

**The Role of Motivation in Foreign Language Writing Proficiency of Dutch Learners of
English**

By Eline van den Brink (4161815)

BA Thesis English Language and Culture

Supervisor and First Reader: Elena Tribushinina

Second reader: dr. Koen Sebregts

7 April 2016

9869 Words



BEOORDELINGSFORMULIER

BACHELOR EINDWERKSTUK

Eerste en tweede beoordelaar vullen het beoordelingsformulier onafhankelijk van elkaar in. Het eindcijfer wordt in onderling overleg bepaald en op het formulier van de begeleider ingevuld, onder het cijfer dat de begeleider zelf gaf. Bij beoordeling met een 6 en 6,5 dient het werkstuk nogmaals beoordeeld te worden door een hoogleraar (Regeling Grensgevallen, zie OER art.5.3). De derde beoordelaar vult een apart formulier in.

De begeleider stelt de student op de hoogte van het eindcijfer en geeft de student feedback namens beide beoordelaars.

De ingevulde en ondertekende beoordelingsformulieren worden gearchiveerd bij het Studiepunt. Graag inleveren of opsturen naar Drift 10, of een scan mailen naar Studiepunt.GW@uu.nl.

Het cijfer moet worden ingevoerd m.b.v Osiris docent, of met een toetsverklaring die bij het Studiepunt wordt afgegeven.

BASISGEGEVENS STUDENT
Naam: Eline van den Brink
Studentnummer: 4161815
Opleiding en major en hoofdrichting (alleen bij LAS en TCS)
Titel eindwerkstuk: The Role of Motivation in Foreign Language Writing Proficiency of Dutch Learners of English
Inleverdatum: 7 April 2016
BASISGEGEVENS BEGELEIDER/1 ^E BEOORDELAAR
Naam
Departement
BASISGEGEVENS 2DE BEOORDELAAR (niet betrokken bij de begeleiding)
Naam
Departement
Betreft oordeel: <input type="checkbox"/> begeleider <input type="checkbox"/> 2 ^{de} beoordelaar

Cijfer door beoordelaar:

Eindcijfer* (eerste en tweede beoordelaar samen):

Datum en handtekening:

FORMELE RANDVOORWAARDEN**

RANDVOORWAARDEN		Commentaar
Verklaring van kennisneming plagiaatregels	<input type="checkbox"/> voldaan <input type="checkbox"/> niet voldaan	
Correct taalgebruik (zinsbouw, spelling, interpunctie)	<input type="checkbox"/> voldaan <input type="checkbox"/> niet voldaan	
Inhoudsopgave en samenvatting	<input type="checkbox"/> voldaan <input type="checkbox"/> niet voldaan	
Annotatie en literatuurlijst volgens de formele regels van het vakgebied	<input type="checkbox"/> voldaan <input type="checkbox"/> niet voldaan	
Vormgeving en afwerking volgens de richtlijnen van de opleiding	<input type="checkbox"/> voldaan <input type="checkbox"/> niet voldaan	

** Indien aan één van deze formele randvoorwaarden niet voldaan is, kan de begeleider/eerste beoordelaar besluiten het werkstuk niet inhoudelijk te beoordelen. De student krijgt een reparatiemogelijkheid. De grensbepaling voldaan/niet voldaan aan de randvoorwaarden ligt bij de opleiding (bijv. aantal taalfouten dat getolereerd wordt).

INHOUDELIJKE BEOORDELING

De beoordelaar geeft per categorie een globaal oordeel dat voorzien wordt van een commentaar waarin duidelijk wordt gemaakt wat de sterke en zwakke punten zijn. Geef bij een onvoldoende nauwkeurig aan wat door de student verbeterd moet worden om een voldoende te behalen.

De onderdelen 1 t/m 7 moeten minimaal met een voldoende worden beoordeeld om tot een voldoende eindcijfer te kunnen komen.

1. PROBLEEMSTELLING	<input type="checkbox"/> onvoldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> voldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> goed
<i>Is de probleemstelling helder geformuleerd? Zijn de deelvragen logisch afgeleid van de hoofdvraag? Is het onderzoek afgebakend en is deze afbakening onderbouwd?</i>			
<u>Commentaar:</u>			

2. WETENSCHAPPELIJKE POSITIONERING	<input type="checkbox"/> onvoldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> voldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> goed
------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Wordt de wetenschappelijke relevantie van het onderzoek duidelijk gemaakt? Is de gebruikte literatuur relevant, representatief en van voldoende wetenschappelijke kwaliteit? Wordt de literatuur adequaat en kritisch besproken?

Commentaar:

3. THEORETISCH KADER

onvoldoende voldoende goed

Sluiten de gekozen theorieën en/of analytische concepten aan bij de onderzoeksvraag? Zijn de centrale concepten/termen duidelijk gedefinieerd?

Commentaar:

4. METHODE

onvoldoende voldoende goed

Is de keuze voor de onderzoeksmethode voldoende verantwoord? Zijn de gebruikte onderzoeksmethoden adequaat om de probleemstelling te beantwoorden? Worden zij op de juiste manier ingezet? Wordt de wijze van gegevensverzameling zorgvuldig beschreven en verantwoord?

Commentaar:

5. ANALYSE

onvoldoende voldoende goed

Wordt de vakkennis voldoende en adequaat ingezet? Is er een goede balans tussen beschrijving en analyse? Is er voldoende terugkoppeling tussen de eigen (empirische) onderzoekresultaten en de literatuur/theorie?

Commentaar:

6. CONCLUSIE onvoldoende voldoende goed

Wordt in de conclusie een antwoord gegeven op de probleemstelling/hoofdvraag? Overstijgt de conclusie het niveau van een samenvatting? Wordt er kritisch gereflecteerd op de eigen aanpak? Worden er suggesties gedaan voor verder onderzoek?

Commentaar:

7. BRONNENGEBRUIK & BRONVERMELDING onvoldoende voldoende goed

Wordt het onderscheid tussen eigen analyse en de analyse van anderen duidelijk aangegeven? Is de bronvermelding adequaat en zorgvuldig? Worden citaten juist ingezet? Wordt er kritisch omgegaan met de literatuur en andere bronnen?

Commentaar:

8. STRUCTUUR VAN HET BETOOG onvoldoende voldoende goed

Wordt de informatie in een logische volgorde gepresenteerd (bijvoorbeeld: inleiding/theoretisch kader, vraagstelling, methode, resultaten, discussie)? Is er een duidelijke hoofdstuk- en alinea-indeling? Is de argumentatie helder en coherent? Zijn paragrafen en alinea's coherent en inhoudelijk goed afgebakend?

Commentaar:

9. LEESBAARHEID & STIJL

onvoldoende voldoende goed

Is het verslag leesbaar en begrijpelijk? Wordt de terminologie uit het vakgebied precies en specifiek gehanteerd?

Commentaar:

10. ZELFSTANDIGHEID (in te vullen door de begeleider) onvoldoende voldoende goed

Werd de feedback zorgvuldig verwerkt? Werden afspraken en deadlines gerespecteerd? Heeft de student veel hulp nodig gehad tijdens het traject? Zo ja, op welke punten (bijv. formulering van de onderzoeksvragen, inkadering in de literatuur, opbouw van het betoog, taal.)

Commentaar:

11. OVERIG

Hier kunt u commentaar geven op aspecten als de innovatieve kwaliteit van het onderzoek, de maatschappelijke relevantie van het eindwerkstuk etc.

SAMENVATTEND OORDEEL

CIJFERVOORSTEL:



VERKLARING KENNISNEMING REGELS M.B.T. PLAGIAAT

Fraude en plagiaat

Wetenschappelijke integriteit vormt de basis van het academisch bedrijf. De Universiteit Utrecht vat iedere vorm van wetenschappelijke misleiding daarom op als een zeer ernstig vergrijp. De Universiteit Utrecht verwacht dat elke student de normen en waarden inzake wetenschappelijke integriteit kent en in acht neemt.

De belangrijkste vormen van misleiding die deze integriteit aantasten zijn fraude en plagiaat. Plagiaat is het overnemen van andermans werk zonder behoorlijke verwijzing en is een vorm van fraude. Hieronder volgt nadere uitleg wat er onder fraude en plagiaat wordt verstaan en een aantal concrete voorbeelden daarvan. Let wel: dit is geen uitputtende lijst!

Bij constatering van fraude of plagiaat kan de examencommissie van de opleiding sancties opleggen. De sterkste sanctie die de examencommissie kan opleggen is het indienen van een verzoek aan het College van Bestuur om een student van de opleiding te laten verwijderen.

Plagiaat

Plagiaat is het overnemen van stukken, gedachten, redeneringen van anderen en deze laten doorgaan voor eigen werk. Je moet altijd nauwkeurig aangeven aan wie ideeën en inzichten zijn ontleend, en voortdurend bedacht zijn op het verschil tussen citeren, parafaseren en plagiëren. Niet alleen bij het gebruik van gedrukte bronnen, maar zeker ook bij het gebruik van informatie die van het internet wordt gehaald, dien je zorgvuldig te werk te gaan bij het vermelden van de informatiebronnen.

De volgende zaken worden in elk geval als plagiaat aangemerkt:

- het knippen en plakken van tekst van digitale bronnen zoals encyclopedieën of digitale tijdschriften zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het knippen en plakken van teksten van het internet zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het overnemen van gedrukt materiaal zoals boeken, tijdschriften of encyclopedieën zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het opnemen van een vertaling van bovengenoemde teksten zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het parafaseren van bovengenoemde teksten zonder (deugdelijke) verwijzing: parafrasen moeten als zodanig gemarkeerd zijn (door de tekst uitdrukkelijk te verbinden met de oorspronkelijke auteur in tekst of noot), zodat niet de indruk wordt gewekt dat het gaat om eigen gedachtengoed van de student;
- het overnemen van beeld-, geluids- of testmateriaal van anderen zonder verwijzing en zodoende laten doorgaan voor eigen werk;

- het zonder bronvermelding opnieuw inleveren van eerder door de student gemaakt eigen werk en dit laten doorgaan voor in het kader van de cursus vervaardigd oorspronkelijk werk, tenzij dit in de cursus of door de docent uitdrukkelijk is toegestaan;
- het overnemen van werk van andere studenten en dit laten doorgaan voor eigen werk. Indien dit gebeurt met toestemming van de andere student is de laatste medeplichtig aan plagiaat;
- ook wanneer in een gezamenlijk werkstuk door een van de auteurs plagiaat wordt gepleegd, zijn de andere auteurs medeplichtig aan plagiaat, indien zij hadden kunnen of moeten weten dat de ander plagiaat pleegde;
- het indienen van werkstukken die verworven zijn van een commerciële instelling (zoals een internetsite met uittreksels of papers) of die al dan niet tegen betaling door iemand anders zijn geschreven.

De plagiaatregels gelden ook voor concepten van papers of (hoofdstukken van) scripties die voor feedback aan een docent worden toegezonden, voorzover de mogelijkheid voor het insturen van concepten en het krijgen van feedback in de cursushandleiding of scriptieregeling is vermeld.



Universiteit Utrecht

In de Onderwijs- en Examenregeling (artikel 5.15) is vastgelegd wat de formele gang van zaken is als er een vermoeden van fraude/plagiaat is, en welke sancties er opgelegd kunnen worden.

Onwetendheid is geen excuus. Je bent verantwoordelijk voor je eigen gedrag. De Universiteit Utrecht gaat ervan uit dat je weet wat fraude en plagiaat zijn. Van haar kant zorgt de Universiteit Utrecht ervoor dat je zo vroeg mogelijk in je opleiding de principes van wetenschapsbeoefening bijgebracht krijgt en op de hoogte wordt gebracht van wat de instelling als fraude en plagiaat beschouwt, zodat je weet aan welke normen je je moeten houden.

Hierbij verklaar ik bovenstaande tekst gelezen en begrepen te hebben.

Naam:

Studentnummer:

Datum en handtekening:

Dit formulier lever je bij je begeleider in als je start met je bacheloreindwerkstuk of je master scriptie. Het niet indienen of ondertekenen van het formulier betekent overigens niet dat er geen sancties kunnen worden genomen als blijkt dat er sprake is van plagiaat in het werkstuk.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	13
2. Theoretical background.....	14
2.1 Conceptualising second language motivation.....	14
2.2 Motivation and second language proficiency.....	17
2.3 Motivation and writing proficiency.....	20
2.4 This study.....	21
3. Research questions and hypotheses.....	22
4. Method.....	24
4.1 Participants.....	25
4.2 Materials.....	25
4.2.1 Writing proficiency task.....	25
4.2.2 Attitude/Motivation questionnaire.....	26
4.3 Procedure and analyses.....	27
4.3.1 Rating and analysis of L2 writing performance.....	28
4.3.2 Rating of the AMTB.....	31
4.3.3 Further analyses.....	32
5. Results.....	33
5.1 English writing proficiency scores.....	33
5.1.1 Vocabulary.....	34
5.1.2 Grammar.....	35
5.1.3 Functional Adequacy.....	36
5.1.4 Overall writing proficiency score.....	36
5.2 Motivational scores.....	37
5.3 Relationships between L2 writing proficiency and motivation.....	39

6. Discussion.....	40
6.1 Differences in L2 writing proficiency and motivation between students from different educational levels.....	40
6.2 Relationships between L2 writing proficiency and dimensions of motivation.....	42
6.2.1 Integrativeness.....	42
6.2.2 Language Anxiety.....	43
6.2.3 Parental Encouragement.....	46
6.2.4 Motivation and its other dimensions.....	46
6.3 Limitations.....	48
7. Conclusion.....	49
8. References.....	50
Appendix A. Writing Task First Class.....	55
Appendix B. Dutch Version of the AMTB.....	56
Appendix C1. Writing Proficiency Rating Scale and Evaluation Criteria.....	66
Appendix C2. Two Rating Examples.....	67

Abstract

This study examined the role of motivation in foreign language writing proficiency. To investigate relationships between various dimensions of motivation and L2 writing proficiency, 150 students from different levels of Dutch secondary education performed an English writing task and filled in a Dutch version of Gardner's (2004) *Attitude/Motivation Test Battery* (AMTB). The results showed a positive relationship between *Integrativeness* and L2 writing proficiency, particularly for the higher levels of secondary education (*havovwo* and *vwo*), and a negative relationship between *Language Anxiety*, especially for *havo* students. Moreover, a negative relationship was found between *Parental Encouragement* and L2 writing performance for both low and high levels of Dutch secondary education.

1. Introduction

In Europe, many educational institutions offer students to learn foreign languages. Within most secondary schools, learning at least one foreign language is part of the compulsory set of courses to broaden a student's linguistic repertoire, and even within primary education, many European countries provide courses of English as a foreign language ("Foreign language learning statistics," 2016). However, second (L2) language and foreign language learners vary greatly, not only in their rate of L2 acquisition but also in their ultimate level of L2 proficiency (Ellis, 2004). Since in both second and foreign language learning situations a language additional to an individual's native language (L1) is learnt, the abbreviation *L2* is used in this paper to indicate both a second language and a foreign language, unless explicitly mentioned otherwise.

Over the last decades, many studies have been dedicated to discovering the factors that influence variation in foreign and second language proficiency. The variables that have been identified as key factors include a student's learning styles and strategies, language aptitude, language anxiety, self-confidence, and motivation and attitudes (Gardner, Tremblay & Masgoret, 1997). The goal of this paper is to examine and refine the role of motivation in foreign language learning, and particularly to investigate the relationship between motivation and writing proficiency in a foreign language. The findings might be relevant to educational institutions that would like to ensure the best possible results of their students in learning another language.

In section 2, the concept of motivation and its various aspects will be discussed. Moreover, studies that have examined motivation in relation to second and foreign language achievement will be addressed with a special focus on Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model of second language acquisition. In addition, studies that have investigated the role of motivation in writing performance will be discussed, which will lead to the research question

of this paper and the formulation of possible outcomes in section 3. In section 4, the materials, procedures, and analyses used in the experiment will be thoroughly explained. In section 5, the results will be shown, and in section 6, the findings and potential limitations of this study will be discussed against the background of previous research, and implications of this study and suggestions for further research will be addressed. A conclusion of this study will be given in section 7.

2. Theoretical background

2.1 Conceptualising second language motivation

According to many researchers, motivation not only initiates language learning, it also plays an important role in long term achievements (cited in Dörnyei, 1998). Moreover, all aspects of L2 learning seem to be influenced by motivation and being highly motivated enables students to compensate for poor language aptitudes and language learning conditions (Dörnyei, 1998). However, motivation is a complex construct consisting of many elements and its precise definition may vary from study to study. Consequently, many researchers have developed theories and models of motivation, including Bandura's (1986) self-efficacy theory, Locke & Latham's (1990) goal setting theory, and Wigfield and Eccles's (2000) expectancy-value theory of motivation.

Similarly, researchers attempt to unravel the complex motivational construct that underlies second and foreign language learning using different methods assessing its various dimensions. One example of an L2 motivational framework is Dörnyei's (2009) L2 Motivational Self System. This model is based on the idea that reducing the differences between a student's current L2 self and his or her desired L2 self serves as the motivational driving force to learn a second language. The L2 Motivational Self System consists of three components: the *Ideal L2 Self*, the *Ought-to L2 Self*, and *L2 Learning Experience*. The *Ideal*

L2 Self refers to the desire of an individual to become someone who speaks a second language. The *Ought-to L2 Self* is concerned with the “attributes” that a student needs to possess to become the *Ideal L2 Self* and to avoid failure (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 29) and the *L2 Learning Experience* involves the influence on motivation resulting from the language learning environment and language learning experience, such as teacher and course evaluations and previous failure or success (Dörnyei, 2009).

Another highly influential theory of L2 motivation is Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model of second language acquisition. Similarly to Dörnyei’s (2009) L2 Motivational Self System, this theory emphasises the role of extrinsic factors, such as the language learning environment, and intrinsic factors, such as adopting features of the target group to become more like a member of that cultural and linguistic community. Gardner (1985) distinguishes between three primary components: *Integrativeness*, *Attitudes toward the Learning Situation*, and *Motivation*. *Integrativeness* refers to the extent to which individuals wish to identify themselves with the other language group (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003). It is a motivational construct that finds its origin in Mowrer’s (1950) model of identification according to which young children are motivated to learn the language of their parents since the acquisition of parental language features could satisfactorily substitute the parents when they are not present (as cited in Gardner, 2005). Therefore, the child learns to make sounds that are similar to those produced by the parents which ultimately leads to the acquisition of many properties of the language spoken by the parents and identification with them (as cited in Gardner, 2005). According to Gardner and Lambert (1972) and their socio-educational approach to second language acquisition (as cited in Gardner, 2005), a similar process takes place in second language learning. They propose that individuals with high levels of integrativeness do not necessarily learn a second language because they wish to fully integrate into the L2 culture and to become actual members of the target language community, but

rather they are willing to adopt certain features of the other cultural/language group. Since linguistic properties, such as vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation, are salient characteristics of another cultural group, an individual's level of integrativeness will affect his or her language learning motivation. Individuals who are interested in the other language community and willing to interact with them, are more motivated to learn their language than individuals who are not (as cited in Gardner, 2005). Moreover, Gardner and Lambert (1972) suggest that integrativeness would be lower in individuals who assign a high value of importance to their own ethnicity than in individuals to whom their own ethnolinguistic heritage plays a smaller role in defining their identity (as cited in Gardner, 2005).

The second component, *Attitudes toward the Learning Situation*, addresses the affective reactions of an individual toward the language learning environment, and the third component, *Motivation*, refers to the student's attitudes and ambitions regarding learning a language and his or her willingness to put energy into learning a foreign or second language (Gardner & MacIntery, 1993).

According to the socio-educational model, *Integrativeness* and *Attitudes toward the Learning Situation* are distinct but correlated concepts that promote an individual's motivation to learn a second language whereas *Motivation* determines second language achievement. In other words, *Motivation* directly influences a student's success in a second language whereas *Integrativeness* and *Attitudes toward the Learning Situation* are indirectly linked to achievement by supporting a student's motivation (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003).

Following Gardner and Lambert (1972), the socio-educational model also distinguishes between two types of motivational orientation, namely *Instrumental Orientation* and *Integrative Orientation*. *Integrative Orientation* is part of *Integrativeness* and involves an individual's desire to identify with the other language community. For instance, an individual might wish to learn English as a second language to meet more English speakers or to feel

more comfortable around them. *Instrumental Orientation*, on the other hand, represents an individual's practical reasons to learn a second language, such as finding a job or being respected by other individuals (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003). However, Masgoret and Gardner (2003) point out that having a certain orientation does not automatically lead to being highly motivated. For example, an individual might be integratively oriented but still have less motivation to learn a second language than someone who is instrumentally oriented, and vice versa.

Other important characteristics of foreign language learning motivation that have been described in research literature on L2 motivation, such as those by Crookes and Schmidt (1991), Dörnyei (1994), and Oxford and Shearin (1994), are personal components, such as the need for achievement and self-efficacy, goal setting, and self-management strategies.

2.2 Motivation and second language proficiency

Since motivation plays an important role in L2 achievement, many studies have been interested in students' responses to motivational constructs and their proficiency levels to investigate the relationship between foreign language achievement and motivation. A meta-analysis by Masgoret and Gardner (2003) that covers 75 studies conducted by Gardner and his associates examined the relationship between second language achievement and the attitudinal/motivational components of Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model of second language acquisition. To assess these components, Gardner developed the *Attitude/Motivation Test Battery* (AMTB), which is also used in the studies included in the meta-analysis by Masgoret and Gardner (2003). The clusters of the AMTB reflect the various types of motivation and orientation of the socio-educational model assessed by multiple subtests. To illustrate, the motivational concept *Integrativeness* is assessed by clusters that measure an individual's openness to a foreign language group and his or her interest in interaction with

members of this group. These clusters are *Attitudes toward the Language Group*, *Interest in Foreign Languages*, and *Integrative Orientation* (Gardner, 2005). *Attitudes Toward the Language Group* contains items that measure, for example, whether an individual would like to become friends with members from the other language group or whether an individual trusts others who are native speakers of the target language. *Interest in Foreign Languages* involves items that measure whether an individual would like to learn many foreign languages or whether an individual would like to meet people who speak foreign languages, and *Integrative Orientation* consists of items that measure the importance that an individual assigns to learning a second/foreign language in order to feel comfortable around people who speak the target language or to meet more people and interact with them (Gardner, 2004).

Additionally, *Instrumentality* is incorporated into the socio-educational model since an individual's practical reasons to learn a second language might also be related to L2 achievement with the dimension *Motivation* mediating this relationship. According to the model, individuals with high levels of integrativeness also tend to have high levels of instrumentality and positive attitudes toward the language learning situation (Gardner, 2005).

Furthermore, some versions of the AMTB include the dimensions *Language Anxiety* and *Parental Encouragement*. As Gardner (2005) points out, anxiety can both have a positive influence on and interfere with second language learning. The latter is particularly the case when an individual is demanded to produce utterances in a second language. Therefore, language anxiety is often believed to have a negative relationship with L2 achievement and the extent to which an individual feels confident about his or her second language abilities. Gardner (2005) indicates that this negative relationship can be interpreted in two ways. First, an individual who experiences high levels of language anxiety might be unable to perform successfully in learning a second language due to interference. Secondly, an individual who is not sufficiently proficient in a second language might reach high levels of anxiety in

situations that require use of the second language.

Parental Encouragement is included to measure the role of the parents in second and foreign language learning. It contains items that measure how a student perceives the encouragement that he or she receives from his or her parents to learn a second language. For example, the items address whether a student's parents highlight the importance of being proficient in a language after formal education or whether they support the student in practicing a foreign or second language (Gardner, 2004). Previous research suggests that students who show more openness to another language community and are interested in binding with members of this community (conceptualised as *Integrativeness*) feel more supported by their parents (as cited in Gardner, 1985).

The findings of the meta-analysis by Masgoret and Gardner (2003) suggest that there is a consistently positive relationship between the motivational/attitudinal variables of the AMTB and second language achievement. Moreover, the cluster *Motivation* seems to correlate more with L2 achievement than the other variables do, followed by *Attitudes toward the Learning Situation* and *Integrativeness*. This is in agreement with the socio-educational model which proposes that *Motivation* directly affects L2 success whereas the other variables indirectly influence L2 achievement. Additionally, the researchers found higher correlations between the motivational components and achievement in second language contexts than in foreign language contexts when grades were used to rate achievement. However, when general proficiency tests and self-ratings were used, the reverse pattern was shown. Furthermore, Papi and Teimouri (2014) studied the relationship between self-reported L2 proficiency and motivation (as defined by Dörnyei's (2009) L2 Motivational Self System) in Iranian learners of English. Even though the least motivated students rated themselves less proficient in English than students with a higher motivation, the researchers failed to find a clear relationship between the students' motivated behaviour and their own ratings of English

proficiency. These and other studies highlight that the method used to assess L2 achievement and motivation seems to determine which variables of L2 motivation correlate with L2 achievement and how high these correlations are (Gardner, Tremblay & Masgoret, 1997; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003).

2.3 Motivation and writing proficiency

Although many studies have examined the relationship between different motivational constructs and L2 proficiency in the broad sense, the relationships between L2 motivation and specific aspects of L2 proficiency, such as L2 writing performance, have been less thoroughly investigated.

With regard to motivation and writing performance in general, many studies show that writing performance can be predicted by self-efficacy (as cited in Troia et al., 2013) and several studies propose that, compared to other motivational variables, self-efficacy pays the largest contribution to writing achievement (as cited in Troia et al., 2013). Self-efficacy refers to the confidence in one's own capabilities and it often serves as a better predictor of human behaviour than what people are actually capable of achieving (Parajes, 2003). Other components of writing motivation that play a role are an individual's interest in a task and the value he or she attributes to performing and achieving a task. Several studies suggest that a great interest in a subject or an activity not only influences the amount of knowledge a student acquires, it also makes it easier for a student to perform a writing task (as cited in Troia et al., 2013). Furthermore, a study by Troia and colleagues (2013) conducted on writing motivation and narrative writing performance of students in elementary, middle, and high school shows that a teacher's rating of a student's writing ability could moderately predict the student's motivation: an increase in writing ability based on the teacher's ratings was associated with an increase in motivation. Moreover, an increase in motivation was related to an increase in

narrative writing.

2.4 This study

Although many researchers agree that motivation plays a key role in (L2) achievement, research conducted on motivation in relation to different aspects of language achievement, such as writing and oral proficiency, is relatively new and it is still unclear how various motivational components are related to these different aspects. Furthermore, even though some studies have examined the relationship between motivation and writing performance, these studies are predominantly based on students' performance in their native language which leaves the role of motivation in foreign language writing proficiency rather unresearched. Therefore, this study is specifically interested in the relationship between motivation and writing proficiency in a foreign language to offer new insights into motivating students to promote their language learning success.

Moreover, to gain a better understanding of the relationship between motivation and foreign language proficiency, it is also important to examine variables that could have a moderating effect on this relationship. For example, most of the studies included in the meta-analysis by Masgoret and Gardner (2003) were conducted in Canada, which is officially a bilingual country, and the availability of a second or foreign language might differ in other language learning environments and therefore have other effects on proficiency. For instance, learning a foreign language (e.g. English) is compulsory in Dutch secondary schools, and often Dutch students learn more than one foreign language during their academic careers. Moreover, English television programmes and films broadcast by Dutch channels are usually provided with subtitles whereas in other countries, such as Germany and France, dubbing of foreign language films and television programmes is more common. Therefore, this study could contribute to the research field of motivation in foreign language learning by

investigating the role of motivation in Dutch learners of English.

3. Research questions and hypotheses

Research question: Is there a relationship between foreign language motivation and writing proficiency for Dutch students learning English in an instructed setting?

Sub question 1. Are there differences in English writing performance and motivational scores between L2 learners from different levels of secondary education?

Hypothesis 1: Generally, between eleven and thirteen years old, Dutch children leave elementary school to enroll in secondary school. The Dutch secondary education system consists of multiple levels varying in degree of difficulty and in the amount of theoretical and practical education that is offered (for a clear overview of these levels, see section 4). In order to select students for these levels, secondary schools consult the advice of a pupil's elementary school teacher which is often based on a student's CITO-test score (students with higher test scores are accepted in higher levels of secondary education) in combination with the student's accomplishments during his or her entire primary school time and an estimation of his or her level of motivation ("Schooladvies," 2010). The CITO-test is similar to an aptitude test and assesses pupils' general knowledge through multiple choice questions about various subjects in which they have been taught during their eight years of primary school, such as (first) language skills.

Importantly, many studies indicate a strong relationship between L1 skills to L2 proficiency (cited in Sparks et al., 2009). A study by Sparks, Patton, Ganschow, and Humbach (2009), for example, followed students for ten years and examined the relationship between first language skills in elementary school and foreign language learning in high school. They found that students' early L1 skills are predictors of L2 learning years later. Moreover, differences in L1 skills were already observable early in elementary school which

might explain individual differences in L2 learning as well. Particularly, the study by Sparks et al. (2009) and other studies support cross-linguistic transfer of L1 decoding and spelling skills to L2 spelling and decoding in the long-term, at least for languages that are orthographically similar.

Therefore, it would be expected that students with who entered higher levels of secondary education (*vwo*) would generally be more proficient in certain subjects than students from lower levels (*vmbo*). Specifically, Dutch *vwo* students might be more proficient in English as a foreign language than Dutch *vmbo* students (*vmbo*). However, most Dutch students are first exposed to English language learning during the last two years of elementary school. Since elementary schools do not distinguish between various levels of education, each student must have been taught in English more or less similarly; at least students from the same elementary school should have learnt English as a foreign language in a comparable way. Therefore, it might be the case students from different levels of secondary education do not differ tremendously in English proficiency during their first year of Dutch secondary school.

Little research has been conducted on differences in motivational scores between individuals from different levels of secondary education. However, some Dutch studies show that the level of motivation is lowest in students that receive pre-vocational secondary education (*vmbo*), especially within students from low socio-economic backgrounds (Van der Veen & Peetsma, 2009). Moreover, according to a study by Peetsma (1996) on general motivation in Dutch secondary school, *vmbo* students often have low levels of self-efficacy and experience high levels of fear of failure (as cited in Nuland, 1996). This suggests that *vmbo* students might also score high on motivational dimensions related to anxiety and low on self-efficacy in foreign language learning. However, I expect that there are also anxious students among the higher levels of secondary education. Moreover, VOCL (Voortgezet

Onderwijs Cohort Leerlingen) studies (as cited in Michels, 2006) showed that *vwo* students seem to be more confident about their capabilities than *havo* students whereas *havo* students tend to be more encouraged by their parents than *vwo* students. In addition, the studies showed no differences in fear of failure levels between these groups (as cited in Michels, 2006).

Sub question 2. Is there a relationship between the multiple dimensions of L2 motivation and writing proficiency as measured by vocabulary, grammar, and functional adequacy? Are certain dimensions of L2 motivation more related to writing proficiency in a foreign language than other dimensions of L2 motivation?

Hypothesis 2: Since many previous studies have shown that motivation largely contributes to L2 achievement, I expect that there will a positive relationship between L2 proficiency and L2 motivation in this study as well. Based on the meta-analysis by Masgoret and Gardner (2003), it is expected that higher correlations will be found between the students' writing performance in a foreign language and their scores on the motivational constructs that measure an individual's motivational intensity, desire to learn the language, and attitudes toward learning English (which is conceptualised as the cluster *Motivation* in the AMTB), compared to other motivational constructs since *Motivation* is believed to have a direct effect on L2 proficiency, according to the socio-educational model. Furthermore, there might be a relation between L2 proficiency and motivational constructs that measure foreign language anxiety. However, since studies disagree about the direction of this relationship, it could either have a positive or a negative effect on L2 proficiency (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989).

4. Method

This study will use data from a PhD research by Leslie Pigott (in preparation) who examines the effects of delaying the explicit focus on form in foreign language acquisition by young

Dutch adolescents. The precise goals and methods of her study are not relevant for this study, and therefore, only relevant methodological information with respect to this study will be described.

4.1 Participants

All participants went to the same school but they differed in levels of formal secondary education. In the Netherlands, secondary school consists of various levels that prepare students differently for further education. For example, *vmbo* prepares students for vocational education, *havo* prepares students for higher professional education, and *vwo* students receive education that will prepare them for university studies (“Senior general secondary education (HAVO) and pre university education (VWO),” n.d.). Other levels of education that are included in this study are *vmbo-havo* and *havo-vwo* which are combinations of levels.

Due to illness or other reasons, not all students were able to take the writing task or to fill in the AMTB: 240 Dutch L2 learners of English performed the writing task and 153 students completed the AMTB. Further analysis showed that 150 students both filled in the questionnaire and performed the writing proficiency task. This group of participants consisted of 16 *vmbo* students, 30 *havovwo* students, 18 *havo* students, 29 *havovwo* students, and 57 *vwo* students between eleven and thirteen years old. The data of these 150 participants are examined in this study.

4.2 Materials

4.2.1 Writing proficiency task

In Pigott’s study, levels of English writing proficiency were assessed using a writing task. In this task, the students were instructed to write an informal letter to their pen friend and they were asked to describe where they live and what their bedrooms look like (see Appendix A).

Subsequently, various aspects of the students' writing performance, such as the use of vocabulary and grammar in the letter, in addition to the functional adequacy of the letter were rated using a five-point scale. The rating of these elements will be explained further below.

4.2.2 Attitude/Motivation questionnaire

In addition, the foreign language motivation of the same students was measured using a Dutch translation of Gardner's (2004) *Attitude/Motivation Test Battery* (AMTB). This questionnaire consists of 104 six-point Likert scale statements to measure the various motivational aspects of the socio-educational model, and thirteen seven-point Likert items that serve as control statements to examine whether the students did not just randomly choose a point of the Likert scale. The AMTB that is used in this study consists of eleven subtests and their corresponding items that assess the various motivational/attitudinal dimensions of Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model discussed in section 2: *Integrativeness* (measured by Integrative orientation, Attitudes toward English speaking people, and Interest in foreign languages), *Attitudes toward the Learning Situation* (measured by English teacher evaluation and English course evaluation), *Motivation* (measured by Motivational intensity, Desire to learn English, and Attitudes toward learning English), *Language Anxiety* (measured by Language class anxiety and Language use anxiety), *Instrumentality* (measured by Instrumental orientation), and *Parental Encouragement*. The participants can respond to the statements of the AMTB using a six-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. To illustrate (Gardner, 2004):

9. I have a strong desire to know all aspects of English.

Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree

The participants were instructed to choose the alternative that corresponds best to their feelings. For an overview of the items of the Dutch AMTB and their corresponding clusters used in this study, see Appendix B. The cluster English Teacher Evaluation was excluded from the AMTB used in this study. This cluster consists of items that assess an individual's opinion of his or her foreign language teacher, such as whether the teacher is an inspiration to the student or whether the teacher is able to interest a student in learning a foreign language (Gardner, 2004). However, many English teachers were involved in Pigott's research project and she did not wish for them to be offended by any of the results. Therefore, it was decided to exclude the cluster from the current study.

4.3 Procedure and analyses

The data of the writing task and the questionnaire were gathered by English teachers of the Dutch secondary school. The parents of the students received a form of consent in which they were informed that their children would take certain tests. The tests were part of the school curriculum, but the parents could raise objections if they were against sharing the anonymised test scores with the University of Utrecht. The examination of the students' writing performance took place at the start of the first school year of Dutch secondary school. The students were instructed to fill in the AMTB just before the Christmas break of the second year of secondary school.

As part of my student assistantship, the writing tests were digitalised and anonymised into a Word file organised per class. To make the writing tests anonymous, each student name was removed and substituted by a code which consisted of the individual student number multiplied by 1512 and then divided by 100. Moreover, the scores of the writing task and the AMTB questionnaire were anonymized and organised in an Excel file. In this Excel file, the items of the AMTB with their corresponding scores were ordered according to which cluster

they belong to, so that items of each cluster appear next to each other in the file. Most items of the AMTB are positive statements, however, several statements are negatively formulated. To easily measure construct validity and to correlate motivational constructs with English writing proficiency, each score on a negative item was converted to a positive score, such that a score of 1 becomes a 6, and vice versa.

4.3.1 Rating and analysis of L2 writing performance

The students' writing performance was rated by two raters based on a five-point rating scale that focuses on the vocabulary and grammar used in the letter, and the functional adequacy of the letter. The scale on which each component of L2 writing proficiency was rated was developed by Piggott (in preparation) for beginner and intermediate young adolescents. The rating scale was based on various scales that include the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) which is explained further below, the Student Oral Proficiency Assessment (SOPA) rating grid, and the Cambridge English Scale which was developed to complement the CEFR ("The Cambridge English Scale," 2016), in addition to observations with respect to L2 writing by Verspoor, Schmid, and Xu (2012). Piggott's rating scale reflects proficiency levels that are used by the CEFR to describe what a foreign language learner is required to produce according to a particular L2 proficiency level (defined by *can do-descriptors*) ("Wat is het ERK?," n.d.). The CEFR distinguishes six levels of proficiency: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2. There are also three plus levels, which are A2+, B1+, and B2+. A1 refers to the lowest level of L2 proficiency whereas C2 indicates that the student performs near-native like in the foreign language. Moreover, the CEFR distinguishes five language skills: listening, reading, speaking (producing L2 speech), interacting (having L2 conversations), and writing and the CEFR specifies at which level students are expected to perform in a foreign language once they graduate from secondary

school, according to the level of education they received (“Wat is het ERK?,” n.d.). For example, *vwo* students are expected to perform English writing tasks at a B2 level when they graduate from secondary school (“Welk ERK-niveau voor vwo?,” n.d.). However, since the participants of this study performed the English writing proficiency task during their first year of secondary education, the participants will most likely perform at a lower level than the CEFR specifies for graduating students. Therefore, the writing rating scale used in this study ranges from the L2 proficiency level A1 to B1. The scale consists of five points and each point reflects a level as defined by the CEFR: point one refers to the A1 level, point two corresponds to the A1+ level, point three indicates level A2, point four reflects level A2+, and five points are attributed to a student whose English writing task corresponds to a B1 level.

This rating scale is used to rate three aspects of English writing proficiency, namely vocabulary, grammar, and functional adequacy. *Vocabulary* is rated based on whether a student uses complex and sophisticated words, whether he or she combines English with words from the native language and whether phrases and chunks occur in the written text. To measure *Grammar*, the raters take a closer look at the sentence structures and examine whether a student only uses simple and short sentences or whether a student is able to produce longer and more complex (e.g. including forms of coordination and subordination) structures. Finally, the *Functional Adequacy* of the letter is established based on whether the student met the expectations of the task and whether he or she was able to communicate a comprehensible message. For a detailed overview of the English writing proficiency rating scale and its evaluation criteria, see Appendix C1. Furthermore, as an illustration, rating examples of a proficient and a less proficient student are included in Appendix C2.

Each English writing proficiency task was rated by two different raters (teacher and researcher). Initially, the students’ writing performance was rated by their regular English teacher, and five different teachers rated the writing tasks of ten English classes in total,

which means that several teachers rated the writing tasks of more than one class. However, since these ratings might be biased based on, for example, a student's behaviour in class, the students' writing performance was rated by the author of this study as well based on the same rating scale and evaluation criteria. To investigate the agreement between the two raters and whether mean writing proficiency scores based on the two ratings could be used for further analysis, the interrater reliability between the two raters was measured using SPSS 23.

Firstly, Pearson's correlation coefficients for the two ratings of each writing proficiency aspect (vocabulary, grammar, and functional adequacy) were calculated. Subsequently, since all writing tasks were rated by two raters, these correlation coefficients were inserted into the Spearman-Brown formula to create the interrater reliability between the two raters. Table 1 shows the outcomes of the reliability test and demonstrates that all values are above 0.7, which indicates that the ratings are reliable. For vocabulary, the interrater reliability varies from a minimum of .730 to a maximum of .881 with a mean of .828. With respect to grammar, the interrater reliability varies from .767 to .919 with a mean of .858. Additionally, the interrater reliability for functional adequacy ranges from .711 to .928 with a mean of .835. Since all ratings have acceptable levels of reliability, the mean scores of the two ratings per student will be used as a measure of a student's English writing proficiency.

Table 1. *Interrater Reliability of Raters (Teacher (T) and Researcher (R)) for Vocabulary, Grammar, and Functional Adequacy*

Raters	N	Vocabulary		Grammar		Functional Adequacy	
		Pearson's <i>r</i>	Interrater reliability	Pearson's <i>r</i>	Interrater reliability	Pearson's <i>r</i>	Interrater reliability
T 1 + R	23	.661**	.796	.809**	.894	.854**	.921
T 2 + R	48	.745**	.854	.723**	.839	.551**	.711
T 3 + R	29	.788**	.881	.850**	.919	.866**	.928
T 4 + R	27	.781**	.877	.775**	.873	.775**	.873
T 5 + R	23	.575**	.730	.622**	.767	.589**	.741

** Sig. at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

4.3.2 Rating of the AMTB

Since the version of the AMTB used in this study is a translated version of Gardner's (1985) original AMTB, it is important to test the homogeneity of the items for each motivational scale of the AMTB to find out whether the Dutch items assess the same motivational construct as well. The internal consistency of the items within each dimension of the Dutch version of the AMTB were measured in SPSS 23 using Cronbach's alfa.

Since not all participants responded to all items of the AMTB, some data were excluded. Table 2 shows the internal consistency per motivational/attitudinal dimension. The reliability analysis indicates that all dimensions are internally consistent, except for *Instrumentality*. However, the reliability coefficient reaches an acceptable level of .712 if item 79 would be removed. Therefore, this item be will excluded from further analysis.

Table 2. *Internal consistency reliability of the Dutch translation of the AMTB*

Dimension	N	Reliability coefficient
Integrativeness	113	.867
Attitudes toward the learning situation	138	.872
Motivation	130	.912
Language Anxiety	130	.941
Instrumentality	141	.610
Parental Encouragement	131	.823

Note. If item 79 is deleted from *Instrumentality*, Cronbach's alfa will increase to .712.

Since the interrater reliability test results showed that there is an acceptably high agreement between the raters, mean scores of the ratings by the two raters were computed for each writing proficiency aspect. Additionally, overall writing proficiency scores were calculated which consist of the sum of the mean *Vocabulary*, *Grammar*, and *Functional Adequacy* scores. Moreover, since the internal consistency reliability test results show that the scales of the Dutch AMTB are internally consistent (with the exclusion of item 79 from *Instrumentality*), scores on the various motivational scales can be used for further analysis, such as for measuring the relationship between writing proficiency and types of motivation using correlations.

4.3.3 Further analyses

To test the hypotheses of this study, the data were analysed in SPSS 23. First, differences in English writing proficiency and ratings of the AMTB between groups from different

educational levels were investigated using a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Bonferroni post-hoc tests. Finally, Pearson's correlations between the motivational clusters of the AMTB and L2 writing proficiency were calculated. Since correlations between the different aspects of L2 writing proficiency were high, as shown in table 3, only the overall English writing proficiency score was used to investigate the relationship between L2 writing performance and motivation. Moreover, differences in correlations between motivation and the overall L2 writing proficiency score for learners from different educational levels were examined.

Table 3. *Pearson's correlations between Vocabulary, Grammar, and Functional Adequacy mean scores*

	Vocabulary	Grammar	Functional Adequacy
Vocabulary	1	.754***	.841***
Grammar	.754***	1	.778***
Functional Adequacy	.841***	.778***	1

Note. Sig. (two-tailed)

*** $p < .001$

5. Results

5.1 English writing proficiency scores

To examine differences in English writing proficiency between L2 learners from different levels of secondary education, a One-Way ANOVA and Bonferroni post-hoc tests with a significance level of .05 were run in SPSS 23. The mean writing proficiency scores for each level of education and the corresponding standard deviations are shown in table 4.

Table 4. *English writing proficiency of L2 learners from different levels of secondary education based on Vocabulary, Grammar, Functional Adequacy, and overall writing proficiency*

	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Vocabulary			
vmbo	16	2.09	.55
vmbohavo	30	2.68	.68
havo	18	2.94	.68
havovwo	29	3.45	.66
vwo	57	3.60	.72
<i>Total</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>3.15</i>	<i>.84</i>
Grammar			
vmbo	16	2.00	.48
vmbohavo	30	2.30	.73
havo	18	2.58	.58
havovwo	29	3.14	.80
vwo	57	3.08	.90
<i>Total</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>2.67</i>	<i>.87</i>
Functional Adequacy			
vmbo	16	2.38	.50
vmbohavo	30	2.70	.69
havo	18	3.22	.49
havovwo	29	3.34	.80
vwo	57	3.82	.69
<i>Total</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>3.28</i>	<i>.85</i>
Overall writing proficiency score			
vmbo	16	6.47	1.27
vmbohavo	30	7.68	1.92
havo	18	8.75	1.54
havovwo	29	9.93	2.06
vwo	57	10.50	2.10
<i>Total</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>9.19</i>	<i>2.38</i>

5.1.1 Vocabulary

Regarding Vocabulary, a One-Way ANOVA $F(4,145) = 21.247$, $p = .000$ indicated statistically significant differences between groups. A Bonferroni post-hoc test showed that *vmbo* students scored significantly lower than *havo* students ($p = .004$), *havovwo* students ($p = .000$), and *vwo* students ($p = .000$). The group did not differ significantly from the *vmbohavo*

group ($p = .057$). The *vmbohavo* students did not perform differently from the *havo* students ($p = 1.000$) on Vocabulary. However, *vmbohavo* students were rated significantly lower than *havovwo* ($p = .000$) and *vwo* ($p = .000$) students. *Havo* students scored significantly higher than *vmbo* students ($p = .004$), but significantly lower than *vwo* students ($p = .005$). Beside no different performance on Vocabulary compared the *vmbohavo* group ($p = 1.000$), the *havo* group also did not differ from the *havovwo* group ($p = .144$). Similarly, the *havovwo* group did not perform differently from the *vwo* group ($p = 1.000$). However, *vwo* students performed significantly better than the other groups (minus *havovwo*) on Vocabulary.

5.1.2 Grammar

Moreover, statistically significant differences between the groups were found in Grammar performance as determined by a One-Way ANOVA ($F(4,145) = 10.838, p = .000$). A Bonferroni post-hoc test revealed that the *vmbo* group performed significantly worse than the *havovwo* group ($p = .000$) and the *vwo* group ($p = .000$). However, the group did perform significantly differently from the *vmbohavo* ($p = 1.000$) and *havo* ($p = .302$) groups. The *vmbohavo* students, on the other hand, scored significantly lower than the *havovwo* ($p = .001$) and *vwo* ($p = .000$) students, but the group performance did not significantly differ from the grammar performance of the *vmbo* ($p = 1.000$) and *havo* ($p = 1.000$) groups. Particularly, the *havo* group did not differ from all other groups. The grammar proficiency of *havovwo* students was rated significantly higher compared to *vmbo* students ($p = .000$) and *vmbohavo* students ($p = .001$), but did not differ significantly from *havo* ($p = .185$) and *vwo* ($p = 1.000$) students. Lastly, *vwo* students performed significantly better than *vmbo* ($p = .000$) and *vmbohavo* ($p = .000$) students, but they did not perform differently from the *havo* ($p = .195$) and *havovwo* ($p = 1.000$) group.

5.1.3 Functional Adequacy

With respect to the Functional Adequacy component, the groups also performed significantly different from each other as determined by a One-Way ANOVA ($F(4,145) = 21.972, p = .000$). A Bonferroni post-hoc test demonstrated that *vwo* students scored significantly higher compared to all other groups. *Havovwo* students scored significantly higher than *vmbo* students ($p = .000$) and *vmbohavo* students ($p = .004$), but they did not perform differently from *havo* students ($p = 1.000$). *Havo* students performed significantly better than *vmbo* students as well ($p = .004$). However, beside no differences from the *havovwo* group ($p = 1.000$), the *havo* group did not significantly differ from the *vmbohavo* group ($p = .107$). Additionally, the *vmbohavo* group's performance on Functional Adequacy did not differ significantly from the performance of the *vmbo* group ($p = 1.000$). Compared to the other groups (minus *vmbohavo*), *vmbo* students were significantly rated the lowest.

5.1.4 Overall writing proficiency score

Statistically significant differences between secondary education groups were found as determined by a One-Way ANOVA ($F(4,145) = 20.510, p = .000$) with respect to overall English writing proficiency scores as defined by the sum of a student's Vocabulary, Grammar, and Functional Adequacy scores. A Bonferroni post-hoc test showed that *vmbo* students scored significantly lower on the writing task compared to *havo* students ($p = .007$), *havovwo* students ($p = .000$), and *vwo* students ($p = .000$). The group did not significantly differ from *vmbohavo* ($p = .433$). The *vmbohavo* students, in turn, scored significantly lower than *havovwo* students ($p = .000$) and *vwo* students ($p = .000$), but did not differ significantly from the *havo* group ($p = .650$). *Havo* students performed significantly better on the English writing task compared to *vmbo* students ($p = .007$). In contrast, they performed significantly worse than *vwo* students ($p = .010$). The group did not differ significantly from the *vmbohavo*

($p = .650$) and *havovwo* ($p = .426$) groups. Students from *havovwo* scored significantly higher compared to students from *vmbo* ($p = .000$) and *vmbohavo* ($p = .000$), but did not differ significantly from the *havo* ($p = .426$) and *vwo* ($p = 1.000$) groups. Finally, the *vwo* students were rated significantly higher than the *vmbo* students ($p = .000$), the *vmbohavo* students ($p = .000$), and the *havo* students ($p = .010$). However, the *vwo* group did not differ significantly from the *havovwo* group ($p = 1.000$).

5.2 Motivational scores

The mean AMTB ratings per dimension and corresponding standard deviations are shown in table 5. There was a statistically significant difference between group responses to the dimension *Attitudes toward the Learning Situation* (assessed by English course evaluation) as determined by a One-Way ANOVA ($F(4,145) = 3.370$, $p = .006$). A Bonferroni post-hoc test revealed that *vmbohavo* students rated *Attitudes toward the Learning Situation* significantly higher than *vwo* students ($p = .05$). There were no statistically differences between the other groups. Additionally, no statistically significant differences between groups were found on other motivational/attitudinal dimension of the AMTB.

Table 5. Mean AMTB rating results and standard deviations of L2 learners from different secondary education levels

	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Integrativeness			
vmbo	16	4.13	.55
vmbohavo	30	4.00	1.02
havo	18	3.95	.74
havovwo	29	4.22	.69
vwo	57	4.14	.68
<i>Total</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>4.10</i>	<i>.75</i>
Attitudes toward the Learning Situation			
vmbo	16	3.62	.86
vmbohavo	30	4.11	1.06
havo	18	3.79	1.00
havovwo	29	3.57	.97
vwo	57	3.24	1.10
<i>Total</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>3.58</i>	<i>1.07</i>
Motivation			
vmbo	16	4.15	.66
vmbohavo	30	4.20	.79
havo	18	4.26	.82
havovwo	29	4.00	.67
vwo	57	4.06	.77
<i>Total</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>4.11</i>	<i>.75</i>
Language Anxiety			
vmbo	16	3.38	.90
vmbohavo	30	2.82	.88
havo	18	2.90	1.26
havovwo	29	3.11	1.02
vwo	57	3.08	1.21
<i>Total</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>3.04</i>	<i>1.09</i>
Instrumentality			
vmbo	16	4.46	.91
vmbohavo	30	4.63	1.06
havo	18	5.11	.85
havovwo	29	4.97	.69
vwo	57	4.64	.78
<i>Total</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>4.74</i>	<i>.86</i>
Parental Encouragement			
vmbo	16	4.41	.55
vmbohavo	30	3.94	.92
havo	18	4.31	.81
havovwo	29	4.22	1.13
vwo	57	4.09	.98
<i>Total</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>4.15</i>	<i>.95</i>

5.3 Relationships between L2 writing proficiency and motivation

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed to examine the relationship between English writing proficiency and motivation as defined by Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model. In table 6, Pearson's correlations between the overall writing proficiency score and the motivational/attitudinal dimensions of the AMTB are shown for each level of secondary education.

Table 6. Pearson's correlations between the motivational/attitudinal dimensions of the AMTB and the overall L2 writing proficiency score

	Overall L2 writing proficiency score					
	<i>vmbo</i>	<i>vmbohavo</i>	<i>havo</i>	<i>havovwo</i>	<i>vwo</i>	<i>All</i>
Integrativeness	-.034	.243	.083	.435*	.281*	.241**
Attitudes toward the						
Learning Situation	.225	.302	.279	.230	.038	-.017
Motivation	-.032	.165	-.311	.199	.065	.002
Language Anxiety	-.004	-.300	-.599*	-.133	-.257	-.199*
Instrumentality	-.169	.071	-.294	.128	.078	.061
Parental						
Encouragement	-.518*	-.137	-.451	-.016	-.286*	-.179*

Note. Sig. (two-tailed)

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

As is shown in table 6, statistically significant correlations between the participants' English writing proficiency and their responses to the motivation types of the AMTB were found for *Integrativeness*, *Language Anxiety*, and *Parental Encouragement*. Firstly, the results show

that the responses of *havovwo* and *vwo* students to *Integrativeness* are positively correlated with their English writing proficiency (*havovwo*: $r = .435$, $n = 29$, $p = .018$; *vwo*: $r = .281$, $n = 57$, $p = .034$). This resulted in a significant positive relationship between *Integrativeness* and English writing proficiency when all groups were taken into account ($r = .241$, $n = 150$, $p = .003$). In contrast, *Language Anxiety* was negatively related to English writing proficiency ($r = -.199$, $n = 150$, $p = .014$), particularly for the *havo* group ($r = -.599$, $n = 18$, $p = .016$).

Similarly, the students' ratings of the dimension *Parental Encouragement* was negatively correlated with their English writing performance ($r = -.179$, $n = 149$, $p = .029$). This was especially the case for the *vmbo* group ($r = -.518$, $n = 16$, $p = .040$) and the *vwo* group ($r = -.286$, $n = 57$, $p = .044$). There were no statistically significant correlations found between English writing proficiency and other motivational/attitudinal dimensions assessed by the AMTB.

6. Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate whether foreign language motivation is related to L2 writing proficiency, especially for Dutch learners of English. As noted in section two, motivation is a multifaceted construct that can be conceptualised in many ways. This study examined attitudes and motivation with respect to foreign language learning from Gardner's (1985) socio-educational perspective. In order to examine this, two sub questions were composed.

6.1 Differences in L2 writing proficiency and motivation between students from different educational levels

The first sub question addressed in this paper is whether there are any differences in English writing performance and motivational ratings between L2 learners from different levels of

Dutch secondary education. I expected that, on the writing task, students who attend pre-university education (*vwo*) would outperform students who attend pre-vocational education (*vmbo*) since their level of education is (partly) based on their CITO-test score. Moreover, research has provided evidence that in the long-term L1 skills, such as spelling and word decoding, may transfer to L2 learning (Sparks et al., 2009). This study illustrates that students from higher educational levels indeed score better on L2 writing proficiency than the lower level students. However, the differences between the groups might be relatively small. For instance, *vwo* students did not differ significantly from *havo/vwo* students and these, in turn, did not perform differently from *havo* students on the English writing test. Still, the *vwo* group outperformed the *havo*, *vmbohavo*, and *vmbo* groups on L2 writing proficiency. Importantly, spelling was not included as an aspect of L2 writing proficiency, even though L2 writing performance could partially be predicted by this language skill in the L1 (Sparks et al., 2009). Therefore, it might be relevant for further research to take this aspect into account to refine the relationship between motivation and L2 writing proficiency.

Furthermore, a study by Wolfersberger (2003) that might be worth noting here examined transfer of L1 writing processes and strategies to L2 writing among Japanese learners of English. His results suggest that L1 writing strategies could transfer to L2 writing processes, but less proficient writers might experience difficulties in fully using these L1 strategies in the L2 writing process. Whether this also applies to Dutch learners of English (or to learners in general whose L1 and L2 are relatively similar) needs to be further investigated.

Moreover, since this study did not take into account the students' CITO-test score, it would be interesting to investigate whether there is indeed a strong relationship between the CITO-test score and L2 proficiency in secondary school for Dutch students.

With respect to differences in AMTB ratings, the results only show a statistically significant difference in ratings of *Attitudes toward the Learning Situation* between *vmbohavo*

and *vwo* students. *Vmbohavo* students rated the dimension higher than *vwo* students ($p = .05$). The dimension *Attitudes toward the Learning Situation* consists of teacher and course evaluations, but only course evaluations have been included in the current study. Therefore, the finding suggests that *vmbohavo* students have more positive attitudes toward their English course than *vwo* students. One explanation could be that the course material used for *vmbohavo* students corresponds better to their interests and levels of aptitude.

6.2 Relationships between L2 writing proficiency and dimensions of L2 motivation

The second sub question addressed in this paper is whether there is a relationship between the various dimensions of L2 motivation (as defined by Gardner's (1985) motivational framework) and the different aspects of L2 writing proficiency (e.g. vocabulary, grammar, and functional adequacy), and whether certain dimensions of L2 motivation are more related to writing proficiency in a foreign language than other dimensions of L2 motivation. The findings of this study suggests that L2 writing performance is indeed related to motivation. However, not all aspects of motivation seem to be strongly associated with writing performance: statistically significant relationships were only found between English writing proficiency on the one hand, and the dimensions *Integrativeness*, *Language Anxiety*, and *Parental Encouragement* on the other hand.

6.2.1 Integrativeness

Firstly, the results reveal a positive relationship between writing proficiency and *Integrativeness*. As pointed out earlier in section 2, *Integrativeness* refers to an individual's openness to new cultures and a desire to identify him or herself with another cultural and linguistic group by adopting certain features that characterize this group (Gardner, 2005). Therefore, the results suggest that students who are open to interact and identify themselves

with the target language group are likely to perform well on writing in that particular language. Interestingly, this positive relationship seems to apply specifically to students from higher levels of secondary education (e.g. *havovwo* and *vwo* students). How could this finding be explained?

First of all, since lower levels of secondary education are more focused on practical rather than theoretical education, it might be the case that students from these levels are more motivated to learn a foreign language for practical reasons, even though analyses did not reveal any differences in instrumental orientation between lower and higher level groups. In contrast, higher levels of secondary education often provide students with a broader perspective on phenomena by providing theories behind these phenomena. Perhaps, students that attend these levels may also be more interested in and more open to new experiences and views in general, which may be reflected by higher levels of integrativeness in language learning as well.

More importantly, it is rather difficult to give a clear definition of the English speaking group and its features. Nowadays, English is a language spoken by individuals from all over the world with diverse cultural backgrounds which suggests that English is not associated with a certain group of individuals or a particular culture anymore. Therefore, integrativeness might not play an essential role in learning a language, such as English, which does not have salient cultural features, or even clear linguistic features since there exist many varieties of English.

6.2.2 *Language Anxiety*

Secondly, the findings illustrate a negative relationship between English writing proficiency and *Language Anxiety* which suggests that students with high levels of L2 anxiety are likely to show poor L2 writing performance either because high levels of anxiety interfere with a

student's writing performance in a foreign language or because students might reach high levels of anxiety due to feeling unable to perform successfully in L2 writing (Gardner, 2005), regardless of type of education.

Several studies have demonstrated significant correlations between L2 class anxiety and course grades, and the significant negative correlations between various aspects of L2 writing proficiency and language anxiety found in this study support these earlier findings. In the current study, these correlations were specifically strong for the *havo* group, but not for all groups and not for all aspects of L2 proficiency. One reason for this could be that relationship between foreign language anxiety and L2 proficiency was not sufficiently strong yet to be significant since the students were only in the first grade of secondary school at the time that the L2 writing test was taken. A study by Gardner, Smythe, Clément, & Glikzman (1976), for example, found that the relation between language anxiety and L2 proficiency seems to increase in strength as students continue their academic career (as cited in MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989). Another explanation could be that the *Language Anxiety* dimension of the AMTB is not the best instrument to assess foreign language anxiety. According to Phillips (1992), students might differ in levels of language anxiety based on their age, teaching strategies and methods, their level of L2 proficiency, the L2 skill that is assessed, and the particular foreign language. Moreover, some researchers emphasise the distinction between trait anxiety (some individuals might have high levels of anxiety in any situation) and state (situation-specific) anxiety (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989; Yamashiro & McLaughlin, 2001). According to MacIntyre and Gardner (1989), it is particularly anxiety related to a foreign language that causes poor L2 performance. In addition, a study by Lalonde and Gardner (1984) shows that between situational anxiety and L2 achievement is rather complex. They found that self-confidence in an L2 (i.e. French) mediates both motivation and situational anxiety in a way that self-confidence indirectly affects L2 achievement. Moreover, Lalonde

and Gardner (1984) argue that high levels of motivation could reduce anxiety: highly motivated students feel less anxious about their level of L2 proficiency which makes them more self-confident. In relation to this, it would be interesting to include L2 self-ratings in research on motivation and L2 proficiency as well to investigate how these variables are connected to each other.

Furthermore, Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) distinguish three types of foreign language anxiety, namely *communication apprehension* (which refers to the anxiety that students experience when they are unable to communicate their thoughts due to a low L2 proficiency), *fear of negative social evaluation* (which refers to individuals being anxious about not making a decent social impression because they feel uncertain about themselves and their L2 production), and *test anxiety* (which refers to anxiety of being academically evaluated) (as cited in MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989). According to MacIntyre and Gardner (1989), *test anxiety* is more related to general anxiety than situational anxiety, and *test anxiety* seems to be both positively and negatively correlated with L2 course grades. In contrast, the *Language Anxiety* dimension of the AMTB only distinguishes between situation-specific anxiety (Language Class Anxiety) and anxiety related to foreign language use in a more general context (Language Use Anxiety) (Gardner, 2004). Hence, it seems that the complexity of language anxiety and its role in motivation and language proficiency is rather under-exposed in the AMTB since it only assesses one side of the multifaceted concept, which might be due to the predominant focus on motivation and attitudes within Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model of second language acquisition. Nonetheless, it would be worthwhile to use a more multidimensional scale of language anxiety to examine how different aspects of language anxiety influence L2 proficiency, and whether there are differences between groups from various educational backgrounds.

6.2.3 Parental Encouragement

Finally, a negative correlation between L2 writing performance and *Parental Encouragement* was found. The items of *Parental Encouragement* measure how students perceive the encouragement they receive from their parents to learn a second/foreign language. The students rated this motivational subtype based on, for example, how much their parents support learning a foreign language and how much importance they attribute to learning another language and being proficient in it (Gardner, 2004). Hence, the negative relationship between this dimension and English writing proficiency found in this study for both low and high levels of secondary education proposes that students with parents who are highly involved in the second language learning process are likely to perform poorly on L2 writing, regardless of level of education (both low and high levels showed a negative relationship).

Since correlational analyses do not permit the establishment of causal links, there might be two explanations for the negative relationship between writing performance and parental encouragement. Firstly, it might be that students whose parents are highly involved in their academic career feel a lot of pressure to perform well which interferes with their writing performance. However, many studies have shown that parental involvement improves academic achievement and language performance (as cited in Bermúdez & Márquez, 1996), hence, parental encouragement might not necessarily lead to poor performance. Instead, it could be that parents become more involved once their children do not perform well at school which could explain a negative relationship as well.

6.2.4 Motivation and its other dimensions

In general, these findings are consistent with previous research since many studies found relationships between motivation and L2 achievement. However, this study did not find significant relationships between all motivational/attitudinal dimensions of the AMTB and L2

proficiency. For example, the results of this study are inconsistent with the meta-analysis by Masgoret and Gardner (2003) which showed a strongly positive relationship between L2 achievement and the motivational cluster *Motivation*. The current study failed to discover any significant correlations between this cluster and L2 writing proficiency. This is surprising since the dimension *Motivation* is thought to directly influence L2 proficiency, according to the socio-educational model, whereas *Integrativeness* is believed to have an indirect effect on L2 achievement by supporting an individual's *Motivation* (Gardner, 2005). Perhaps, correlations would have been significant (and higher) if other types of assessment were used. Masgoret and Gardner (2003), for instance, point out that correlations between dimensions of the AMTB and grades tend to be lower than correlations between the dimensions and self-ratings. Hence, this provides another reason to include self-ratings as well in further research on L2 proficiency and motivation.

Moreover, the groups from different levels of secondary education differed in number of participants. For example, the *vmbo* group included only 16 students whereas the *vwo* group consisted of 57 students. This could have influenced the possibility to find significant correlations in all groups as well.

Furthermore, a study by Kun (2013), which used the mini-AMTB to examine the relationship between motivation and English receptive vocabulary of pupils from various Dutch elementary schools, did not find significant correlations between the motivational dimensions and pupil's English receptive vocabulary in a regular elementary school. The results only showed a significant positive correlation between language anxiety and instrumental orientation on the one hand, and English receptive vocabulary on the other hand for pupils that attend EarlyBird education (a type of elementary education in which children are exposed to English as a foreign language from very early on). This suggests that the age of acquisition and length of exposure to an L2 might also influence an individual's level of

motivation. Moreover, Kun (2013) points out that, despite of high levels of motivation, a positive relationship between motivation and L2 vocabulary in students from regular elementary schools might fail to appear because of students' use of inefficient strategies to learn an L2. Therefore, high levels of L2 motivation might not necessarily be associated with high levels of L2 proficiency (Kun, 2013).

6.3 Limitations

There are some limitations to the current study. Firstly, the motivation questionnaire and the English writing test were administered approximately a year apart. The writing test was administered at the start of the first year of secondary school whereas the students filled in the questionnaire in December during the second school year. Consequently, the correlations between L2 writing proficiency and motivation measured in this study might slightly deviate from correlations measured in other studies. For instance, students' responses to the AMTB may have been influenced by their failures and successful performances that occurred after the writing test used in this study. On the other hand, if the AMTB was also taken at the start of secondary school, students' responses might have reflected expectations (for example, positive attitudes toward the English course) that could have disappeared after more experience with the course. Hence, the relationship between L2 writing proficiency and motivation might vary under different circumstances. In addition, the current study did not take into account the age of acquisition or socio-economic status of the students although these are thought to influence language learning as well (as cited in Paradis, 2011).

Moreover, since the writing test was part of the school curriculum and the students would eventually receive a grade for their writing performance, teachers might have (unconsciously) been biased toward the school's grading system when rating the writing tests. Nonetheless, the ratings between the teacher and the researcher were reliable which suggests

that this limitation did not have serious consequences for this study.

Further limitations of this study are related to Gardner's (1985) model of second language learning on which this study was based. This theory has been subjected to a large amount of criticism. For instance, it has been noted that Gardner's theory does not take into account the influence of previous learning achievements on motivation, and that Gardner fails to view motivation as a dynamic construct instead of a static one (Ellis, 2015). Moreover, as pointed out earlier, many studies that took a socio-educational approach to motivation have been conducted in Canada, and often by Gardner himself. The role of integrativeness might be particularly relevant in language learning environments where there are distinct L1 and L2 groups, such as in Canada, however, integrativeness might be less essential to motivation for individuals from relatively monolingual or, in contrast, highly multicultural countries (Ellis, 2015). Additionally, the incompleteness and ambiguity of the socio-educational model have been addressed by Au (1988). He argues that several studies found counterevidence for the integrative motive hypothesis which proposes that integrative motivation positively influences L2 achievement. This raises some questions about its generality. Moreover, according to Au (1988), the model brushes aside these findings by explaining no or negative relationships between L2 achievement and integrative motive in terms of "contextual considerations" which makes the model rather difficult to falsify (p. 82). Nevertheless, many studies have demonstrated that the AMTB is a valid and reliable instrument across various foreign and second language learning environments (cited in Yamashiro & McLaughlin, 2001).

7. Conclusion

Overall, this study provides evidence for a relationship between motivation and L2 writing proficiency. However, the direction of the relationship seems to depend on the particular motivational type. The current study found a positive relationship between integrativeness and

L2 writing performance, which is consistent with Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model. Moreover, negative relationships were found between L2 writing proficiency on the one hand, and language anxiety and parental encouragement on the other hand. The latter finding is interesting since many previous studies have demonstrated a positive influence of parents' involvement on students' academic achievement.

The findings of this study suggest that foreign language teaching methods would particularly be more effective when these methods are able to reduce anxiety in students and encourage students to produce the L2. Furthermore, students' L2 writing proficiency might benefit from increased levels of integrativeness, which proposes that successful performances can be achieved by designing methods that integratively motivate students.

References

- Au, S. Y. (1988). A critical appraisal of Gardner's social-psychological theory of second language (L2) learning*. *Language Learning*, 38(1), 75-99.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bermúdez, A., & Márquez, J. (1996). An examination of a four-way collaborative to increase parental involvement in the schools. *The Journal of Educational Issue of Language Minority Students*, 16(3) 1-16.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 273-284.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31(3), 117-135.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Zoltán Dörnyei & Ema Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9-42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (2004). Individual Differences in Second Language Learning. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 525-551). Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foreign language learning statistics. (2016). Retrieved March 22, 2016, from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Foreign_language_learning_statistics
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.
- Gardner, R. C. (2004). *Attitude/motivation test battery: International AMTB research project*. Canada: The University of Western Ontario.
- Gardner, R. C. (2005). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics/Canadian Linguistics Association Joint Plenary Talk, May 30, 2005; London, Ontario. Retrieved from <http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/>
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Newbury House Publishers.
- Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). A student's contributions to second-language learning. Part II: Affective variables. *Language Teaching*, 26(01), 1-11.
- Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F., & Masgoret, A. (1997). Towards a full model of second

- language learning: An empirical investigation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 344-362.
- Kun, S. F. (2013). *De rol van motivatie bij het leren van een tweede taal* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Utrecht University Repository.
- Lalonde, R. N., & Gardner, R. C. (1984). Investigating a causal model of second language: Where does personality fit? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, 16(3), 224-237.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). Work motivation and satisfaction: Light at the end of the tunnel. *Psychological Science*, 1(4), 240-246.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second-language learning: toward a theoretical clarification*. *Language Learning*, 39(2), 251-275.
- Masgoret, A. M., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: a meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language Learning*, 53(1), 123-163.
- Michels, B. (2006). *Vershil moet er wezen. Een werkdocument over verschillen tussen havo en vwo-leerlingen in de tweede fase en handreikingen om daarmee om te gaan.* Retrieved April 6, 2016, from http://www.slo.nl/downloads/archief/vershil_20moet_20er_20wezen.pdf/
- Mowrer, O. H. (1950). *Learning theory and personality dynamics: Selected papers*. New York: Ronald Press, U.S.
- Nuland van, H. J. C. (2011). *Eliciting classroom motivation: Not a piece of cake* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Leiden University Repository (9789490858056).
- Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(1), 12-28.
- Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of

- the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 139-158.
- Paradis, J. (2011). Individual differences in child English second language acquisition: Comparing child-internal and child-external factors. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 1(3), 213-237.
- Papi, M., & Teimouri, Y. (2014). Language learner motivational types: A cluster analysis study. *Language Learning*, 64(3), 493-525.
- Phillips, E. M. (1992). The effects of language anxiety on students' oral test performance and attitudes. *The Modern Language Journal*, 76(1), 14-26.
- Pigott, L. E. B. (in preparation). *First meaning then form: a longitudinal research on the effects of delaying the explicit focus on form for young adolescent L2 learners* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Utrecht University.
- Schooladvies. (2010). Retrieved March 27, 2016, from <http://www.cito.score.nl/schooladvies.html>.
- Schrijven. (n.d.). Retrieved March 26, 2016, from <http://www.erk.nl/leerling/candostellingen/schrijven/>
- Senior general secondary education (HAVO) and pre university education (VWO). (n.d.). Retrieved February 12, 2016, from <https://www.government.nl/topics/secondary-education/contents/senior-general-secondary-education-havo-and-pre-university-education-vwo>
- Sparks, R., Patton, J., Ganschow, L., & Humbach, N. (2009). Long-term crosslinguistic transfer of skills from L1 to L2. *Language Learning*, 59(1), 203-243.
- The Cambridge English Scale. (2016). Retrieved March 29, 2016, from <http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/exams/cambridge-english-scale/>
- Troia, G. A., Harbaugh, A. G., Shankland, R. K., Wolbers, K. A., & Lawrence, A. M. (2013). Relationships between writing motivation, writing activity, and writing performance:

- Effects of grade, sex, and ability. *Reading and Writing*, 26(1), 17-44.
- Veen van der, I., & Peetsma, T. (2009). The development in self-regulated learning behaviour of first-year students in the lowest level of secondary school in the Netherlands. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 19(1), 34-46.
- Verspoor, M., Schmid, M. S., & Xu, X. (2012). A dynamic usage based perspective on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(3), 239-263.
- Wat is het ERK? (n.d.). Retrieved March 26, 2016, from <http://www.erk.nl/leerling/watiserk/>
- Welk ERK-niveau voor vwo? (n.d.). Retrieved March 26, 2016, from <http://www.erk.nl/leerling/erkenvwo/>
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy–value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 68-81.
- Wolfersberger, M. (2003). L1 to L2 writing process and strategy transfer: A look at lower proficiency writers. *TESL-EJ*, 7(2), 1-12.
- Yamashiro, A. D., & McLaughlin, J. (2001). Relationships among attitudes, motivation, anxiety, and English language proficiency in Japanese college students. In P. Robinson, M. Sawyer, & S. Ross (Eds.), *Second language research in Japan* (pp. 112-126). Tokyo: The Japan Association for Language Teaching.

Appendix A.

Writing Task First Class (from Piggott (in preparation))

You are going to write a letter to your new PenFriend Jonathan. To get to know each other you are going to say something about where you live and what your room looks like. A letter must have a beginning, middle and an end (see example below). When you're done count the amount of words and write them in the top right corner (there is no minimum or maximum).

Good luck!!

Write a letter!!

Describe your room!

Write about:

- Introduce yourself first:name/age
- Say where you live, town/city.
- Where in the house is your room (upstairs/downstairs)
- Size of your room..
- What you have on your walls...
- How many windows are there.....
- Furniture you have (name at least six things)
- Where the furniture is (use three prepositions, on, between etc.)
- About your clothes....where do you keep your clothes.....
- What is your favourite thing in your room...
- What don't you like in your room.
- Who cleans your room and when.
- EXTRA/SPECIAL info and a good ending.

Example layout:

12 December 2015

Dear Jonathan,

BEGINNING.....
.....
.....

MIDDLE.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

END.....
.....

Best wishes/kind regards,

(your name)

Appendix B.

Dutch Version of the AMTB (reduplicated with permission from Piggott (in preparation))

Integrativeness

(A desire, willingness, or affective ability to adopt features of another cultural community and make them part of one's own behavioural repertoire)

Integrative orientation

Four positively keyed items, each expressing a reason for learning English for the purpose of communicating with English speaking people to satisfy social as opposed to purely instrumental objectives.

Questions: 8, 28, 50 72

8. Het is belangrijk om Engels te leren zodat ik me dan meer op mijn gemak voel rond mensen die Engels spreken.

28. Engels leren is belangrijk omdat ik dan meer verschillende mensen kan ontmoeten en met ze kan spreken.

50. Engels leren is belangrijk omdat ik hiermee de Engelse manier van leven beter zal begrijpen en op prijs zal stellen.

72. Engels leren is belangrijk omdat ik dan gemakkelijker met Engels sprekende mensen kan omgaan.

Attitudes toward English speaking people

Eight positively keyed items referring to target groups who speak English. The focus is on attitudes toward English speaking communities in general.

Questions: 7, 27, 40, 49, 53, 71, 91, 104

7. Als Nederland geen contact zou hebben met Engelssprekende landen, zou dit een groot nadeel zijn.

27. De meeste Engelstalige sprekers zijn zo vriendelijk en gemakkelijk in de omgang, ik ben blij dat ze mijn vrienden zijn.

40. Ik zou graag veel Engelstalige vrienden willen hebben.

49. Engelstalige mensen zijn erg sociaal en aardig.

53. Mensen met Engels als moedertaal mogen met recht trots zijn want zij hebben de wereld verrijkt.

71. Ik zou graag meer mensen leren kennen, die Engels als moedertaal hebben.

91. Hoe meer ik Engels sprekende mensen leer kennen, hoe leuker ik ze vind.

104. Je kunt mensen met Engels als moedertaal, altijd vertrouwen.

Interest in foreign languages

Five positively keyed and five negatively keyed items, and is designed to assess a more general aspect of integrativeness referring to any other language group.

Questions positive: 1, 21, 42, 65, 85

1. Ik zou graag veel vreemde talen perfect willen spreken.
21. Ik wou dat ik kranten en tijdschriften in veel verschillende talen kon lezen.
42. Ik zou graag veel andere talen willen leren.
65. Als ik van plan zou zijn om in een ander land te verblijven, zou ik proberen de taal te leren.
85. Ik vind het leuk om mensen te ontmoeten die vreemde talen spreken.

Questions negative: 12, 32, 55, 76, 95

12. Vreemde talen leren is niet leuk.
32. Ik heb echt geen belangstelling voor vreemde talen.
55. Het is niet belangrijk voor ons om vreemde talen te leren.
76. De meeste vreemde talen klinken bot en hard.
95. Ik zie liever een gedubd/gesynchroniseerd televisie programma dan een ondertiteld televisie programma in onze taal.

Attitudes toward the learning situation

English teacher evaluation*

Five positively and five negatively keyed items designed to assess the degree of positive attitude toward the language teacher.

Questions positive: 5, 25, 46, 69, 89

5. Ik ga graag naar Engelse les omdat mijn docent Engels erg goed is.
25. Mijn docent Engels is beter dan al mijn andere docenten.
46. Mijn docent Engels heeft een dynamische en interessante manier van lesgeven.
69. Mijn docent Engels is een grote bron van inspiratie voor mij.
89. Ik vind mijn docent Engels echt leuk

Questions negative: 14, 34, 58, 78, 97

14. Ik vind mijn docent Engels niet erg goed.
34. Des te minder ik mijn docent Engels zie, des te beter.
58. Mijn docent Engels is een van de minst plezierige mensen die ik ken.
78. Ik zou graag een andere docent Engels willen hebben.
97. Mijn docent Engels slaagt er niet in om de informatie op een interessante manier te presenteren.

* This dimension is excluded from the study.

English course evaluation

Five positively keyed and five negatively eyed, and is designed to assess the degree of positive attitude toward the English course.

Questions positive: 20, 41, 64, 84, 102

20. Ik zou graag meer tijd willen besteden aan Engelse les en minder aan andere lessen.
41. Ik vind de activiteiten in de Engelse les veel leuker dan die in andere lessen.
64. Omdat ik Engelse les zo leuk vind, zou ik later graag Engels studeren.

- 84. Ik heb altijd zin in mijn Engelse les.
- 102. Engels is een van mijn favoriete vakken.

Questions negative: 10, 30, 52, 74, 93

- 10. Mijn Engelse les is echt tijdverspilling.
- 30. Ik vind mijn Engelse les saai.
- 52. Om eerlijk te zijn, heb ik weinig belangstelling voor mijn Engelse les.
- 74. Om eerlijk te zijn, vind ik mijn Engelse les niet leuk.
- 93. Ik vind het moeilijk iets positiefs te bedenken wat betreft mijn Engelse les.

Motivation

Motivational intensity

Five positively keyed and five negatively keyed items that refer to the amount of work done, persistence, and consistency in focus.

Questions positive: 13, 33, 56, 77, 96

- 13. Ik doe mijn best om het Engels wat ik zie en hoor, te begrijpen.
- 33. Ik houd mijn Engels bij door er iedere dag wat aan te doen.
- 56. Als ik iets niet begrijp tijdens mijn Engelse les, vraag ik altijd mijn docent om hulp.
- 77. Ik doe echt mijn best om Engels te leren.
- 96. Als ik Engels aan het leren ben, laat ik me niet afleiden en besteed ik mijn aandacht aan mijn opdracht.

Questions negative: 3, 23, 44, 67, 87

- 3. Ik besteed niet veel aandacht aan het commentaar dat ik tijdens mijn Engelse les ontvang.
- 23. Ik kijk mijn opdrachten niet meer na als ik ze terug krijg van mijn docent Engels.
- 44. Ik stel het maken van mijn huiswerk voor Engels zo lang mogelijk uit.
- 67. Als ik de uitleg van mijn docent Engels niet begrijp, geef ik het snel op and verslapt mijn aandacht.
- 87. Ik heb geen zin om de ingewikkelde aspecten van Engels proberen te begrijpen.

Desire to learn English

Five positively keyed and five negatively keyed items that refer to the desire to learn English.

Questions Positive: 9, 29, 51, 73, 92

- 9. Ik wil graag alle aspecten van de Engelse taal leren.
- 29. Als het aan mij lag zou ik al mijn tijd besteden om Engels te leren.
- 51. Ik wil de Engelse taal zo goed leren dat ik me ermee op mijn gemak voel.
- 73. Ik zou graag zoveel mogelijk Engels willen leren.
- 92. Ik wou dat ik vloeiend Engels sprak.

Questions negative: 17, 37, 61, 81, 99

- 17. Beheersing van de Engelse taal is niet een belangrijk doel in mijn leven.
- 37. Ik droom er soms van om met Engels te stoppen.
- 61. Mijn oorspronkelijke wens om Engels te kennen, is bijna verdwenen.

81. Om eerlijk te zijn, wil ik echt niet Engels leren.
99. Ik ben niet geïnteresseerd om meer Engels te leren dan de basis.

Attitudes towards learning English

Five positively keyed and five negatively keyed items that refer to the positive affect associated with the activity. The pleasure and enjoyment associated with the process.

Questions positive: 6, 26, 47, 70, 90

6. Engels leren is echt super.
26. Ik vind het erg leuk om Engels te leren.
47. Engels is een belangrijk onderdeel van het studiepakket van school.
70. Ik ben van plan om zoveel mogelijk Engels te leren.
90. Ik vind het geweldig om Engels te leren

Questions negative: 8, 38, 62, 82, 100

8. Het is belangrijk om Engels te leren zodat ik me dan meer op mijn gemak voel rond mensen die Engels spreken.
38. Ik zou mijn tijd liever aan andere lessen dan Engels besteden.
62. Engels leren is tijdverspilling.
82. Ik vind Engels leren saai.
100. Ik zou rustig en zelfverzekerd zijn als ik een maaltijd in het Engels moest bestellen.

Language Anxiety

Language class anxiety

Questions positive: 16, 36, 60, 80, 98

16. Ik voel me nooit erg zeker van mijzelf als ik tijdens onze Engelse les moet spreken.
36. Ik voel me echt niet op mijn gemak om spontaan antwoord te geven tijdens onze Engelse les.
60. Ik maak me zorgen omdat andere leerlingen in mijn klas beter Engels lijken te spreken dan ik.
80. Ik word zenuwachtig als ik in de Engelse les spreek.
98. Soms ben ik bang dat de andere leerlingen in de klas mij zullen uitlachen als ik Engels spreek.

Questions negative: 4, 24, 45, 68, 88

4. Ik word niet zenuwachtig als ik een vraag moet beantwoorden tijdens mijn Engelse les.
24. Ik voel me zelfverzekerd als ik gevraagd word om tijdens mijn Engelse les te spreken.
45. Ik ben heel rustig als ik moet spreken tijdens Engelse les.
68. Ik snap niet waarom andere leerlingen zo zenuwachtig zijn als zij Engels moeten spreken tijdens de les.
88. Leerlingen die beweren zenuwachtig te worden tijdens Engelse les, proberen gewoon uitvluchten te verzinnen.

Language use anxiety

Questions positive: 11, 31, 54, 75, 94

- 11. Ik zou zenuwachtig worden als ik Engels met een toerist moest spreken.
- 31. Ik vind het eng als ik ergens Engels moet spreken.
- 54. Ik zou het moeilijk vinden om Engels te spreken aan de telefoon.
- 75. Ik zou me zeer ongemakkelijk voelen om buiten schooltijd ergens Engels te spreken.
- 94. Ik word nerveus als iemand me iets vraagt in Engels.

Questions negative: 19, 39, 63, 83, 101

- 19. Ik voel me erg op mijn gemak als ik Engels moet spreken.
- 39. Ik vind het helemaal niet erg om Engels te spreken.
- 63. In zou me op mijn gemak voelen als ik iemand de weg moest wijzen in Engels.
- 83. Ik zou me op mijn gemak voelen Engels te spreken in de aanwezigheid van Japans- en Engels sprekende mensen.
- 101. Ik zou rustig en zelfverzekerd zijn als ik een maaltijd in het Engels moest bestellen.

Instrumentality

(A language learner could be motivated to learn another language not for the social implications but rather for some practical gain that might be imagined)

Instrumental orientation

Questions positive: 15, 35, 59, 79

- 15. Engels leren is belangrijk want ik heb het nodig voor mijn carrière.
- 35. Engels leren is belangrijk, het is goed voor mijn ontwikkeling.
- 59. Engels leren is belangrijk om een goede baan te vinden.
- 79. Engels leren is belangrijk want andere mensen zullen mij meer respecteren als ik Engels ken.*

* This item is excluded from the study.

Parental encouragement

Questions: 2, 22, 43, 48, 57, 66, 86, 103

- 2. Mijn ouders proberen mij te helpen om Engels te leren.
- 22. Mijn ouders vinden het erg belangrijk dat ik Engels leer.
- 43. Mijn ouders vinden dat ik het vak Engels gedurende mijn hele schoolperiode moet aanhouden.
- 48. Mijn ouders hebben benadrukt hoe belangrijk Engels voor mij zal zijn als ik klaar ben met school.
- 57. Mijn ouder willen dat ik mijn docent om hulp vraag als ik een probleem heb met Engels.
- 66. Mijn ouders zijn erg geïnteresseerd in alles wat ik doe tijdens mijn Engelse les.
- 86. Mijn ouders stimuleren mij om mijn Engels zo veel mogelijk te oefenen.
- 103. Mijn ouders vinden dat ik meer tijd aan Engels moet besteden.

Enquête

Hierbij vind je een aantal uitspraken (beweringen) waar sommigen het mee eens zijn en

anderen niet. Omcirkel één keuze waarbij je de mate van je instemming of afwijzing aangeeft. Het volgende voorbeeld dient ter verduidelijking van de werkwijze.

- a. Spaanse voetballers zijn veel beter dan Braziliaanse voetballers
Helemaal niet mee eens
Redelijk niet mee eens
Beetje niet mee eens
Beetje mee eens
Redelijk mee eens
Helemaal mee eens

Als antwoord op vraag a, moet je één keuze omcirkeld hebben. Sommigen zullen het hiermee helemaal niet mee eens zijn, terwijl anderen er juist helemaal mee eens zijn, en weer anderen zijn een minder sterke mening toegedaan. Wat je hebt omcirkeld is jouw mening gebaseerd op wat weet en hebt gehoord. Let op: er is geen goed of fout antwoord.

1. Ik zou graag veel vreemde talen perfect willen spreken. (1)
2. Mijn ouders/verzorgers proberen mij te helpen met het leren van Engels. (2)
3. Ik besteed niet veel aandacht aan het commentaar dat ik tijdens mijn Engelse les ontvang. (3)
4. Ik word niet zenuwachtig als ik een vraag moet beantwoorden tijdens mijn Engelse les. (4)
5. Ik ga graag naar Engelse les omdat mijn docent Engels erg goed is.*
6. Engels leren is echt super. (5)
7. Als Nederland geen contact zou hebben met Engelssprekende landen, zou dit een groot nadeel zijn. (6)
8. Het is belangrijk om Engels te leren zodat ik me dan meer op mijn gemak voel rond mensen die Engels spreken. (7)
9. Ik wil graag alle aspecten van de Engelse taal leren. (8)
10. Mijn Engelse les is echt tijdverspilling. (9)
11. Ik zou zenuwachtig worden als ik Engels met een toerist zou moeten spreken. (10)
12. Vreemde talen leren is niet leuk. (11)
13. Ik doe mijn best om het Engels wat ik zie en hoor, te begrijpen. (12)
14. Ik vind mijn docent Engels niet erg goed.*
15. Engels leren is belangrijk want ik heb het nodig voor mijn carrière. (13)
16. Ik voel me nooit erg zeker van mijzelf als ik tijdens onze Engelse les Engels moet spreken. (14)
17. Beheersing van de Engelse taal is niet een belangrijk doel in mijn leven. (15)
18. Ik haat Engels. (16)
19. Ik voel me erg op mijn gemak als ik Engels moet spreken. (17)
20. Ik zou graag meer tijd willen besteden aan Engelse lessen en minder aan andere lessen. (18)
21. Ik wou dat ik kranten en tijdschriften in veel verschillende talen kon lezen. (19)
22. Mijn ouders/verzorgers vinden het erg belangrijk dat ik Engels leer. (20)
23. Ik kijk mijn opdrachten niet meer na als ik ze terug krijg van mijn docent Engels. (21)
24. Ik voel me zelfverzekerd als ik gevraagd word om tijdens mijn Engelse les te spreken. (22)
25. Mijn docent Engels is beter dan al mijn andere docenten.*

26. Ik vind het erg leuk om Engels te leren. (23)
27. De meeste Engelstalige sprekers zijn zo vriendelijk en gemakkelijk in de omgang, ik ben blij dat ze mijn vrienden zijn. (24)
28. Engels leren is belangrijk omdat ik dan meer verschillende mensen kan ontmoeten en met ze kan spreken. (25)
29. Als het aan mij lag zou ik al mijn tijd besteden om Engels te leren. (26)
30. Ik vind mijn Engelse les saai. (27)
31. Ik vind het eng als ik ergens Engels moet spreken. (28)
32. Ik heb echt geen belangstelling voor vreemde talen. (29)
33. Ik houd mijn Engels bij door er iedere dag wat aan te doen. (30)
34. Des te minder ik mijn docent Engels zie, des te beter.*
35. Engels leren is belangrijk, het is goed voor mijn ontwikkeling. (31)
36. Ik voel me echt niet op mijn gemak om spontaan antwoord te geven tijdens onze Engelse les. (32)
37. Ik droom er soms van om met Engels te stoppen. (33)
38. Ik zou mijn tijd liever and andere lessen dan Engels besteden. (34)
39. Ik vind het helemaal niet erg om Engels te spreken. (35)
40. Ik zou graag veel Engelstalige vrienden willen hebben. (36)
41. Ik vind de activiteiten in de Engelse les veel leuker dan die in andere lessen. (37)
42. Ik zou graag veel andere talen willen leren. (38)
43. Mijn ouders/verzorgers vinden dat ik op school altijd Engels moet blijven leren. (39)
44. Ik stel het maken van mijn huiswerk voor Engels zo lang mogelijk uit. (40)
45. Ik ben heel rustig als ik moet spreken tijdens Engelse les. (41)
46. Mijn docent Engels heeft een dynamische en interessante manier van lesgeven.*
47. Engels is een belangrijk onderdeel van het studiepakket van school. (42)
48. Mijn ouders/verzorgers hebben benadrukt hoe belangrijk Engels voor mij zal zijn als ik klaar ben met school. (43)
49. Engelstalige mensen zijn erg sociaal en aardig. (44)
50. Engels leren is belangrijk omdat ik hiermee de Engelse manier van leven beter zal begrijpen en op prijs zal stellen. (45)
51. Ik wil de Engelse taal zo goed leren dat ik me ermee op mijn gemak voel. (46)
52. Om eerlijk te zijn, heb ik weinig belangstelling voor mijn Engelse les. (47)
53. Mensen met Engels als moedertaal mogen met recht trots zijn want zij hebben de wereld verrijkt. (48)
54. Ik zou het moeilijk vinden om Engels te spreken aan de telefoon. (49)
55. Het is niet belangrijk voor ons om vreemde talen te leren. (50)
56. Als ik iets niet begrijp tijdens mijn Engelse les, vraag ik altijd mijn docent om hulp. (51)
57. Mijn ouders/verzorgers willen dat ik mijn docent om hulp vraag als ik een probleem heb met Engels. (52)
58. Mijn docent Engels is een van de minst plezierige mensen die ik ken.*
59. Engels leren is belangrijk om een goede baan te vinden. (53)
60. Ik maak me zorgen omdat andere leerlingen in mijn klas beter Engels lijken te spreken dan ik. (54)
61. Ik ben alle zin die ik ooit had om Engels te leren aan het verliezen. (55)
62. Engels leren is tijdverspilling. (56)
63. In zou me op mijn gemak voelen als ik iemand de weg moest wijzen in Engels. (57)
64. Ik vind de Engelse les zo leuk, ik kijk ernaar uit om in de toekomst meer Engels te leren. (58)

65. Als ik van plan zou zijn om in een ander land te verblijven, zou ik proberen de taal te leren. (59)
66. Mijn ouders/verzorgers zijn erg geïnteresseerd in alles wat ik doe tijdens mijn Engelse les. (60)
67. Als ik de uitleg van mijn docent Engels niet begrijp, geef ik het snel op and verslapt mijn aandacht. (61)
68. Ik snap niet waarom andere leerlingen zo zenuwachtig zijn als zij Engels moeten spreken tijdens de les. (62)
- 69. Mijn docent Engels is een grote bron van inspiratie voor mij.***
70. Ik ben van plan om zoveel mogelijk Engels te leren. (63)
71. Ik zou graag meer mensen leren kennen, die Engels als moedertaal hebben. (64)
72. Engels leren is belangrijk omdat ik dan gemakkelijker met Engels sprekende mensen kan omgaan. (65)
73. Ik zou graag zoveel mogelijk Engels willen leren. (66)
74. Om eerlijk te zijn, vind ik mijn Engelse les niet leuk. (67)
75. Ik zou me zeer ongemakkelijk voelen om buiten schooltijd ergens Engels te spreken. (68)
76. De meeste vreemde talen klinken bot en hard. (69)
77. Ik doe echt mijn best om Engels te leren. (70)
- 78. Ik zou graag een andere docent Engels willen hebben.***
79. Engels leren is belangrijk want andere mensen zullen mij meer respecteren als ik Engels ken. (71)
80. Ik word zenuwachtig als ik in de Engelse les spreek. (72)
81. Om eerlijk te zijn, wil ik echt niet Engels leren. (73)
82. Ik vind Engels leren saai. (74)
83. Ik zou me op mijn gemak voelen Engels te spreken in de aanwezigheid van Nederlands- en Engels sprekende mensen. (75)
84. Ik heb altijd zin in mijn Engelse les. (76)
85. Ik vind het leuk om mensen te ontmoeten die vreemde talen spreken. (77)
86. Mijn ouders/verzorgers stimuleren mij om mijn Engels zo veel mogelijk te oefenen. (78)
87. Ik heb geen zin om de ingewikkelde aspecten van Engels te proberen te begrijpen. (79)
88. Leerlingen die beweren zenuwachtig te worden tijdens Engelse les, proberen gewoon een uitvlucht te verzinnen. (80)
- 89. Ik vind mijn docent Engels echt leuk.***
90. Ik houd van Engels leren. (81)
91. Hoe meer ik Engels sprekende mensen leer kennen, hoe leuker ik ze vind. (82)
92. Ik wou dat ik vloeiend Engels sprak. (83)
93. Ik vind het moeilijk iets positiefs te bedenken wat betreft mijn Engelse les. (84)
94. Ik word nerveus als iemand me iets vraagt in het Engels. (85)
95. Ik zie liever een Nederlands ingesproken televisie programma dan een Nederlands ondertiteld televisie programma. (86)
96. Als ik Engels aan het leren ben, laat ik me niet afleiden en besteed ik mijn aandacht aan mijn opdracht. (87)
- 97. Mijn docent Engels slaagt er niet in om de informatie op een interessante manier te presenteren.***
98. Soms ben ik bang dat de andere leerlingen in de klas mij zullen uitlachen als ik Engels spreek. (88)
99. Ik ben niet geïnteresseerd om meer Engels te leren dan de basis. (89)

100. Als ik van school af ben, ga ik niet door met Engels leren, ik vind het niet interessant. (90)
101. Ik zou rustig en zelfverzekerd zijn als ik een maaltijd in het Engels moest bestellen. (91)
102. Engels is één van mijn favoriete vakken. (92)
103. Mijn ouders/verzorgers vinden dat ik meer tijd aan Engels moet besteden. (93)
104. Je kunt mensen met Engels als moedertaal, altijd vertrouwen. (94)

Controle vragen

Het doel van dit onderdeel van de vragenlijst is om je gevoelens over een aantal zaken vast te stellen. Wij willen graag jouw mening over de volgende 13 uitspraken. Iedere uitspraak wordt gevolgd door een schaal van 1 tot 7, met een label aan iedere kant. Voor iedere uitspraak, graag een van nummers omcirkelen die jou het best omschrijven.

1. Mijn motivatie om Engels te leren zodat ik kan communiceren met Engels sprekende mensen is:

Zwak - 1: -2: -3: -4: -5: -6: -7: Sterk

2. Mijn oordeel over Engels sprekende mensen is:

Ongunstig -1: -2: 3: -4: -5: -6: 7: Gunstig

3. Mijn belangstelling voor vreemde talen is:

Heel weinig -1: -2: -3: -4: -5: -6: -7: Heel veel

4. Mijn wens om Engels te leren is:

Zwak -1: -2: -3: -4: -5: -6: -7: Sterk

5. Mijn houding wat betreft Engels leren is:

Ongunstig -1: -2: -3: -4: -5: -6: -7: Gunstig

6. Mijn oordeel over mijn docent Engels is:

Ongunstig -1: -2: -3: -4: -5: -6: -7: Gunstig*

7. Mijn motivatie om Engels te leren voor praktische redenen (bijvoorbeeld: een goede baan) is:

Zwak - 1: -2: -3: -4: -5: -6: -7: Sterk

8. Ik vind het spannend om buiten de les Engels te spreken:

Niet erg -1: -2: -3: -4: -5: -6: -7: Heel erg

9. Mijn oordeel over mijn Engelse les is:

Ongunstig -1: -2: 3: -4: -5: -6: 7: Gunstig

10. Ik vind het spannend om in mijn Engelse les te spreken:

Niet erg -1: -2: -3: -4: -5: -6: -7: Heel erg

11. Mijn motivatie om Engels te leren

Heel weinig -1: -2: -3: -4: -5: -6: -7: Heel veel

12. Mijn ouders stimuleren mij om Engels te leren:

Niet veel -1: -2: -3: -4: -5: -6: -7: Heel veel

13. Buiten school kom ik in aanraking met de Engelse taal.

Niet veel -1: -2: -3: -4: -5: -6: -7: Heel veel.

* The items highlighted in yellow belong to the variable English teacher evaluation which is excluded from the current study.

Appendix C1.

Writing Proficiency Rating Scale and Evaluation Criteria (Reduplicated with Permission of Piggott (in preparation))

	1 (A1.0)	2 (A1+)	3 (A2)	4 (A2+)	5 (B1)
Vocabulary Density diversity and sophistication	Produces only isolated words combined with words from L1 and/or incorrect use of words. Unable to produce all words needed to communicate the entire message. Clearly struggles.	Produces mainly isolated words and phrases. Phrases and chunks can occur but are divers and not always target like.	In addition to isolated words, uses phrases/chunks. Use is quite divers but not always accurate or sophisticated. Able to communicate with words.	Is able to use a wide range of words, phrases, chunks to communicate. Predominantly Accurate production, however not always target like/sophisticated.	Uses a wide range of words, phrases, chunks to communicate. There is a balanced production of target like choice of words. Errors are due to attempts to produce more complex words or word combinations.
Grammar Diversity and sophistication	Only uses short simple sentences. A lot of sentences are not target like structures.	Predominantly uses one (simple) sentence structure. Variation can be present but is unsuccessful. Grammar is not yet sufficiently sophisticated to convey the intended message correctly.	Can create correct grammatical sentences. Structures can be very divers but not always successful. Structures are still predominantly short and simple.	Mainly creates correct grammatical sentences. Length of sentences is not only short and there are some forms of coordination and subordination.	Creates correct grammatical sentences and has a balanced use of different sentence types (divers). Grammatical errors are due to attempts at more complex L2 structures.
Functional Adequacy	Overall the task was unsuccessfully completed. Content scarcely conveys the intended message.	Task was almost successfully completed. Content sometimes met the expectations. The general message is starting to be comprehensible.	Task was overall successfully completed. Content sometimes didn't meet the expectations. The general message is mainly comprehensible.	Task was successfully completed. Content met the expectations of the task and were comprehensible enough in the ears of a native speaker	Task was very successfully completed. Content was relevant and met the expectations. Utterances were predominantly comprehensible.

Appendix C2.

Two Rating Examples

Student: 113098**Level of education:** vwo**Letter:***Dear Jonathan,*

My name is [name], I'm twelve years old and currently live in [place], a small village in the Netherlands. My bedroom is upstairs, and it's pretty big. The walls aren't very decorated, because I like to have a tidy room. I only have one window, but it's big enough to lighten the entire room. I have a bed, a desk, a closet, a chair, a lamp and a rug. The closet is next to the bed, and the rug is on the floor. My desk is between my wall and my bed. I keep my clothes in my closet. They're mostly colored blue, but I have some grey t-shirts as well. I don't have skinny jeans or sweaters, because I don't like them very much. The best thing in my room is my chair. It's very big and comfortable to sit in. The worst thing is my TV, because it's too big and the quality isn't the greatest.

I clean my own room, but only when my mom asks me to do it. I think my room is pretty neat, but it can get cold, because I always forget to close my window.

Anyway, this was my little talk about my room. If you're interested to see it, then come over sometime!

*Best wishes,**[name]***Vocabulary mean score: 5**

Explanation: The student correctly uses a wide range of target words, phrases and chunks in the letter, such as *currently*, *small village*, *pretty big/neat*, *the entire room*, and *the quality isn't the greatest*. The student uses many adjectives and adverbs to support a sophisticated description of his or her bedroom. Furthermore, the student produces target-like words without interference of the L1.

Grammar mean score: 5

Explanation: The student is able to create grammatically correct sentences in the L2. The length of these sentences is not only short, but also contain forms of coordination and subordination, using linking words such as *because*, *but only when*, and *as well*. The student produces target-like structures without interference from the L1.

Functional Adequacy mean score: 5

Explanation: The task was successfully completed: the content is native-like and relevant and the letter meets the task expectations. Moreover, the letter is comprehensible to the reader and it is not only directed to the pen friend in the beginning of the letter: the letter closing, in which the student invites Jonathan to come over if he is interested to see the student's bedroom, addresses the notion of the pen friend as well.

Student: 112387**Level of education:** vmbohavo**Letter:**

Dear Jonathan,

Hello I'm [name] I am 13 allmost 14 years old. and i live in a town on a farm. my bedroom is upstairs in the house, and in my room sleep I allon, first i sleep with my brother in 1 room that was horrible.

my room is under roof, there is dus one window. in my room is a bed next to the wall of the roof and a wardrobe next to my bed, on the another site of myn wardrobe is a big bureau with a chair next to the bureau is also a chair for my clothes. my favroute thing on my bedroom are my climbing stuff, want i love climbing.

but helaas moet go my room cleaning want my mother or vather does dat not.

Best wishes,

[name]

ps: says not to miss bosirs that she are a good theatcher is kuch kuch

Vocabulary mean score: 1

Explanation: The student clearly struggles to write a fluent and comprehensible letter in English. He or she is unable to produce all L2 words that are needed to communicate the entire message. The student often combines target words with words from the L1 (such as *dus*, *want*, *helaas*, and *moet*) to fill the gaps in sentences.

Grammar mean score: 1

Explanation: The student predominantly uses short simple sentences and barely produces forms of subordination. Moreover, the student is unable to perform the past tense when it is needed, and the prepositions are not always successful (e.g. *on my bedroom*). Similarly, the sentences do not always follow a target-like SVO order (e.g. *sleep I allon*).

Functional Adequacy mean score: 1

Explanation: Due to the use of L1 and incorrect words in combination with poor grammar, the content scarcely conveys the intended message of the letter, especially in the ears of an English speaker.