression analysis. For perception 'incorrect' was used as a reference category. The /æ/ was used as a reference category for vowel type.*

	Coefficient	Standard Error	t	Significance	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower	Upper
Intercept	-0.459	1.213	-0.378	.705	-2.839	1.922
Instrumentality	-0.009	0.012	-0.807	.420	-0.032	0.014
Integrativeness	0.004	0.007	0.612	.541	-0.010	0.019
Vowel type	-1.672	1.268	-1.318	.188	-4.160	0.816
Integrativeness*Vowel type	-0.004	0.008	-0.566	.572	-0.019	0.011
Instrumentality*Vowel type	0.055	0.013	4.367	.000**	0.030	0.080

** significant at the $p < .001$ level

motivation and vowel type was not significant ($p = .572$). However, there was a significant interaction between instrumental motivation and vowel type ($p < .001$). This shows that the effect of instrumental motivation was different for the perception of /æ/ and /e/. Specifically, every unit of increase in instrumental motivation led to a larger increase in the odds of the correct perception of /æ/ than that of /e/ by a factor of 0.054.

5.3 Perception of Consonants

The percentages of correct perception of the voiced and voiceless word-final obstruents can be found in Table 4.3. On average, the responses to the consonants were correct in 69.7% of the cases. Both the voiceless and the voiced consonants were mostly perceived correctly. The voiced consonants were perceived correctly slightly more often than the voiceless consonants.

Table 4.3. *Perception of voiceless (N=620) and voiced (N=616) consonants in percentages*

	Incorrect	Correct
[-voice]	32.4	67.6
[+voice]	28.2	71.8
Total	30.3	69.7

The results of the mixed model logistic regression analysis on the perception of consonants can be found in Table 4.4. No significant main effect was found for either type of motivation (instrumentality, $p = .594$; integrativeness, $p = .240$). There was also no significant interaction between integrative motivation and consonant type ($p = .308$). However, the interaction between instrumentality and phoneme type was significant ($p = .011$). This means that the effect of instrumental motivation differed significantly per type of consonant.

According to the model, a unit of increase in instrumental motivation led to a faster rise in the odds of perceiving voiceless consonants correctly compared to voiced consonants by 0.038.

Table 4.4. *Summary of the results of the mixed model linear regression analysis. For perception ‘incorrect’ was used as a reference category. The voiceless consonants were used as a reference category for consonant type.*

	Coefficient	Standard Error	t	Significance	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower	Upper
Intercept	-0.459	1.213	-0.378	.705	-2.839	1.922
Instrumentality	-0.009	0.012	-0.807	.420	-0.032	0.014
Integrativeness	0.004	0.007	0.612	.541	-0.010	0.019
Vowel type	-1.672	1.268	-1.318	.188	-4.160	0.816
Integrativeness	-0.004	0.008	-0.566	.572	-0.019	0.011
*Vowel type						
Instrumentality	0.055	0.013	4.367	.000**	0.030	0.080
*Vowel type						

** significant at the $p < .001$ level

6. Discussion and Conclusion

6.1 Integrative Motivation

The first research question of this study was whether integrative motivation affects the perception of English phonemic contrasts in Dutch secondary-school students. It was hypothesized that integrative motivation positively affects the perception of English phonemic contrasts for these learners of English. However, no significant relation between integrative motivation and the perception of consonants or vowels was found. The hypothesis that integrativeness affects the ability to distinguish phonemic contrasts can therefore not be confirmed.

6.2 Instrumental Motivation

Another research question was whether there is a relation between instrumental motivation and the perception of phonemic contrasts by Dutch secondary-school students. The hypothesis was that instrumental motivation positively affects the perception of phoneme contrasts. No

main effect of instrumental motivation on the perception of phonemes was found in this study. This is contrary to what was expected.

6.3 Motivation and Phoneme Type

It was also examined whether the effect of integrative and instrumental motivation was dependent on type of consonant or vowel. No interaction between integrativeness and type of phoneme was found in this study. This is not in line with the hypothesis that there is a difference in the effect of integrative motivation between types of phonemic contrasts. However, for both the perception of word-final obstruents and vowels, there was a significant interaction between instrumental motivation and phoneme type. The hypothesis that the relation between instrumental motivation and the ability to perceive the difference between English phonemic contrasts is dependent on the type of phoneme can be confirmed.

The participants with a higher instrumental motivation were more likely to perceive the /æ/ vowel correctly compared to the /e/ vowel, in spite that the effect of motivation was expected to be larger for the more difficult /e/ vowel. Contrary to the expectations, the results suggest that the effect of instrumental motivation on the perception of vowels is larger for less difficult vowels compared to difficult vowels. For the consonants, the participants with a higher instrumental motivation were more likely to perceive the voiceless consonants correctly compared to the voiced consonants. This also contradicts the expectation that the effect of motivation would be larger for the relatively difficult phoneme type voiced obstruents. Instead, the findings of this study indicate that the effect of instrumental motivation is larger for less difficult consonant types.

For both consonants and vowels, the effect of instrumental motivation was dependent on phoneme type in such a way that the less difficult phoneme types were more likely to be perceived correctly with a higher instrumental motivation compared to the more difficult

phoneme types. This is contrary to earlier expectations that the effect of motivation is larger for more difficult phonemes because more effort is needed to acquire these phonemes.

6.2 Implications

The results of this study suggest that instrumental, but not integrative motivation, affects the acquisition of some phoneme types. It is possible that there is no relation between integrative motivation and the perception of phonemic contrasts, because integrative motivation is less relevant when learners do not communicate with native speakers of the language they are learning. Due to globalization, English is often used as a lingua franca to facilitate contact between non-native speakers of the language (Lamb, 2004; Kormos & Csizér, 2008).

However, no significant difference between the amount of integrative and instrumental motivation was found, which indicates that the intensity of integrative motivation itself is not decreased by globalization. There is also no reason to believe that learners' attitude towards native speakers changes when English is learnt as a foreign language. However, the relevance of this attitude to language learning decreases, because communicating with this group of speakers is less important in a global context. The effect of integrative motivation on language learning is therefore weakened when English is learned as a foreign language, which is in line with the finding that there is no relation between integrative motivation and the perception of phonemic contrasts. On the other hand, globalization does not affect instrumental motivation. In both second and foreign language learning contexts, the acquisition of English has pragmatic value for the learner. In this study, the effect of instrumental motivation on the perception of phonemic contrasts was larger for less difficult phonemes compared to more difficult phonemes.

6.3 Limitations

There are a few limitations in the current study. Firstly, some participants completed the survey at home. Gardner (1985) argues that the correct procedure in administering the AMTB is crucial for obtaining reliable results. However, for the participants who finished the survey at home, it was impossible to check whether they adhered to the instructions and completed the experiment in a quiet room. Another drawback of this study is that only four of the statements assessed instrumental motivation. Although the materials of Gardner's AMTB were copied, it could be argued that four statements are too limited to fully examine participants' instrumental motivation. Also, caution is required in generalising these results to other learner groups. The participants in the current study were all in the third grade of secondary school and all studied on *HAVO* or *VWO* level, which are the two highest levels of secondary education in the Netherlands. Possibly, the amount and type of motivation might differ per level of education. For example, students from lower levels might be focused more on the practical use of L2 learning, while students from higher levels might be more interested in other cultures resulting in a higher integrative motivation. Although there were no differences in motivation between the TTO and non-TTO class, there might be differences in motivation between learners of different levels of education. To be able to make generalisations to other learner groups and to implement the results found in the current study, it is important that more research is done with students of other ages and levels of education.

6.5 Future Research

The results of this study indicate that instrumental motivation has a larger effect on less difficult phonemes compared to more difficult phonemes. Further research could investigate whether this interaction between motivation and the degree of difficulty in acquisition also applies to other aspects of learning an L2, like syntax. On the other hand, no effect of integrative motivation on the perception of phonemes was found in this study, which might be due to globalization. Future studies should explore new ways to assess integrative motivation

in a global context. For example, research investigating the relation between motivation and proficiency in English, could adjust subtests from the AMTB to assess whether learners of English want to identify with other non-native speakers of English as well as native speakers of English.

Furthermore, in this research, the relation between motivation and the perception of phonemic contrasts was examined. The perception of phonemic contrasts is an important aspect of L2 acquisition as it can prevent difficulties with the differentiating between minimal pairs, like /bed/ and /bæd/. It would be interesting to investigate whether the effect of motivation on phonemic contrasts in perception is similar for the production of these contrasts, since improvement in the perception of L2 sounds has been shown to influence the production of these sounds as well (Bradlow et al., 1997).

Further studies investigating the effect of motivation on L2 phonology could also consider influence of the learner's target accent. For example, learners who want to speak American English might consider different phonemes to be important to acquire than learners targeting a British English variety. A learner's target variety probably also affects integrative motivation, as learners who target a particular accent may well be more integratively motivated towards speakers of that variety.

Since all secondary-school students in the Netherlands are required to learn English, it is important to examine whether students from different levels of secondary education differ in their motivation and how this affects their learning of English. Students from different educational levels might consider different reasons for learning a language to be relevant for them. For example, students from *VMBO* might be more instrumentally motivated, while students at *VWO* level might be more inclined to learn English for integrative reasons. Since differences in type of motivation may influence its effect on proficiency, it is important to know which aspects of motivation matter to students from different educational levels. This

information could then be used in the language learning classroom to increase students' motivation and help them acquire English as well as possible.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank prof. dr. Aoju Chen for her encouragement and guidance throughout the process of writing this thesis. I also thank her and dr. Koen Sebregts for their invaluable comments on earlier versions of this thesis. I am particularly grateful to Margreet Pieper for allowing me to use her materials for the perception experiment. Finally, thanks are due to the teachers and students who welcomed me in their classes and willingly participated in the experiment.

References

- Atay, D. & Kurt, G. (2010). The socio-educational model of second language acquisition: The Turkish context. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 3088-3093.
- Best, C. T., McRoberts, G. W., & Sithole, N. M. (1988). Examination of perceptual reorganization for non-native speech contrasts: Zulu click discrimination by English-speaking adults and infants, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 14, 345-360.
- Best, C. T., & Strange, W. (1992). Effects of phonological and phonetic factors on cross-language perception of approximants, *Journal of Phonetics*, 20, 305-330.
- Bialystok, E. & Hakuta, K. (1999). Confounded age: Linguistic and cognitive factors in age differences for second language acquisition. In D. Birdsong (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition and the Critical Period Hypothesis* (pp. 161-181). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Boersma, P. & Weenink, D. (2014). Praat: Doing phonetics by computer. Computer programme version 5.3.62. <http://www.praat.org/>.
- Broersma, M. (2005). Perception of familiar contrasts in unfamiliar positions. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 117, 3890-3901.
- Bongaerts, T., Mennen, S., Slik, F. van der, (2000). Authenticity of pronunciation in naturalistic second language acquisition: The case of very advanced late learners of Dutch as a Second Language. *Studia Linguistica*, 54, 298-308.
- Bradlow, A. R., Pisoni, D. B., Akahane-Yamada, R. & Tohkura, Y. (1997). Training Japanese listeners to identify English /r/ and /l/: Some effects of perceptual learning on speech production. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 101, 2299-2310.

- Chalak, A. & Kassaian, Z. (2010). Motivation and attitudes of Iranian undergraduate EFL students towards learning English. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 10(2), p. 37-56.
- Chen, M. (1970). Vowel length variation as a function of the voicing of the consonant environment. *Phonetica*, 22, 129-159.
- Crowther, C. S. & Mann, V. (1992). Native language factors affecting use of vocalic cues to final consonant voicing in English. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 92, 711-722.
- Doel, R.Z. van den. (2006). *How Friendly are the Natives? An Evaluation of Native-speaker Judgements of Foreign-accented British and American English*. (PhD thesis). LOT: Utrecht.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning*, 53(51), p. 3-32.
- Flege, J. E. (1987a). A critical period for learning to pronounce foreign languages? *Applied Linguistics*, 8, 162-176.
- Flege, J. E. (1987b). The production of “new” and “similar” phones in a foreign language: evidence for the effect of equivalence classification. *Journal of Phonetics*, 15, 47-65.
- Flege, J. E. (1995). English vowel production by Dutch talkers: more evidence for the “similar” vs “new” distinction. In A. James & J. Leather (Eds.), *Second-Language Speech: Structure and Process* (pp. 11-52). New York, NY: De Gruyter.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery: Technical Report*. London. University of Western Ontario.

- Gardner, R. C. (2006). The socio-educational model of Second Language Acquisition: A research paradigm. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 6, 237-260.
- Grijzenhout, J. & Krämer, M. (2000). Final devoicing and voicing assimilation in Dutch derivation and cliticization. *Lexicon in focus*, 45, 55-82.
- Hernández, T. (2006). Integrative motivation as a predictor of success in the intermediate foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 605-617.
- Koet, T. (2007). *Polder English in Dutch ears: empirical studies on the evaluation of the pronunciation of English as a foreign language*. University of Amsterdam.
- Kormos, J. & Csizér, K. (2008). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behaviour. *Language Learning*, 58, 327-355.
- Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System*, 32, 3-19.
- Masgoret, A.-M., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, Motivation, and Second Language Learning: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Conducted by Gardner and Associates. *Language Learning*, 53, 123-163.
- Moyer, A. (1999). Ultimate Attainment in L2 Phonology: The Critical Factors of Age, Motivation, and Instruction. *SSLA*, 21, 81-108.
- Moyer, A. (2004). *Age, Accent, and Experience in Second Language Acquisition: An Integrated Approach to Critical Period Inquiry*. Multilingual Matters.
- Moyer, A. (2007). Do Language Attitudes Determine Accent? A Study of Bilinguals in the USA. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 28, 502-518.

- Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R. & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning, 50*, 57-85.
- Pieper, M. (2017). Bad or Bet? The Effect of Pronunciation Teaching on Dutch Secondary School Pupils' Production and Perception of English Phonemes.
- Piske, T., MacKay, I. R. A, & Flege. J. E. (2001). Factors affecting degree of foreign accent in an L2: a review. *Journal of Phonetics, 29*, 191-215.
- Rijksoverheid (n.d.). Wat is tweetalig onderwijs (tto) in het voortgezet onderwijs? Retrieved from <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/onderwijs-en-internationalisering/vraag-en-antwoord/wat-is-tweetalig-onderwijs-tto-in-het-voortgezet-onderwijs>.
- Scovel, T. (1969). Foreign accents, language acquisition, and cerebral dominance. *Language Learning, 19*, 245-253
- Vandergrift, L. (2005). Relationships among motivation orientations, metacognitive awareness and proficiency in L2 listening. *Applied Linguistics, 26*, 70-89.
- Yousofi, N. & Naderifarjad, Z. (2015). The Relationship between Motivation and Pronunciation: A case of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2*, 249-262.

Appendix A – Stimuli in the Perception Test

1. pæp	29. u:b	57. pet
2. pek	30. i:k	58. tæp
3. ib	31. kek	59. ɒp
4. fet	32. tef	60. fæf
5. ɔ:b	33. tæp	61. kæp
6. u:d	34. ʊk	62. ɔ:g
7. ɒt	35. ip	63. i:d
8. kæf	36. fæt	64. fek
9. it	37. fæk	65. ɒt
10. ig	38. ɔ:p	66. kæk
11. ɒb	39. ɒd	67. fef
12. u:t	40. u:g	68. i:p
13. tet	41. kep	
14. tep	42. ɒk	
15. ɒb	43. ɔ:k	
16. ik	44. ʊg	
17. u:p	45. tæk	
18. ɔ:d	46. ket	
19. id	47. pæf	
20. pef	48. i:b	
21. tek	49. ʊp	
22. i:g	50. kef	
23. ʊd	51. kæt	
24. fep	52. pæk	
25. tæf	53. u:k	
26. ɒg	54. fæp	
27. i:t	55. pæt	
28. pep	56. ɔ:t	

Appendix B – Motivation Questionnaire

Instructions

Nu volgen een aantal stellingen waar sommige mensen het mee eens zijn en anderen oneens. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden omdat veel mensen verschillende meningen hebben. We zouden het fijn vinden als je jouw mening over elke stelling aangeeft door te klikken op het punt dat het best aangeeft in hoeverre jij het met een stelling eens of oneens bent.

De volgende is een voorbeeldvraag. Klik op de mogelijkheid naast de stelling die het beste aangeeft wat jouw mening is.

1. Nederlandse hockeyers zijn beter dan Russische hockeyers.

Helemaal mee oneens / Redelijk mee oneens / Licht mee oneens / Neutraal / Licht mee eens / Redelijk mee eens / Helemaal mee eens

Bij het antwoorden van deze vraag, moet je op één van bovenstaande antwoorden hebben geklikt. Sommige mensen zouden op ‘Helemaal mee oneens’ geklikt hebben, anderen op ‘Helemaal mee eens’ en weer anderen op een van de mogelijkheden tussenin. Het antwoord dat jij hebt aangeklikt, laat zien wat jouw mening hierover is op basis van wat je weet en hebt gehoord. Let op, er is geen goed of fout antwoord. Wat belangrijk is, is dat je jouw mening aangeeft.

Geef alsjeblieft je directe reacties op elk van de onderstaande items. Verspil geen tijd met nadenken over elke stelling. Geef onmiddellijk je mening na het lezen van elke stelling. Aan de andere kant moet je het wel zorgvuldig invullen, omdat het belangrijk is dat we je echte mening te weten komen.

‘Following are a number of statements with which some people agree and others disagree. There are no right or wrong answers since many people have different opinions. We would

like you to indicate your opinion about each statement by clicking the alternative below it which best indicates the extent to which you disagree or agree with that statement. Following is a sample item. Click on the alternative next to the statement which best indicates your feeling.

1. Dutch hockey players are better than Russian hockey players

Strongly disagree / Moderately disagree / Slightly disagree / Neutral / Slightly agree /
Moderately agree / Strongly agree

In answering this question, you should have circled one of the above alternatives. Some people would circle Strongly Disagree, others would circle Strongly Agree, and still others would circle one of the alternatives in between. Which one you circled would indicate your own feelings based on everything you know and have heard. Note, there is no right or wrong answer. All that is important is that you indicate your personal feeling. Please give your immediate reactions to each of the following items. Don't waste time thinking about each statement. Give your immediate feeling after reading each statement. On the other hand, please do not be careless, as it is important that we obtain your true feelings.'

Questions

Interest in Foreign Languages

1. Als ik in het buitenland ben, zou ik het leuk vinden om de taal van de mensen daar te kunnen spreken.²

'If I were in a foreign country I would like to be able to speak the language of the people.'

² All statements were worded positively. Although this might have led to a response bias, it was considered more important to follow the exact same procedure as in Gardner (1985). Another option of duplicating all the statements with a positively and negatively worded counterpart was considered, but dismissed because it would double the subjects' workload and might lead to participant fatigue.

2. Het is voor Nederlanders belangrijk om vreemde talen te leren.

‘It is important for Dutch people to learn foreign languages.’

3. Ik wou dat ik een andere taal perfect kon spreken.

‘I wish I could speak another language perfectly.’

4. Ik wil literatuur van een vreemde taal in de originele taal lezen, in plaats van een vertaling.

‘I want to read the literature of a foreign language in the original language rather than a translation.’

5. Ik zou graag willen dat ik kranten en bladen in een andere taal kon lezen.

‘I wish I could read newspapers and magazines in another language.’

6. Ik wil heel graag een heleboel vreemde talen leren.

‘I would really like to learn a lot of foreign languages.’

7. Als ik van plan was om in een ander land te verblijven, zou ik erg mijn best doen om de taal daar te leren, zelfs als ze mij in het Nederlands zouden kunnen verstaan.

‘If I planned to stay in another country, I would make a great effort to learn the language even though I could get along in Dutch.’

8. Ik zou ook een vreemde taal op school leren als het niet verplicht was.

‘I would study a foreign language in school even if it were not required.’

9. Ik vind het leuk om mensen die andere talen spreken te ontmoeten en naar hen te luisteren.

‘I enjoy meeting and listening to people who speak other languages.’

10. Een vreemde taal leren is een leuke ervaring.

‘Studying a foreign language is an enjoyable experience.’

Attitudes toward British English speakers

1. De Britten zijn erg attent op de gevoelens van anderen.

‘The British are considerate of the feelings of others.’

2. Ik heb een positieve attitude tegenover Britten.

‘I have a favourable attitude towards the British.’

3. Hoe meer ik leer over de Britten, hoe leuker ik hen vind.

‘The more I learn about the British, the more I like them.’

4. Britten zijn betrouwbaar.

‘The British are trustworthy.’

5. Ik heb het Britse volk altijd bewonderd.

‘I have always admired the British people.’

6. Britten zijn erg vriendelijk en gastvrij.

‘The British are very friendly and hospitable.’

7. Britten zijn opgewekt, aardig en gastvrij.

‘The British are cheerful, agreeable and good humoured.’

8. Ik zou het Britse volk graag beter leren kennen.

‘I would like to get to know the British people better.’

9. Britten zijn erg aardige en gulle mensen.

‘The British are a very kind and generous people.’

10. Voor het grootste gedeelte zijn de Britten oprecht en eerlijk.

‘For the most part, the British are sincere and honest.’

Attitudes toward American English speakers

1. De Amerikanen zijn erg attent op de gevoelens van anderen.

‘The Americans are considerate of the feelings of others.’

2. Ik heb een positieve attitude tegenover Amerikanen.

‘I have a favourable attitude towards the Americans.’

3. Hoe meer ik leer over de Amerikanen, hoe leuker ik hen vind.

‘The more I learn about the Americans, the more I like them.’

4. Amerikanen zijn betrouwbaar.

‘The Americans are trustworthy.’

5. Ik heb het Amerikaanse volk altijd bewonderd.

‘I have always admired the American people.’

6. Amerikanen zijn erg vriendelijk en gastvrij.

‘The Americans are very friendly and hospitable.’

7. Amerikanen zijn vrolijk, aardig en opgewekt.

‘The Americans are cheerful, agreeable and good humoured.’

8. Ik zou het Amerikaanse volk graag beter leren kennen.

‘I would like to get to know the American people better.’

9. Amerikanen zijn erg aardige en gulle mensen.

‘The Americans are a very kind and generous people.’

10. Voor het grootste gedeelte zijn de Amerikanen oprecht en eerlijk.

‘For the most part, the American are sincere and honest.’

Integrative Orientation

Engels leren kan belangrijk voor me zijn, omdat...

‘Studying English can be important for me because...’

1. ...ik me dan meer op me gemak kan voelen bij Engelsprekenden.

‘...it will allow me to be more at ease with English speaking people.’

2. ...het me de mogelijkheid geeft om meer verschillende mensen te ontmoeten en met hen te spreken.

‘...it will allow me to meet and converse with more varied people.’

3. ...ik dan Engelse kunst en literatuur beter kan begrijpen en waarderen.

‘...it will enable me to better understand and appreciate English art and literature.’

4. ...ik dan makkelijker mee kan doen met activiteiten in andere culturen.

‘...I will be able to participate more freely in the activities of other cultures.’

Instrumental Orientation

Engels leren kan belangrijk voor me zijn, omdat...

‘Studying English can be important for me because...’

1. ...ik het nodig heb in mijn verdere loopbaan.

‘...I’ll need it for my future career.’

2. ...het een slimmer persoon van me zal maken.

‘...it will make me a more knowledgeable person.’

3. ...ik denk dat het handig is om later een goede baan te krijgen.

‘...I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job.’

4. ...andere mensen me meer zullen respecteren als ik een vreemde taal ken.

‘...other people will respect me more if I have a knowledge of a foreign language.’