

Exploring Motivation in Relation to Proficiency and Group Dynamics

Katsuko Matsubara*

This study explores the types of language learning motivation and learning preferences among Japanese EFL learners and their relationship with learner proficiency. While research on motivation pay much attention to the types of motivational components that exist among learners with different social context, the review of literature indicates that focusing on the dynamics of classroom learning in relation to motivation was limited in the past studies. In this study, the author examines motivation and learning preferences as well as focusing on the classroom dynamics of learning which involves the relationship among students and a teacher. First, principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted by administering motivation items and learning preference items to Japanese college freshmen. Four components were extracted as a result of PCA. Then, the follow-up multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted in relation to learner proficiency. One of the characteristics that identified among Japanese learners was the classroom dynamics. The results are discussed in terms of the relationship between components identified and learner proficiency.

Introduction

Motivation is a key factor for language learning to increase students' interest in learning and ultimately leading students to autonomous learning. Therefore, many researchers have been interested in learner motivation and focused on identifying the types of motivation as well as the students' purpose of learning English. While research on motivation pay much attention to the types of motivational components that exist among Second Language (L2) learners, the review of literature indicates that focusing on the dynamics of classroom learning in relation to motivation was limited in the past studies. The results of previous studies on motivation thus focused mostly on the different types of motivational components identified according to different social milieu and learning situation. In this review, the author discusses the limitation of past studies on motivation and addresses the importance of classroom dynamics in order to understand the unstable nature of motivation, which may be influenced by people who are involved in the learning process and the learning environment.

Motivation Research in Different Social Contexts

Recently, few motivation studies have shifted their focus from addressing the importance of identifying the types of motivation among learners in different social contexts to the effects of a supportive learning environment in relation to learner motivation (Clément, Baker, & MacIntyre, 2003; Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1994; Dörnyei, 1990, 1994, 2001; Williams & Burden, 1997; Wu, 2003). In the past, motivation studies were conducted in many different social contexts which included both English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) (Gardner, 1988; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1991; Lukmani, 1972; Oller, Baca, Vigil, 1977; Yamamoto, 1993; Yashima, 2002). Therefore, results of these studies varied in terms of understanding the types of motivational constructs that exist among learners and the relationship between learners' motivation and L2 achievement. In addition, even narrowing to the EFL situation in Japan, the results of motivation studies varied, and therefore, individual and situational difference among these studies seem to have

*Aomori Public College

influenced the results. For example, Brown, Robson, and Rosenkjar (2001) and Matsubara (2001) investigated Japanese university students' motivational components and found integrative motivation as a major construct, while Kimura, Nakata, and Okumura's (2001) study showed that motivational components among Japanese learners are different across grade levels. The results of their study suggest that motivational components are more complex, and therefore, they do not categorize integrative motivation as one construct. Their study included situation-specific motivation, teacher-specific motivation and activity-specific motivation. What was lacking in the earlier studies about motivation was to extend the investigation into an education-specific learning context. Education-specific learning context includes external influences such as interaction with other people, the learning environment, and cultural norms within a specific group of students. If motivation is considered as context-specific, students' motivation in relation to their learning situation and classroom learning organization such as relationship with other members of the classroom needs to be taken into account. Particularly from a pedagogical perspective, consideration of the learner involvement in a specific learning situation will lead to a better understanding of the complex and multi-dimensional aspects of motivation across different learning situations (Dörnyei, 1990, 2001; Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003).

Group Dynamics and Language Learning Motivation

Beginning in the 1990's, a few researchers started to discuss the importance of group dynamics in relation to learner motivation (Clément et al., 1994; Dörnyei, 1994, 1997; Dörnyei & Malderez, 1997; Johnson & Johnson, 1991). The idea of group dynamics was first

elaborated by Lewin (1995). Lewin used the term "dynamics" in order to explain the complex nature of interaction among individuals and groups. By using this term, Lewin tried "to stress the powerful impact of these complex social processes on group members" (Forsyth, 1990, p.11). Clarifying Lewin's explanation of group dynamics, Forsyth (1990) defines a group as "two or more interdependent individuals who influence one another through social interaction". Thus, group dynamics focuses on the human relationships which involve two or more people in the particular organization or situation.

Although the idea of group dynamics became popular in the field of social psychology and organizational management, researchers can apply the theory and research in classroom management and learning behavior of students. Since group dynamics focuses on the way groups and individuals interact in the changing environment, application of the theory in classroom learning has considerable implications for a researcher to understand the behavior and attitudes of individuals and small groups. (Evans & Dion, 1991; Long & Porter, 1985; McGroarty, 1993).

One of the key assumptions of group dynamics is that human behavior is a function of both the personal characteristics of individual and the characteristics of the environment (Lewin, 1995). Thus, group dynamics includes the features of the group, the group members, and the situation as important factors in a psychological model of human behavior. Group dynamics explicates how humans behave as they do in relation to the other people in the group and the types of environments in which they are interacting. By analyzing the nature of group dynamics in the classroom, the researcher may reveal the complex process of how teacher, peers, and small group interaction in-

fluence learners' attitudes, motivation and achievement (Dörnyei & Malderez, 1997).

While motivation studies remain popular in the field of SLA, studies on motivation addressing the importance of group dynamics began to emerge only gradually. When the past studies on learner motivation suggested that situation-specific factors seem to influence learner motivation in a foreign-language classroom, researchers began to focus on classroom dynamics for better understanding of learner behavior and attitudes (e.g. Clément et al., 1994; Dörnyei, 1994, 1996, 1997; Ushioda, 2001; Wu, 2003).

Studies on groups include the specific analysis of small group behavior such as studying group structure, group norms, interaction patterns, and group cohesion. For example, based on a questionnaire on attitudes, self-confidence and motivation, Clément et al.'s (1994) study revealed the presence of a classroom-based characteristic which is identified by classroom cohesion and evaluation. The study discussed that "English achievement is related significantly to self-confidence, the evaluation of learning environment and the motivational indices" (p. 439). The study further states that group cohesion relates to a positive perception of learning environment. The results suggest that aspects of classroom learning behavior including the teacher, the students, the tasks and group relationships are interdependent in the classroom and significantly affect L2 learning behavior.

A study on young learners' motivation and learning environment by Wu (2003) suggests that classroom variables such as tasks, instructional support, and evaluation can result in promoting students' intrinsic motivation. Wu conducted a study on the relationship between a positive learning environment and the success or failure of Chinese EFL learners. The

study also suggests that a teaching method which provides cooperative learning and instructional support results in enhancing learners' self-perceptions of L2 competence.

When a language instructor can promote group cohesiveness and positive learning environment, the outcome seems to stimulate students' motivation and increase the opportunity for cooperative learning. On the other hand, group influence does not necessarily work positively. What are the important issues involved in getting a group to work effectively? According to Johnson and Johnson (1991), in order for a group to work effectively, the group must accomplish its goals, maintain good working relationships, and be willing to adapt to changing conditions. Considering the effect of the group in learner attitudes, behavior, and learning goals, it seems necessary to pay close attention to the group dynamics aspect of classroom learning in relation to learner motivation.

Past studies related to cooperative learning and motivation argue that quality and quantity of small group interaction, types of instruction, and task types influence group performance and learner attitudes toward the classroom. On the other hand, most of these studies do not address the relationship between these constructs identified in the classroom and language proficiency. Although past studies address the relationship between the positive effects of group dynamics and learner motivation, self-confidence, and L2 learning behavior, it is yet not clear how these variables interact with instruction, small group relationships, learning goals, and L2 proficiency. Studies of group dynamics and motivation have discussed the importance of group cohesion and group performance, but have not yet addressed how these key issues of group dynamics are associated with language proficiency. Therefore, the

purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between motivational components, as identified in a questionnaire on motivation and learning preferences reflecting group dynamics, and L2 proficiency. First, the author investigates types of motivational components and learning preferences among Japanese EFL learners. Second, the author investigates the relationship between the emerging factors and proficiency groups.

Research Questions

1. What are the important components of motivation and learning preferences among Japanese university students?
2. What motivational factors are associated with which proficiency groups?
3. What learning preferences are associated with which proficiency groups?

Methods

Participants

The 162 participants in this study were studying at a university in a rural area of Japan. All of them were first-year business majors enrolled in one-year required freshmen English courses. They were divided into elementary, regular, and honor levels based on their language proficiency. Students' proficiency was measured by the TOEIC IP test. The students take TOEIC IP test three times a year, in April, July and January. This study used the students' TOEIC score in July after they had taken one semester of English. The average TOEIC score was 391 with a range from 180 to 525.

Materials

The total questionnaire items consisted of 32 items measured by five-point Likert scale format, ranging from strongly agree five to strongly disagree one. The first 16 items were

intended to measure the motivational components previously discussed in Gardner (1985), Clément et al. (1994), and Kimura et al. (2001). The author selected and modified items reflecting intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, integrative motivation, and instrumental motivation. The author used many of these items for a previous study on motivation in Japan, and therefore, this instrument was a revised version of that one (Matsubara, 2001).

The second 16 items were intended to measure learning preferences. The learning preference items were modified version of the Motivation and Strategy Questionnaire (MSQ) by Ehrman (1996). Although Ehrman's questionnaire is labeled as a motivation and strategy questionnaire, these items actually measure learning preferences in the classroom rather than learning strategies. Therefore, these items were modified based on Japanese students' learning preferences associated with classroom dynamics. These items included individual vs. group learning preferences and teacher-centered vs. student-centered learning preferences.

Procedure and Statistical Analysis

The questionnaire was administered after one semester of English. The students took a TOEIC IP test at the end of semester, so the questionnaire was administered at the similar time as when they took the test. In order to answer the research questions, the author conducted the analyses in the following order. First, descriptive statistics were computed for questionnaire items and the TOEIC score to confirm normal distribution. Then the author conducted analyses in two steps. First, a PCA was performed in order to check the reliability of the questionnaire and to identify the components of motivation and learning preferences among the participants. Second, one-way MANOVA

was performed using the factor scores and proficiency groups. The purpose of the MANOVA was to see if different proficiency levels account for the differences in motivation and learning

preference components. Table 1 shows the questionnaire and descriptive statistics for each of the 32 items. The number of subjects (N), mean (M), and standard deviation (SD) are given.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for the 32 Questionnaire Items (N=162)

Questionnaire Items		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Motivation items (16items, alpha=.88)		
1 I study English because it is fun.	3.93	1.05
2 I study English to get a better job.	3.44	1.09
3 I try to use English when I have opportunity outside the class.	3.16	1.06
4 I study English because it is necessary to work in the international field.	3.44	1.11
5 English lesson is hard, but it is worth trying.	4.39	0.81
6 I study English because I have better chance to get a job.	3.69	0.96
7 I try to take as much English classes as I can beside required class.	3.17	1.10
8 I can get a lucrative job when my English skills improve.	3.23	0.95
9 I study English to know the culture of English speaking country.	3.20	1.19
10 I study English to broaden my view.	3.76	1.09
11 I study English to experience something new in English speaking country.	3.44	1.27
12 I study English because I like to interact with foreigners.	3.37	1.18
13 I study English to know how English speaking country functions.	2.89	1.09
14 To study English is inevitable part of education.	4.23	0.87
15 I study English to know the people of English speaking country.	3.41	1.17
16 I like to study many foreign languages.	3.72	1.32
Learning preferences and group dynamics items (16items, alpha=.72)		
17 It is effective to do pair work and small group activities.	4.09	0.94
18 It is effective when the teacher explain grammar in Japanese.	3.96	1.05
19 It is effective when I know the members of small group well.	3.87	1.10
20 It is effective when the teacher corrects grammar and spelling mistakes.	4.20	0.92
21 It is effective when I know the students in the class well.	3.94	0.99
22 It is effective when the teacher corrects all mistakes on students.	3.25	1.08
23 It is important to have the same teacher continuously.	3.69	1.13
24 It is effective to solve problems and corrects mistakes on my own.	4.44	0.70
25 The effect of learning is decided by the way teacher teaches.	3.53	0.98
26 The effect of learning is decided by the way I learn.	4.22	0.79
27 It is effective to use computers to study English.	3.78	0.95
28 It is effective to use only English in class.	3.41	1.15
29 It is effective to study alone.	3.33	1.00
30 It is effective to use English as much as possible in class.	4.38	0.71
31 It is effective to use English as much as possible outside class.	4.09	0.85
32 It is effective to go to English speaking country.	4.72	0.56

Results

Components of Motivation and Learning Preferences

Principal factors extraction with varimax rotation was performed on 32 items. Table 2 presents the resulting of factor extractions with an item loading greater than .30 as a criterion. Although nine factors were extracted, there were some complex loadings across factors.

Therefore, item loadings greater than .45 were used as a criterion for this analysis. As a result, four factors were extracted, accounting for 44.78% of variance in the 32 items. Cronbach's alpha statistics were computed for internal consistency. The reliability of each of four factors was checked, and all factors were internally consistent and well defined by variables indicating Factor 1 for .91, Factor 2 for .66, Factor 3 for .72, Factor 4 for .69, respectively.

Table 2

Results of Principal Component Analysis (N=162)

Item	Questionnaire Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	<i>h</i> ²
11	To experience something new in English speaking country.	.847				.757
13	To know how English speaking country functions.	.830				.765
15	To know the people of English speaking country.	.821				.748
12	Because I like to interact with foreigners.	.809				.693
9	To know the culture of English speaking country.	.806				.660
10	To broaden my view.	.758				.676
4	Because it is necessary to work in the international field.	.639				.661
3	I try to use English when I have opportunity outside the class.	.607				.497
1	I study English because it is fun.	.547				.707
24	It is effective to solve problems and corrects mistakes on my own.		.693			.615
26	The effect of learning is decided by the way I learn.		.668			.582
32	It is effective to go to English speaking country.		.618			.507
30	It is effective to use English as much as possible in class.		.578			.708
14	To study English is inevitable part of education.		.484			.582
6	I study English because I have better chance to get a job.			.853		.783
2	I study English to get a better job.			.742		.664
8	I can get a lucrative job when my English skills improve.			.641		.644
21	It is effective when I know the students in the class well.				.811	.758
19	It is effective when I know the members of small group well.				.775	.711
20	The teacher corrects grammar and spelling mistakes.				.572	.627
22	It is effective when the teacher corrects all mistakes on students.				.484	.617
Eigenvalue		7.140	3.440	1.960	1.780	
Percentage of Variance		22.320	10.740	6.140	5.560	
Cumulative Percentage of the Total Variance		22.320	33.070	39.210	44.780	
Cronbach's alpha		.911	.664	.721	.690	

Factor 1 received loadings from nine items. Items 1, 3, and 10 relate to intrinsic motivation indicating the interest in learning English. Other items except for item 4 are all related to integrative motivation indicating interest in English speaking countries and people. Item 4 concerns instrumental motivation, but overall the items in Factor 1 relate to intrinsic and integrative motivation. Thus, this factor is labeled as *Integrative-Intrinsic Motivation*.

Factor 2 received loadings from five items. Four items were from learning preferences, focusing on the ways students prefer to learn English. Item 32 and 30 relate to the preference of using English over their native language. Item 24, 26, and 14 relate to learner's belief about English education and learning preference. Therefore, this factor is labeled as *Learning Preference and Learner Belief*.

Factor 3 received loadings from three items. They are all related to instrumental motivation. Thus, this factor is labeled as *Instrumental Motivation*.

Factor 4 received loadings from four items. All items focus on the dynamics of classroom

learning. Items 19 and 21 relate to the relationship with other classmates and learning group members. Items 20 and 22 relate to teacher-centered learning. Although these items seem to focus on the different aspects of learning, all of them relate to classroom dynamics and identify students' preference on the types of learning that take place in the classroom. Thus, this factor is labeled as *Classroom Dynamics*.

Motivation, Learning Preference, and Proficiency

In order to answer the previously stated research questions two and three, a 3 (proficiency groups) x 4 (Factor 1 - 4) one-way MANOVA was conducted. The independent variables were three different proficiency groups divided according to the results of TOEIC test scores. They were divided as high, mid, and low proficiency levels. The four factor scores, two from motivation and two from learning preferences were entered as dependent variables. Table 3 shows descriptive statistics for three proficiency groups and factor scores for each dependent variable.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for the Three Dependent Variables

Dependent Variables	Group	mean	SD	n
Factor 1	High	0.119	0.914	51
	Mid	0.127	0.941	53
	Low	-0.217	1.100	57
	Total	0.003	1.000	161
Factor 2	High	-0.069	0.800	51
	Mid	0.052	0.823	53
	Low	0.134	0.894	57
	Total	0.042	0.841	161
Factor 3	High	0.000	1.130	51
	Mid	-0.060	0.904	53
	Low	0.051	0.982	57
	Total	-0.001	1.000	161
Factor 4	High	-0.036	0.953	51
	Mid	-0.285	1.030	53
	Low	0.328	0.915	57
	Total	0.010	0.993	161

The goal of MANOVA is to identify significant differences among groups on several dependent variables. In this case, the purpose was to reveal any differences in motivation and learning preferences among difference language proficiency groups.

Before conducting MANOVA, the author checked assumptions for statistical analysis. The homogeneity of variance, outliers, and multicollinearity were checked to meet the assumptions. For data screening, the data were checked for multivariate outliers using Box plots for each of the four dependent variables. There was one outlier found in Factor 2, based on the criterion that the outlier had more than 3.67 standard deviations above or below the mean. One participant from the high proficiency group was removed from the data, leaving 161 cases. The remaining data were checked for multivariate outliers using Mahalanobis distance in SPSS regression. None were found.

Homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices was tested using the Box's *M* statistic. Each group had fairly close *N* sizes and each group had more than 20 degrees of freedom

within each cell. The Box's *M* statistics were not significant indicating that there was no serious problem regarding the heterogeneity of groups in this study.

MANOVA assumes linear relationships among all pairs of dependent variables. Linearity was checked by using SPSS plots for each pair. All pairs appeared to have linear relationships. Multicollinearity was also checked by examining the Pearson product-moment correlation matrix. No correlation was found above .80, indicating that there was no multicollinearity found in the data. Hence all the assumptions for MANOVA were checked and after eliminating one outlier case from the study, 161 cases remained.

After checking all the assumptions for MANOVA, the four factor scores were submitted as dependent variables, with proficiency levels as independent variables, to the one-way MANOVA analysis. The analysis confirmed that all multivariate statistics (Pillai's trace, Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's trace, and Roy's largest root) indicated significance ($p < .05$). (see table 4)

Table 4

<i>Result of One-way MANOVA</i>						
Effect	Value	<i>F</i>	Hypothesis <i>df</i>	Error <i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	
Pillai's trace	0.107	2.199	8	312	0.027	
Wilks' Lambda	0.894	2.231	8	310	0.025	
Hotteling's trace	0.118	2.262	8	308	0.023	
Roy's largest root	0.109	4.254	8	156	0.003	

Therefore, univariate follow-up ANOVAs were run, one for each dependent variable

(see table 5).

Table 5*Univariate ANOVA for Factor 1-4*

Source		<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2	Power
Factor 1	Contrast	4.282	2	2.141	2.162	0.118	0.027	0.437
	Error	156.48	158	0.99				
Factor 2	Contrast	1.125	2	0.562	0.793	0.454	0.01	0.184
	Error	112.099	158	0.709				
Factor 3	Contrast	0.342	2	0.171	0.168	0.845	0.002	0.076
	Error	160.584	158	1.016				
Factor 4	Contrast	10.496	2	5.248	5.619	0.004*	0.066	0.854
	Error	147.564	158	0.934				

* $p < .0125$

Only one ANOVA, for Factor 4 (Classroom dynamics), was significant at $p < .0125$ (bonferroni adjustment by four variables). The partial η^2 for Factor 4 was the highest among the equivalent values for the four dependent variables, at .066, indicating that 6.6% of the vari-

ance in that factor was accounted for by the proficiency group comparison.

A posthoc Scheffé's test revealed that there were significant differences between proficiency groups in Factor 4 only. Table 6 shows the results.

Table 6*Summary of Post-hoc Scheffe's Test*

Factors	Post hoc (Scheffe's test) Results
Factor 1	
Factor 2	
Factor 3	
Factor 4	Low > Mid*

* $p < .01$

Regarding RQ2 about the relationship between motivational factors and proficiency levels, the ANOVA results for Factor 1-4 did not reveal any significant differences among the three groups. Regarding RQ3 about the relationship between learning preferences and proficiency groups, however, the Scheffe test revealed a significant difference for Factor 4 only. The interaction plot for Factor 4 as a result of posthoc comparison revealed that there

was significant difference between the low proficiency group and the mid proficiency group. Low proficiency group showed the highest mean for Factor 4 while the mid proficiency group showed the lowest mean. This suggests that the low proficiency were more affected by classroom dynamics as identified specifically as a preference for teacher instructed learning and a concern for peer group relationships.

Discussion

RQ1: What are the important components of motivation and learning preferences among Japanese university students?

The present study revealed that Japanese EFL students have integrative motivation identified as a result of questionnaire. However, items in this factor include some items related to intrinsic motivation. The results were similar to previous research by Brown et al. (2001) and Matsubara (2001). Also, the results were somewhat similar to those of Kimura et al. (2001). Their argument was that motivational components were more complex and they identified their first factor as intrinsic-instrumental-integrative motive and indicated that intrinsic and integrative motivation are categorized as one factor among Japanese EFL learners. The present study had similar result in terms of complexity in motivation components. Instrumental motivation was identified as one factor and three items in this factor clearly indicated students' interest in learning English in relation to future jobs. Thus, this component was not as complex as the rest of the identified components. In addition to motivational components, learning preferences and group dynamics items (identified as classroom dynamics) were present among students in this study. Learning preference and learner belief components were mostly based on their beliefs but some items on learning preferences. At first, these items were selected to identify whether Japanese students have tendency to believe that English is important. However, item 24 (It is effective to solve problems and corrects mistakes on my own) and item 26 (The effect of learning is decided by the way I learn) shows that these students prefer to study on their own. In fact, the reverse item 22 (It is effective when

the teacher corrects all mistakes on students) is identified as classroom dynamics item and shows students' preference to study with other people's support.

RQ2: What motivational components are associated with which proficiency groups?

This study attempted to see if there was any significant relationship between motivational components and learner proficiency measured by test scores. According to the previous studies conducted by Brown et al. (2001), and Matsubara (2001), there was a significant relationship between integrative motivation and learner proficiency. Wu's (2003) study also suggested that intrinsic motivation results in more perceived competence and perceived autonomy than what is found in less intrinsically oriented students. Although this study identified integrative-intrinsic motivation as one factor, there was no significant relationship found among three different proficiency levels.

RQ3: What learning preferences are associated with which proficiency groups?

Learning preferences were identified in two factors, the learning preference/learner belief factor and the classroom dynamics factor. There is no significant relationship between the learning preference/learner belief factor and learner proficiency. On the other hand, the classroom dynamics factor was significantly associated with three proficiency groups. The results imply that the low proficiency group prefers teacher-centered lectures and prefers to have good relationships with their peers. It is interesting that Kimura et al.'s (2001) study also indicated that a teacher-centered approach was the only factor identified as significantly different across different grade levels. Their study showed that second year male high school participants significantly preferred teacher-centered lectures. Although

their comparison was not based on proficiency level, it is worth noting the result. The results of present study suggest that low proficiency Japanese EFL students tend to prefer teacher-centered lectures. In addition, the results revealed that these students who prefer teacher-centered lectures also consider it important to have good relationships with their peers. The possible reason for this result is that the low proficiency group tends to rely on others' help while advanced learners have already developed learner autonomy.

Conclusion

The findings from this study reveal similarities and differences in results with previous studies regarding the types of motivation identified among Japanese EFL learners. Although there are situational and individual differences between ESL and EFL learners, some components such as intrinsic-integrative motivation and instrumental motivation were present among Japanese EFL learners as well as among ESL students from the past studies. The present data also suggest that learner beliefs and learner preferences fall into patterns among Japanese students. Particularly, a group classroom dynamics factor, including teacher-centered learning and preference for group support was identified, and this finding matched similar results with previous study of Japanese high school students. Finally, the results of this study indicated that low proficiency learners most strongly tend to prefer teacher-centered learning and rely on group support. This implies the importance of teacher as a facilitator of learning and provider of enough peer interaction among students to obtain positive learning experiences in the classroom.

Although classroom dynamics items were included in this questionnaire, the number of

items was small and does not provide deep understanding of what is happening in the classroom in terms of the relationship between the teacher and the students. For future research, more items should be added for better understanding of classroom dynamics, and the relationships among learner motivation, classroom dynamics and learner proficiency should be explored more among different levels of language learners with different learning contexts.

(Received : June 9, 2006, Accepted : June 20, 2006)

References

- Brown, J. D., Robson, G., & Rosenkjar, P. R. (2001). Personality, motivation, anxiety, strategies, and language proficiency of Japanese students. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 361-391). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i.
- Clément, R., Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2003). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The effects of context, norms, and vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 22(2), 190-209.
- Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44(3), 417-448.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning*, 40, 45-78.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(2), 273-284.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1996). Moving language learning motivation to a larger platform for theory and practice. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 71-80). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching mo-*

- tion. New York: Longman.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Malderez, A. (1997). Group dynamics and foreign language teaching. *System*, 25 (1), 65-81.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrman, M. (1996). *Understanding second language learning difficulties*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ehrman, M., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). *Interpersonal dynamics in second language education: The visible and invisible classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Evans, C. R., & Dion, K. L. (1991). Group cohesion and performance: A meta-analysis. *Small Group Research*, 22, 175-186.
- Forsyth, D. R. (1990). *Group dynamics* (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Gardner, R. C. (1988). The socio-educational model of secondlanguage learning: Assumptions, findings, and issues. *Language Learning*, 38, 101-126.
- Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1991). An instrumental motivation in language study: Who says it isn't effective? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 57-72.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1991). Cooperative learning and classroom and school climate. In B. J. Fraser & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Educational environments: Evaluation, antecedents, and consequences* (1st ed., pp. 55-74). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kimura, Y., Nakata, Y., & Okumura, T. (2001). Language learning motivation of EFL learners in Japan: A cross-sectional analysis of various learning milieus. *JALT Journal*, 23 (1), 47-65.
- Lewin, K. (1995). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. In L. W. Porter & G. A. Bigley (Eds.), *Human relations* (pp. 5-41): Cambridge: University Press.
- Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-228.
- Lukmani, Y. M. (1972). Motivation to learn and learning proficiency. *Language Learning*, 22, 261-273.
- Matsubara, K. (2001). The effect of five elements on English proficiency. 2001 *JALT Hokkaido Proceedings*, 53-60.
- McGroarty, M. (1993). Cooperative learning and second language acquisition. In D. D. Holt (Ed.), *Cooperative learning* (pp. 19-46). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.
- Ushioda, E. (2001). Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 93-126). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center University of Hawai'i at M'anoa.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wu, X. (2003). Intrinsic motivation and young language learners: The impact of the classroom environment. *System*, 31, 501-517.
- Yamamoto, H. (1993). Identifying how components of motivation as well as attitudes affect Japanese college students' leaning of EFL. *Seinan Jyogakuin Tanki Daigaku Kenkyu Kiyo*, 40, 1-14.
- Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *Modern Language Journal*, 86 (1), 54-66.