
Does English Medium Instruction (EMI) Make a Difference on Student Motivation?*

İşıl Atlı, Ondokuz Mayıs University, isil_atli@hotmail.com

Dalga Özal, Ondokuz Mayıs University, dozal@omu.edu.tr

Recommended citation: Atlı, I. and Özal, D. (2017). Does English Medium Instruction (EMI) Make a Difference on Student Motivation? *Journal of Language Research (JLR)*, 1(1), 25-36.

Abstract: English Medium Instruction (EMI) has been a growingly popular practice in public and private universities around Turkey. Following the trend of internationalization overeagerly, Turkish universities have started undergraduate and graduate programs run partially or fully in English, yet they have given not enough thought to what it requires to teach and learn an academic subject in an additional language. Decision makers at the tertiary level have often regarded English language proficiency as the only indicator of success in these programmes and mistakenly believed that the required English proficiency level could be attained within a year through the “Preparatory Year English Language Programme (PYP)” offered by the language school of the university. However, it has been seen that in many cases, these one-year-long intensive English programmes have failed to meet the needs of the students preparing to study their prospective academic fields in English, and low student motivation has been observed as a major hindrance. The aim of this study is to find out if choosing an EMI programme has a positive effect on student motivation and English language proficiency and to discover if there is a positive correlation between student motivation and academic achievement. For that purpose, during the spring semester of the academic year 2016-2017, 40 PYP students enrolled in an EMI programme run fully (100%) in English, 40 PYP students enrolled in an EMI programme run partially (30%) in English and 40 PYP students enrolled in a programme run completely in Turkish were given Gardner’s Attitude/Motivation Test Battery Questionnaire. Then students’ end-of-the-year test scores were collected to identify if there is a correlation between student achievement and motivation in these three groups of students. Based on the findings, pedagogical implications for PYPs will be discussed.

Keywords: *Attitude, Motivation, English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI), Tertiary Education*

INTRODUCTION

What is the role of motivation in language learning? What factors affect student motivation in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) or English as a Second Language (ESL) classrooms? Does motivation determine success, with low motivation resulting in lower grades and high motivation in higher grades? These are some of the major questions related with motivation in the domain of foreign and second language learning.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Attitude and Motivation

Students walk into EFL/ESL classrooms holding remarkably different attitudes toward the language itself, its speakers, its country of origin, the culture behind it, language teachers, course materials, to mention but a few. This, in turn, is known to affect students’ desire and speed to learn the language and their ultimate success in the language classroom. As Murray and Christison (2011) puts it, “when learners have a positive attitude about the target language, the culture, the speakers, these attitudes are thought to have a positive influence on learning outcomes. Similarly, negative attitudes are thought to adversely affect learning, and ultimately, L2 proficiency” (p. 175). With a similar view, Al-Tamimi and Shuib (2009) writes that “... attitudes may play a very crucial role in language learning as they would appear to influence students’ success or failure in learning” (p.33).

* This study was presented at the 1st International Black Sea Conference on Language and Language Education held on September 22-23, 2017 at Ondokuz Mayıs University.

Another affective factor closely linked with attitude is believed to be motivation. Although lacking a compromised definition, motivation has an undeniably important role in all kinds of learning, and it is often referred to in order to explain individual differences among language learners, along with other linguistic and non-linguistic factors. According to Harmer (2001), "at its most basic level, motivation is some kind of internal drive which pushes someone to do things in order to achieve something" (p. 51). Dörnyei (2005) posit that "motivation provides a primary impetus to initiate learning in the L2 and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process" (p. 65). Adopting a similar view, Ellis (1997) considers motivation as an umbrella term that embraces attitudes. He goes on to point out that "... motivation involves the attitudes and affective states that influence the degree of effort that learners make to learn an L2" (p. 75). These definitions point at motivation as the driving force behind language learning and motivation and attitude as two inseparable entities.

Other than starting and continuing the language learning process, motivation is also associated with success. Gardner (2006), for example, argues that "students with higher levels of motivation will do better than students with lower level" (p. 241). Similarly, emphasizing the key role of motivation on success, Johnson & Johnson (1999) count motivation as one of the characteristics of successful language learners. Referring to Gardner's extensive research on motivation, they state that "Gardner has consistently found out that his scales of motivational intensity, desire to learn the language and attitudes to learning the language has been strongly related to achievement" (p. 222).

Types of Motivation

It is known that people take up and carry on a task, including language learning, for a variety of reasons, which helps us distinguish between types of motivation. As a general construct, motivation is classified as intrinsic or extrinsic, depending of the source of the moving force behind learning. That is, "those who learn for their own self-perceived needs and goals are intrinsically motivated, and those who pursue a goal only to receive an external reward from someone else are extrinsically motivated" (Brown, 2000, p. 162). The anticipation of reward is the line that draws the distinction between intrinsically and extrinsically motivated learners. In a language classroom, for instance, an intrinsically motivated learner does not look out for an external reward but take part in learning for the sake of learning. In the case of extrinsically motivated learners, the behaviour is instigated and continued by the anticipation of external rewards, such as grades, recognition, gifts, positive feedback, and so on.

Another renowned method of classifying motivation is creating an instrumental vs. Integrative spectrum. Such a classification pertains essentially to language learning contexts. According to Ellis (1997), when instrumentally motivated, "learners make efforts to learn an L2 for some functional reason- to pass an examination, to get a better job, or to get a place at a university" (p. 75). Integrative motivation, on the other hand, is undergirded by the learner's desire to learn about or be a part of the group that speaks the language in question.

While the key role of motivation and attitudes in language classrooms is widely acknowledged, the question of whether one type of motivation is superior to the other remains unanswerable as the power of each type is determined largely by the individual learner.

Gardner's Attitude and Motivation Test Battery

Over the last 50 years, attitude and motivation have been popular topics in SLA research. A plethora of research have been done in order to explore student's attitudes and motivation and to determine to what extent these constructs influence student's linguistic attainment in EFL/ESL settings. Many of these studies have used and are still using an infamous assessment tool known as the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) formed by R. C. Gardner, a pioneering name in social sciences to investigate the role of motivation in language classrooms.

Gardner (1985) states that AMTB was developed to fill the need to assess non-linguistic aspects of language learning and initially focused on "the investigation of English speaking students learning

French as a second language." These non-linguistic variables were believed to be associated with L2 learning and were grouped into five main categories of (1) integrativeness, (2) attitudes towards the learning situation, (3) motivation, (4) language anxiety, (5) other attributes (Gardner & Tremblay & Masgoret, 1997). Each of these categories included sub-scales. For example, an individual learner's motivation to learn L2 is measured through (a) attitudes towards learning the language, b) desire to learn the language, c) motivational intensity. Of these categories, according to Gardner & Tremblay & Masgoret (1997), "... the three components of motivation tend to be correlated with each other and to correlate more highly with achievement than do the measures of integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation (Lalonde & Gardner, 1985)" (p. 346), which suggests a stronger link between motivation and achievement than with other components.

The influence of motivation in general on success has intrigued researchers, language teachers and others involved in language teaching, who were in search for an answer to explain individual differences in the learning process and low student success. Having been formed by Gardner in 1958, AMTB was improved and reformed by Gardner and Lambert (1972). Since then, it has been used in many different contexts and translated into various languages to be used in research worldwide (Gardner, 2004). Despite having been developed over 50 years ago, it is still one of the most extensively resorted tools in motivational research in SLA. (see e.g. Fazlı & Seyyedrezai, 2016; Priyantın, 2014; Jain & Sidhu, 2013; Tahaineh & Daana, 2013; Al-Zubeiry, 2012).

Previous Research on Motivation and Achievement in EMI and CLIL Contexts

Given the size of the research pool touching on the interrelatedness between motivation and overall achievement in SLA, it is impossible to mention all previous research here. Therefore, the selection of studies discussed here will be limited to those that have been conducted recently and especially in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) or English Medium Instruction (EMI) settings due to its resemblance to the context of the current study.

CLIL and EMI are two distinct but closely linked concepts and are used interchangeably in some sources despite the attempts to define them separately. Therefore, it is important to take a glance at their definitions before moving on to the studies that investigate their influence on motivation. CLIL is a recent phenomenon that emerged in the European Union in 1990s to refer to the latest trend of teaching school subjects through the medium of a foreign language to promote the authenticity and meaningfulness of language learning as opposed to EFL classes where the foreign language is the goal rather than a medium. The popular and widely accepted definition of CLIL suggests that it is "a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language" (Coyle et. al. 2010, p.1). In a CLIL setting, additional language refers to any language that is not used in students' immediate environment. On the other hand, EMI is defined as "the use of English language to teach academic subjects in countries or jurisdiction where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English" (Dearden, 2014, p.2). While CLIL and EMI are used interchangeably in some contexts as both are used in EFL settings, they are indeed different in terms of the languages concerned, the educational levels they are implemented in and the focus of the lesson. To summarize the discrepancies very briefly, EMI limits itself with the use of English only, tertiary level of education and content teaching, whereas CLIL is broader in these respects, and the approach sits on an exhaustively described theoretical base.

One commonality that CLIL and EMI shares is their potential to impinge on student motivation by providing them with a genuine reason to learn and practice a foreign language, which previous language teaching methods lack. Therefore, CLIL and EMI have been in the spotlight of motivation research for a while. To test CLIL's alleged influence on student motivation and achievement, Lasagabaster (2011) conducted a cross-sectional study involving 191 secondary school students who were enrolled in CLIL in addition to regular EFL classes or EFL classes only. The motivational intensity of the participants was assessed via a 13-item questionnaire in the form of five point likert-scale and their English achievement using English tests described in detail in the actual study. Lasagabaster (2011) writes that "the results confirm the benefits of CLIL from both a motivational and a language competence

perspective" (p. 3). Another study that investigates the assumed link between CLIL and increased motivation belongs to Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2014). Similar to the previous one, this quantitative study involving 393 secondary school students in CLIL and EFL students indicated CLIL students' advantage over EFL students in terms of motivation. However, the authors suggest that their results should be approached with a grain of salt as "individual and contextual differences" may change the results (Doiz, Lagabaster & Sierra, 2014). Research have also shown results contradicting with CLIL's motivation-related premises. A study carried out by Fernandez-Fontecha & Canga Alanso (2014) on motivation in CLIL and non-CLIL settings, for example, revealed that non-CLIL learner were more motivated than CLIL learners. Based on their findings, the researchers suggested that CLIL's impact on student motivation could be context-bound. These and other studies are an obvious indication of academic interest in the interrelatedness between CLIL type provisions and motivation. Unlike CLIL, a well-formed approach to learning content and language, EMI does not seem to have received its fair share from motivation research. An overview of literature has shown that researchers have chosen to focus on student and teacher perceptions of EMI, problems and challenges experienced rather than investigating a possible link between EMI and motivation.

Problem Statement

EMI is a popularly growing phenomenon among Turkish universities. Despite the lack of an explicit language policy statement and methodological consensus, public and private universities start undergraduate and graduate programs run fully (100%) or partially (30%) in a foreign language, mostly in English. Freshmen who get a place in one of these programs are required to prove their proficiency in English either by submitting a nationally or internationally recognized English test, such as TOEFL or YDS or achieve the passing grade at the English proficiency exam delivered at the beginning of the academic year by the relevant department of the university. Those who fail to do so are required to attend "Preparatory Year English Language Programme (PYP)", whose aim is to prepare students for their prospective EMI programs. Although EMI students are expected to be intrinsically motivated to study English, low student motivation is one of the main problems observed by the instructors and expressed by the students enrolled in PYPs.

Aim of The Study

The aim of this study is to find out if choosing an EMI programme has a positive effect on student motivation and English language proficiency and to discover if there is a positive correlation between student motivation and academic achievement.

Research Questions

1. Is there a correlation between PYP students' achievement scores in English and their motivational intensity?
2. Is there a correlation between PYP students' gender and motivational intensity?
3. Is there a significant difference among PYP students' motivational intensity enrolled in programs run fully in English (full EMI), partially in English (partial EMI) or fully in Turkish?

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The participants of this study consist of a total of 117 students enrolled in the elective and compulsory PYP at Ondokuz Mayıs University (OMU) School of Foreign Languages during the Academic Year 2016-2017. Of the participants, 38 were enrolled in a full EMI undergraduate programme, 39 in a partial

EMI programme and 40 in a programme run in Turkish. Thirty-seven of the students in the full EMI programme were preparing to study Medicine in the following year, and only one to study Economics. Students in the partial EMI group were preparing to study Materials Science and Engineering or Aerospace Engineering. Students in the final group were attending elective PYP and were preparing to study in various faculties, departments or vocational schools at OMU. PYP is compulsory only for EMI students and elective for other freshman students. According to the Regulations Regarding the Guidelines to be followed in Foreign Language Education and Education through a Foreign Language in Institutions of Higher Education, which was published in the Official Gazette on March 23rd 2016, PYP is compulsory for all EMI programs and elective for others. The following table demonstrates the number of participants according to their gender and nationality.

Table 1: Participants According to Gender and Nationality

Gender		
Female	Male	Total
57	60	117
Nationality		
Turkish	International	Total
112	5	117

As the table illustrates, the study includes 57 female and 60 male PYP students; 112 Turkish and 5 international PYP students.

Instruments

In the data collection process, "The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery" (AMTB) (2004), one of the most widely-used tools used in discovering the role of motivation in foreign language learning, has been used. The original questionnaire was developed for use with secondary school students studying English as a foreign language. Therefore, two items- item 25 and 40- have been discarded from the questionnaire as these items did not correspond to the PYP context at OMU. Pre-administration, the questionnaire has also been translated into Turkish- students' native language- by the researchers for comprehension and reliability reasons. Upon the administration of the questionnaire on 117 PYP students during the Spring Semester of the academic year 2016-2017, the reliability of the questionnaire was recalculated via SPSS, and it proved to be .78 Cronbach Alpha.

Upon the administration of the questionnaire, students' average achievement scores in English were collected from the coordinating instructors at OMU School of Foreign Languages. The correlation between students' average achievement scores in English and their scores in AMTB were calculated via SPSS. For that purpose, the researchers have used ANOVA. To investigate the relationship between gender and motivation, T-test has been used.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, findings obtained in the research are presented in tabular form and the results are discussed.

Table 2: Correlation between Student Achievement and Motivation

		ACHIEVEMENT SCORE	MOTIVATION
ACHIEVEMENT SCORE	Pearson Correlation	1	-,055
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,554*
	N	117	117
MOTIVATION	Pearson Correlation	-,055	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,554	
	N	117	117

*P>0.05 There is no correlation between achievement score and motivation

As it is seen in Table 2, there is no correlation between PYP students' achievement scores and their motivational intensity.

It was expected that there would be a high positive correlation between the achievement levels and motivation of the participants in this study, especially those in the elective preparatory groups. Yet, the students had preferred the preparation class entirely by their own will. However, they were found to have a level of achievement that was incompatible with surprisingly low levels of total motivation. Even though there are researches with similar results showing no or a slight relationship between motivation and achievement in terms of total motivation of students from different departments in Turkey (Uçar, 2009; Çetinkaya, 2017), the current situation gave the impression that assessment instruments used in the School of Foreign Languages should be revisited. Beyond that, perhaps the assessment tools cannot evaluate what is taught or they do not evaluate it well enough.

Table 3: Correlation between Gender and Motivation

		GENDER	MOTIVATION
GENDER	Pearson Correlation	1	-,083
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,376*
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	29,231	-142,692
	Covariance	,252	-1,230
	N	117	117
MOTIVATION	Pearson Correlation	-,083	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,376	
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	-142,692	101977,07
	Covariance	-1,230	879,113
	N	117	117

*P>0.05 There is no correlation between gender and motivation.

The findings obtained by analysing the data reveal that regarding gender differences, there is no statistically significant difference between female and male students' motivational intensity.

Table 4: Motivational Differences between Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1262,875	2	631,437	,715	,492*
Within Groups	100714,202	114	883,458		
Total	101977,077	116			

*P>0.05 There is not a significant difference between groups.

When the research findings were examined in terms of motivational differences between the groups, those enrolled in programs run fully in English (full EMI), partially in English (partial EMI) or fully in Turkish, it was revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the motivation levels of the groups.

AMTB assesses total motivational level of the students under 12 sub-categories, that is to say:

- Interest in Foreign Languages
- Parental Encouragement,
- Motivational Intensity,
- English Class Anxiety,
- English Teacher Evaluation,
- Attitude toward Learning English,
- Attitude toward English Speaking People,
- Desire to Learn English,
- English Course Evaluation,
- English Use Anxiety,
- Integrative Orientation,
- Instrumental Orientation

Although the information presented in tables 2, 3 and 4 have answered all the research questions, and in general there is not a significant interrelation between the participants’ achievement levels and their motivation, in other words, their total motivational level has no effect on their achievement scores; regarding the frequency levels of some AMTB items with remarkable results, especially those directly related to integrative and instrumental motivation, some mild differences and similarities in terms of attitude and motivation between groups should be examined.

Table 5: Interest in Foreign Languages

	Questions	ELECTIVE (NOP=40)		PARTIAL EMI (NOP=39)		FULL EMI (NOP=38)	
		Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
POSITIVE ITEMS	1	40	0	39	0	36	2
	21	39	1	34	5	38	0
	40	40	0	37	2	38	0
	63	40	0	39	0	38	0
	83	32	8	31	8	31	7
NEGATIVE ITEMS	12	10	30	12	27	3	35
	31	7	33	11	28	7	31
	53	4	26	2	37	2	36
	74	8	32	11	28	9	29
	93	19	21	17	22	9	29

Taking the students’ interest in foreign languages, the frequency of the AMTB items in Table 5 proves that;

95, 5% of the Elective Prep students,
 92,3% of the Partial EMI students and
 95,2% of the Full EMI students

have positive attitudes about having perfect foreign language skills, learning more than one foreign language and meeting people who speak foreign languages. On the other hand, most of them do not agree with the idea that learning foreign languages is not important. As a result, all groups could be said to have strongly positive attitudes towards foreign languages.

Table 6: Motivational Intensity

	Questions	ELECTIVE (NOP=40)		PARTIAL EMI (NOP=39)		FULL EMI (NOP=38)	
		Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
POSITIVE ITEMS	13	32	8	34	5	31	7
	32	15	25	12	27	18	20
	54	31	9	30	9	25	13
	75	20	20	19	20	23	15
	94	19	21	23	16	25	13
NEGATIVE ITEMS	3	15	25	18	21	10	28
	23	19	21	15	24	6	32
	42	23	17	18	21	12	26
	65	13	27	10	29	7	31
	85	23	17	25	14	13	25

The frequency of the items related to motivational intensity presented in Table 6 displays the motivational intensity levels of the students. According to Table 6, EMI groups are better motivated than the Elective group. Among all groups, the full EMI group has the strongest motivational intensity with an average of 64, 2%. Moreover, Table 6 shows that full EMI students work hard to learn English, they are more focused to learn English and they appreciate all kinds of aid or feedback they receive in their English classes. Full EMI is followed by Partial EMI with an average of 60, 5% and finally by Elective Prep with an average of 58, 5%.

As mentioned earlier, students in full EMI group are medicine students. The reason why these students have the highest motivational intensity level may be because they are going to take their entire education in English. In addition, because of the reason that Problem Based Teaching method is used at the Faculty of Medicine in Ondokuz Mayıs University, the students are expected to do all their presentations and applications in English; in addition, they do their examinations in English as well. As a result, full EMI students are aware of the need to have a good command of English when they go to their faculties, and because of this, they may have a higher motivational intensity than the other groups.

Table 7: Attitude toward Learning English

	Questions	ELECTIVE (NOP=40)		PARTIAL EMI (NOP=39)		FULL EMI (NOP=38)	
		Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
POSITIVE ITEMS	6	33	7	26	13	30	8
	25	27	13	19	10	32	6
	45	35	5	31	8	34	4
	68	38	2	28	11	34	4
	88	33	7	24	15	33	5
NEGATIVE ITEMS	18	4	36	8	31	3	35
	37	18	22	26	13	17	21
	60	3	37	6	33	2	36
	80	10	30	13	26	5	33
	98	4	36	4	35	3	35

Table 7 shows that;

- 83% of the Elective Prep students,
- 65, 6% of the Partial EMI students and
- 85, 7% of the Full EMI students

have positive attitudes towards English language. As is seen, the full EMI has the strongest positive attitude whereas the partial EMI has the weakest. Furthermore, almost 70% of the partial EMI participants expressed that they would rather spend their time on subjects other than English. The reason why the partial EMI groups have the most negative attitude level may be that the number of the courses given in English in their departments is quite limited and as a result, the students may think that they will not need English in their departments.

Table 8: Integrative Orientation

	Questions	ELECTIVE (NOP=40)		PARTIAL EMI (NOP=39)		TOTAL EMI (NOP=38)	
		Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
POSITIVE ITEMS	8	36	4	38	1	38	0
	27	38	2	36	3	35	3
	48	25	15	23	16	22	16
	70	37	3	34	5	33	5
NEGATIVE ITEMS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

The frequency levels of the items related to integrative orientation in AMTB prove that almost 85% of the students in all groups have high levels of integrative motivation. Therefore, considering the positive items in the AMTB, it can be said they express that studying English is important because it will allow them to be more at ease with people who speak English; it will allow them to meet and converse with more and varied people; it will enable them to better understand and appreciate the English way of life and they will be able to interact more easily with speakers of English.

Table 9: Instrumental Orientation

	Questions	ELECTIVE (NOP=40)		PARTIAL EMI (NOP=39)		TOTAL EMI (NOP=38)	
		Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
POSITIVE ITEMS	15	40	0	38	1	38	0
	34	37	3	36	3	35	3
	57	38	2	37	2	34	4
	77	18	22	31	8	20	18
NEGATIVE ITEMS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Regarding the instrumental motivation of the groups, it can be said that the partial EMI has the highest level of motivation. 91% of the students in this group say that studying English is important because they will need it for their career and English will be useful in getting a good job in the future. In addition, 83 % of other groups are instrumentally motivated.

Although the Partial EMI groups have a negative attitude toward learning English, the reason why the instrumental motivation levels are so high might be explained as follows: As it has been stated earlier, the partial EMI groups consist of Aerospace Engineering and Material Science and Engineering students. Moreover, English is one of the most apparent job requirements in engineering. Brown (2000) states that “Instrumental motivation refers to motivation to acquire a language as means of attaining instrumental goals” (p.162). Especially Aerospace Engineering students have an obvious goal: all aviation employees must master the lingua franca.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this study, it was examined whether there is a positive correlation between students' motivation and their achievement scores in PYP at Ondokuz Mayıs University School of Foreign Languages during the Academic Year 2016-2017.

- In the end of the study, it was discovered that there is no correlation between PYP students' achievement scores and their motivational intensity.
- Moreover, it was found that there is no statistically significant difference between genders,
- Finally, it was revealed that there is no statistically significant difference between the motivation levels of the groups those enrolled in programs run fully in English (full EMI), partially in English (partial EMI) or fully in Turkish.

However, in case the total motivation is put aside and some significantly high motivational sub-categories, such as integrative and instrumental orientations are taken into account, it was understood that the students are integratively and instrumentally motivated, especially those who have obvious career goals. From this point of view, it can be said that EMI makes a difference on student motivation.

To find an answer to the possible question that might arouse “How can the students with low levels of motivation be successful?” the assessment tools, namely the mid-term exams, the final exam, the quizzes etc. used in the School of Foreign Languages throughout the academic year should be re-examined and revised if necessary.

References

- Al-Tamimi, A. & Shuib, M. (2009). Motivation and Attitudes towards Learning English: A Study of Petroleum Engineering Undergraduates at Hadhramout University of Science and Technology. *Journal of Language Studies*, 9(2), 29-55.
- Al-Zubeiry, H. Y. A. (2012). The Socio Psychological Orientations of Saudi Learners of English as a Foreign Language. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Languages and Literature*, 8, 13-52.
- Brown, D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. NY: Longman.
- Coyle, D. & Hood, P. & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Çetinkaya, G. (2017). *The Relationship among Language Learning Strategies, Motivation and Academic Achievement of University Preparatory School Students*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.
- Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a Medium of Instruction- a Growing Global Phenomenon*. [Available Online at <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/english-a-medium-instruction-%E2%80%93-a-growing-global-phenomenon>, Retrieved on November 11, 2015.]
- Doiz, A. & Lagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. M. (2014). CLIL and Motivation: The Effect of Individual and Contextual Variables. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 209-224.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of Language Learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Fazlı, S. & Seyyedrezaei, S. H. (2016). The Effect of Task Based Language Teaching on Elementary EFL Learners' Motivation. *Journal of Language Sciences & Linguistics*, 4(2), 103-108.
- Fernandez- Fontecha, A. & Canga Alanso, A. (2014). A Preliminary Study on Motivation and Gender in CLIL and Non-CLIL Types of Instruction. *International Journal of English Studies*, 14(1), 21-36.
- Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery: Technical Report (1985)*. [Available Online at <http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/AMTBmanual.pdf>, Retrieved on September 28, 2017.]
- Gardner, R. C. & Tremblay, P. F. & Masgoret, A. M. (1997). Towards a Full Model of Second Language Learning: An Empirical Investigation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 344-362.
- Gardner, R. C. (2004). *Attitude and Motivation Test Battery: International AMTB Research Project*. [Available Online at <http://www.nkhy.net/jingpinke/buchongyuedu/Motivation%20measurement-AMTB.pdf>, Retrieved on September 28, 2017.]
- Gardner, R. (2006). The Socio-Educational Model of Second Language Acquisition: A Research Paradigm. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 6, 237-260.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Essex: Longman.
- Jain, Y. & Sidhu, G. K. (2013). Relationship between Anxiety, Attitude and Motivation of Tertiary Students in Learning English as a Second Language. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90(2013), 114- 123.
- Johnson, K. & Johnson, H. (Eds.) (1999). *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Great Britain: Blackwell Publishing.

- Lagabaster, D. (2011). English Achievement and Student Motivation in CLIL and EFL Classes. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 5-17.
- Lalonde, R. N. & Gardner, R. C. (1985). On the Predictive Validity of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6, 403-412.
- Murray, D. E. & Christison, M. (2011). *What English Language Teachers Need to Know Volume 1: Understanding Learning*. NY: Routledge.
- Priyantini, T. (2014). Students' Attitudes towards Cooperative Learning in Enhancing Their Motivation to Speak. Paper Presented at *The 61st TEFLIN International Conference*, Sebelas Maret University, Solo, 7-9, 846-849.
- Tahaineh, Y. & Daana, H. (2013). Jordanian Undergraduates' Motivations and Attitudes towards Learning English in EFL Context. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(2), 159-180.
- Uçar, S. (2009). *The Preferences of Turkish University EFL Students for Instructional Activities in Relation to Their Motivation*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.