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This study was designed to investigate the relationships among types of classroom activities, defined as either structural or communicative, and the motivation, communication, and achievement of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students. The participants were 22 Turkish EFL students at the pre-intermediate level of proficiency attending the Middle East Technical University Preparatory program. The researcher used two different techniques to collect her data for this study: classroom observations to determine communication, operationalized as student participation in the classroom, and questionnaires to measure students' motivation. The study attempted to answer three research questions.

The first research question concerned to what extent student motivation is related to the communicativeness of classroom activities. The mean score calculated from the motivation questionnaires showed that students' motivation during communicative activities was higher than the mean score for motivation during structural activities (Ms = 3.22
and 2.78, respectively). Thus, communicative activities were able to motivate students more than structural activities.

The second research question answered the question to what extent participation in the classroom is related to the communicativeness of classroom activities. The results obtained from the observation checklists indicated that the students participated more, and thus communicated more during communicative activities since the mean score for participation during communicative activities was higher than the mean score for participation during structural activities (Ms = 6.62 and 2.16, respectively).

The third research question investigated to what extent the achievement of students is related to their motivation and classroom participation. The results showed a strong relationship between both structural and communicative participation and achievement ($r = .57$ and $.59$; $p = .005$ and .003 respectively), but the relationship between both types of students' motivation and achievement was not significant. However, an indirect relationship between motivation and achievement was found, since motivation is related to participation, which in turn is related to achievement.

In addition, results of the study show 67% co-variance between structural and communicative participation, suggesting that, students who participate in structural activities, also take part in communicative activities, and
vice versa. There is also considerable co-variance, 54%, between motivation during structural activities and motivation during communicative activities, indicating that students who are motivated during one type of activity are also motivated during the other type.

The results of the study showed that there is a strong relationship among activity types and motivation, participation, and achievement of the students. If teachers keep in mind that students can be motivated to participate in class, and that participation in both structural and communicative activities are strongly related to achievement, they will include activities in the classroom which enable students to participate in the class and thus to get good results in learning the language.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Learning a foreign language has always been an important goal in many people's lives. Although millions of people try to learn a foreign language, not all of them show the same success in this field. The variation in proficiency can be the result of different factors. Motivation is one of these factors. Because motivation is an important variable in language learning, many researchers have studied it. Motivation is best defined by Gardner (1985) as "the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes toward learning the language" (p. 10).

Most of the literature on motivation focuses on the motivation students bring with them to the classroom. According to Dunkel (1948), type of motivation answers the question why the individual is studying the language. It refers to the goal. There can be many reasons why people are trying to learn a foreign language, such as, to be able to speak with members of the target language community, to get a job, to be able to travel, to please parents, or to satisfy a language requirement (cited in Gardner, 1985). This study is interested in the intensity of motivation that is generated in the classroom based on classroom factors, rather than on the type of motivation students bring with them to the language learning situation.
According to Dunkel (1948, cited in Gardner, 1985), intensity of motivation emphasizes the nature of the approaching-the-goal behavior. As explained by Gardner (1985), in second language acquisition, motivational intensity has been assessed by determining the amount of effort the individual expends to achieve the desired goal. Gardner's (1985) definition of motivation includes four main factors: (a) a goal (in this case, achievement of a certain level of proficiency in a second language), (b) the behavior or effort expended to achieve that goal (or motivational intensity), (c) a desire to attain the goal, and (d) favorable attitudes towards learning the language. According to Girard (1974), the intensity of motivation results from the intensity of the last three factors. The first factor, goal, is not directly connected with the classroom situation, but the other three: behavior, desire, and attitudes, correspond with the basic components of the teaching situation: the learner, the teacher, and the method used.

Some methods have a greater motivating power than others. Girard (1974) mentions that motivation depends very much on the extent to which the method takes into consideration the learners' interests and possibilities: the closer the connection between method and learner, the higher the motivating power.
Although motivation is known to be a very important factor in students' success, the most common approach in language teaching in Turkey is the Structural Approach which does not take student motivation and interest into consideration. Traditional approaches and activities which do not allow learners to participate actively in the lesson are still very common in Turkey. Demircan (1988) indicates that the most important reason for the usage of traditional approaches, especially the Grammar Translation Method, is the exam system in Turkey. Almost all English exams are heavily oriented towards grammar. Baskan (1969) emphasizes that language teaching in Turkey means teaching grammar (cited in Demircan, 1988).

I have been working at Dokuz Eylul University for two years, where I teach preparatory class students who are placed according to the results of a placement test which is given at the very beginning of the academic year. Some of the students have very little knowledge of English, and some of them are complete beginners because they studied German or French when they were high school students.

Dokuz Eylul University is not a complete English-medium university. Some of the departments are in English and the students of these departments have preparatory education in English. These students belong to Maritime Business, International Affairs, American Literature, English Language
Teaching, Economics, and graduate programs in Engineering and Economics. The aim of the program is to teach them the necessary and useful aspects of English in one year, as their further education is fully dependent on the English they gain in the preparatory program. It is the teachers' responsibility to help students reach the level of English required in their own departments.

From my own observations, and the experiences of my colleagues, I have learned that students prefer grammar explanations rather than communicative activities. Most classroom activities and exercises are prepared to teach the structures of the target language. As a result of this teaching technique, students have sufficient knowledge of the structures of English and their scores on achievement tests are satisfactory, but it can easily be seen that they cannot use the knowledge they have gained in conversations and in writing courses, in which they have to use the language creatively or communicatively.

Nowadays, the Communicative Approach is being used to some extent in Turkey. As Nunan (1991) stated, "the basic principle underlying all Communicative Approaches is that learners must learn not only to make grammatically correct, propositional statements about the experimental world but must also develop the ability to use language to get things done" (p. 25). The Communicative Approach requires that
teachers motivate students so that they will participate actively in language learning. According to Nunan (1991), in order to achieve successful results in the language teaching-learning process, theoretical assumptions and the learner's ability to use the target language effectively should proceed side by side. It is necessary to form grammatically correct utterances for the sake of more effective communication, but sometimes perfectly grammatical sentences may not permit people to communicate easily. The Communicative Approach also enables learners to share ideas and opinions with their classmates. Students are likely to communicate with each other and use the language effectively in communicative situations when they become motivated, and as a result, achieve a greater level of success in the language.

One of the most important aspects in language teaching is to motivate students so that they can use the language effectively in meaningful contexts. Some studies have investigated the influence of affective variables, teacher behavior, gender, and age on motivation, but it is difficult to find studies which correlate classroom activities with motivation, communication, and achievement.

One such study which did investigate the relationships among classroom activities, and student motivation, participation, interaction, and communication was conducted
at Bilkent University, in the MA TEFL Program (Yemenici, 1992). However, this study differs from Yemenici's (1992) in several respects. Although both this study and Yemenici's aimed to examine the influence of the Communicative and Structural Approaches on student motivation and communication, the research design of this study was different, as observations were used to determine the degree of communication and the motivation of students during different activities, classified as structural or communicative, as they occur during the normal flow of the lesson rather than through intervention techniques. In addition, the results of an achievement test collected at the end of the observation period were used to determine if there was a relationship between motivation, communication, and the level of achievement, a relationship Yemenici did not investigate in her study.

Purpose of the Study

This study is a correlational study. Correlational studies are used to understand relationships among characteristics of people or other entities (Johnson, 1992). They can be classified as either relationship or prediction studies. In relationship studies the researchers study the relationship between measures of different variables obtained at approximately the same time. In prediction studies, the researchers are concerned with measuring
variables that can be used to predict performance on another variable, either at some future time or at the same time. This study is a relationship study which aims to find out the relationships among the communicativeness of classroom activities, motivation, communication, and achievement in language learning. It is expected that activities based on a Communicative Approach will result in greater student participation in the classroom than activities which emphasize the structures of the target language, and are based on drills. Therefore, this study distinguishes between types of classroom activities, and aims to show to what extent both communicative and structural activities in the classroom affect motivation, communication, and the achievement of the students.

Significance of the Study

Research done in the classroom environment can help teachers solve certain problems that arise from lack of student motivation and participation. By demonstrating the relationships among classroom activities, motivation, participation, and achievement, this study will encourage teachers to use activities in the classroom that motivate students and allow them to participate, since after all, achievement of the students is the goal of most language classrooms.
Research Questions

The study will try to find an answer to the following research questions:

1. To what extent is student motivation related to the communicativeness of classroom activities?

2. To what extent is student communication in the classroom, operationalized as student participation in the classroom, related to the communicativeness of classroom activities?

3. To what extent is achievement in language learning related to both student motivation and student communication in the classroom, the latter operationalized as student participation in the classroom?

Definitions of Terms

Motivation

The term motivation has been defined by different researchers in different ways. For the present study, motivation will be defined as students' degree of interest in the lesson.

Communication

Communication can be defined simply as the exchange of thoughts and ideas. In Communicative Language Teaching, the teacher provides the students with a purpose so they can exchange ideas and thus communicate. According to Malamah-Thomas (1988), in order to achieve communication, "the plan
of action must be carried out in a context of interaction" (p. 47). If there is interaction from student to student and from teacher to students, effective communication can take place. In this study, the communication of students will be measured by means of their active participation in the class, including interaction from teacher to students and from student to student.
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Despite many studies on the relationship among affective variables including motivation in second language acquisition (Belmont & Skinner, 1993; England, 1983; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, Smythe & Clement, 1979; Kraemer, 1993; Ramage, 1990), there has not been much research on the relationships among the types of classroom activities, and motivation, communication, and achievement of students. Thus, the purpose of this study will be to investigate the correlational relationships among these variables.

Foreign language teachers try to find answers for questions, such as, 'Which teaching method is the most effective method?', 'How can students be motivated enough to learn a language?'. Many methodological approaches have tried to provide answers to these questions and they have influenced language teachers and researchers for years.

In this chapter, I will discuss the different types of activities which take place in the classroom, the relationships among these activity types and the motivation, communication and achievement of EFL learners in the classroom, as revealed in previous studies conducted in this field.

The Classification of Approaches and Activities

Nunan (1991) divides the approaches used in language teaching into two categories: the Structural (or
Traditional) and Communicative Approaches.

**Structural Approach**

According to Nunan (1991), the Traditional (or Structural) Approach focuses on the second language as a structure or a system of grammatical patterns. In this approach language items are selected and sequenced based on linguistic criteria. The focus is on the formal and bookish usage of the language, with the main aim to have students produce grammatically correct sentences. The classes are teacher-centered, with the teacher as the authority. There is no tolerance shown for errors, and reading and writing are given more emphasis than speaking and listening.

**Communicative Approach**

According to Nunan, "the Communicative Approach grew out of the dissatisfaction with structuralism and the situational methods of 1960s" (p. 24). In the Communicative Approach, language items are selected and sequenced according to the needs and interests of the learners. In contrast to traditional approaches, the Communicative Approach emphasizes everyday language and its main aim is to have students communicate effectively and in a manner appropriate to the context in which they are working. Spoken interactions are as important as reading and writing.

Even though the class is more learner-centered when it is compared to classes taught using traditional approaches
which are mostly teacher-centered, several roles are assumed for teachers in the Communicative Approach. Breen and Candlin (1980, cited in Richards & Rodgers, 1986) describe teacher roles in the following terms:

1. Teacher as a facilitator: The teacher facilitates the communication process between all participants in the classroom and between these participants and the various activities and texts.

2. Teacher as an independent participant: The teacher acts as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group and as an organizer of resources.

3. Teacher as a needs analyst: The teacher tries to learn the needs of the students and tries to prepare activities to fulfill the students' needs.

4. Teacher as a group process manager: The teacher organizes the classroom as a setting for communication and communicative activities including group and pair work activities.

As usage is more important than form, partially correct and incomplete utterances are usually welcomed. The main emphasis is on communication rather than mastery of language forms, so the roles of learners differ from in traditional second language classrooms. The learners act as negotiators within the group and within classroom procedures and activities (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).
Structural and Communicative Activities

The activities designed in the light of the Structural and Communicative Approaches can be classified as structural or communicative activities, respectively.

Structural activities. In the Structural Approach, grammar rules are presented with examples. Exceptions to each rule are also given and the students are asked to apply the rule to some different examples. Students are given lists of grammar rules and vocabulary items, and they are asked to memorize them. Students are required to make their own sentences with the new vocabulary items, in order to show that they understood the meaning and the usage of the words and the grammar rules (Larsen-Freeman, 1986).

Communicative activities. Communicative activities are based on five principles. Johnson and Morrow (1987) state these principles as follows:

1. The Information Transfer Principle: The main characteristic of communicative language teaching is that it focuses on the ability to understand and convey information. One way of this is information transfer. This principle can be used in all skills. The learners are supposed to transfer the knowledge they received from a text to tables, graphs, or forms, or vice versa; using the tables, graphs, or forms they write passages.

2. The Information Gap Principle: In daily life,
people use the language to communicate with each other. They try to learn what they do not know. This aspect of the language is applied to language teaching with the information gap principle. This principle is especially important for two reasons: Firstly, it permits genuine information flow in the class; the students tell each other information they do not already know. Secondly, the students focus on their written or spoken work according to the messages they get from other sources, such as the teacher, their classmates, and the teaching materials.

3. The Jigsaw Principle: In this principle, students are given only one part of the information needed to complete a task. When they combine their information, they are able to complete the task. Activities based on this principle bring fun, excitement, and interest to the class.

4. The Task Dependency Principle: The main aim is to carry the outside world into the classroom. Students are exposed to the tasks in which they can find real-life situations.

5. The Correction for Content Principle: Language is a system developed for communicative purposes. The usage of imperfect grammar will lead to misunderstandings that will cause the receiver to get a wrong message. If mistakes cause a distraction in communication, the teacher may correct the mistakes.
Classroom Activities and Motivation

The main aim of classroom activities should be to attract students' attention, and to motivate students so they can learn better. The term motivation has been defined in a number of ways, depending on what researchers understand by it: "total desire to learn" (Dulay, Burt & Krashen 1982), "or an interest coming from an inward drive, emotional interest, or a desire to learn" (Gardner, 1985). According to Gardner and MacIntyre (1993), motivation contains three components: "desire to achieve a goal, effort expended in this direction or motivational intensity, and attitudes toward language learning" (p. 2).

The consensus of most studies is that motivational constructs, including effort expended, desire to learn the language, and instrumental and integrative motivation are related to successful second language learning. Most of the studies conducted on motivation have been interested in the type of the motivation that students bring to the classroom, rather than the motivation generated in the classroom. Of all the motivational constructs discussed in the literature, motivational intensity is the most relevant to this study, as effort expended presumably includes the amount a student participates in the classroom.

Foreign language teachers are interested in whether motivation can be increased by the pedagogical techniques
and learning activities which educators use. A central element of classroom teaching is the design of learning activities. It is the belief of the researcher that teaching communicative activities leads to greater motivation, participation, and communicative competence in the classroom than structural activities. Efforts to teach a second language within a communicative framework have led to certain methodologically-motivated organizational changes in the classroom environment and in the design of learning activities. In relation to the specific needs and interests of the students, ESL classrooms often undergo certain changes in instructional materials, learning activities, and student-teacher or student-student interactional patterns. For example, teachers have regularly begun to use small-group and pair work as a means of increasing their students' target language practice time (Doughty & Pica, 1986).

Long and Porter (1985) talk about the pedagogical effects of group work, one type of classroom activity which motivates learners and leads to increased participation in the classroom. They state that group work increases language practice opportunities, improves the quality of student talk, and motivates learners. The "lockstep," teacher-led method, limits the quantity and the quality of student talk since teacher-centered conversations are rarely found outside courtrooms, wedding ceremonies, and
classrooms. In such settings, one speaker asks a series of questions to which the answers are usually known to both parties. Teachers quickly correct any errors and students quickly realize that what they say is less important than how they say it. These type of activities may develop grammatical accuracy, but students should be provided with conversational skills, which will enable them to communicate outside the classroom. Group work is very helpful in gaining this ability. First of all, unlike the lockstep method, group work gives the students face-to-face communication in a small group for about five minutes; students do not limit themselves to producing hurried, isolated sentences, but they deal with cohesive and coherent sequences of utterances through which they develop discourse competence. Students also take on roles and adopt positions in group work which the lockstep method does not allow. Through group and pair work, students can develop at least some of the variety of skills which make up communicative competence in a second language.

There have been numerous research studies which have found a relationship between classroom activities, including group work, and motivation. In a research study conducted by Long and Porter (1985), it was found that group work motivates learners, and allows for a greater quantity and richer variety of language practice.
In another study conducted by Littlejohn (1982, cited in Long & Porter, 1985), small-group, independent study was found to increase motivation to study Spanish among beginning students. Learners responding to a questionnaire reported that they felt less inhibited and freer to speak and make mistakes while they were working in small groups.

According to Good (1983), the attitude of students towards classroom activities influences how they approach learning. Marchall and Weinstein (1984) state that activities that involve variety and diversity are more likely to facilitate an interest in learning and a mastery orientation (cited in Ames, 1992).

Malone and Lepper (1987) described challenge, interest, and perceived control as factors which should be included in the design of learning tasks. They argued for activities which offer personal challenge (effort), give students a sense of control over the product, and increase students' interest over time. They found that when tasks are enriched or involve "motivational embellishments" (p. 89), they are more likely to create a purpose for learning (cited in Ames, 1992).

Classroom Activities and Participation

Some researchers have been interested in the importance of participation in the classroom and have conducted studies to find out whether there is a relationship between types of
activities and student participation.

As Paris and Winograd (1990) explained, when students focus on the activity or on skill improvement and value the learning, they are likely to feel empowered in their pursuits and show active participation and to feel more satisfied with school learning in general.

Some studies support the need for communicative activities for active class participation. They investigated the effectiveness of communicative uses of the target language, as opposed to teacher-centered explanations of language features (reviewed in Pica, 1987). When learners use the target language to communicate with native speakers or with each other, they must often ask and answer questions when certain items of discourse are not understood.

Some studies investigated the superiority of grammar consciousness-raising tasks, provided through communicative activities, to traditional grammar instruction of problematic structures to increase student participation. In such a study, Fotos (1994) worked with 160 Japanese university EFL learners. The research was conducted in three different classes. The first class received three teacher-centered grammar lessons on adverb placement, indirect object placement, and relative clause usage. The second class performed three grammar tasks dealing with the
same grammar structures. The third one performed communicative tasks matched with the grammar tasks in terms of length, format, instructions, and task features, but lacking grammatical task content. The researcher concluded from the results of the study that grammar consciousness-raising tasks could be recommended to the field of language teaching as useful pedagogy at a time when many teachers are looking for acceptable ways to bring formal instruction on grammar back into their communicative activities. Such tasks would harmonize the goals of more traditional educational curricula emphasizing the formal study of language aspects with communicative goals, which enable learners to participate in the lesson and to be more active throughout the activities.

A survey of research on the amount of task talk produced by manipulating task format and negotiated interaction (Long, 1989) indicated that the learners used the most complex target language structures in information gap activities in which all learners were required to exchange information (cited in Fotos, 1994).

Another study conducted by Yemenici (1992) researched the effects of the Communicative and Structural Approaches on student motivation, interaction, participation, and communication. The study was conducted with 14 students who volunteered to participate from the Department of English
Language and Literature at Ankara University. All of the subjects were repeat students and all of them were graduates of English-medium high schools. The research was conducted by giving sample lessons during the first five weeks based on the Structural Approach, and during the second five weeks, lessons based on the Communicative Approach. After each five weeks, students were given a questionnaire to assess their reactions to the sample lessons. At the end, the results of the two questionnaires were compared. The results of Yemenici's (1992) study indicated that the students felt themselves more relaxed and wanted to participate in the lesson during the communicative type of activities, more than during the structural type of activities.

Even though Yemenici's study seems similar to this study, their designs are completely different. This study aims not only to describe the influence of the different classroom activities on student motivation, participation and communication, but it also intends to find out the correlational relationship among the activity types, motivation, communication, and achievement of the students. During the previous research, the subjects were given treatment, and their motivation and participation were measured at the end of these treatment periods. In contrast to that study, during this study the subjects were observed
in the natural classroom setting, and their motivation and participation were measured without giving them a treatment. Another difference is that this study measured achievement, to determine whether there was a relationship among motivation, participation, and achievement, a relationship which the previous study was not interested in.

Classroom Activities and Achievement

Seliger (1977) found that learners who initiated or participated in interactions which required using L2 in and out of the classroom made more rapid progress and fewer L1 transfer errors than learners who interacted little (cited in Pica, 1994).

In another study conducted by Ely (1986), high correlations between students' classroom participation and their oral correctness were found (cited in Johnson, 1992). In this study, Ely investigated whether voluntary oral participation in a Spanish foreign language classroom, in a U.S. university, was associated with greater proficiency. In the study, six teachers and 75 students participated. Participation was defined as the number of times a student asked or answered a question or provided information in Spanish without being individually nominated to do so.

In order to show the relative importance of communicative- or structure-focused teaching in language learning achievement, a study was conducted by Daughty
This study compared gains in relative clause usage achieved by learners who read passages which contained the target structure. One group received a presentation of formal grammar rules together with the text, and another group received meaning-focused treatment in which paraphrases and clarifications of the text-content were shown with target structures visually highlighted and printed in capital letters. The results demonstrated that the meaning-focused treatment group showed a better recall of the content of the reading text than the group exposed to a formal presentation of grammar rules.

Pica (1987) found that interaction between the students and the teacher is important in promoting improved learner comprehension of the target language, and also, compared to a teacher-centered language lesson, the usage of tasks and group work has been found to expose learners to more comprehensible input and to require learners to make more adjustments in their own output.

In this chapter, the different studies which show the importance of motivation, participation, and achievement in the language teaching field were discussed. The aim of this present research study is to determine the relationships among these variables, in relation to activity types which take place in EFL classrooms in Turkey, as there has been no research study to date which has investigated the
relationship among the variables in question.
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

This study is a correlational study which aims to examine the relationships among the communicativeness of classroom activities, student motivation, participation in the classroom, and achievement in language learning. The researcher used different techniques for collecting and analyzing the data, combining qualitative and quantitative research. In this chapter, the characteristics of the subjects, the instruments used, the data collection procedures, and the data analysis techniques will be explained.

Subjects

For this study, a class of Middle East Technical University (METU) preparatory program students were chosen. The reason for the selection of this class of students from METU was that both Dokuz Eylül, my home institution, and METU are state universities. In addition, the level of the students in this class was similar to the level of the students in the home university of the researcher. Moreover, the teacher of the class at METU was known to be a good practitioner of the Communicative Approach. Most of the teachers at METU make an effort to use the Communicative Approach in the class, even though there are some limitations due to students' needs, the examination system, and time limitations. In spite of all these limitations,
the language education at METU is more communicative in contrast to Dokuz Eylul, where language education is based on the Structural Approach. It was assumed that as a result of the general communicative orientation at METU, there would be a greater variety of activities and a greater degree of participation in the classroom which would facilitate data collection for this study. The selected class consisted of 13 female and nine male students, a total of 22, at the pre-intermediate level. The average age was 18.

Before the classroom observations began, the students were given a consent form, which assured them that their names would be kept confidential, and the results of the study would not affect their performance at school (see Appendix A). At the beginning of the observations, they were given a structured questionnaire to obtain some background knowledge about them (see Appendix B). They were also given a 5-point Likert-type scale of agreement to determine their attitude towards learning English (see Appendix C). The items on the questionnaire were adopted from Gardner's (1985) Attitude Motivation Test Battery. The results of these instruments were used to describe the subjects.

According to the results of the first part of the questionnaire, 69% of the students graduated from State High
Schools, and 26% of them graduated from Vocational High Schools. The results indicated that 56% of them had English courses about 2-4 hours a week during their Secondary and High School education, which means that the majority of students did not have a good background in English. On the other hand, their attitude towards learning English was positive, as the majority of the students agreed or strongly agreed with the positively worded items on the attitude scale. ($M = 4.16$ for positively worded items; $M = 1.5$ for negatively worded items, out of a possible range of scores from 1 to 5). Eighty-two percent of the students stated they did not find themselves proficient in English. Fifty-six percent said they lacked listening and speaking activities, and 52% said that they did not experience audio-visual activities in their previous English education, suggesting that their English language education was not taught using communicative methods. Sixty percent of the students came from families in which no family member knew English. The rest of them had English-speaking family members, but they did not benefit from them, as the students were living far away from their families.

Instruments

Questionnaires

The questionnaire given to the students at the beginning of the data collection period contained questions
both about the students' background, as well as about their attitude towards learning English. The results of these two questionnaires were presented in the Subjects section of this chapter. Even though attitude towards learning English was not a variable in this study, it was thought that knowing students' attitudes beforehand would be beneficial for the study, as attitudes are considered related to motivation.

Questionnaires were given after each class period to measure the motivation of the students during the different activities (see Appendix E). This questionnaire consisted of 10 items, aimed at measuring the motivation of students, based on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The students were asked to assess their degree of interest and motivation during the different activity types conducted during the class period. The responses on the scale were: very much (5); much (4); some (3); a little (2); and not at all (1).

Observation Checklists

As the data collection was based primarily on observations, observation checklists, seating charts, and verbal flow charts were prepared for use during the observations (see Appendix D). Seating charts were used to record the participation of the students. These charts were developed for this study by modifying Richard and Nunan's (1990) observation checklists. The purpose of the charts
was to determine the amount of student participation in the classroom during different types of activities. Verbal flow charts were considered appropriate to use because they record who is talking to whom and how frequently. It directly records participation in the classroom.

The classification of activities was based on Nunan's (1991) description. Activities were divided into two types: communicative and structural.

The students' attempts at participation were divided into different categories: voluntary question (VQ); voluntary participation (VP); voluntary answer (VA); involuntary participation (IP); involuntary answer (IA); student-to-student interaction (SS); at task (AT); off task (OT).

In recording the students' participation, the researcher made a distinction between participation, questions and answers. When the teacher opened a discussion at the beginning of the lesson with the help of pre-reading questions, or closed a discussion at the end of the lesson with post-reading questions, students' attempts to contribute to these discussions were labelled as participation. If students themselves wanted to take part in the activity or the discussion, their participation was labelled voluntary participation. If the teacher asked them to join the discussion or asked their opinion, their
participation was labelled *involuntary participation*. When the students asked questions when they did not understand something, these attempts were labelled *voluntary question*. When the teacher asked a question which needed only one answer, it was classified as *answer*, and according to whether the teacher called on the student or not, the answer was labelled either as *voluntary* (when the student volunteered the answer the question), or *involuntary answer* (when the teacher addressed a particular student to answer the question).

**Achievement Test**

An achievement test was given at the end of the observation period and included the topics covered during the observations (see Appendix F). The purpose was to determine if students who were more motivated or who participated more in class also received higher scores on the achievement test.

**Procedures**

The first variable in the study, the communicativeness of the classroom activities, was determined during the observations, by using Nunan's (1991) classification scheme to categorize activities as either communicative or structural.
Questionnaires

A questionnaire was developed using a 5-point Likert-type scale, to measure the students' motivation, the second variable, in this study, during communicative and structural activities in the classroom. In the preparation of the scale, the need to use the same form after each class was taken into consideration. The statements were written to be broad enough so that students would not need to fill out different questionnaires for different lessons or for different type of activities.

The motivation questionnaire was piloted beforehand with Bilkent University students. For the pilot test two open-ended questions were also included, asking students to state what prevents them from participating and what encourages them to participate in the classroom. Their answers were used to modify some of the statements on the motivation scale accordingly.

The questionnaire was given to the subjects right after every lesson. In order to see whether the students were motivated more through communicative or structural activities, this scale was given more than once, depending on the number of activities which took place in the classroom. To be able to save time and prevent students from becoming overly restless with this procedure, the students were asked to circle the appropriate numbers on the
scale to reflect their motivation during communicative activities, and to write down the appropriate numbers next to the scale to indicate their motivation during structural activities. The researcher classified the activities conducted during the lesson as either structural or communicative according to Nunan's (1991) scheme. She informed the students before they filled out the motivation questionnaire which activities that day were considered structural and which activities communicative. There were generally three or four activities included in each lesson. At the beginning, this procedure was a little bit complicated for the students, but as time passed, they got used to it, and were able to manage it without any problems.

Observation Checklists

The communication of the students, the third variable in this study, was measured by means of student participation in the classroom. Students were observed once a week, two hours each day, for seven weeks. At the beginning of the observations, verbal flow charts, modified from Richard and Nunan (1990), were prepared. When the observations began, it became impossible to follow the interaction in the classroom using arrows. The researcher then substituted acronyms, developed according to the needs of the observations which were described in the Instruments section of this chapter.
Students' participation was measured by counting the number of times they took part in the lesson, either by answering the questions voluntarily, involuntarily, or by asking questions. Each attempt at participation was given points. Voluntary attempts were given two points, whereas involuntary attempts were given one point. Voluntary attempts at participation were given more points than involuntary attempts because they were considered more communicative, and therefore, of greater value for this study. The points were added up to determine the student's overall participation score, used to operationalize communication in the classroom.

**Achievement Test**

At the end of the observations, an achievement test, the dependent variable in this study, was administered to the students to determine how much they had learned. The test included topics covered during the observations and was given to the students to determine if the students who were more motivated or who participated in class more also received higher scores on the achievement test.

This test was prepared by the researcher in cooperation with the course teacher, and included, as it was a reading class, criteria suggested by Hughes (1989) in preparing reading tests for reliability and validity. The test was prepared using portions of the course textbook covered
during the observations, including both structural (questions related to the structure of the language) and communicative (questions which required students to use language in meaningful ways) type of questions. The aim of the achievement test was to measure how much the students had learned during the observation period, to be able to correlate individual student achievement with their level of motivation and degree of participation in the classroom. To accomplish this aim, the researcher preferred using material covered during the observations rather than including new material.

The test was given without prior warning, as the researcher did not want to introduce a confounding variable, preparation for the exam, into the study. If the students had been informed about the test beforehand, measuring the relationship among motivation, participation, and achievement would have been unnecessarily complicated since the students who had studied for the exam might have received better grades, regardless of their level of motivation or degree of participation during the class activities. The students were given 45 minutes, a sufficient amount of time, to complete the test. Because of National and Religious holidays, the test was given two weeks after the observations ended. This period helped the researcher avoid the influence of memory.
The test had two parts: reading and writing. For the reading part, a reading passage on "Being Blind" was followed by questions related to sentence structure and information transfer. A second reading passage about "Smoking" was followed by general comprehension, vocabulary, and reference questions. The questions were also taken from the textbook.

In the writing part, students were given a short reading passage about the characteristics of a typical American teacher, and were asked to write a comparison/contrast essay with the characteristics of a typical Turkish teacher.

Data Analysis

For each student, a file including their name, future department, age, educational background, English background, and attitude towards learning English was prepared. After each observation, participation and motivation scores of each student were added to their file in accordance with the types of activities in the classroom. At the end of the observation period, an achievement test was given and the student's score was also included in this file. The aim of the analysis was to determine students' degree of motivation and participation in the classroom, in relationship to the communicativeness of classroom activities, classified as either communicative or structural with their achievement in
language learning.

Pearson product-moment correlation, Spearman rank-order correlation, and dependent sample t-test analyses were used to determine the strength and direction of these relationships.
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Overview of the Study

The aim of this study was to explore the relationships among the types of activities conducted in the classroom, and the motivation, communication, and achievement of EFL students. Motivation of the students was measured by using a 5-point Likert-type scale, comprised of 10 items. Communication of the students was measured by their class participation during classroom activities. At the end of the observation period, an achievement test was given to measure how much the students had learned during the observations. In order to analyze the relationships among the activity types, and the motivation, participation and achievement of the students, Pearson product-moment correlation, Spearman rank-order correlation, and paired t-test procedures were used.

Overview of Analytical Procedures

The statistical analysis was carried out in four stages. During the first stage, the motivation and communication scores of the students were calculated. To measure the motivation of the students, they were given a 5-point Likert-type scale at the end of every class observed. The possible responses to each item on the scale included: very much (5); much (4); some (3); a little (2); and not at all (1). A score of 5 represented the highest
level of motivation and 1 represented the lowest level of motivation. The same questionnaire was used to measure the motivation of students during both communicative and structural types of activities.

In order to be able to calculate the participation of the students, they were observed once a week, two hours each day, over a period of 7 weeks. During this period, seating charts were used to record students' participation. Their participation was determined as follows: (V) voluntary question; (VP) voluntary participation; (VA) voluntary answer; (IP) involuntary participation; (IA) involuntary answer; (SS) student-to-student interaction; (AT) at-task; (OT) off-task.

To calculate participation, numbers were assigned for each of these categories. Voluntary questions, voluntary participation, voluntary answer, student-to-student interaction, and at task were given two points. The number of attempts in each category were added up and multiplied by two. Involuntary participation and involuntary answer attempts were given one point, multiplied by one, and the results added up. Voluntary attempts at participation and student-to-student interaction were considered more communicative, as they both result in a more natural form of communication. Off-task was given zero points, as the students were not involved in the activity and did not show
any effort to participate.

In order to distinguish between motivation and participation during structural and communicative activities, mean values for structural motivation, communicative motivation, structural participation, and communicative participation were calculated for each student. Scores for structural and communicative motivation, and amount of participation during structural and communicative activities were added up separately, and divided by the number of observations in which there had been structural activities or communicative activities, respectively. Since during two of the observations the teacher did not include any structural activities, the sum of each students' structural motivation and participation were divided by five. Because the teacher included communicative activities during every observation, the sum of each students' communicative motivation and participation were divided by seven, the total number of observations.

When the observations ended, a test prepared by the researcher was given to the students to measure whether the more motivated and those who had participated more received higher grades than those who were not motivated and did not participate. The test was comprised of reading and writing parts. In the reading part, each correct answer was given two points. In the writing part, students' compositions
were graded holistically. The compositions which included appropriate features of a comparison/contrast essay, and which contained most of the information in the reading passage, were given 20 points. The others were graded accordingly. Grammar and spelling mistakes were not taken into consideration. For reliability of scoring, the test papers were graded twice by two different raters: One was the researcher and the other, another English teacher. There was 100% inter-rater reliability in scores obtained.

The second stage of the analysis examined whether there were relationships among types of motivation, types of participation, and test results. The scores students received from their motivation questionnaires and participation check-lists were correlated with their scores from the achievement test. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine these relationships.

During the third stage, a paired t-test was applied to structural motivation and communicative motivation as one pair, and structural participation and communicative participation as the second pair. Because the correlations between both of these variables were so high, this test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between these pairs of variables (structural and communicative motivation, and structural and communicative
participation), or if each pair represented essentially the same construct.

During the fourth stage, Spearman rank-order correlation formula was applied to the pair of motivation variables and the pair of participation variables to confirm the significance of the correlations obtained from Pearson Product-moment correlation coefficient. One rationale for using Spearman rank-order correlation is to test the results of Pearson r when the sample size is less than 30 cases. As this study had a small sample of subjects, only 22 cases, the application of Spearman rank-order correlation was considered appropriate.

Results of the Study

Before computing Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, the motivation and participation scores of the students were placed in the variable list with the name of each case in the computer. In the discussion that follows the tables, correlations were considered significant at the .05, .01 or .001 level, with a single asterisk (*) indicating significance at the .05 level, double asterisks (**) at the .01 level and triple asterisks (***) at the .001 level.

Students' scores from the questionnaires were tabulated to determine their overall level of motivation and participation during structural and communicative
activities. The highest score obtained from the motivation questionnaire was 3.7 for structural activities and 3.8 for communicative activities. The lowest scores were 1.7 and 2.3, respectively. The scores for participation during structural activities ranged from 0 (zero) to 6; on the other hand, the lowest score in participation during communicative activities was 3 and the highest score was 18.5. Table 1 gives the mean scores and standard deviations of motivation and participation of the subjects during different type of activities.

Table 1
Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Motivation and Participation during Structural and Communicative Activities
N = 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Motivation</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Motivation</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Participation</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Participation</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the scores in Table 1 indicate, students' motivation and participation were higher during communicative
activities than structural activities. In other words, students were more motivated, and thus, participated more during communicative activities.

According to the results in Table 1, communicative activities have a greater motivating power than structural activities. As language teachers, should we include only communicative activities in our classes? Do motivation and participation during different types of activities correlate with each other, and with the achievement of students? In order to understand whether these relationships exist or not, Pearson product-moment correlation was applied to all variables in the study and the results were displayed in Table 2.
Table 2

Correlation Matrix of Relationships among Variables in the Study

\( N = 22 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Str. Mot.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. Part.</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Mot.</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Part.</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.82***</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achv.</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\*p \leq .05; **p \leq .01; ***p \leq .001.

According to Gardner (1985), a correlation coefficient of .40 is considered a good correlation for affective variables, such as attitudes and motivation. The results obtained from Pearson product-moment correlation procedure, as displayed in Table 2, indicate a strong correlation between structural motivation and structural participation \((r = .50*)\). The correlation between structural motivation and communicative participation was strong, too \((r = .51*)\). The correlations between structural and communicative
motivation, and achievement, however, do not show a significant correlation ($r = .37$ and .11, respectively). On the other hand, the correlations between participation during both type of activities and achievement were highly significant ($r = .57^{**}$ for structural participation; $r = .59^{**}$ for communicative participation). Interestingly enough, the results do not show a significant correlation between motivation during communicative activities and participation during communicative activities ($r = .30$), nor does communicative motivation correlate significantly with achievement ($r = .11$) or structural participation ($r = .08$).

The results of this analysis show that there was a significant correlation between the types of participation (structural and communicative) and achievement, but not between types of motivation and achievement. It can thus be said that students who participated more in class, received higher scores or achieved more than those who did not participate as much.

The very strong correlations between structural motivation and communicative motivation ($r = .73^{***}$), and structural participation and communicative participation ($r = .82^{***}$) suggested the need to test whether types of motivation and types of participation were indeed distinct, or whether they were in fact unitary constructs. In order to determine this, a $t$-test was performed on the means of
structural and communicative motivation, and on the means of structural and communicative participation (see Table 3).

Table 3

Differences among Two Different Types of Motivation and Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Str. Mot.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Mot.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. Part.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Part.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


***p < .001.

A paired t-test procedure tests for a significant difference between the means of each pair of variables, to determine if they are distinct or not. The results of the paired t-test reported in Table 3 indicate that there was a statistically significant difference between the two types of motivation and participation. Therefore, the two types of motivation and participation can be considered as distinct constructs, in spite of the high correlations.
between them.

Selected correlation coefficients were squared to determine to what extent there was co-variance in scores for motivation and participation. The squared correlation coefficients ($r^2$) are reported in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Str. Part./Str. Mot.</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Part./Str. Mot.</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. Part./Comm. Mot.</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Part./Comm. Mot.</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Mot./Str. Mot.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Part./Str. Part.</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Based on the results reported in Table 2, students' participation in the classroom, during both structural and communicative activities, can be explained to some extent by their structural motivation. Structural motivation explains
25% of the variance in structural participation, and 26% of the variance in communicative participation. On the other hand, communicative motivation does not account for any variance in participation, either structural or communicative ($\chi^2 = .01$ and .09, respectively).

The correlation coefficients of both types of motivation and participation were also squared to determine to what extent the variance of one type of motivation and communication can be explained by the other type. As shown in Table 2, 54% of students' communicative motivation can be explained by their structural motivation. That means, if students are motivated during structural type of activities, they are similarly motivated during communicative type of activities. It can also be understood from the table that 67% of the communicative participation of students can be explained by their participation during structural activities.

In order to confirm the correlations obtained from the Pearson product-moment correlation procedure, Spearman rank-order correlation was also applied to all variables in the study. This analysis was applied to test whether the correlations obtained from Pearson product-moment correlation were significant or not, because one rationale in the usage of Spearman rank-order correlation is to test
the results of Pearson $r$ when the sample has less than 30 cases. The researcher felt the need to apply this analysis, since the sample for this study consisted of only 22 subjects.

First of all, the two variables with the strongest correlation were selected as pairs. That is, structural participation and communicative participation ($r = .82^{***}$) were chosen as the first pair, and structural motivation and communicative motivation ($r = .73^{***}$) were chosen as the second pair.
Correlations among Different Types of Motivation and Participation

N = 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair of variables</th>
<th>rho</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Str. Mot. &amp; Comm. Mot.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. Part. &amp; Comm. Part.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. Mot. &amp; Str. Part.</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Mot. &amp; Comm. Part.</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


rho = Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient.

***p < .001.

The rationale in applying Spearman rank-order correlation was to test whether the results obtained from Pearson product-moment correlation were really significant or not, as the sample for this study was smaller than 30 cases. The results of both Pearson product-moment correlation and Spearman rank-order correlation showed similar results. The two types of motivation and participation correlated significantly with each other, and at the strongest level of all pairs of variables.
According to the results of Pearson product-moment correlation, the strongest correlation was between structural and communicative participation ($r = .82^{***}$); but in Spearman rank-order correlation, the correlation between the two types of motivation was stronger than for the two types of participation. ($\rho = .73^{***}$ and $\rho = .69^{***}$ respectively). According to Brown (1988), $\rho = .67$ is significant at $p < .01$ level.

The other pairs of variables, structural participation and structural motivation, and communicative motivation and communicative participation, did not show any significance at $\rho$ level, in contrast to Pearson product-moment correlation in which structural participation and structural motivation correlated significantly at $0.50^*$. Overall, however, the correlations between these latter two pairs of variables were less important than the correlations between the two types of motivation and two types of participation.

The results can thus be interpreted as, if the students are motivated during structural activities, they are also motivated during communicative activities; and if they participate in structural activities, they also participate in communicative activities. Motivation and participation scores of students during both activity types were parallel, but mean scores of motivation and participation were higher during communicative activities than during structural
activities. When a student obtained high motivation and participation scores during structural activities, the same student got higher scores during communicative activities. Activities which emphasize sentence structure and functions of words in a sentence are useful to make students aware of the aspects of the language being taught. During this study, it was observed that students who were provided with the necessary information about the structure of the language and who practiced this information during structural activities participated more in communicative activities which aimed to make students practice the language in real-life situations. Motivation during structural activities explains a considerable amount of variance in motivation and participation during communicative activities. Furthermore, participation in structural activities explains a considerable amount of variance in participation during communicative activities, suggesting that overall, motivation and participation during structural activities lead to motivation and participation during communicative activities.
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Overview of the Study

It was emphasized in Chapter 1 that the activities conducted in the classroom play an important role in students' motivation, communication, and achievement. As the main aim of teachers is to motivate their students and have them participate in the class so they can be more successful in language learning, teachers always feel a need to use different types of activities. Even though many methodological approaches exist in language teaching, the most popular one in Turkey is the Structural Approach, which does not take student motivation and interests into much consideration. In this study, the researcher tried to find relationships among activity types, specifically communicative and structural activities, and students' motivation, communication in the classroom, and achievement.

Twenty-two pre-intermediate level preparatory class students from Middle East Technical University (METU) were chosen as the subjects of the study. They were observed for 14 hours by means of observation checklists and their motivation was measured with Likert-type scale questionnaires at the end of each lesson. The achievement of the students was measured by an achievement test given at the end of the observation period. The statistical analysis consisted of Pearson product-moment correlation, Spearman
rank-order correlation, and dependent sample t-test.

This chapter consists of three parts. In the first part, the results of the study with the conclusions drawn from them will be summarized. In the second section, limitations of the study will be discussed, based on the design of the study, subjects, and results. Suggestions for further research and educational implications will be presented in the third section.

Summary of the Results and Conclusion

The results obtained from the mean scores of motivation and participation during communicative and structural activities showed that during communicative activities, students' motivation and communication, measured in terms of class participation, were higher than during structural activities. The results also pointed out that students who participated more during both structural and communicative activities obtained better grades from the achievement test. Motivation, on the other hand, did not show a significant correlation with achievement of the students, but motivation of the students during structural activities showed a strong relationship with their participation in communicative activities. That means, if the teachers motivate the students using structural activities, such as with drills based on the structure of the target language and give the students conscious knowledge of grammar points, and
vocabulary, they will be able to motivate students during communicative activities, such as information gap, information transfer, and jigsaw puzzles.

Observations of the class support the relationship between communicativeness of classroom activities and participation of students on a more global level. Students were generally more active and participated in the lesson more during group work activities. For example, one day, when the teacher asked the students to talk about their favorite teachers, none of them wanted to talk, so the teacher immediately formed the class into groups of three and it was observed that all of the students joined the activity wholeheartedly. Similar results were obtained by Long and Porter (1985) about the positive effects of group work on student participation and interaction. The results of this study also supported the results obtained by Yemenici (1992) in that in both of the studies students' participation and interaction were higher during communicative activities than during structural activities.

Paris and Winograd (1990) took activity types, participation, and learning into consideration. According to them, when the students focus on the activity, they value the learning and feel empowered by participating, so they reach a higher level in learning in general. As the results of the present study indicate a strong relationship between
participation and achievement, it can be concluded that Turkish EFL learners may reach a higher level in achievement, to the extent they participate in the classroom.

The correlation between structural motivation and communicative participation showed a similarity with the results of the study conducted by Fotos (1994). In that study, Fotos wanted to determine the superiority of grammar consciousness-raising tasks using communicative activities, to traditional grammar instruction, to increase students' participation. The researcher suggested the usage of tasks which combine Structural and Communicative Approaches in the language teaching field. In the present study, the results of the statistical analysis displayed a similar result: Students participate in communicative activities to the extent they are motivated during structural activities.

Limitations of the Study

Even though this was an interesting and useful study, and one which will give language teachers information about the relationships among the activity types, motivation, communication, and achievement of the students, there are also some limitations, due to the selection of subjects, size of sample, and statistical procedures used.
Selection of Subjects and Sample Size

First of all, the setting of the study and subjects were not randomly selected. METU was chosen as the setting. It is an English-medium state university where the Communicative Approach is widely used. Furthermore, a specific class was chosen from METU, first of all, because the majority had graduated from state high schools with a limited background knowledge in English, similar to the students in the home university of the researcher. The second reason for having selected that class was their teacher, as she was known to be a good practitioner of the Communicative Approach. Besides that, the students had good attitudes towards learning English. In other words, they were highly motivated because they were students of an English-medium university. They were also aware that English is very important not only for their further education, but also for their occupations.

If the same research had been conducted at a different university, the results might have been different, depending on the students' needs, attitudes, and interests. The teacher may also have affected the results of the study because during the observations, she displayed a good combination of both structural and communicative activities. If she had showed a tendency to use only one type of activity, I would not have been able to compare motivation
and participation during both communicative and structural activities. In other words, the results of this study are highly specific to the particular setting, and are therefore not generalizable to other EFL university contexts in Turkey.

The size of the sample is also important in the generalizability of the results. Since the study included only 22 subjects, as well as the subjects not having been randomly selected, the results cannot be generalized to all Turkish EFL students at the university level.

**Statistical Procedure**

The size of the sample also created some difficulties for the statistical analyses. Data were analyzed by using Pearson product-moment correlation to indicate the relationships among the variables. Based on the characteristics of the raw data, it was suggested to the researcher to use multiple regression, but the limited number of cases did not make it possible, since this analysis requires a minimum of five cases for each variable. If there had been a sufficient number of subjects, and if multiple regression had been applied, the researcher might have obtained additional results that would have indicated which of the independent variables (structural motivation, communicative motivation, structural participation, or communicative participation) is the best predictor of
Implications of the Study

Implications for Further Research

The intention of the researcher was to determine to what extent structural and communicative activities affect student motivation, communication, and achievement. Limitations in the number and selection of subjects, and resulting limitations in applying more sophisticated statistical procedures prevented the researcher from investigating the extent to which these variables predict achievement. This research was designed as a correlational study to determine the relationship among the variables included in the study. For further research, it is suggested to conduct a similar study with a larger, randomly-selected sample so that the results can be generalized.

In addition, a causal modelling technique championed by Joreskog and Sorbom (1978) could be applied to the data, as well as multiple regression. This technique enables researchers to test the validity of specific structural causal models based on correlational data and to evaluate whether the hypothesized concepts are identified by their underlying measured variables (cited in Gardner, 1985). It is an extension of path analysis, but is more general. It not only allows the researchers to identify the significance
of paths of relationships, but also the adequacy of fit of the entire model, as well. To conduct this statistical analysis, there is a general computer program referred to as LISREL, which is an acronym for the more general label, Linear Structural Relations.

Most of the researchers who have worked on affective variables have dealt with the types of the motivation that students bring to the classroom. The main concern of this research study was the motivation which is generated in the classroom by means of different activity types and teaching materials. Future research studies could investigate the relationship between the motivation students bring with them to the classroom—for example, instrumental and integrative—(Gardner, 1985), and motivation generated in the classroom. In other words, are students who are either integratively or instrumentally motivated, or both, demonstrate greater motivation in the classroom as a result of various classroom factors?

Educational Implications

This study dealt with variables which play important roles in language teaching and learning. To highlight the relationships among activity types, motivation, communication, and achievement may inform language teachers of the extent of their importance. Knowing that students can be motivated to participate in the classroom, and that
participation during both communicative and structural activities is strongly related to achievement should encourage teachers to include both structural and communicative activities in the classroom, which will enable students to participate in multiple ways. Evidence of this kind is important to help bring about a greater variety of teaching methods in the EFL classroom in Turkey, which is still heavily influenced by the Structural Approach.

The findings of this study should be useful in designing classroom activities for EFL learners. As the study pointed out, using only communicative or structural activities is not effective enough in language teaching. Instead, using a combination of activities which will enable learners to become motivated and thus participate in the lesson will make them more successful, as well.
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Appendix A

Consent Form

I am a student at Bilkent University MA TEFL Program. I need your help for my thesis which will be submitted as a partial fulfillment of the Master's degree. I would like you to be as accurate as possible since the success of this study depends on your answers. Your answers will be kept confidential, that is they will not be reported in any of the written material, and will not affect your grades.

Thank you for participating in this study.

If you have any questions about the study, you can contact either with the researcher:

Munevver Buyukyazi
MA TEFL Program
Bilkent University
2664070/5272

or the study advisor:

Susan Bosher
Bilkent University
MA TEFL Program
2664390
Appendix B

Educational Background Questionnaire

Read the questions and circle the answers which describe your situation best:

1. Your name and surname:

2. Your age:

3. What kind of a high school did you graduate from?
   a) state high school
   b) vocational high school
   c) Anatolian high school
   d) private school
   e) others (please explain)

4. Approximately how many hours of English a week did you have during secondary school?
   a) Two or less than two hours
   b) 2-4 hours
   c) 4-6 hours
   d) more than 6 hours

5. Approximately how many hours of English a week did you have during high school?
   a) Two or less than two hours
   b) 2-4 hours
   c) 4-6 hours
   d) more than 6 hours
6. What is your attitude towards learning English?
   a) I am very interested
   b) I am not very interested
   c) I am undecided but because of my job I have to
   d) I want to learn English
   e) other (please explain)

7. What do you think you have gained from the English classes you have taken up to now?
   a) only grammar rules
   b) a general introduction to English
   c) I don't find myself proficient in English
   d) I find myself proficient in English
   e) other (please explain)

8. What do you think was missing in the English classes that you have covered up to now?
   a) group and pair-work activities
   b) listening and speaking activities
   c) the lack of audio-visual materials
   d) the method followed by the teacher wasn't appropriate for the class
   e) other (please explain)
9. a) Does any of your family members speak English?
   a) Yes       b) No

If your answer is "YES" to the above question, how do you benefit from them?

   a) I have the chance to practice with them
   b) I ask them about anything I have difficulty in understanding
   c) They do my assignments
   d) I do not benefit from them at all.
Appendix C

Attitude Questionnaire

Read these statements below and circle the number which best describes your situation:

**Scoring key:**
1. strongly disagree
2. disagree
3. neutral
4. agree
5. strongly agree

1. Learning English is really great.
   1 2 3 4 5

2. When I leave school, I shall give up the study of English because I am not interested in it.
   1 2 3 4 5

3. I hate English.
   1 2 3 4 5

4. Learning English is a waste of time.
   1 2 3 4 5

5. I'd rather spend my time on subjects other than English.
   1 2 3 4 5

6. English is an important part of the school program.
   1 2 3 4 5

7. I plan to learn as much English as possible.
   1 2 3 4 5
Scoring key:  
1. strongly disagree  
2. disagree  
3. neutral  
4. agree  
5. strongly agree

8. I love learning English.
   1 2 3 4 5

9. I think that learning English is dull.
   1 2 3 4 5

10. I really enjoy learning English.
    1 2 3 4 5
### Appendix D
#### Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AT VP</th>
<th>VA-VA IA</th>
<th>VP-IA VP</th>
<th>VP-VA VP</th>
<th>VP-VA IA</th>
<th>VA-VA IA</th>
<th>VA-VA IA</th>
<th>VA-VA IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key
- **AT** = At Task
- **OFF** = Off Task
- **VP** = Voluntary Participation
- **IP** = Involuntary Participation
- **VA** = Voluntary Answer
- **IA** = Involuntary Answer
- **SS** = Student to Student Interaction

---

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VA-VA IA</th>
<th>VP-IA VP</th>
<th>VP-VA VP</th>
<th>VP-VA IA</th>
<th>VA-VA IA</th>
<th>VA-VA IA</th>
<th>VA-VA IA</th>
<th>VA-VA IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Motivation Questionnaire

Name: ___________________________  Date: ______________

READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH DESCRIBES YOUR SITUATION BEST:

SCORING KEY: 1. not at all
2. a little
3. some
4. much
5. very much

Today during the lesson I,

1. was interested in the activities. 1 2 3 4 5
2. paid attention to the activities. 1 2 3 4 5
3. felt willing to participate in the activities. 1 2 3 4 5
4. volunteered to participate in the activities. 1 2 3 4 5
5. tried to answer the teacher's questions to myself. 1 2 3 4 5
6. enjoyed the activities. 1 2 3 4 5
7. found the activities useful. 1 2 3 4 5
8. learned a lot. 1 2 3 4 5
9. asked question when I didn't understand 1 2 3 4 5
10. was interested in what my classmates said. 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix F

Achievement Test

Name:
Date:

READING TEST

PART I.

Look through the text carefully and find answers to the following questions:

How easily someone adjusts to losing his sight depends on his own character, and on the help he gets from everyone around him. Of course, the effort he puts into becoming independent is very important and it can be effected by his age and whether or not he has other handicaps like deafness or being in a wheelchair as well. For example, if you are born alive, your idea of the world is made up of touch, sound, taste and smell. If you lose your sight later in life, you can remember what things look like, but it takes time and courage to realize that you can go to work, bring up family, enjoy games and hobbies- the things you used to do when you could see. Of the 130,000 or so blind people in Britain, more than half are 75 or older, an age when it's more difficult to make a new start. One way to imagine what it's to be blind is to think of something you do everyday, and then work out how you would do it if you couldn't see. How would you pour a cup of tea? tell the others time? play a game of football or cards? These things might seem difficult, but with RNIB's liquid level indicator which bleeps when the cup is full, one of our 'tactile'watches that opens so that you can feel the hands, a football that makes a noise and our brailled playing cards with the usual pictures so that you can play with your sighted friends, the problems
Paragraph 1

1. What is the subject of depends on (line 1-2)?
2. What are the objects of depends on (line 1-2)?
3. What is the subject of is very important (line 4)?
4. What does it (line 4) refer back to?
5. Which phrase and clause does and (line 5) join?
6. Which word or phrase does or (line 7) join?

Paragraph 3

What do these clauses describe?

a) which bleeps when the cup is full—...
   (line 20)

b) that opens so that you can feel the hands—...
   (line 21-22)?

c) that makes a noise—...
   (line 22)

d) with the usual pictures so that you can play with your sighted friends—...
   (lines 23-24)

Read the text carefully and then complete the following summary in your own words:

The most important but difficult thing about going blind is learning to.............life without sight. How easily you do this depends on ............... and ............... The speed with which you become independent can be affected by............. and ............... It takes............. and ............... to learn how to continue doing what you did
before you lost your sight. If you are ........
(and........ the blind people in England are seventy-five
and over) it is hard to ...............
First, Mr Eyres says nobody asked the passengers for their views, and quotes his Harris poll in which only a quarter favoured a ban. In fact, we have been conducting polls among passengers for several years. Our typical results have shown more than half of passengers in favor of the ban, about one in three indifferent and only about 15% opposed. The figures are different from Forest's, but we have ourselves produced different results by asking different questions.

Second, our decision was not the result of some sort of health crusade. Our primary aim is simply to make the Underground railway cleaner, more comfortable, and more attractive to passengers. We also could not ignore the safety factor. Our decision was really a rather tentative one: a ban on trains but not on platforms, and no dramatic change on buses. And we have undertaken to review the position next year.

As is so often the case, the middle ground is the most dangerous place to stand when the bullets are flying.

Tony Ridley
Managing Director, LT

DAMAGE: I wonder if Stephen Eyres, who seems to have a great concern for the taxpayer, would be willing to pay for his own medical care when he gets his carcinoma of bronchus or coronary artery disease as a direct result of his smoking, or will he expect the taxpayer to foot the bill so that he can continue with his disgusting and self-destructive habit?

M Carey
Cardiff

DISGRACE: Apart from making no mention of the
recommendation by the Department of Transport's inspector reporting on the Goodge Street fire that smoking should be banned in the tubes, and the inclusion of pure fiction about ASH campaigners turning their attentions to alcohol, there was one omission of which your newspaper should be deeply ashamed.

Was it not verging on the improper, and a gross disservice to your readers, for both you and the author of the piece to fail to admit that his wretched, anti-social organization, Freedom Organization for the Right to Enjoy Smoking Tobacco", is sponsored by the tobacco industry?

David Simpson
Director, ASH

DOOMED: As an active non-smoker I would like to say that in this instance I would agree with the pro-smoker. Dog-fouling on footpaths carries a fine, yet how many times has one seen this enforced? None. How would the smoking ban be enforced? It will be hard for fellow-passengers to object to those who disobey the rule.

Amanda Nicholls
London E17

Choose the best alternative

1. Smokers are now expected to be able to last a short.......without a cigarette.
   a) journey   b) travel   c) trip   d) voyage
2. LT see the ban initially as a kind of.......a) attempt   b) experience   c) experiment   d) test
3. Before the ban was introduced, there was a publicity
campaign to..... the public.
a) advertise  b) announce  c) inform  d) threaten

4. One slogan that was not accepted for the campaign was......your cigarettes at home.
a) Forget  b) Leave  c) Let  d) Miss

5. When asked my passengers suggested......smoking to continue on the platform.
a) allowing  b) it is allowed  c) to allow  d) to be allowed

6. LT turned......the idea of banning smoking on the platform too.
a) back  b) down  c) off  d) out

7. LT will have to create a new type of......as inspectors will be needed to enforce the ban.
a) employment  b) job  c) situation  d) work

8. The writer of Letter 4 thinks the ban will not......
a) achieve  b) manage  c) work  d) win

9. The problem is what to do when someone commits......
a) a crime  b) nuisance  c) an offence  d) a trouble

10. Smoking can cause many health problems,.....to the heart and lungs.
a) in common  b) in fact  c) in particular  d) on purpose

PART III.

Read the paragraph about a typical American teacher. Then write an essay comparing and contrasting the typical American and Turkish teachers. DO NOT use more than 200 words.

A "typical" American teacher today would be a woman in her early forties who had taught for fifteen years, most in her present district. Over those years, she would have returned to her local college or university often enough to acquire enough credits for a master's degree. She would be married and the mother of two children. She would be white and not politically active. Her formal political affiliation, if she had one, would be with the Democratic
Party. She would teach in a suburban elementary school staffed largely by women, although, in all likelihood, the school principal would be a male. She would have about twenty-three pupils in her class. Counting her after-hours responsibilities, she would put in a work week slightly longer than that of the average worker.