This study examined the construct validity of the Motivation Orientation and Language Learning Strategy Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS). The MOLLS is a Likert-type scale, that has 20 items in 5 broad categories in the motivation orientation scale (MOS) and 18 items in 3 broad categories in the language learning strategies scale (LLSS). These items were adapted for learning English as a foreign language from previous research (M. Entwhistle and P. Ramsden, 1983; J. Nicholls and others, 1985; J. Nicholls, 1989; and W. Lambert and others, 1972). and then were modified to be used for students learning Spanish as a foreign language. A total of 321 students attending a rural U.S. University participated in the study. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to examine the construct validity of the instrument, and internal consistency reliability was examined within each category. The suggested model was not confirmed for the MOS or the LLSS. Further exploratory factor analyses were performed to examine the underlying structures for both MOS and LLSS. The paper discusses items that were culturally biased and that need revision. Three appendixes contain the MOLLS and suggested factors for each item in the MOS and the LLSS. (Contains 4 tables and 35 references.) (Author/SLD)
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Abstract

The purpose of this study lies in examining the construct validity of "Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS). The MOLLS is a Likert-type scale, including twenty items in five broad categories in motivation orientation scale (MOS) and 18 items in three broad categories in language learning strategies scale (LLSS). These items were adapted for learning English as a foreign language from previous research (Entwhistle & Ramsden's, 1983; MOS, in Nicholls et al., 1985 and Nicholls, 1989; Lambert et al., 1972) and was slightly modified to be used for students learning Spanish as a foreign language.

A total of 321 students attending a rural American university participated in the study. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to examine construct validity of the instrument. In addition, internal consistency reliability was performed within each category. As a result, the suggested model was not confirmed in either MOS or LLSS. Further exploratory factor analyses were performed to examine the underlining structures for both MOS and LLSS. Items which were culturally biased and needed to be revised were discussed.
Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this study lies in examining the construct validity of "Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS). The MOLLS is a Likert-type scale, including twenty items in five broad categories in motivation orientation scale (MOS) and 18 items in three broad categories in language learning strategies scale (LLSS) (See Appendix A). These items were adapted for learning English as a foreign language from previous research (Entwhistle & Ramsden's, 1983; MOS, in Nicholls et al., 1985 and Nicholls, 1989, Lambert et al., 1972) and was slightly modified to be used for students learning Spanish as a foreign language.

Previous research has been done in different countries addressing motivation of second language acquisition and the learning strategies. However, these researches focused on students' learning English as a second language. Since Spanish is a popular second language in American college, it will be interesting to see the motivation and the learning strategies students have in learning Spanish as a second language. As a reliable and valid instrument is necessary for any research findings to be meaningful, the validation of the instrument is essential. It is believed that once the instrument is reliable and valid, it can be used to provide valuable information regarding the motivation and the learning strategies of students learning Spanish as a second language. It will also support insights that demonstrate the potential to increase instructional effectiveness and student success in university foreign language programs.

Since the instrument addresses both motivation and learning strategies of learning a second language, this paper will discuss the construct validity of the instrument in motivation and in learning strategies separately.

Theoretical Framework

A: Learning Strategies of learning a second language

From the perspective of education, researchers confine learning strategies to the domains of cognition and metacognition. Learning strategies are the general approaches or plans of a learner as well as the higher-level clusters of learning tactics that work together to produce a uniform learning outcome (Schmeck, 1988). These higher-level clusters include 1) conceptualizing (e.g. categorizing, comparing, contrasting, hierarchically organizing, abstracting, and networking ideas), 2) personalizing (e.g. self-referring, generating examples, translating into personal language and images, and linking new information with prior personal experience), and 3) memorizing (repetitive rehearing of information, using mnemonics, and encoding verbatim).

Learning strategies also refer to a learner's behaviors that intend to influence how the learner processes information. During learning, these behaviors control one's cognitive processes, attention, rehearsal, encoding, and retrieval. These are techniques used for selecting information and building internal and external connections (Mayer, 1988).

Furthermore, Entwhistle and Ramsden (1983) distinguished two types of general study strategies: deep processing and surface-level strategies. Deep processing strategies include processes such as discriminating important from unimportant information, trying to figure out
how new information fits with existing information, and monitoring comprehension. Surface-level strategies include simply practicing over and over, memorizing all the new words, and rehearsing information.

Generally speaking, studies in education show at least one class of learning strategies related to deep processing (or covert cognitive process) and another related to surface processing (overt cognitive process). Although some may include subscales of deep processing and surface processing (Chissom & Iran, 1992), the general concepts of deep and surface processing still hold true. More importantly, results have found that deep processing strategies are significantly and positively related to GPA, an indication of achievement (Kardash & Amlund, 1991; Chissom & Iran, 1992).

In a cross-cultural study, Wong et al. (1996) tested the validity of Biggs’s (1987) “Learning Process Questionnaire” (LPQ) and identified three factors (deep, surface, and positioning of achieving). The dimensions of deep and surface approaches to learning received cross-cultural support, while the positioning of achieving dimension varied from culture to culture. In conclusion, the study supported the factors of deep and surface approaches of the LLS scale across different cultural groups.

In addition to the studies mentioned above, a class of strategies is listed in Oxford’s “Strategy Inventory For Language Learning” (SILL), which closely relates to functional practice strategies (Nyikos & Oxford, 1993). Several studies have used SILL and confirmed the validity of this instrument (Oxford, 1986).

Presently, empirical support in the area of language learning strategies using factor analysis and related techniques is required, in order to generate conceptualized categories of language learning strategies that can be significantly and consistently related to other language learning variables. Accordingly, the LLSS in the “Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales” instrument was developed to include three factors, namely, deep-processing, surface-level, and functional factors (see appendix c).

B: Motivation of learning a second language

1. Intentional Theory of Motivation

From the intentional perspective of achievement motivation, Nicholls and colleagues (Nicholls, 1984; Nicholls, Patashnick, & Nolen, 1985; Nicholls, 1992) postulated that students’ motivation orientation is their predisposition to seek certain types of experience and the related beliefs about the causes of success; this framework is intended to be generalized across different fields.

Studies based on intentional theory have focused on three motivation orientations: task orientation, ego orientation, and work avoidance. Task orientation has to do with one’s purpose of gaining knowledge, working one’s best and collaborating with others. On the other hand, ego orientation has to do with one’s purpose of studying to demonstrate superior ability over others. Another dimension, work-avoidance, has also been identified which has to do with making least amount of effort to get away with it.

Empirical studies supporting the three orientations included students of various age groups (Nicholls, et al., 1985; Nicholls, Cobb, Wood, and Yackel, 1990; Thorkildson &
Nicholls, 1998). Results generally found that a greater personal concern with learning and understanding was significantly related to the belief that success is attributed to interest, effort (Thorkildsen & Nicholls, 1998), trying to understand (Nicholls, et al., 1985), and cooperation with peers (Nicholls, et al, 1990). Furthermore, students who seek to be more able than others (i.e., more ego oriented) were more likely to believe that schooling leads to wealth and status (Nicholls et al., 1985), and that competitiveness causes success (Thorkildsen & Nicholls, 1998).

A cross-domain study (Duda and Nicholls, 1992) found that student’s motivation orientation can be generalized across academic work and sports. This study associating personal goals and beliefs about the causes of success found that the students’ ego orientation in schoolwork and that in sports were highly correlated and task orientation in both schoolwork and sports were also significantly related.

2. Gardner’s socio-psychological model

In the area of second language acquisition, students learn a language not simply to understand it, to accomplish a task, or to appear more able than others; they learn a second/foreign language for instrumental reasons, such as, for career promotion (Dornyei, 1990; Gardner, 1985) or integrative reasons, e.g., making friends with the people who speak the language (Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Such social-educational model of language learning, developed by Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972) postulated that there are two major motivation orientations for language learning: integrative and instrumental. Integrative motivation is identified with positive attitudes toward the target language group and potential for integrating into that group, or at least an interest in meeting and interacting with members of the group. Instrumental orientation refers to more functional reasons for learning a language, such as to pass a required examination or to get a better job or promotion.

Early empirical studies have shown that integrative motivation is important for successful acquisition of a second language (Gardner, 1972; Lambert, Gardner, Barik, & Tunstall, 1972) and also important for the intention to continue to study the language (Clement, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977), and that instrumental orientation did not seem to relate to successful language learning (Gardner, 1979; Lambert et al., 1972). Studies in 1980s, however, found that integrative motivation may not be the strongest predictor for language learning (Gardner, 1988; Gardner & McIntyre, 1991; Au, 1988). Furthermore, studies in the 90s have suggested that motivation for learning a second language may not be as simple as integrative-instrumental dichotomy; other motivation components can also play important role: desire for knowledge, a new challenge, need for achievement (Dornyei, 1990, 1994a, 1994b), intellectual stimulation, and personal challenge (Oxford & Shearin, 1994).

In conclusion, intentional theory of motivation emphasizes the task, ego, and work-avoidance orientations (Nicholls, 1984), which were tested to cross different subject domains (Duda & Nicholls, 1992). However, in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), Gardner (1985, p. 65) emphasized that motivation – such as instrumental and integrative orientations -- and attitude determine the extent to which individuals will actively involve in learning the target language. The MOS in the “Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales” instrument was developed to include 5 orientations, namely, task, ego, work-avoidance, instrumental and integrative orientations (see Appendix B)
Method

Participants:

A total of 321 students enrolled in Spanish classes in the Fall 2001, Spring 2002 and Summer 2002 semester at a rural university participated in the study.

Instrument:

The MOLLS is a Likert-type scale, including twenty items in five broad categories in motivation orientation scale (MOS) and 18 items in three broad categories in language learning strategies scale (LLSS). These items were adapted for learning English as a foreign language from previous research (Entwhistle & Ramsden's, 1983; MOS, in Nicholls et al., 1985 and Nicholls, 1989; Lambert et al., 1972) and was slightly modified to be used for students learning Spanish as a foreign language.

Procedures:

The MOLLS was slightly modified (For Spanish as a Foreign Language) and was administered to a total number of 321 rural American university students in their first Spanish course.

Research questions:

This study intends to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the underlying dimensionality of the LLSS?
2. What is the underlying dimensionality of the MOS?
3. Is the instrument consistent within constructs?

Results

A: LLSS

In previous study Chen (1999) suggested a three factor structure model of the LLSS. The three factors included deep-processing, surface-level, and functional factors. We used this suggested model to perform confirmatory factor analysis to examine whether the LLSS’s structure was consistent with the previous study. The results did not confirm the suggested 3-factor model (N=321, df=132, $\chi^2=926.51$, RMSEA=0.14, GFI=0.74, AGFI=0.67, NFI=0.71, NNFI=0.70, CFI=0.74, CN=60.65). Since the confirmatory factor analysis did not confirm the 3 factor model, an exploratory factor analysis was used to examine the number and the nature dimensions. Factors were extracted using a principal component analysis maximum likelihood method. The exploratory factor analysis suggested a 3-factor model, as the first three factors accounted for fifty-five percent of the total variance. Table 1 shows the factor structure coefficient for each item. By carefully examining the items loading on each factor, we found that seven items loaded on different factors, than indicated by the suggested model.

Internal consistency reliability was performed to test the correlation among items for each
factor. Table 2 shows the internal consistency reliability of the LLSS in each factor. The internal consistency reliabilities were above 0.8 for the functional and deep-processing factors. However, the surface-processing factor had lower reliability coefficients.

B: MOS

Since the previous study (Chen, 1999) suggested 5 factors of the MOS, confirmatory factor was performed to examine whether the MOS structure was consistent with the previous study. The results did not confirm the suggested 5-factor model (N=321, df=160, $X^2=791.65$, RMSEA=0.11, GFI=0.81, AGFI=0.75, NFI=0.73, NNFI=0.72, CFI=0.77, CN=83.68).

As the confirmatory factor analysis did not confirm the suggested model from the previous study, the number and nature of dimensions measured by the MOS were identified through an exploratory factor analysis. Factors were extracted using a principal component analysis maximum likelihood method. The exploratory factor analysis suggested a 5-factor model. The first five factors accounted for fifty-nine percent of the total variance. Table 3 shows the factor structure coefficient for each item. However, after examining and comparing the factor pattern matrices for the five factor solution, some items were problematic. Questions 5 and 8 appeared to load on a separate factor. In addition, questions 13 and 17 were loaded on one factor and questions 16 and 19 were on another factor, although these 4 items were supposed to measure Integrative Orientation.

Internal consistency reliability was performed to test the correlation among items for each factor. Table 4 shows the internal consistency reliability of the LLSS in each factor. All of the internal consistency reliabilities were above 0.7 except Task and Instrumental factor.

Conclusion

A valid and reliable instrument is essential to the meaningful interpretation of research findings. The confirmatory factor analysis did not confirm the model that was suggested in the previous study for both LLSS and MOS. This suggests that the instrument may not be used without further validation. Perhaps items on the instrument were not clearly written and could be interpreted in different way. The MOS was originally developed to include 5 different orientations (task, ego, work-avoidance, integrative, and instrumental). However, after carefully examining the factor structure and the correlation among the factors, four factors were more suitable. We combined the ego and work-avoidance as one factor since the correlation is high between the two factors ($r=0.72$). Perhaps, some items which classified as work-avoidance could also be Ego-related. For example, Question number 6: I don’t have to work hard in finishing assignments, could also interpreted as Ego orientation. Question 11: I don’t do homework yet I get away with it, was very vague. It could be interpreted as work-avoidance or could be something else.

The internal consistency reliability coefficient was high in the deep-processing and functional factors in LLSS. The items within these two factors appear to be suitable. However, the surface-processing factor yielded a low reliability coefficient. This may be contributed to unclearly written items and/or a small number of items within this particular scale. Further study may include adding more items to the surface-processing scale and rephrasing the unclear items. As in MOS, since current data showed the original ego items and work-avoidance items loaded in one single factor, it probably suggested that those who are orientated toward performing better
than others (ego orientation) also work hard only to show superiority to others, otherwise, they just want to make least amount of effort in order to get away with the task (work avoidance). Ego orientation is closely related to work avoidance.

Although this study did not confirm the suggested structure of the LLSS and MOS, it did provide information regarding the items of the MOLLS. This preliminary validation study suggested the revision of the instrument for further study. Once the instrument is valid and reliable, it can be used to obtain information to support insights that demonstrate the potential to increase instructional effectiveness and student success in university foreign language programs.
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Table 1: Factor Structure Coefficient for Each Item in LLSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>-.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Internal Consistency Reliability of the LLSS in Each Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=321</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient (r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>.8361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep- Processing</td>
<td>.8045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface- Level</td>
<td>.6582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Factor Structure Coefficient for Each Item in MOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Internal Consistency Reliability of the MOS in Each Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>N=321</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>0.5712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego</td>
<td>0.8227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Avoidance</td>
<td>0.7686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>0.7658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>0.2520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Motivation Orientation & Language Learning Strategies Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS for SFL, version 2.3)

I. Motivation:
The following items are descriptions about people learning Spanish. Please indicate how much you think each description applies to you.

5 indicates Strongly Agree  4 indicates Agree  3 indicates Neutral
2 indicates Disagree  1 indicates Strongly Disagree

Under the following situation, you feel you have had a really successful day in school.
I feel most successful if

1. What I learn in Spanish motivates me to know more.
2. I have learned a lot more than I used to be.
3. My performance is better than others.
4. The Spanish exam is very easy.
5. My friends and I help each other working on problems and assignments.
6. I don’t have to work hard in finishing assignments.
7. My Spanish score is higher than others.
8. I finish an assignment by working hard.
9. I show others my Spanish is good.
10. The Spanish assignment is easy.
11. I don’t do homework yet I get away with it.
12. I am the only one who can answer the teacher’s questions in Spanish.

Why are you learning Spanish?
I am learning Spanish because.....

13. I want to be like the Spanish-speaking people
14. Learning Spanish enables me to make friends with Spanish-speaking people.
15. A person with good Spanish ability is highly recognized in our society.
16. Spanish credits are required.
17. I want to know more of the culture of Spanish-speaking countries.
18. I want to pass related examinations, such as teacher license exams, etc.
19. Good Spanish proficiency will increase job opportunities.
20. So one day I can live at an Spanish-speaking country.

II. Learning strategies:
The following are some strategies that you may use for learning Spanish. Please indicate how much you think each description applies to you.

1. I often listen to Spanish broadcasting.
2. I analyze sentence structure so I can understand the meaning.
3. I look for opportunities to speak with others in Spanish.
4. I often think about my progress in Spanish.
5. I have clear goals in how I am going to study Spanish.
6. I make plans and arrangement to study Spanish.
7. I try to figure out how new things I learn in Spanish fit with what I know.
8. I find many ways to use Spanish.
9. ( ) I read Spanish other than text books.
10. ( ) I spend a lot of time in memorizing and reciting things I learn in Spanish.
11. ( ) In order to memorize the sentences, I read them again and again.
12. ( ) To be familiar with Spanish conversation, I often watch Spanish-speaking movies.
13. ( ) I talk to myself in Spanish.
14. ( ) In order to understand the meaning of the sentence, I read it several times.
15. ( ) I write diary, take notes in Spanish.
16. ( ) I take notes word by word without skipping anything.
17. ( ) When I come across any new work while I read, I immediately look up the dictionary.
18. ( ) I look for rules in Spanish structure.

III. Please provide the following information or circle whichever items that best describe you.

Age:_________ Gender: Male, Female Year in college: __________

Major:________________________________________________________

Military service: ______for ______years

Work Experience: ________________________ for ______ years

Parents' Spanish proficiency: None, Low, Medium, High

Location of Hometown: Urban, Country

Computer Usage: None, Infrequent, Sometimes, Frequent

Leisure activities: _____________________________________________

The End of Scales.

If you have questions concerning this survey, please e-mail: jbenjami@mnsfld.edu
Thank you for your cooperation.
Appendix B

The suggested factors for each item in the Motivation Orientation Scale: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS for SFL, version 2.3)

The following items are descriptions about people learning Spanish. Please indicate how much you think each description applies to you.
5 indicates Strongly Agree  4 indicates Agree  3 indicates Neutral
2 indicates Disagree        1 indicates Strongly Disagree

Under the following situation, you feel you have had a really successful day in school.

I feel most successful if
1. (t1) What I learn in Spanish motivates me to know more.
2. (t2) I have learned a lot more than I used to be.
3. (e1) My performance is better than others.
4. (w1) The Spanish exam is very easy.
5. (t3) My friends and I help each other working on problems and assignments.
6. (w2) I don't have to work hard in finishing assignments.
7. (e2) My Spanish score is higher than others.
8. (t4) I finish an assignment by working hard.
9. (e3) I show others my Spanish is good.
10. (w3) The Spanish assignment is easy.
11. (w4) I don't do homework yet I get away with it.
12. (e4) I am the only one who can answer the teacher's questions in Spanish.

Why are you learning Spanish?

I am learning Spanish because.....
13. (g4) I want to be like the Spanish-speaking people
14. (g1) Learning Spanish enables me to make friends with Spanish-speaking people.
15. (i1) A person with good Spanish ability is highly recognized in our society.
16. (i2) Spanish credits are required.
17. (g2) I want to know more of the culture of Spanish-speaking countries.
18. (i3) I want to pass related examinations, such as teacher license exams, etc.
19. (i4) Good Spanish proficiency will increase job opportunities.
20. (g3) So one day I can live at an Spanish-speaking country.

t: task orientation; w: work-avoidance; e: ego orientation; i: instrumental orientation;
g: integrative orientation
Appendix C

The suggested factors for each item in the Language Learning Strategies Scales: For Spanish as a Foreign Language (MOLLS for SFL, version 2.3)

The following items are descriptions about people learning Spanish. Please indicate how much you think each description applies to you.

5 indicates Strongly Agree  4 indicates Agree  3 indicates Neutral
2 indicates Disagree       1 indicates Strongly Disagree

1. (f1) I often listen to Spanish broadcasting.
2. (d1) I analyze sentence structure so I can understand the meaning.
3. (f2) I look for opportunities to speak with others in Spanish.
4. (d2) I often think about my progress in Spanish.
5. (d3) I have clear goals in how I am going to study Spanish.
6. (d4) I make plans and arrangement to study Spanish.
7. (d5) I try to figure out how new things I learn in Spanish fit with what I know.
8. (f3) I find many ways to use Spanish.
9. (f4) I read Spanish other than text books.
10. (s1) I spend a lot of time in memorizing and reciting things I learn in Spanish.
11. (s2) In order to memorize the sentences, I read them again and again.
12. (f5) To be familiar with Spanish conversation, I often watch Spanish-speaking movies.
13. (f6) I talk to myself in Spanish.
14. (d6) In order to understand the meaning of the sentence, I read it several times.
15. (f7) I write diary, take notes in Spanish.
16. (s3) I take notes word by word without skipping anything.
17. (s4) When I come across any new work while I read, I immediately look up the dictionary.
18. (d7) I look for rules in Spanish structure.
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