

Motivation for L2 Learning: The Role of some Variables

Elahe Sotoudehnama¹

Motivation has been widely accepted by both teachers and researchers as one of the primary factors that influences FL/ SL learning. Believing so, its relationship with other variables has been the point of investigation in this study. The present study tries to investigate the relationship between Iranian Undergraduate English Major (IUEM) students' motivation for English language learning and different variables including: university, gender, type of study (private /public) , job (employment/ unemployment), year of study (freshmen to seniors), and age . The results indicate that none of the above-mentioned variables play any role in the learners' motivation in English language learning but one. The only variable which plays a role in the degree of motivation is the year of study. Surprisingly, freshmen are significantly more motivated than seniors.

key words: *motivation; university; job; employment /unemployment; age; gender; private /public; year of study*

1- Introduction

Man's behaviour has been the point of investigation for a long time from different aspects. Sometimes the origin of behaviour has been considered within the individual, and some other time it has been studied in relation to others.

Psychologists study motivation because they want to know why behaviour occurs or why organisms tend to do what they do. In addition to psychology, other fields of study such as history, art,

¹ -Faculty Member, Department of English Language, Alzahra University
esotoude@alzahra.ac.ir

literature, etc. also attempt to understand the motivations behind actions.

Motivation has been widely accepted by both teachers and researchers as one of the major elements that influence the rate of success in L2 learning. Motivation provides one of the key factors that enhance learning in L2; indeed many other factors involved in L2 learning are based on motivation to some extent. In fact individuals with the highest degree of abilities, and the best teachers with the most appropriate curricula do not seem to be able to accomplish long-term goals if the learners lack the sufficient motivation. Due to the central importance attached to it, motivation has been the target of a great deal of researches in L2 during the past decade.

The researchers were either oriented by psychological or socio- psychological aspects. Those who were largely oriented by a social psychological approach to motivation were mostly inspired by the work of Gardner and Lambert (Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972).

2- Review of Literature

Search about motivation and reasons attributed to it were initiated by the “Need Theories”. Although need theories are currently not generating a great deal of research, they still represent a potentially useful way of attaining a broader and deeper understanding of the complex phenomena that we call “motivation”. Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory proposing that the needs that motivate human action are limited in number and are arranged hierarchically, (Maslow, 1943 cited in Gerow,1995) and Murray’s Manifest Needs Theory proposing that individuals can be classified according to the strength of various personality-need variables,(Murray, 1938 cited in Steers and Porter 1987) are the two prominent of the need theories. These theories were followed by reinforcement theories, which attribute individual behaviour to the association of stimulus, response and reward (Oxford and Shearin 1994). Due to the limitations of the reinforcement theory, it was substituted by cognitive approach to motivation, which assumes that individuals engage in some form of conscious behavior. That is, people are seen as reasoning, thinking individuals who often consider the

5/ Motivation for L2 Learning...

consequences of their action. Thus cognitive theories attempt to develop models concerning the thought procedure people go through as they decide to perform an action (Steers and Porter 1987). This theory, gaining popularity, has revealed itself in different forms such as, expecting-value theories, equity theory, goal setting theories, and self-determination theories, each of which include different sub-theories by itself.

As it was mentioned, some researchers consider the root of motivation in the society and hence, in the attitude toward other people. Studies in this field related to L2 learning were inspired by Gardner and Lambert (1972) and were continued by them and some other researchers. Gardner (Gardner 1983, 1985) presented the evolved form of his socio-educational model of L2 learning, which holds that L2 learning takes place in the social milieu in which cultural beliefs could influence the development of two sets of attitudinal variables: integrativeness and attitude toward the learning situation.

This socio-educational model was confirmed by some researchers (Ainsfeld and Lambert,1961; Spolsky,1969; Salim 1995) and rejected by some others (Luckmani,1972; Perez 1984; Lizabeth, 1983). Gardner and his associates have conducted a great number of studies in all of which motivation is considered to include three components: a) desire to learn the language; b) motivational intensity, and c) attitudes toward learning the language, except one study (Tremblay and Gardner 1995) in which two of the motivational components are changed.

There have been some investigations about different kinds of motivation and its assessment (Lepper & Henderlong Corpus & Iyengar 2006; Mori 2007), the relationship between motivation and English language proficiency (Clement et al. 1994; Crookes and Schmidt, 1991; Dornyei, 1990, 2001), motivation and attitudes (Gardner and Lambert, 1972), and motivation and task performance (Dornyei and Kormos, 2000; Dornyei, 2002, Kormos and Dornyei,2004) but as far as the knowledge of the researcher is concerned, the role of other variables such as university, gender, , private /public study, job, year of study, and age in motivation are not investigated.

The present study tries to check the role of the mentioned variables in the Iranian Undergraduate English Major students' motivation in English Language Learning (ELL) based on Gardner's above-mentioned three motivational components.

2-The Study

The present study tries to answer the following questions:

Is there any significant difference in the IUEM (Iranian Undergraduate English Major) students' motivation in English language learning as far as their 1) university, 2) gender, 3) kind of study, i.e., private /public study, 4)job i.e., employment / unemployment, 5) year of study, i.e., freshman to senior, and 6) age are considered?

3- Method

3-1- Participants

A total number of 262 literature major participants from four different universities: Tehran, Alzahra, Allameh Tabatabaiee, and Shahid Beheshti from freshman to senior, participated in the present study. It is worth mentioning that in each part of the study, as different tables demonstrate, the total number of the participants varies from analysis to analysis which is due to the removal of listwise deletion of cases for incomplete responses to some items in the questionnaire.

3-2-Instruments

A questionnaire including 30 items was used to measure the participants' motivation. The questionnaire consisted of three components: a) desire to learn the language; b) motivational intensity, and c) attitude toward the language. All the items in the first part of Gardner's (1985) AMTB (Attitude/Motivation Test Battery) were used but translated into Persian for eliciting the degree of the IUEM students' motivation .

Of these 30 items, the first 20 ones, checking desire to learn the language and motivational intensity respectively were presented in the form of multiple choice questions each consisting of three choices. The other 10 items followed the Likert-scale format. Each item was answered on a 5-point scale, ranging from strong disagreement (1) to strong agreement (5).

3-3- Scoring method

Each individual's score in motivation is the sum of the scores on the first 20 items in the form of multiple choice and the other 10 in the form of Likert scale (1-5) ranging from strong disagreement (1), to strong agreement (5).

To be able to add two different kinds of measurement, i.e., scores of multiple choice items and scores of Likert scale items; the researcher converted them into the same scale, i.e., percentage. The sum of each individual's score in these two parts indicates his/her degree of motivation.

3-4- Data Analysis

To answer the 1st and 5th questions, two one-way ANOVAs were conducted. The answer to the 2nd, 3rd and 4th questions were estimated through three independent sample *t*-tests and the 6th question was estimated by the use of correlation.

5- Results

To answer the first question, i.e., if the IUEM students' motivation of different universities differs significantly from each other, a one-way ANOVA was conducted. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of the participants' motivation in the four universities.

As the means indicate the highest degree of motivation belongs to the students' in Tehran University and then to those in Alzahra University. Though the result of the one-way ANOVA (Table 2) indicates that the difference among the four universities is significant ($F_{(3,258)} = 2.815, p < .05$), in the post-hoc Scheffe test (Table 3), this significance is not revealed. In fact the highest degree of significance is related to that of between Tehran and Allameh Tabatabaai but on the border line ($P = .052$).

To answer the next question, i.e., if the participants' motivation differs significantly between males and females, an independent sample *t*-test was conducted. Table 4 provides the information related to the descriptive statistics of males' and females' motivation, which shows the latter, is higher than the former. The results of the *t*-test (Table 5) indicate that the difference between males and females in motivation is not significant ($t_{(259)} = 1.860, p > .05$).

To answer the next question, i.e., if the participants' motivation differs significantly if their type of study differs [i.e. if they pay any money (private) or if they don't (public)], an independent sample *t*-test was conducted. Table 6 reveals the descriptive statistics of the motivation with the higher mean belonging to those who pay money (private); the result of the *t*-test (Table 7) indicates that this difference is not significant ($t_{(259)} = 1.083, p > .05$).

Another independent sample *t*-test was conducted to find the difference in the motivation of employed and unemployed students. Table 8 shows that, like the previous variable, though the mean of the employed ones is more than the unemployed students, no significance is revealed in the *t*-test ($t_{(258)} = .314, p > .05$) (Table 9).

Next table (Table 10) provides the information related to the participants' motivation at different years of English language study i.e. from freshman to senior.

To check if the difference among the means is significant or not a one-way ANOVA was conducted. The number of the units passed determined the student's year of study:

Freshman: 25-35 units passed; Sophomore: 36-70 units passed; Junior: 71-100 units passed; Senior: 101-135 units passed.

The result (Table 11) shows that the difference is significant ($F_{(3, 253)} = 3.860, p < .05$).

The post-hoc Scheffe test (Table 12) indicates that the students in the first year are significantly more motivated than the ones in the last year.

To answer the last question, i.e., if there is any relationship between the participants' motivation and their age, a Pearson correlation was conducted. The result ($r = 0.64$) shows that there is no significant relationship between the motivation and the age.

6- Discussion

“Our students don't seem to be motivated enough.” This sentence is heard from many teachers teaching at different levels of university. Is it true in fact?

It seems that this statement should be paid attention to from different aspects. Learners are individuals studying at different

ages and in different conditions. Different variables can play important roles in the degree of their motivation.

Considering the role of universities, the participants were not significantly different in motivation which indicates the use of the same course syllabus, and implies the use of somehow similar materials, and maybe similar methodologies.

Co-education, when males and females study together, is heard to be a factor that increases learners' motivation. This is negated in the light of the results of this study. Alzahra University being unique for women should have learners with the lowest level of motivation in comparison to other universities, but the result reveals it to be wrong. There is not any significant difference between Alzahra University students and the other three. In fact students of Alzahra University have higher motivation than Allameh Tabatabaai and Shahid Beheshti University students (Table 1) though, of course, not significant.

Considering the employment situation, one may think that the learners who work are more motivated than the unemployed ones because they are after promotion, which is based on learning more information. On the other hand, one may think that the unemployed learners have more motivation for studying because it somehow guarantees their future. The results from the comparison between employed and unemployed students indicate that though the difference is not significant, the employed ones have a higher motivation to keep their presents status. In other words, it seems the motivation for preserving the present situation is more effective than the attempt for achieving something in the future.

The other relevant factor to the previous one is the kind of study, i.e., financial aspect of studying. So many times it is heard from the teachers or authorities that those students who pay money (private ones), seem to have a higher degree of motivation. According to the results of the present research, this intuitive statement seems logical; they outperform the ones who don't pay any money, though this difference is not significant. In fact, this variable is somehow related to the employment/unemployment factor. Learners who have to pay money, have to work to be able to continue studying. In other words, working and money paying can be considered as two motivating factors.

Finally one of the main variables, which seems effective is the different degrees of motivation for L2 learning during the four years of study. During the first year of their study in the university, the learners are highly motivated, while as time passes, they lose their motivation in English language learning subsequently, with the minimum level in the last year. It seems that the learners “expectations” or their “needs” are not fulfilled which might be either because of the mismatch between their needs and syllabus design or because of the inappropriacy of the way of teaching or pedagogical objectives. Whichever the reason might be, it is an issue, which is worth paying attention to.

7- Conclusion

The results of the present study might be worth paying attention to for teachers and educational policy makers. The aim of teaching English to English major students is to train highly proficient students in this major. Since researchers believe in motivation being one of the main factors affecting L2 proficiency, the role of other factors affecting this motivation is worth paying attention to. Among the factors investigated in this study, employment of the participants as well as their paying money for studying was effective in the increase of their motivation although not significantly. And gender though playing some roles, with females having a higher motivation than the males, again was not significant. On the other hand, the year of their study was shown to have a significant relationship with motivation. That is, if teachers want to have highly motivated learners in English language learning, they should try to increase their students’ motivation or at least maintain their motivation at the level of their entrance to the university, through different techniques such as needs analysis, clarifying the pedagogical objectives, and making a balance between those needs and the present approved or used materials.

References

- Ainsfeld, M. and Lambert, W.E. (1961) "Social and Psychological Variables in Learning Hebrew". *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63, 524-529.
- Clement, R. Dornyei, Z., and Noels, K.A. (1994) "Motivation, Self- Confidence, and Group Cohesion in Foreign Language Classroom". *Language Learning*, 44:3,417-448.
- Crookes, G. and Schimdt, R.W. (1991)"Motivation: Reopening The Research Agenda". *Language Learning*, 41:4,469-512.
- Dornyei, Z. (1990)" Conceptualising Motivation in Foreign Language Learning". *Language Learning*, 40:1, 45-78.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001)' *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Dornyei, Z. (2002)" The Motivational Basis of Language Learning Tasks". In Peter Robinson (Ed.), *Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. (pp.137-158). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dornyei, Z.& Kormos, J. (2000) "The Role of Individual and Social Variables in Oral Task Performance". *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 275-300.
- Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E. (1959)" Motivational Variables in Second Language Acquisition". *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13, 266-272.
- Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E. (1972) *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Newbury House: Rowley, MA.
- Gardner, R.C. (1983)" Learning Another Language: A True Social Psychological Experiment". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 2, 219-240.
- Gardner, R.C. (1985) *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.
- Gerow, J.R. (1995) *Psychology: An Introduction*. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Kormos, J. & Dornyei, Z. (2004) *The Interaction of Linguistic and Motivational Variables in Second Language Task Performance*. [Online]. Available: <http://www.ualberta.ca/~german/ejournal/kormos2.htm>.

- Lizabeth, E. (1983)" *The Role of Integrative Motivation in English as a Second Language Learning Among a Group of Foreign Students in The United States*". Paper Presented at The Annual Convention of Teaches of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Lepper, M.R. & Henderlong Corpus, J. & Iyengar, S.S. (2006). "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivatioal Orientaions in the Classroom: Age differences and Academic Correlates". *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97,2,184-196.
- Luckmani, Y.M. (1972)" Motivation to Learn and Language Proficiency". *Language Learning*, vol. 22, No. 2, 261-273.
- Morri, S. (2007)" Reading Motivation to Read in a Foreign Language". *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 19,1.
- Oxford, R.L. and Shearin, J. (1994)"Language learning Motivation: Expending The Theoretical Framework". *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12-28.
- Perez, M.H. (1984). *The Relation of Social Attitudes and Language Study Motivation with English Ability Among Immigrant High School Spanish Speaking Students* (second Language, Hispanic minorities).[online]. Available:<http://www.lib.umi.com/dissertations/fullcit?p8509018>.
- Salim, A.R. (1995)" Attitudes and Cultural Background and Their Relationship to English in a Multicultural Social Context: The Case of Male and Female Arab Immigrants in Canada". *Educational Psychology*, 15 (3), 323-335.
- Spolsky, B. (1969)"Attitudinal Aspects of Second Language Learning". *Language Learning*, 19, 271-283.
- Steers, R.M. and Porter, L.W. (1987) *Motivation and Work Behaviour*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Tremblay, P.F., and Gardner, R.C. (1995) "Expanding the motivation Construct in language learning". *The Modern Language Journal*, 79 (4), 505-5.

13/ Motivation for L2 Learning...

Table1. Descriptive Statistics of Motivation in Four Universities

university	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Tehran	65	176.5128	12.10775	1.50178
Azzahra	70	173.9429	17.79820	2.12729
Allameh Tabatabaai	83	169.0442	18.35872	2.01513
Shahid Beheshti	44	171.9242	13.64327	2.05680
Total	262	172.6896	16.26765	1.00502

Table 2. ANOVA for universities

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2188.822	3	729.607	2.815	.040
Within Groups	66881.263	258	259.230		
Total	69070.085	261			

Table 3. Multiple Comparisons for universities

(I) Universities	(J) Universities Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	upper Bound
Tehran	Azzahra	2.56996	2.77334	.835	-5.2343 10.3742
	Allameh	7.46864	2.66672	.052	-.0356 14.9729
	Beheshti	4.58858	3.14320	.547	-4.2565 13.4337
Azzahra	Tehran	-2.56996	2.77334	.835	-10.3742 5.2343
	Allameh	4.89868	2.61276	.321	-2.4537 12.2511
	Beheshti	2.01861	3.09756	.935	-6.6980 10.7352
Allameh	Tehran	-7.46864	2.66672	.052	-14.9729 .0356
	Azzahra	-4.89868	2.61276	.321	-12.2511 2.4537

	Beheshti	-2.88007	3.00247	.821	-11.3291	5.5690
Beheshti	Tehran	-4.58858	3.14320	.547	-13.4337	4.2565
	Azzahra	-2.01861	3.09756	.935	-10.7352	6.6980
	Allameh	2.88007	3.00247	.821	-5.5690	11.3291

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics of Males 'and Females' Motivation

	Sex of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Motivation	male	41	168.3252	17.56772	2.74362
	female	220	173.4530	15.94732	1.07517

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics of Type of course (Private/ Public)

	Kind of study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Motivation	public	175	171.9562	15.97791	1.20782
	private	86	174.2791	16.89683	1.82203

Table 8
Descriptive statistics for job (Employed/ Unemployed)

	Job of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Motivation	employed	31	173.5699	20.48544	3.67929
	non -employed	229	172.5910	15.68433	1.03645

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics of Subjects' Motivation at Different Years of Study

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
freshman	91	176.1355	15.25560	1.59922
sophomore	60	173.4722	14.88971	1.92225
junior	71	171.5822	14.70792	1.74551

15/ Motivation for L2 Learning...

senior	35	165.6190	21.19689	3.58293
Total	257	172.8236	16.22536	1.01211

Table 11. ANOVA for different years of study

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2949.530	3	983.177	3.860	.010
Within Groups	64445.585	253	254.726		
Total	67395.115	256			

Table 12. Multiple Comparisons for different years of study

(I) Year based on units passed	(J) Year based on units passed Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower bound	upper bound
freshman	sophomore 2.66331	2.65417	.800	-4.8066	10.1332
	junior 4.55337	2.52723	.357	-2.5592	11.6660
	senior 10.51648(*)	3.17444	.013	1.5823	19.4506
sophomore	freshman -2.66331	2.65417	.800	-10.1332	4.8066
	junior 1.89006	2.79877	.928	-5.9868	9.7669
	senior 7.85317	3.39460	.151	-1.7006	17.4069
junior	freshman -4.55337	2.52723	.357	-11.6660	2.5592
	sophomore -1.89006	2.79877	.928	-9.7669	5.9868
	senior 5.96311	3.29629	.354	-3.3140	15.2402
senior	freshman -10.51648(*)	3.17444	.013	-19.4506	-1.5823
	sophomore -7.85317	3.39460	.151	-17.4069	1.7006
	junior -5.96311	3.29629	.354	-15.2402	3.3140

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 5 Independent Samples Test for males and females

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
	Equal variances assumed	.562	.454	-1.860	259	.064	-5.12781	2.75709	-10.5569
Equal variances not assumed			-1.740	53.001	.088	-5.12781	2.94674	-11.0382	.78263

Table 7-Independent Samples Test for type of course (private/ public)

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
	Equal variances assumed	.088	.767	-1.083	259	.280	-2.32281	2.14459	-6.54591
Equal variances not assumed			-1.063	160.934	.290	-2.32281	2.18601	-6.63981	1.99408

Reference in Agrammatism

Tahmineh Heydarpur¹

Agrammatism is a language disorder (i.e. a syntactic one) that has attracted neurolinguists' and language-speech therapists' attention in recent year. There are different approaches to this problem. Many researchers consider agrammatism to be a psychological or motor disorder rather than a linguistic one. However, the purpose of this article is to introduce agrammatism from a linguistic point of view, and to analyze and describe the disorders that agrammatic patients show in comprehending different syntactic structures, especially those containing anaphoric expressions (specifically reflexive pronouns) and Pronominals.

Key Words: *referent, language disorder, anaphoric expressions, non canonical*

¹-Post graduate student, Linguistics, Allame Tabatabai University
tahmineh003@yahoo.com

Culioli's Philosophical Approach

Jinuss Shirvan¹

The theory of "Enunciation" presented by Antoine Culioli takes the grammatical categories of natural languages into consideration and aims at presenting explanations for the questions put forward. The afore mentioned theory rests on experiential principles. In the philosophical and scientific framework adopted by Culioli issues such as metalanguage, the asymmetry between production and recognition and the concept of lexis are important. In exploring this theory, certain issues such as formalization, the formulation of linguistic act, the problem of meaning and the theory of linguistic operation and Culioli's philosophical approach are introduced.

Key Words: *metalanguage, formalization, recognition, linguistic operation*

¹ - Faculty member, Islamic Azad University, Tehran Central Branch
Jinuss_shirvan@yahoo.fr

Semantic Changes of European Non – Professional Loan Words in New Persian Language in The Last Century

Zahra Tourani¹

The object of this survey is to explore semantic changes of European non - professional loan words in new Persian language in the last century. Loan words meanings in the borrower language are usually different from the original meanings in the lender one. In this way, semantic changes happen. The author believes that surveying semantic changes of loan words can be instrumental in historical linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and in translating text from foreign languages. Moreover, the study of loan words semantic changes can be culturally informative. In this study, four hundred and three words are selected among three thousands European loan words in which semantic change occurred after entering Persian language. These semantic changes have been investigated. Then, statistical analysis of various semantic changes are presented.

Key words: *semantic changes, loan word, borrowing, non-professional words*

¹ - M.A. Graduate in Linguistics, Islamic Azad University, Tehran Central Branch mn_turani@yahoo.com

Lexicon: from Standard Theory to Minimalist Program

Maryam Kiani¹

Propounding generative grammar, involves a broad range of changes, in its body from standard theory to minimalist program, in this case the amount of information which exist in different modules like lexicon, has been changed and the enhancement of different kinds of features in this modules causes deletion of complex transformational and grammatical processes. The present essay's main objective is to explore factors which have strong influence on Chomsky's approach from auto syntax to lexica list theory and arguing the place of lexicon in minimalist program according to which the definition of lexicon in minimalist program will be prepared.

Key Words: *Autonomous Syntax, Lexica list, Lexicon, Minimalist program*

¹ - M.A.Graduate, linguistics, Alzahra University
Maryam.Kianie1357@gmail.com

Determining Factors in Distinguishing between Landmark & Trajector and Different Kinds of Landmark

*Arsalan Golfam*¹
*Sepide Abdolkarimi*²

Understanding situational relationship between things and their location in the outer world is the primitive and at the same time among the basic cognitive achievements of man kind, which is acquired from early childhood. On the other hand, prepositions are linguistic devices used for the linguistic codification of the situational relationship between things and their special situation in the outer world. This paper is an attempt to introduce the concept of Landmark and Trajectory, considering the concept of Perspective within the cognitive framework, different kinds of relationship between Landmark and Trajectory and the fact that these relations can be used in abstract cases. In the latter case we face the expression Imagery Schema. Authors have used their intuitions in considering the degree of naturalness of linguistic structures and have found out that factors like size of objects, movement or steadiness, fore grounding and back grounding are determining factors in considering a linguistic element as the Landmark or Trajectory in linguistic structures. These factors are those used by children in early stages of cognitive processing which have a close relationship with visual perception.

Keywords: *Perspective, Landmark, Trajectory and Imagery Schema.*

¹- Faculty Member, Linguistics Department, Tarbiat Modarres University
golfamar@yahoo.com

²-postgraduate student, Linguistics Department, Tarbiat Modarres University
sepidehabdolkarimi79@gmail.com

“KE” in Persian Language: Typological Approach

Negar Momeni¹

Typology has numerous applications in linguistics and other sciences. Typology means taxonomy or classification. Asher encyclopedia (1995) defines typology as structural variations among languages. Typology classifies languages on the basis of some criteria. These criteria fall in linguistic universalities and exist in native speakers' minds. One of these criteria is the connector which acts between identifying element and identified element. This connector connects subordinate clause and the main clause. This connector is “KE” in Persian language. The researcher aims at studying the structures after “KE” and their related information structures. The researcher draws the conclusion that verbs coming after “KE” should be finite in relative, cleft, pseudo-cleft, subordinate and question structures. Different kinds of tenses can appear in structures after “KE”. Noun phrase is the freest phrase; it can be questioned in all these structures. Finally, what Holliday specifies as old and new information is compatible with structures after “KE”. It means theme and rheme are old and new information respectively. In question statements “KE” is new information.

Key Words: *typology, subordinate structure, information structure, question word "KE"*

¹- post graduate student, linguistics, Tarbiat Modarres University
n-momeni@modares.ac.ir

انگیزه یادگیری زبان دوم: نقش برخی عوامل

الهه ستوده نما^۱

مدرسان و محققان، انگیزه را یکی از عوامل اصلی که بر یادگیری زبان خارجی/ زبان دوم تاثیر دارد پذیرفته اند. با چنین اعتقادی، ارتباط انگیزه با سایر عوامل مورد تحقیق قرار گرفته است. در تحقیق حاضر تلاش بر آن است تا ارتباط میان انگیزه دانشجویان رشته زبان انگلیسی برای یادگیری زبان انگلیسی و عوامل متعدد از جمله دانشگاه، جنسیت، نوع درس خواندن به صورت روزانه/ شبانه (با / بدون پرداخت هزینه) شغل، سال تحصیل و سن، مورد بررسی قرار گیرد. نتایج این تحقیق نمایانگر آن است که به غیر از یک عامل، سایر متغیرهای فوق الذکر هیچ نقشی در میزان انگیزه یادگیری زبان انگلیسی ندارند. تنها عاملی که در میزان انگیزه برای یادگیری زبان انگلیسی نقش دارد، سال تحصیلی می باشد. نتیجه به دست آمده نشان می دهد دانشجویان سال اول به میزان معنا داری انگیزه بالاتری از دانشجویان سال آخر دارند.

واژه های کلیدی: انگیزه، یادگیری زبان دوم، عامل شغل، جنسیت، سن، سال تحصیلی