

The Relationship between Learners' Motivation (Integrative and Instrumental) and English Proficiency among Iranian EFL Learners

Mahshid Ghanea, Hamid Reza Zeraat Pisheh, Mohammad Hassan Ghanea

Abstract—The current study aims at investigating the relationship between the learners' integrative and instrumental motivation and English proficiency among Iranian EFL learners. The participants in this study consisted of 128 undergraduate university students including 64 males and 64 females, majoring in English as a foreign language, from Shiraz Azad University. Two research instruments were used to gather the needed data for this study: 1) Language Proficiency Test. 2) A scale on motivation which determines the type of the EFL learners' motivation. Correlation coefficient and t-test were used to analyze the collected data and the main result was found as follows: There is a significant relationship between the integrative motivation and instrumental motivation with English proficiency among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University.

Keywords—English proficiency, motivation

I. INTRODUCTION

MOTIVATION is of particular interest to both teachers and researchers because of the crucial role it plays in second or foreign language learning. The social-psychological implications of second or foreign language learning have been investigated from different viewpoints for many years. According to [1] second language study is removed from the purely educational realm and instead places it at the center of "social psychology". "Languages are unlike any other subject taught in a classroom in that they involve the acquisition of skills or behavior patterns which are characteristic of another culture. As a consequence, the relative degree of success will be influenced to some extent by the individual's attitudes toward the other community or to other communities in general as well as by the beliefs in the community which are relevant to the language learning process."

Four classes of variables in the Socio-Educational Model involve: "The social milieu, individual difference, language acquisition context, and outcomes. The language acquisition process is viewed as involving a particular causal interplay of these four types of variables. The variable of individual

differences comprises intelligence, language aptitude, motivation and situational anxiety [1]."

The concept of motivation is a multi-faceted construct which involves effort (motivational intensity), cognitions (desire), affect (attitude) and goal. Attitude involves other ethnic groups and the language learning situation underlies motivation [1]. Orientation is defined as a desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages through knowledge of a foreign language.

Two types of motivation relevant to foreign language learning are: integrative and instrumental motivation. Gardner and Lambert in [2] have identified these two orientations as the two extreme of a continuum. At one extreme, the integratively motivated learners wish to learn a new language in order to identify with or become a part of new social or cultural group. They want to integrate themselves into the culture of the second language. At the other extreme learners wish to acquire a language as a means for attaining instrumental or utilitarian goals such as furthering their career, reading technical material, translation and so forth.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The success of any action usually depends on the extent to which individuals strive to attain their purpose, along with their desire to do so. In general, people have come to refer to this psychological factor, the impulse that generates the action, as motivation. As the term itself indicates, it is a "motive force", something that prompts, incites or stimulates action. According to The Short Oxford English Dictionary, motivation is "that which moves or induces a person to act in a certain way; a desire, fear, reason, etc which influences a person's volition: also often applied to a result or object which is desired [3]."

Williams and Burden (1997:120) see motivation as: "a state of cognitive and emotional arousal, a state which leads to a conscious decision to act and give rise to a period of sustained intellectual and/or physical effort [3]." Thus intellect and affect combine with volition and perseverance to result in what is known as motivated behavior. The same idea is conveyed in different words by [1] who seems to explain the term with precision: "motivation is a combination of effort plus desire to achieve a goal plus favorable attitudes towards the goal to be accomplished."

Motivation seems to be of various types and strengths. "Motivation does imply some incentive that causes the individual to participate in activity leading toward a goal and to persevere until the goal is reached. Motivation is affected

A. Mahshid Ghanea is affiliated with Islamic Azad University, Zahedshahr Branch. (phone: +989177191504; fax: +987323523900; e-mail: Ghanea1390@gmail.com).

B. Hamid Reza Zeraat pisheh is affiliated with Islamic Azad University, Zahedshahr Branch. (phone: +989173084275; fax: +987323523900; e-mail: Farsiran3@gmail.com).

C. Mohammad Hassan Ghanea is affiliated with Islamic Azad University, Zahedshahr Branch. (phone: +989177049830; fax: +987323523900; e-mail: artpoem1@yahoo.com).

by students' self-concept, values, needs, and goals. Motivation is influenced by success or failure in past classroom activities, by the social environment of the class, and by the teacher's behavior [4].” When teachers talk about motivation, they are generally referring to students' effort to learn.

The most influential model of language learning motivation in the early sixties through the eighties of the previous century was that developed by Canadian psychologist R.C. Gardner and his associates [1]. The Gardner's (1985:10) theory of second language motivation is based on the definition of motivation as “the extent to which an individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity.” More specifically, motivation is conceptualized to subsume three components, motivational intensity, desire to learn the language and an attitude towards the act of learning the language. According to him, second language study is removed from the purely educational realm and instead places it at the center of “social psychology”. “Languages are unlike any other subject taught in a classroom in that they involve the acquisition of skills or behavior patterns which are characteristics of another culture. As a consequence, the relative degree of success will be influenced to some extent by the individual's attitudes toward the other community or to other communities in general as well as by the beliefs in the community which are relevant to the language learning process [1].” The model came to be known as the *Socio-educational Model*.

Reference [5] revised his socio-educational model. It is comprised of four sections, “external influences, individual differences, language acquisition contexts, and outcomes.” The category of external influences replaces the social milieu in earlier versions, and is more general in its nature. External influence means “any factors that might influence language learning.” There are two classes of external influences indicated, history and motivators. History means “that complex of social and personal variables that the individual brings with him or her that can influence second language acquisition.” Examples include the socio-cultural milieu in which the individual lives as well as the personal family background. Currently, there is the belief that one can distinguish between motivation and motivating. It is proposed that teachers can help the language learning process by motivating their students.

Also, it is helpful to think of Gardner's model as classifying motivation at two levels, *goal* or *oriented motivation* and *core motivation*. The motivation at the goal level includes the learner's core motivation, the learner's orientation to language learning, and the learner's attitudes towards the learning situation.

“The variable, motivation, refers to the driving force in any situation [5].” In the socio-educational model, motivation to learn the second language is viewed as requiring three elements. First, the motivated individual expends *effort* to learn the language. That is, there is a persistent and consistent attempt to learn the material by doing homework, by seeking out opportunities to learn more, by doing extra work, etc.

Second, the motivated individual *wants* to achieve the goal. Such an individual will express the desire to succeed, and will strive to achieve success. Third, the motivated individual will *enjoy* the task of learning the language. Such an individual will say that it is fun, a challenge, and enjoyable, even though at times enthusiasm may be less than at other times.

In the socio-educational model, all three elements, *effort*, *desire*, and *positive affect* are seen as necessary to distinguish between individuals who are more motivated and those who are less motivated. Each element, by itself, is seen as insufficient to reflect motivation. Some students may display effort, even though they have no strong desire to succeed, and may not find the experience particularly enjoyable. Others may want to learn the language, but may have other things that detract from their effort, etc. The point is the truly motivated individual displays effort, desire, and affect.

In this definition, motivation is described as goal-directed; the learners' immediate goal is to learn the language. In order to understand why learners were motivated, it is necessary to understand the learners' ultimate goal or purpose for learning the language. Reference [5] refers to this as the learner's orientation and identified two distinct orientations for learning a language: *integrative* and *instrumental*.

Integrative orientation refers to a learner's desire to learn more about the cultural community of the target language or to assimilate to some degree in the target community. Integrative orientation refers to a desire to increase the affiliation with the target community.

Instrumental orientation, in contrast, is a more utilitarian orientation; it refers to learners' desire to learn the language in order to accomplish some non-interpersonal purpose such as to pass an exam or to advance a career.

“These orientations are part of the learner's motivation at the goal level and affect the learner's core motivation [1].” Gardner's hypothesis was that the integratively oriented learners were more persistently and intensely motivated than other learners. “An integratively oriented learner would likely have a stronger desire to learn the language, have more positive attitudes towards the learning situation, and be more likely to expend more effort in learning the language [1].”

Many of Lambert's (1972) studies and one study by Spolsky (1969) found that integrative orientation generally accompanied higher scores on proficiency tests in a foreign language. The conclusion from these studies was that integrative orientation may indeed be an important requirement for successful language learning. Some teachers and researchers have even gone so far as to claim that integrative orientation is absolutely essential for successful second language learning [6].

However, many researchers have tried to analyze language learning motivation without considering the different social context in which it occurs. For example, some researchers have found instrumental orientation to be a major factor in research conducted in the social contexts of India, Japan and the Philippines.

Towards the end of the 1980s and into the early 1990s the research focus turned to the differences between ESL learners

(those living within the target language culture) and EFL learners (those studying the target language within their own culture). For example, Dornyei (1990) suggests that in EFL context, where learners have not had sufficient experience of the target language community, motivational factors such as instrumental motivation should receive special attention [7]. Oxford (1996) considers that EFL environments differ from the ESL situation and recommended that instrumental motivation be a main focus for research in EFL contexts [7].

Even Gardner himself with his associates, have recently found that certain contexts point toward instrumental orientation as an effective motive for language success, and others favor integrative motivation.

Such variable findings in empirical investigation do not necessarily invalidate the integrative-instrumental construct. They point out that there is no single means of learning a second language: Some learners in some contexts are more successful in learning a language if they are integratively oriented and others in different contexts benefit from an instrumental orientation [6]. The findings, also, suggest that the two types of motivation are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Second language learning is rarely motivated by attitudes that are exclusively instrumental or exclusively integrative. Most situations involve a mixture of each type of motivation. Second language motivation should not, therefore be considered as a force choice between integrative and instrumental orientations. Both types are important. A student might learn a second language well with an integrative motivation or with instrumental one or indeed with both, for one does not rule out the other or with other motivation. Both integrative and instrumental motivation may lead to success, but lack of either causes problems [8].

The third component of Gardner's goal motivation is the learner's *attitude* towards the learning situation. In the context of a language classroom, the learning situation could include variables such as the teacher, the textbook, classroom activities, classmates and so forth. The learner's attitude toward these variables will influence the learner's core motivation as well as the learner's orientation. Positive attitudes toward the learning situation will likely produce greater enjoyment in the study of language, desire to learn the language, and effort expended in learning the language. In the expansion of the construct of integrative motivation, Graham (1984) claimed that integrative motivation had been too broadly defined. He made a distinction between *integrative* and *assimilative* motivation: Integrative motivation is the desire, on the part of a language learner, to learn the second language in order to communicate with, or find out about members of the second language culture, and does not necessarily imply direct contact with the second language group. Assimilative motivation is the drive to become an indistinguishable member of a speech community, and it usually required prolonged contact with the second language culture. Assimilative motivation is characteristic of persons who, perhaps at a very young age, learn a second language and second culture in order to identify almost exclusively with that second culture [6].

Gardner's theory is important to keep in mind but as several researchers have pointed out its emphasis is clearly on the social aspects of motivation rather than on the role of motivation in the classroom. In this regard, Pennycook (1995:41) says: We cannot reduce questions of language to such social psychological notions as instrumental and integrative motivation, but must account for the extent to which language is embedded in social, economical and political struggles [9].

Researchers Crooks & Schmidt (1991) were some of the first to question Gardner's approach stating that the empirical evidence is not clear enough to support the notion that integrative motivation is a cause and second language achievement the effect. They also say that its emphasis on social aspects is a limiting feature and discuss the need for approaches that are more suited to second language education. Crooks & Schmidt identified a clear need to research and classify second language learning motivation as it relates directly to the classroom. They identify four areas of second language motivation, the micro level, the classroom level, the syllabus level, and a fourth level involving factors from outside the classroom. The micro level involves the cognitive processing of second language input. At the micro level learner motivation is evidenced by the amount of attention given to input. The classroom level includes the techniques and activities employed in the classroom. The syllabus level refers to the choice of content presented and can influence motivation by the level of curiosity and interest aroused in the students. Finally factors from outside the classroom involve informal interaction in the second language and long term factors [8].

Discussion of the definition and measurement of second language learning motivation are four conditions for motivation introduced by Keller, included in Crook's & Schmidt's (1991). Keller's four conditions are: *Interest* (in the topic and activity), *Relevance* (to the students' lives), *Expectancy* (expectations of success and feelings of being in control) and *satisfaction* (in the outcome) [8]. These four conditions contain elements of each of the major approaches to motivational psychology. The expectancy-value theory is represented in each condition. Expectancy itself is treated as a condition and Relevance, Interest, and Satisfaction are all related to the value placed on the task. Autonomy, an integrated tenet of the self-determination theory, is included in the condition of expectancy. Goal-directed theories are represented in the condition of satisfaction in the outcome, the extent to which goals are met.

Dornyei (2003) points out that the self-determination theory is one of the most influential theories in motivational psychology [9]. According to the theory developed by Deci, Connell, & Ryan (1989:580) "to be self-determining means to experience a sense of choice in initiating and regulating one's own actions [9]." This is referred to as autonomy. The theory distinguishes between two kinds of motivations: intrinsic and extrinsic.

When students engage in a task or activity in order to satisfy their curiosity the task is intrinsically motivating. It is

these types of tasks that are viewed as most beneficial in the classroom. *Intrinsic* motivation refers to an individual's motivation to perform a particular activity because of internal rewards such as joy, pleasure and satisfaction of curiosity. Whereas in *extrinsic* motivation the individual expects an extrinsic rewards such as good grades or praise from others.

Deci (1995:23) defines intrinsic motivation: Intrinsically motivated activities are ones for which there is no apparent reward except the activity itself. People seem to engage in the activities for their own sake and not because they lead to an extrinsic reward.... Intrinsically motivated behaviors are aimed at bringing about certain internally rewarding consequences, namely, feelings of competence and self-determination [6].

Externally motivated behaviors, on the other hand, are carried out in anticipation of a reward from outside and beyond the self. Typical extrinsic rewards are money, prizes, grades and even certain types of positive feedback. Behaviors initiated solely to avoid punishment are also extrinsically motivated, even though numerous intrinsic benefits can ultimately accrue to those who, instead, view punishment avoidance as a challenge that can build their sense of competence and self-determination [6].

Several studies have attempted to prove that intrinsically motivating activities lead to better learning. Maslow (1970) claims that intrinsic motivation is clearly superior to extrinsic [6]. According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, we are ultimately motivated to achieve "self-actualization" once the basic physical, safety, and community needs are met.

Ramage (1990) finds that foreign language high school students who were interested in continuing their study beyond the college entrance requirement were positively and intrinsically motivated to succeed. In contrast, those who were only in the classes to fulfill entrance requirements exhibited low motivation and weaker performance [6].

It is important to distinguish the intrinsic-extrinsic construct from Gardner's integrative-instrumental motivation: "While many instances of intrinsic motivation may indeed turn out to be integrative, some may not. For example, one could, for highly developed intrinsic purposes, wish to learn a second language in order to advance in a career or to succeed in an academic program. Likewise, one could develop a positive affect toward the speakers of a second language for extrinsic reason: parental reinforcement, teacher's encouragement, etc [6]." Baily (1986) illustrates the relationship between the two dichotomies in table 1 [6]:

TABLE I
MOTIVATIONAL DICHOTOMIES

	INTRINSIC	EXTRINSIC
Integrative	L2 learner wishes to integrate with the L2 culture (e.g., for immigration or marriage)	Someone else wishes the L2 learner to know the L2 for integrative reasons (e.g., Japanese parents send kids to Japanese-language school)
Instrumental	L2 learner wishes	External power

	to achieve goals utilizing L2 (e.g., for a career)	wants L2 learner to learn L2 (e.g., corporation sends Japanese businessman to U.S for language training)
--	--	--

The intrinsic-extrinsic continuum in motivation is applicable to foreign language classrooms around the world. "Regardless of the cultural beliefs and attitudes of learners and teachers, intrinsic and extrinsic factors can be quite easily defined much more universally so than the integrative-instrumental continuum that relies exclusively on a social-psychological approach. One's attitude toward target language culture is but one of many aspects of this complex phenomenon that we call motivation [6]."

Noels (2001), referring to Vallerand (1997) and later works by Vallerand & colleagues classifies the two types of motivations, within education, into different categories [9]. The intrinsic motivation (IM) could be one of three kinds: IM-Knowledge (the pleasure of knowing new things), IM-Accomplishment (the pleasure of accomplishing goals), and IM-Stimulation (the pleasure sensed when doing the task). He continues that the extrinsic motivation has also been classified along a continuum of three categories according to the extent to which the goals are self-determined. *External regulation* refers to actions that individuals pursue and that are determined by sources that are external to the individual, such as tangible benefits and costs. If learning the language is made for such an external incentive and this incentive is removed the activity of learning will halt. The second, less external regulation is *introjected regulation*, which refers to activities performed due to some external pressure that the individual has incorporated into the self. This is still not a self-determined activity since it has an external rather than internal source. An example is a person who learns the language in order not to feel ashamed if he does not know it. At the end of continuum, resides the *identified regulation*. Individuals who possess such a regulation are driven by personally relevant reasons, such as that the activity is important for achieving a valued goal. Individuals who learn a second language because they think it is important for their educational development, for example, all fall within this category. Another concept that is fundamental to the self-determination theory is the concept of *amotivation*. Deci & Ryan (2000:237) propose: "Amotivation, or learned helplessness, is the situation in which people lack the intention to behave. They see no relation between the efforts they make and the outcomes they get. This happens when they lack self efficacy or a sense of control on the desired outcomes. In this case, the learner has no goal and thus possesses neither intrinsic nor extrinsic motivation to perform the activity [9]."

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

In recent years, there has been an increasing demand for learning second or foreign language learning. This study

explores the relationship between learners' motivation and English proficiency among Iranian EFL learners. The researcher intends to find out if integrative and instrumental motivation correlates with the level of proficiency in English as a foreign language. This study addresses the following research questions:

1. Is there a significant difference between the mean of proficiency scores of the integratively motivated students and that of the instrumentally motivated ones among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?
2. Is there a significant difference between the mean of integrative motivation and that of the instrumental motivation among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?
3. Is there a relationship between the integrative motivation and their English proficiency among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?
4. Is there a relationship between the instrumental motivation and their English proficiency among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?
5. Is there a significant correlation between the integrative motivation and instrumental motivation with English proficiency among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?
6. Is there a significant difference between the instrumental motivation and gender among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?
7. Is there a significant difference between the integrative motivation and gender among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?

IV. METHOD

A. Participants

128 university students majoring in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) were chosen as the participants out of 160 learners who took part in the study. The subjects were from the Department of Foreign Languages of Shiraz Azad University. They were undergraduate students including 64 males and 64 females. The participants were selected from among all four proficiency levels (freshman, sophomore, junior and senior) so that they could be the true representative of the undergraduates. Since the study did not aim at investigating the effect of major (teaching or translation) as a variable the participants were chosen from the students of both teaching and translation majors.

B. Instruments

The first instrument in this research was Language Proficiency Test, which was taken from the book known as the Michigan Proficiency or the Michigan ECPE. This is a standardized test used to measure the proficiency of the students. It contained 35 items: ten cloze, ten grammar, ten vocabulary, and five reading items. All of the items are in the multiple choice format. In cloze section, learners read a cloze passage from which ten words had been removed. They chose from four answer choices, the word that best filled each blank in the passage. The correct answer was the word that fitted in

the passage correctly both in terms of grammar and meaning. In the grammar questions, learners selected the grammatically correct word or phrase to replace what was missing from a sentence. In the vocabulary questions, they selected the most appropriate word to complete a sentence. In the reading questions, they chose the correct answer to comprehension questions. Each problem in these sections had only one correct answer. Unanswered problems were counted wrong. There was no penalty for guessing. The final score was based on the number of problems answered correctly.

The reason why listening comprehension, writing, and speaking sections were not included in the test was that the EFL context in Iran is mostly written literacy oriented and most of the exams held in the university to determine the proficiency level of the students entering university, consist of structure, vocabulary and reading comprehension.

The reason to prepare and use this reduced test was the fact that students might lose their patience if they were supposed to stay for a long time in the test session and this might affect the study.

Reference [10] calculates the test-retest reliability with 30 subjects from Shiraz Azad University. The coefficient of reliability was 0.84 which was significantly high and the index of correlation indicating the criterion-related validity was 0.75.

The second instrument is a scale on motivation which determines the type of the EFL learners' motivation. It consists of 8 positive and negative statements. The positive items are coded from 5 to 1, that is 5 for strongly agree, 4 for agree, 3 for no opinion, 2 for disagree, and 1 for strongly disagree. However, the opposite is done in the case of negative statements. The items of the scale were drawn from second or foreign language learning such as dornyeis (1990) Clement and Kruidenieer's (1983), Pierson, Fue, and Lee's (1980), and Chihara and Oller's (1978) [11]. The total number of the item is 8 which are divided into two categories. The first category consisting of 4 items, determine if the EFL students are instrumentally motivated. The second category consisting of 4 items, determine if the EFL learners are integratively motivated. To facilitate the task of participants and avoid any misunderstanding of the items, the Persian translation of the test was used in this research.

To determine the reliability of the scale, it was administered twice (with a time interval of two weeks) to a group of 60 students [11]. The scale consisted of two categories for each of which the coefficient of reliability was estimated separately. The reliability of 0.80 was obtained for the first category and 0.71 for the second category. Moreover, [10] calculated the criterion-related validity and the correlation was 0.78.

C. Data Collection

All the participants in the present study were required to take part in two different tests, namely Language Proficiency Test and Motivation Test. The objective of the study was explained to the participants and they were given enough time to complete them. So, they were expected to answer the items as carefully as possible. The data were collected in one session.

V.RESULT

1. Is there a significant difference between the mean of proficiency scores of the integratively motivated students and that of the instrumentally motivated ones among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?

To find out the answer the t-test was used.

Table II presents that the mean of proficiency scores of the integratively motivated students is equal to 25.17 and the mean of proficiency scores of the instrumentally motivated students equals 25.54.

TABLE II
THE T-TEST

Variables	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	Sig.
Integrative proficiency	64	25.171	4.380	-0.506	126	0.612
Instrumental proficiency	64	25.546	3.939			

According to $p\text{-value} = 0.612$ and $p \geq \alpha = 0.05$ the mean of proficiency scores of both groups is nearly equal. So, the null hypothesis is confirmed.

2. Is there a significant difference between the mean of integrative motivation and that of the instrumental motivation among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?

The t-test was used to find out the answer.

TABLE III
THE T-TEST

Variables	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	Sig.
Instrumental motivation	64	26.015	2.831	0.299	126	0.766
Integrative motivation	64	25.875	2.484			

Table III shows that the mean of integrative motivation equals 25.87 and the mean of instrumental motivation is equal to 26.01. According to $p\text{-value} = 0.766$ and $p \geq \alpha = 0.05$ the mean of integrative and instrumental motivation is equal. So, the null hypothesis is confirmed.

3. Is there a relationship between the integrative motivation and their English proficiency among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?

Pearson correlation coefficient was used to analyze the relationship between the integrative motivation and their English proficiency, the result was statistically significant, since: ($r = 0.74$, $n = 64$, $p < 0.05$, two-tailed). Thus, there was a significant relationship between integrative motivation and their English proficiency among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University and the null hypothesis is rejected.

4. Is there a relationship between the instrumental motivation and their English proficiency among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?

Pearson correlation coefficient was applied to analyze the relationship between the instrumental motivation and their English proficiency, the result was statistically significant, since: ($r = 0.85$, $n = 64$, $p < 0.05$, two-tailed). So, there was a

significant relationship between instrumental motivation and their English proficiency among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University and the null hypothesis is rejected.

5. Is there a significant correlation between the integrative motivation and instrumental motivation with English proficiency among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?

Pearson correlation coefficient was used to analyze the relationship between the integrative motivation and instrumental motivation with English proficiency, the result was statistically significant, since: ($r = 0.79$, $n = 128$, $p \leq 0.05$, two-tailed). So, there was a significant relationship between the integrative motivation and instrumental motivation with English proficiency among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University and the null hypothesis is rejected.

6. Is there a significant difference between the instrumental motivation and gender among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?

The t-test was used to find out the answer.

Table IV shows that the mean of instrumental motivation of females equals 26.68 and the mean of instrumental motivation is equal to 25.34.

TABLE IV
THE T-TEST

Instrumental	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	Sig.
Female	32	26.687	2.632	1.940	62	0.057
Male	32	25.343				

According to $p\text{-value} = 0.057$ and $p \geq \alpha = 0.05$ the mean of instrumental motivation of females and males is equal. Thus, the null hypothesis is confirmed.

7. Is there a significant difference between the integrative motivation and gender among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University?

To find out the answer, the t-test was applied.

TABLE V
THE T-TEST

Integrative	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	Sig.
Female	32	25.812	2.176	-0.2	62	0.842
Male		25.937	2.793			

Table V presents that the mean of integrative motivation of females equals 25.81 and the mean of integrative motivation of males is equal to 25.93.

According to $p\text{-value} = 0.84$ and $p \geq \alpha = 0.05$ the mean of integrative motivation of females and males is equal. Thus, the null hypothesis is confirmed.

VI. CONCLUSION

There was a significant relationship between the integrative motivation and instrumental motivation with English proficiency among EFL learners of Shiraz Azad University.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. C. Gardner, "Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The role of Attitudes and Motivation". London: Edward Arnold. (1985).
- [2] W. E. Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, "Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning." Rowley: Newbury House Publishers. (1972).
- [3] A. Caciora, and S. Veronica, "Motivation in language learning." University of Orada. Faculty of Electric Engineering, Information and Technology. Phone number: 0744241599.
- [4] K. Chastain, "Developing Second Language Skills. Theory and Practice" (3rd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace and Javanovich. (1988)
- [5] R. C. Gardner, (2001). "Language Learning Motivation: The Student, the Teacher, and the Researcher." Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education, (2001). 7, 1-18. E-mail: gardner@uwo.ca. Web page: <http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/>
- [6] H. D. Brown, (1994). "Principles of language learning and teaching" (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. (1994).
- [7] Y. Kimura, and Y. Nakata, and T. Okumara, (2000). "Language Learning Motivation of EFL learners in Japan." A Cross Sectional Analysis of Various learning Millieus." Jalt Journal. (2000). 47-65.
- [8] A. Liuoliene, and R. Metuniene, "Second Language Learning Motivation." Santalka. Mykolas Romeris University. (2006). E-mail: ukk@mruni.lt.
- [9] F. Keblawi, "A Review of Language Learning Motivation Theories." Jameca. (12). 23-57.
- [10] M. Ghanea, (2005). "An Investigation into the Relationship between Learners' Creativity and English Proficiency among Iranian EFL learners." M.A. Thesis, Shiraz Azad University.
- [11] N. Maghsudi, (1998). "The Relationship between Motivation and English Proficiency among Iranian EFL Learners." M.A. Thesis. Shiraz Azad University.