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Abstract

This study examined the motivation to study English and the English achievement of Vietnamese university students, using the expectancy-value model as a theoretical framework. Given the Vietnamese context, an additional variable was added to the model. This variable measured students’ motivation to study English as a means of pleasing their parents and bringing honour to their family.

The investigation used a mixed method approach that included surveys, focus group interviews, and individual interviews. Data were gathered in three universities located in Ho Chi Minh City. Participants were first year university students who were studying non-English majors but who were required to take English classes and lecturers who teach English classes. The quantitative component was a survey completed by 1207 students. The qualitative component was individual interviews with nine lecturers of English and focus group interviews with their 72 male and female students who also completed the survey.

The quantitative data were analysed using structural equation modelling (SEM). The results provided support for the expectancy-value model. Students’ expectancy to do well in English predicted students’ achievement in English. Students’ values, particularly the utility value of studying English, predicted students’ willingness to take additional courses in English. The new family variable directly predicted students’ interest in English and their utility value of English and indirectly predicted students’ willingness to take additional courses in English. Students’ sex predicted expectancy to
do well, interest in English, utility value of English, willingness to take additional English courses, and achievement in English.

The interview data from lecturers and students provided additional insights into students’ motivation to study English and their experiences of English classes. Students and lecturers agreed that most students were motivated to achieve a level of oral competency in English that would help them get desirable jobs after graduation. However, most English classes devoted little time to this aspect of English and the oral competency of most students was low. There were a number of reasons for this situation. The influence of the family, an integral part of a Confucian-based culture, on students’ motivation to study English also was explored in detail.

The thesis finishes with a set of recommendations for ways in which the teaching of English, especially the teaching of oral English, in universities in Vietnam might be improved.
Chapter One
Introduction to the Study

Introduction

Vietnam has a history of foreign domination and war. The Chinese occupied Vietnam for about a thousand years. The French controlled Vietnam from 1858 to 1954 (Harbon, Lap, & Laws, 2014). That was followed by what is described in the West as the Vietnam War, in which communist forces in northern Vietnam battled non-Communist forces in southern Vietnam, aided by a large forces of Western soldiers, particularly from the United States. The Vietnam War lasted from 1954 to 1975 when the northern forces triumphed. The end of the War saw the Communist north take control of the country.

There can be no doubt that the Vietnamese people are hard-working, resourceful, and resilient. After years of war and domination by foreign powers, Vietnam was a poor country economically. In 1986 the government adopted the policy of Doi Moi (open door) (Fry, 2009; Shapiro, 1997). The policy announced that Vietnam would open up to the outside world, even the non-communist world, in an attempt to raise the living standards of its people. Vietnam was to join the international markets. Part of the policy initiative to grow the economy was to raise the English competence of Vietnamese people because that should help Vietnam gain success internationally (Hang, 2009; C. Pham, 2016).
English now is accepted as the dominant international language. According to Guo and Beckett (2007), English not only is used by approximately 400 million people in English-speaking countries such as Britain and the United States but also by billions of people from non-English speaking countries, particularly in Asia. In relation to Asia, Crystal (2009, as cited in Cheng, 2012) observed that in China alone, there are 200 to 500 million bilingual speakers of English. Wong and Kam (2004) note that English language teaching and learning is flourishing in East Asia. Increasing numbers of students from non-English speaking countries now are required to study in schools and universities where English is the medium of instruction (D. W. Cho, 2012; Hamid & Kirkpatrick, 2016; Hamid, Nguyen, & Baldauf Jr., 2013; N. T. T. Vu & Burns, 2014).

The education system was to be used to raise competence in English. Primary schools, high schools, and universities would provide instruction in how to speak English. Even with such a concerted effort to raise competence in English, it is recognised widely that most students do not speak English well enough to conduct fluent conversations with English-speaking people (T. T. Tran, 2013a; Tuan & Mai, 2015; H. V. Van, 2013). There are a number of reasons why fluency in oral English remains poor, and these will be discussed in later chapters. At the university level, all students must study and pass three years of a foreign language (almost always English), even those who are majoring in other areas. English-speaking graduates are considered to be more employable than those who cannot speak English and more likely to have opportunities to work or study overseas (Hang, 2009).

The current study is an examination of the motivation to study English of non-English major university students. A widely accepted model of motivation and
performance was selected to form the theoretical framework of the study. The expectancy-value model has been used in many contexts to examine students’ motivation to learn (Eccles, 2009, 2011; Eccles & Wigfield, 1995, 2002; Parsons et al., 1983; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000; Wigfield, Tonks, & Klauda, 2016). It highlights two important predictors of achievement behaviour: expectancy of success on a task and the value (or values) attached to the task. The model proposes that students’ achievement, effort, persistence, and choice of achievement tasks can be explained by their expectancy-related beliefs as well as the value (or values) they attach to the tasks.

To the researcher’s knowledge, this is the first time this model has been used in a Vietnamese context, particularly in a Vietnamese university context. Does the model make sense in a non-Western context? Does the model provide a defensible explanation of students’ motivation and achievement? Do notable sex differences emerge between male and female students, as they do in studies in Western contexts? Are there particular aspects of Vietnamese culture that can be added to the model to provide more explanatory power? One might also pose the question - is it appropriate to use a model developed in a Western context in an Asian country? These questions will be addressed later in the study.

Finally, given the concern that the teaching of English in Vietnamese schools and universities has failed to produce high levels of communicative competence in English, what do university students have to say about their English studies? Do they have suggestions for ways in which their communicative competence could be enhanced?
Research Questions

The following questions were posed:

1. What factors predict students’ performance on the end-of-semester English test?
2. What factors predict students’ willingness to undertake additional study in English, either concurrently with their university students or after graduation from university?
3. To what extent is students’ sex a factor in performance on the English test and willingness to take extra English courses?
4. If the study exposes inadequacies in the operation of English courses in universities in Vietnam, how might these courses be improved?

Organization of the Thesis

The thesis is organised in the following fashion.

Chapter Two first provides an historical overview of the history of Vietnam. This is followed by a discussion of the role of English in Vietnamese history, and then the steps the Government is taking in an attempt to develop students’ competence in English at the university level. Concerns that the teaching of English in Vietnam does not produce the ability to speak easily in English are raised. What factors account for this lack of communicative competence?

Chapter Three provides a description of the development of Eccles’ expectancy-value model of motivation, including its roots in earlier work by Atkinson. The main
constructs within the model are explored in detail, along with supporting research evidence. The links with Bandura’s self-efficacy model of students’ motivation also are explored. The chapter provides evidence of the robust nature of this model and hence its use in the current study.

Chapter Four provides a rationale for the methodology adopted by the study. Both quantitative (survey) data and qualitative (interview) data were gathered. In excess of 1200 students from three universities in Ho Chi Minh City who were studying non-English majors completed the survey. The survey contained items used in expectancy-value research in other countries. In addition, 72 students and nine English lecturers participated in interviews to explore the expectancy and value ideas in the survey and other aspects of studying English at university.

Chapter Five contains a description of the analysis of the quantitative survey data. Given the large sample, structural equation modelling (SEM) was used as a confirmatory approach to a multivariate analysis of the expectancy-value model. The causal processes in the model are represented by a series of structural equations. Empirical support for the hypothesised model was established and then employed to determine the extent to which the hypothesised model was consistent with the data. Goodness of fit criteria then were used to test the plausibility of the hypothesised relations among the variables. A new variable that was particularly pertinent to the Vietnamese context was added to the expectancy-value model.

Chapter Six contains an analysis of the interview data collected from students and English lecturers. There were 72 male and female students, across the three
universities in the study, interviewed in small groups of six. The interview questions addressed the expectancy-value constructs measured in the survey data. Students also were asked more generally about the operation of their English classes and their suggestions for ways to improve them. In addition, nine English lecturers were interviewed individually about the motivation of their students studied, or did not study, for their English tests?

Chapter Seven contains a discussion of the results of the study, combining the quantitative and qualitative results. Does the expectancy-value model provide a useful way of understanding students’ achievement and decisions about whether or not to take additional courses in English? Does the new variable added to the expectancy-value model provide useful explanatory power to the model? The limitations of the study are noted, along with suggestions for future research. The chapter finishes with a set of recommendations for ways in which the teaching of English in universities in Vietnam could be improved.
Chapter Two

Higher education and English teaching and learning in Vietnam

Introduction

Understanding the context in which students are learning a foreign language helps a researcher to understand students’ motivation to learn that language (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). This chapter provides a discussion of the history of teaching and learning English in Vietnam. This chapter starts by providing a brief overview of Vietnam and its education system. It then provides a historical overview of foreign language policies in Vietnam. The chapter continues with a description of the role of English in Vietnam. The last section provides a brief overview of Vietnamese higher education, and then follows with a discussion of the current state of teaching and learning English in Vietnamese higher education.

Vietnam: Demographic detail and its system of education

Vietnam, an “S” shaped country on the Indochina Peninsula in Southeast Asia, is bordered by China in the north, by Lao and Cambodia on the west, and by the ocean in the east. Its total area is 331,700 square kilometres (D. T. Ha et al., 2004). It has 62 provinces and Hanoi is the capital city. In 2015, Vietnam has a population of approximately 94 million people (Central Intelligence Agency, 2015). It has 54 ethnic groups, with the Viet people comprising almost 90% of the whole population, and the other 53 groups accounting for just over 10%. Each group has its own language (Ashwill & Diep, 2005). Vietnamese is the official national language (Kosonen, 2013).
The formal education system in Vietnam consists of early childhood education, general education, and higher education. General education comprises three levels: primary education lasts for five years (grades 1 to 5 for children aged 6 to 10); lower secondary education lasts for four years (grades 6 to 9 for children aged 11 to 14); and upper secondary education (commonly known as high school) lasts for three years (grades 10 to 12 for adolescents aged 15 to 17). Primary education and lower secondary education are compulsory. Completion of upper secondary education (high school) is not compulsory. Higher education consists of diploma, bachelors, masters and doctorate programs.

Vietnam’s education system is centralised. The Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) is the only authority. It provides guidelines, programs, and curricula for the whole education system, both public and private (T. T. Dang, 2010; L. T. Tran, Le, & Nguyen, 2014). All students from public and private schools have to sit the same national examinations. MOET also administers the national university entrance examination for those who wish to attend university.

A brief historical overview of foreign language policies in Vietnam

To understand the development of EFL (English as a foreign language) in Vietnam, it is helpful to consider it in relation to Vietnam’s political history. Le (2007) outlines four historical phases that have shaped the country’s foreign language policy: the Chinese colonial period (111BC-938AD), the French colonial period (1858-1954), the Vietnam War period (1954-1975), and the post-reunification period (after 1975).
These historical periods had strong influences on foreign language policies, particularly foreign language choice for the education system. For example, Chinese, with its Han scripts, was used as the official language in administration, ritual activities, education, and literature throughout the 10 centuries of Chinese domination (Harbon et al., 2014; Thinh, 2006; Wright, 2002). When Vietnam regained independence in 938, the Vietnamese people developed Vietnamese scripts (Chu Nom), based on Chinese characters, as an alternative means of expressing their own language. While Chu Nom, considered a symbol of national identity, was widely used in daily life and literature, Chinese remained the official language of Vietnamese monarchies (Do & Do, 2014; Harbon et al., 2014).

Chu Nom was gradually superseded in the 17th century by a new Vietnamese script, Quoc Ngu, a writing system using Roman characters, introduced by European missionaries. Since then, Quoc Ngu has developed into the present Vietnamese language (Do & Do, 2014; T. N. Pham, 2014).

During French colonisation (1858-1954), French was made the official language. It became the language used in government correspondence, business documents, and education. Vietnamese (Quoc Ngu), even though taught in schools, was not given prominence. Chinese was not used in education after 1919 when the French closed all Confucianist schools (Thinh, 2006). English was taught as a foreign language in a few private schools in big cities. It was used by a small number of people, mainly for the commercial purposes.
The victory of Dien Bien Phu in 1954 ended French domination in Vietnam, bringing the role of French as an official language to an end. The Vietnamese language resumed its dominant role in the education system. Other languages including Russian, Chinese, English and French were taught as foreign languages. However, these languages were treated differently in the north and the south of Vietnam (Denham, 1992).

With the Geneva Agreement in 1954, Vietnam was divided into two parts with different political orientations. In the north, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, supported by Russia and China, promoted Russian and Chinese languages. Chinese and especially Russian were taught in high schools and universities. English was offered at the tertiary level on a limited basis (Denham, 1992; V. C. Le, 2007). In contrast, in the south, the Republic of Vietnam, supported by the United States, promoted English and French as the main foreign languages to be taught in secondary schools and universities (Thinh, 2006).

The Vietnam War finished in 1975. National reunification meant the end of different policies for foreign languages in the two parts of Vietnam. During the ten years after 1975, as part of the political, economic, and education links with the communist bloc of nations led by the Soviet Union (Shapiro, 1997), Russian was the main foreign language taught in Vietnam (N. Q. Tien, 2008). The influence of English was reduced (V. C. Le, 2007; N. Nguyen, 2012; Wright, 2002), and English was offered to a very small number of students (Denham, 1992; Thinh, 2006). In higher education, enrolment in English dropped significantly. Thinh (2006, p. 6) observed: “at the University of Ho Chi Minh City, the annual quotas for English training declined from
60 students (1975) to a dozen (1985).” However, as a result of major socio-economic changes in Vietnam after 1986 and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the Russian language gradually lost its position as a main foreign language taught in Vietnam (T. N. Pham, 2014; Thinh, 2006).

During the decade from 1975 to 1985, Vietnam experienced political isolation and the stagnation of the national economy. This difficult situation prompted the Vietnamese government to change policies (Thinh, 2006). In 1986, the government launched the so-called open-door policy, known as Doi Moi (Economic Renovation) (Harbon et al., 2014). Vietnam decided to expand relations with countries regardless of ideological differences and implemented a market-oriented economy. The use of English would provide opportunities for Vietnam to build up relations with English speaking countries as well as countries that use English as the language for international cooperation and trading. As Thinh (2006, p. 1) notes, “English has thus regained its role as the main foreign language taught and used in Vietnam.”

The role of English in Vietnam

The period from 1986 up to the present has seen a major expansion of English in Vietnam. As previously discussed, in 1986, the Vietnamese government introduced its ‘open door’ policy. Vietnam put an end to its isolation and took steps to integrate itself into the international community in an attempt to enhance its commercial and economic ties with other countries (Shapiro, 1997). Vietnam joined the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in 1995, the Asia–Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) in 1998, and the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2007, and signed the Bilateral Trade
Agreement with the U.S. in 2000 (N. Nguyen, 2012). The country has experienced significant growth in foreign investment. This has increased the demand for Vietnamese to develop competency in English (T. K. A. Dang, Nguyen, & Le, 2013; Harbon et al., 2014; Hiep, 2006a; T. N. N. Huong & Hiep, 2010; Kirkpatrick, 2012; V. C. Le, 2007; C. Pham, 2016; L. Phan, Hien, & Effeney, 2015; Vang, 2004; Wright, 2002).

As Crystal (1997) points out, English is used as the language for communication among international organizations such as ASEAN, APEC and WTO. An English-speaking population is important for Vietnam as it moves to develop international collaborations and promote trading and investment cooperation. English is considered the most important foreign language in Vietnam (H. T. M. Nguyen, 2011; Vang, 2004; Viet, 2008). It is seen as the key to science, technology, diplomacy, and commerce (N. Nguyen, 2012; H. V. Van, 2013).

Competence in English is particularly important at the tertiary level (Canh, 2002; T. N. N. Huong & Hiep, 2010; L. Phan et al., 2015; Thinh, 2006; T. T. Tran, 2013a). Graduates will need English to communicate effectively in the international environment (MOET, 2004; T. T. Tran, 2013a). Competence in a foreign language is a requirement for university graduation (N. Nguyen, 2012). Higher education students can choose which foreign language to study. Among the four most popular foreign languages including English, French, Chinese, and Russian currently offered in the education system (H. V. Van, 2013), English is the choice of 94% of undergraduates and 92% of post-graduates (H. V. Van, 2010). The three universities in the current study have 100% of students choosing English as their foreign language.
At the secondary levels (grade 6-12), English is taught as a school subject throughout the country (Can, 2007; Denham, 1992; Thinh, 2006; Vang, 2004). English is not yet a compulsory school subject for primary education. However, in big cities such as Ho Chi Minh City and Hanoi, English is offered to primary students (Vang, 2004). Tra (2008) argues that English should be made a compulsory subject starting at the primary level so that students are equipped with a good command of English when they enter higher education.

The importance of mastering foreign languages, particularly English, pervades government thinking. For example, in 1994, all government officials were required to study a foreign language, particularly English (N. Nguyen, 2012; Thinh, 2006). In 2008, the government launched ‘Teaching and learning foreign languages in the national education system in the period of 2008-2020 (Mai, 2014; Manh, 2012; Ngo, Spooner-Lane, & Mergler, 2015; T. N. Pham, 2014), also called the National Foreign Language Project 2020 (Do & Do, 2014; Hung, 2013; C. Pham, 2016) with a budget of approximately 5 billion United States dollars (Mai, 2014). This major project is designed to improve the quality of teaching and learning English in the national education system to meet the increasing demand for English in the context of globalisation and international interdependency (V. T. Nguyen & Mai, 2015; C. Pham, 2016; T. N. Pham, 2014).

Among the four foreign languages (English, French, Russian and Chinese) currently offered in the education system, English is acknowledged as the most important (T. K. A. Dang et al., 2013). By 2020, all students, starting from grade 3, are expected to study English, based on the assumption that children can acquire a language
more easily if they are exposed to that language at the very early age. This trend towards early exposure is occurring in other Asian countries where English is not the mother tongue (Baldauf Jr., Kaplan, Kamwangamalu, & Bryant, 2011; Baldauf & Nguyen, 2012; Kirkpatrick, 2011; H. T. M. Nguyen, 2011).

Particularly for higher education students, the project aims to provide extensive exposure to English classes (Hung, 2013; Manh, 2012). To enhance the quality of English language education, one of the aims of the project is to make English the medium of instruction (EMI) in both public and private universities (Manh, 2012). As a result, a number of EMI programs have been offered in universities in Vietnam (L. Phan et al., 2015; H. V. Van, 2010). For example, the government has introduced 30 Advanced Programs in which English is the medium of instruction in a range of subjects including economics, technology, and sciences (MOET, 2008; N. T. T. Vu & Burns, 2014). This move to EMI in Vietnamese higher education is in line with the expansion of EMI classes across the world (e.g. Byun et al., 2011; D. W. Cho, 2012; Hamid et al., 2013; Kirkpatrick, 2011).

To conclude, the government has strongly endorsed the role of English in the economic and social advancement of Vietnam. Not only is English taught in public and private schools and universities, but also hundreds of English language centers are offering courses in English. As Thinh (2006) observes, English teaching has spread with an unprecedented speed. Proficiency in English is seen as an opportunity to gain social and professional success. Students study English to enhance their job prospects (Hang, 2009). Parents bring their children to English classes after school as a means of securing a good future for them (Thinh, 2006).
Vietnamese higher education

Historical perspective on higher education in Vietnam

It has been argued that complex and tragic historical legacies have led to poor quality in Vietnamese higher education (Do, 2014; Do & Do, 2014; Harman, Hayden, & Nghi, 2010; P. L. Huong & Fry, 2004a; Vallely & Wilkinson, 2008). The following provides a brief discussion of the development of the Vietnamese higher education system that, prior to 1986, was shaped by external powers. These powers include China, France, the Soviet Union, and the United States.

Vietnam has a long history of higher education. The oldest known institution is the Royal College, established in 1076, with the values and ideologies resembling China’s higher education system (P. L. Huong & Fry, 2004b). Vietnam experienced approximately 1000 years of Chinese colonization (111BC-938AD) (P. L. Huong & Fry, 2004a). Such a long period of Chinese domination influenced many aspects of Vietnamese life, including its education. Influenced by Confucian and Taoist ideologies, the system mainly delivered lessons on moral conduct and virtues to male dignitaries. The Confucian pedagogical approach of teachers transmitting knowledge and students accepting that knowledge in a relatively passive manner persists to this day. Students rarely are encouraged to think or act creatively or to challenge the knowledge teachers present to them.
During the French domination of Vietnam (1858-1954), little money was allocated to higher education. As a consequence, Vietnam fell behind neighbouring countries in the quality of its institutions of higher education (Vallely & Wilkinson, 2008). During nearly a century of French colonization, only a few French-style higher education institutions were established, mainly to produce technical human resources to serve the colonial economy (L. T. Tran, Marginson, & Nguyen, 2014; Wright, 2002). The system served the wealthy elite who benefited from the colonial system (P. L. Huong & Fry, 2004a, 2004b). French was enforced as the standard language in education. In the 1940s, only three per cent of the population had access to schooling (Welch, 2010). In 1945, 95% of the Vietnamese population was illiterate (P. L. Huong & Fry, 2004b; Welch, 2010).

In the period 1954-1975 Vietnam was spilt into two parts. The higher education system in the north was influenced by the Soviet Union model with its narrowly specialised mono-disciplinary universities. Higher education was highly centralised with research and teaching treated separately (L. T. Tran, Marginson, et al., 2014; T. T. P. Vu & Marginson, 2014; Welch, 2010). Although the Soviet Union did contribute to the development of higher education in Vietnam, the focus on narrow specialisation meant that students were not prepared to respond to changing contexts (Welch, 2007).

Vietnamese higher education in the south was influenced by the American model with a focus on diversity. The United States was committed to expanding higher education (P. L. Huong & Fry, 2004a). Public and private universities and community colleges were established. In comparison with the elitist nature of the former French colonial system, the American model provided greater access and more practical
training for students. The intention was to develop the economy and support the South Vietnamese government (P. L. Huong & Fry, 2004a). The curricula were based on American models (L. T. Tran, Marginson, et al., 2014).

At the time of the national reunification of Vietnam in 1975, the two higher education systems merged. The new system was highly centralised, in line with the Soviet model (George, 2010). Links between teaching and research were neglected. The quality of schools deteriorated as the national economy deteriorated (P. L. Huong & Fry, 2004a).

Higher Education Reforms since 1986

Challenges for higher education in Vietnam

As noted previously, in 1986, the Vietnamese Government decided to change from a communist-style centralised economy to a market-oriented economy (Doi Moi) (Fry, 2009). The reforms have accelerated Vietnam’s integration into the global economy (Do & Do, 2014; H. Le, 2014). The weakness of the higher education system has been exposed because of its inability to provide skilled professional workers required in the new market economy (Do & Do, 2014; Huy & Hamid, 2015; T. T. Tran, 2013c). As many as 50% of university graduates could not find jobs in their area of specialization (L. T. Tran & Marginson, 2014; Vallely & Wilkinson, 2008). The universities are not producing graduates in areas of need.
Graduates’ low English proficiency has been a matter of concern. Some argue that Vietnam higher education is in crisis (e.g. Vallely & Wilkinson, 2008). They point to weaknesses including rigid and outdated curricula (L. T. Tran & Marginson, 2014), out-of-date teaching and learning methods, an excessively centralised system of control (Do & Do, 2014), and lack of qualified academic staff (Do, 2014; Do & Do, 2014). Vietnam has no universities recognised as leading universities. Even within ASEAN countries, Vietnamese universities are struggling to keep up (Do & Do, 2014; Vallely & Wilkinson, 2008).

**Diversity and governance**

In response to the problems outlined in the previous section, the Vietnamese government has introduced a number of reforms (H. Le, 2014; T. L. P. Pham, 2012; Vallely & Wilkinson, 2008). The government’s ambitious target is to have a university in the top 200 of the world by 2020 (Do, 2014).

One of the major reforms in higher education is more diversification in types of higher education institutions. Before 1986, most higher education institutions were run by the government. The system now comprises public, private, and foreign-owned institutions (Do & Do, 2014; Fry, 2009; P. L. Huong & Fry, 2004a). This move to more diversity in higher education has resulted in a sharp increase in the number of higher education institutions. For example, in 1993, Vietnam had 103 higher education institutions. Most of them were small and specialized, a legacy of the Soviet influence on higher education. Only one of these was private (Hayden & Thiep, 2010). In 2012,
Vietnam had 419 tertiary education institutions, of which 82 are private institutions. This is an increase of more than 400% within two decades (Do, 2014).

Before 1993, highly specialized universities (for example, only offering programs in engineering) were common. These days there are many multi-disciplinary universities offering a variety of programs (Do, 2014; Fry, 2009; H. Le, 2014; L. T. Tran, Marginson, et al., 2014). There also has been a major increase in the number of higher education students, from roughly 133,000 in 1987 (Do & Do, 2014) to more than 2.2 million in 2012 (Do, 2014; Tuyet, 2014). The policy of the Vietnamese government to diversify higher education has been seen as a major achievement. As Fry (2009) points out, with a limited national budget for education, the emergence of private fee-charging universities increases the number of institutions with little cost to the government. Vietnam has a population of approximately 90 million people, with 60% under the age of 30 years. Given the large youthful population, there is a strong demand for higher education and training services (Australian Government Department of Education and Training, 2015b).

Along with more diversity in the system, changes have been made to the governance of institutions in an attempt to reduce government control and give universities greater autonomy (Hayden & Thiep, 2007). However, changing a heavily centralised system of higher education is not easy (L. T. Tran, Marginson, et al., 2014). Scholars have argued that the highly centralised system hinders flexibility and responsiveness to workplace needs (Do, 2014; Do & Do, 2014; L. T. Tran, Le, et al., 2014). Both public and non-public higher education institutions remain subject to strong
central control, particularly in student recruitment, establishment of new programs, quality assurance, and accreditation (Do, 2014).

**Internalisation**

Internationalisation has been another prominent change to higher education in Vietnam (Fry, 2009). This refers to the expansion and enhancement of international cooperation and integration in education (N. T. Anh, 2009). The government has opened up the education sector to foreign education providers. There are programs run entirely by foreign institutions in foreign-owned campuses located in Vietnam or programs run jointly with local Vietnamese partners (Fry, 2009). Since 2000, there has been an increasing number of foreign education institutions establishing campuses in Vietnam (L. T. Tran, Marginson, et al., 2014).

For examples, the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT) from Australia opened campuses in the major cities of Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh City. They have approximately 6000 students, mainly in information technology, business, accounting and finance (Do & Do, 2014; Fry, 2009). Foreign institutions from Belgium, France, Germany, United Kingdom, Canada, the United States, and Australia have developed hundreds of joint degree and franchising programs with Vietnamese institutions. Australia alone has collaborated with Vietnamese universities to deliver 36 joint programs for undergraduate and post-graduate students (L. T. Tran, Marginson, et al., 2014).
Another notable form of internationalisation is student and staff mobility (N. T. Anh, 2009). Vietnamese students have been encouraged to study overseas through self-funding and scholarships. Tuyet (2014) pointed out that, in 2012, more than 100,000 Vietnamese students are studying overseas, more than ten times the number in 2001. Australia, the United States, and the United Kingdom receive the most Vietnamese students. Up to 2015, there were 27,216 Vietnamese students studying in Australia, of which higher education had the highest share of enrolments (Australian Government Department of Education and Training, 2015a). Since 2000, the Vietnamese government has funded students and staff to study overseas through Project 322, Project 911, and Project 165 (Tuyet, 2014; H. V. Van, 2013). For example, the aim of Project 911 is to fund 23,000 higher education staff to undertake doctoral study for the period 2010-2020. Of these, 10,000 students have gone overseas to study (L. T. Tran, Marginson, et al., 2014).

By joining with prestigious foreign partners, Vietnamese universities can foster exchange programs and learn from these institutions (Do & Do, 2014; Tuyet, 2014). The increasing number of staff and students trained in foreign countries enriches the workforce in Vietnamese universities and in the broader society (L. T. Tran, Marginson, et al., 2014; Tuyet, 2014).

In its move to strengthen ties with foreign higher education institutions, the Vietnamese government wants to meet international standards for quality of teaching and learning. However, Huong and Fry (2004a) have argued that the Vietnamese higher education system has a number of weaknesses that at present prevent it reaching those standards. One notable weakness is Vietnamese students’ lack of proficiency in English.
This is particularly problematic in programs in which English is the medium of instruction (Manh, 2012). Students’ lack of competence in English is a major “hindrance to international integration and the improvement of quality in Vietnamese higher education” (Nghi, 2010, p. 56).

To conclude, the 1986 Doi Moi reforms opened up Vietnam to the Western world. The reforms included a push to internationalise higher education within Vietnam, to encourage higher education students to study overseas, and to encourage the learning of English throughout Vietnam.

Teaching and learning English in Vietnamese higher education

English programs in higher education

EFL instruction in the higher education system in Vietnam can be categorised in two broad ways: English major programs and non-English major programs (Ngo et al., 2015). English major programs cover a variety of English subjects including English linguistics, English language teaching methodology, British and American literature and cultural studies, and English theories. To be eligible to study in English major programs, students must sit the national university entrance examination, managed by the MOET (it should be noted that, in the future, students’ end of high school examinations may replace university entrance examinations). The examination includes an English test, and students must meet the minimum pass score set by the MOET as well as the minimum score set by the university they want to enter (MOET, 2015).
After completing university, English major students can work as teachers of English, interpreters, and translators (H. V. Van, 2010). English major programs are offered by a small number of universities in Vietnam, while non-English major programs are offered by all the universities to the great majority of university students (94%) (H. V. Van, 2010). Because this study focuses on non-English major students, a more detailed discussion of the non-English major programs is presented in the following paragraphs.

Non-English major programs are designed for students majoring in specialist fields such as information technology, economics, law, and engineering. English is taught as a minor subject in their specialist discipline programs (Ngo et al., 2015), about 10% of the total credit hours of their university program during the first three years (6 semesters) of their four year program (H. V. Van, 2010). The number of students in non-major English classes ranges from 40 to 105 (Canh & Barnard, 2009). They must sit mid-term and final term English tests and obtain a satisfactory total score. A large number of universities now require students to pass an international standardized English test such as the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) or the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) with a minimum score set by their university before students are allowed to graduate (L. Phan et al., 2015).

Non-English major studies continue for three years of the four year program. According to Hang (2009), most universities do not have policies or guidelines that encourage students to continue learning English after they complete their compulsory English units. Many graduates of non-English major programs have limited levels of
English competence and are unable to communicate in English for their work (Hang, 2009; Ngo et al., 2015; T. T. Tran, 2013a; P. T. T. Van, 2012).

The motivation for learning English among English-major students and non-English major students is diverse. It includes better job opportunities, enhancing the chances of higher level study, or overseas study opportunities. Trang & Baldauf Jr. (2007) argue that most non-English major students learn English because it is a university requirement. N. T. L. Nguyen (2015) argues that many non-English major students are not motivated to study English. The current study investigates the motivation to learn English of non-English major students.

**English competency in Vietnam**

Despite the fact that English is the most important foreign language taught in the education system, there is widespread agreement that current EFL education is ineffective and student proficiency remains low (K. H. K. Anh, 2010; T. N. Anh & Ly, 2015; Huy & Hamid, 2015; Manh, 2012; Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012; L. H. Tien, 2013; T. T. Tran, 2013a; H. V. Van, 2013). For example, H. V. Van’s (2008) investigation of 60 first year non-English major students showed that 50 students performed poorly when tested using the Key English Test (KET). The KET is the lowest level of a five-level standardised English testing system called the Cambridge English Second Language Examination (CESLE). A majority of students in his study could not communicate in English, even in simple situations. T. T. Tran (2013a) also observed that though students were able to understand simple information in familiar situations, they could not engage in daily communication in English.
The Department of Higher Education’s review of reports of English proficiency in 59 universities shows that 51.7% of graduates were unable to meet the level of English proficiency required for their work (T. Ha, 2008). Vallely and Wilkinson (2008) and L. H. Tien (2013) point out that large numbers of Vietnamese university graduates are unable to demonstrate reasonable levels of English proficiency. Only 90 out of 2000 Vietnamese IT students could pass the standardised assessment test of the Intel company, an international maker of computer chips (Vallely & Wilkinson, 2008). Of this group of 90 students, only 40 met the English proficiency standard which is a hiring prerequisite for their manufacturing facility in Ho Chi Minh City. However, a November 2015 report on national trends in English proficiency has better news (EF Education First, 2015). Analysing the English test data of 910,000 adults from 70 countries, the report noted that Vietnam was one of the Asian countries that showed significant improvement in English proficiency from the previous year, although it still ranked Vietnam in the ‘moderate proficiency’ group.

University students’ low English proficiency after seven or more years of English study at secondary schools has been highlighted in the press in Vietnam (P. Anh & Hien, 2012; Ngan, 2004; Nhat, 2012). Students’ attitudes towards learning English are not always positive (N. T. L. Nguyen, 2015; Trang & Baldauf Jr., 2007). Undoubtedly, there are multiple reasons for students’ poor performance and negative attitudes: poor textbooks, a limited English-speaking environment, large class sizes, under-qualified teachers, outdated teaching methods, and outdated testing systems (Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012; H. T. Nguyen, Fehring, & Warren, 2015; H. T. Nguyen,

**Teacher shortage**

Almost all higher education Vietnamese students choose English as their compulsory foreign language (T. N. Pham, 2014; H. V. Van, 2013; N. T. T. Vu & Burns, 2014). This has resulted in a shortage of English teachers, particularly teachers with good English proficiency (T. N. Pham, 2014; H. V. Van, 2010; Vinh, 2012). For example, in 2009, the Vietnam National University, the most prestigious university in Vietnam, had more than 54,000 students enrolled but only 184 lecturers of English (Vinh, 2012). Of these lecturers, only 53 were continuing full-time lecturers. In addition, as noted by Vinh (2012), only 13% of teachers of English at the Vietnam National University spent time in English-speaking countries as part of their training.

For less prestigious universities, it is even more difficult for them to find sufficient qualified teachers of English. According to V. T. Nguyen & Mai (2015) and L. H. Tien (2013), it is difficult for teachers of English from non-native English speaking countries to achieve sufficient English competence to be effective teachers. Because of scarcity, lecturers in English have large teaching loads and large class sizes. They have little time to improve their own English proficiency and to investigate ways of improving their teaching.

**Approaches to teaching and learning**
Approaches to teaching and learning in higher education in Vietnam have failed to keep abreast of worldwide changes in practice (L. T. Tran, Le, et al., 2014). Traditional teaching arrangements predominate. Influenced by a Confucian-based culture that emphasises a hierarchical teacher-student relationship, students are expected to respect and to obey teachers, and to wait for teachers to initiate activities (Luan, 2015). The teacher is the model of correct behaviour and primary source of knowledge. Many Vietnamese proverbs emphasise the important role of teachers. One of the popular ones is Không thầy đồ mày làm nên (Without a teacher, you cannot do anything successfully). Teachers are considered always to be correct, and not to be questioned by students (Luan, 2015; T. T. Tran, 2013b). Students tend to be silent in class, shy about participating in class activities, and unwilling to ask questions even if the teacher encourages them to do so. They are generally rather passive recipients of knowledge.

Confucian tradition has generated an approach to teaching and learning that is ‘intertwined with teacher-centred pedagogy and practice of spoon-feeding students’ (L. T. Tran, Le, et al., 2014, p. 95). The traditional grammar-translation approach remains prominent (Canh & Barnard, 2009; Giao & Hoa, 2004; H. T. Nguyen et al., 2014; Nhan & Lai, 2012; T. Q. Tran & Duong, 2015). This method focuses on English grammatical rules, memorisation of vocabulary, written exercises, and reading and writing. There is little practice of oral English (H. T. Nguyen et al., 2014; T. Q. Tran & Duong, 2015). Grammar rules are explained and students are expected to learn them. Teachers deliver knowledge and students are expected to learn it. There is little interaction between lecturers and students, and little use of interactive language activities. Students do not practise using English in real-life situations (T. T. Tran, 2013a). This pedagogical approach is far from desirable (EF Education First, 2015; T. N. Pham, 2014).
On a more positive note, Confucian culture encourages students to work hard and to want to obtain new knowledge. Students from Confucian-based cultures are well known for their emphasis on expending effort to achieve success. On the other hand, a Confucian culture can discourage students from becoming independent, self-confident, and interactive language learners (T. H. Nguyen, 2002). Student passivity and teacher dominance is at odds with the Western approach to learning a language (T. T. Tran, 2013b). There have been calls for a change in pedagogy towards a more student-active approach to learning and there have been initiatives to encourage students to be more active and creative (e.g. T. N. Anh & Ly, 2015; Hiep, 2007; Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012; V. D. Tran & Lewis, 2012; Truc, 2010). However, there has been little progress with these initiatives (Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012; L. T. Tran, Le, et al., 2014).

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), a modern Western approach to learning a language, emphasises students’ meaningful communication rather mastery of grammatical forms (H. T. Nguyen et al., 2014; Richards, 2006; Viet, 2008). CLT has been introduced into some university English classrooms (Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012). However, most language teachers who have received training in the Communicative Approach continue to use the traditional grammar-translation method (Canh & Barnard, 2009; Hiep, 2006b; Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012; Tomlinson & Dat, 2004; T. Q. Tran & Duong, 2015). Constraints that inhibit the adoption of CLT include lecturers’ own lack of English competence and lack of a language environment conducive for communication practices (Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012; H. V. Van, 2013).
Tomlinson and Dat’s study (2004) showed that many teachers do not wish to change their grammar-focused teaching methods. Some teachers point out that students are not willing to participate in communicative activities. According to Hiep (2005), many teachers are concerned that if they engage in classroom interaction, students will not have enough time to cover the syllabus. Even teachers who want to implement innovative methods can be daunted by large class sizes and inadequate infrastructure (Canh & Barnard, 2009; T. T. Dang, 2010). Lessons are teacher-dominated and focused on grammar because of grammar-based examinations (Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012; T. Q. Tran & Duong, 2015). While teacher competence is measured by students’ test scores, both teachers and students will focus on grammar (Canh, 2001; Harbon et al., 2014). The nature of the examination dictates both teaching and learning. As they say, the tail wags the dog.

Summary

This chapter has provided a broad overview of English education in Vietnam. The chapter began by highlighting the socio-economic, historical, and political factors affecting foreign language policy in general and English policy in particular. This was followed by a discussion of the role of English in Vietnam, particularly in higher education. The major social-cultural, economic and historical factors influencing the higher education system were examined, with an emphasis on the period after the introduction of the Doi Moi policy. Major reforms, including a push for diversification and internalisation, have been made to the higher education system. A major impediment in the processes of modernisation and internationalisation has been students’ poor proficiency in English.
The chapter then examined the current state of EFL practice in Vietnam. Although the Vietnamese government has made a concerted effort to improve English proficiency among university students, the system continues to struggle with a shortage of qualified teachers, students’ lack of motivation to study English, an examination system that focuses on grammar, and Confucian-oriented teaching methods that inhibit the quality of English teaching and learning.

This study will focus on students’ motivation to study English. Motivation plays a major role in language acquisition. As Dornyei (1998) points out, no matter how adverse the learning conditions and no matter how little language learning aptitude learners possess, learners can make great strides in their language learning with sufficient motivation. In spite of the salience of motivation in language learning, it has received meagre attention in Vietnam. This research is an attempt to fill the gap.

The following chapter will review the expectancy-value theory of motivation. This theory provides the theoretical and research framework that underpins the current study.
Chapter Three

Literature review

Chapter Two provided a broad historical overview of English education in Vietnam to assist understanding of Vietnamese university students’ motivation to learn English. This chapter begins with a definition of motivation. Following this is an examination of Eccles’ and colleagues’ expectancy-value model, a well-received theory of motivation that focuses on students’ expectancies for success in an area and the values they assign to that area. Eccles’ model provides the theoretical framework of the current research.

Motivation defined

The term motivation comes from the Latin root word meaning “to move.” The study of motivation focuses on what “… moves people to act and why people think and do what they do” (Eccles, Wigfield, & Schiefele, 1998, p. 1017). It has provoked debate among scholars, spawned numerous theoretical models encompassing different variables, and different understanding of the construct. There is no single definition of motivation. It is defined in different ways because it can be looked at from numerous perspectives.

Pintrich and Schunk (1996, 2002) drew attention to one important shift in the field of motivation: the inclusion of cognitive concepts and variables in theories of motivation. Many early conceptions linked motivation with inner forces such as instincts, volition and will, or with behavioural terms such as stimuli and reinforcement
More current views of motivation focus on the individual’s thoughts and beliefs that then are transformed into action (e.g. Eccles et al., 1998; Pintrich, 2003b). Schunk, Pintrich, and Meece (2008) conclude that current perspectives on motivation “emphasize learners’ constructive interpretations of events and the roles that their beliefs, cognitions, affects, and values play in achievement situations” (p. vi). In their view, motivation involves mental processes that initiate, direct and support human actions. “Motivation is the process whereby goal-directed activities are instigated and sustained” (Schunk, Meece, & Pintrich, 2014, p. 5).

Although there are disagreements about the nature of motivation, the Schunk’s and colleagues’ (2014) definition captures the points considered by many researchers to be central to motivation. Their definition incorporates elements basic to cognitively-based theories of motivation including attribution theory (Weiner, 1985, 2004, 2005), expectancy-value theory (Eccles, 1993, 2005a, 2011; Parsons et al., 1983; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000, 2002; Wigfield et al., 2016), achievement goal theory (Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliot, 2005; Nicholls, 1984), social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1977, 1997), and related self-theories including self-concept and self-esteem (Harter, 2006; Marsh, Trautwein, Lüdtke, Köller, & Baumert, 2005; Marsh & Yeung, 1997). These major theoretical and conceptual perspectives stress the role of constructs such as students’ beliefs, values, and goals as influences on motivation, serving to explain behaviours such as task choice, effort, persistence, and achievement. In particular, the expectancy-value theory links achievement, persistence, and choice to individuals’ expectancy-related beliefs and beliefs about the value of the task (Eccles, 2009, 2011; Parsons et al., 1983; Wigfield & Eccles, 2002).
Expectancy-value theory has been productive in the literature of motivation, with a large, well-documented body of empirical studies to support its validity and utility for explaining students’ achievement-related performance and choices (Eccles, 2005a, 2009, 2011; Eccles, Wong, & Peck, 2006; Musu-Gillette, Wigfield, Harring, & Eccles, 2015; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000; Wigfield et al., 2016). Initially developed as a framework for explaining adolescents’ performance and choices in mathematics (Parsons et al., 1983), subsequently it has been broadened to other academic domains (such as English, language arts, instrumental music), academic choices, sport, and physical skill activities (e.g. Eccles & Harold, 1991; Eccles, Wigfield, Harold, & Blumenfeld, 1993; Fredricks & Eccles, 2002; Jacobs, Lanza, Osgood, Eccles, & Wigfield, 2002; Nagy et al., 2008; Trautwein & Lüdtke, 2007; Watt, 2004; Wigfield et al., 1997; Xiang, McBride, & Bruene, 2006). The current study uses the expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation as its theoretical framework.

According to Pintrich (2003a), students’ motivation usually is driven by two fundamental questions: Can I do this task? and Why am I doing this task? These questions correspond to the key motivational components of expectancy-value theory: expectancy-related beliefs and task-value beliefs. This chapter focuses on the expectancy-value model developed by Eccles, Wigfield and their colleagues. It provides the theoretical and research framework that underpins the current study.

**Expectancy-value theory: A brief history**
The expectancy and value constructs have a long history in the field of achievement motivation (Higgins, 2007; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992; Wigfield et al., 2016). Drawing on earlier work of Lewin and Tolman in the 1930s (for a review, see Wigfield, Tonks, & Klauda, 2009), Atkinson (1957) formulated an expectancy-value model to account for individuals’ various achievement-related behaviours such as persistence, striving for success, and choice of achievement tasks. Atkinson proposed that these behaviours were impacted by three major components of an individual: his motives, his probability/expectancy of success, and the incentive value he gave to a task.

Achievement motives (the first component) were assumed as stable dispositions. There were two key achievement motives: the motive to approach success and the motive to avoid failure. The second component, probability of success, referred to one’s expectancies for achievement on a specific task. The incentive value (the third component) was defined as one’s ‘pride in accomplishment’ (Atkinson, 1957, p. 360). Atkinson assumed that incentive value and the probability (expectancy) of success were inversely related. He argued that the incentive value of success (pride) is higher for difficult than for easy tasks (see Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). The more difficult one perceived a task to be, the more highly one would value a successful outcome. That is, if a task were deemed to be easy, the expectancy of success increased, and the value of the task decreased. Conversely, if a task were deemed to be difficult, the expectancy of success decreased, and the value of the task increased. Thus, for Atkinson, expectancies and values referred to specific tasks in which individuals were engaged, rather than general dispositions.
By defining incentive value as the inverse of the probability of success, and by equating incentive value as 1.0 minus the probability of success, Atkinson determined probability of success using his mathematical model (Schunk et al., 2014). As Wigfield and Eccles (1992) point out, this equation ‘removed’ incentive value from Atkinson’s model. Incentive value was relatively ignored in research on achievement motivation for a long time (Eccles et al., 1998).

Eccles et al. point out that although the assumed inverse relation between the probability of success and incentive value can be supported, particularly with laboratory tasks often used in Atkinson’s theory, this inverse relationship has not always received empirical support in real world contexts. Today, most researchers assume that expectancy and value are positively related (Eccles, 2005a, 2009; Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Eccles et al., 1998; Feather, 1982). Value has been investigated as a separate and essential component in the expectancy-value theory (e.g. Eccles, 1987, 1993, 2005a, 2009; Feather, 1982, 1988; Parsons et al., 1983; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992, 2000, 2002).

Research on the constructs of expectancy and value continues. Researchers have moved away from mathematic models and propose greater emphasis on contextual influences. Many motivational theories include expectancy and value constructs. However, the Expectancy-Value theory developed and tested over 40 years by Eccles, Wigfield, and colleagues has generated the most theory and research in academic settings (e.g. Ball, Huang, Cotten, Rikard, & Coleman, 2016; Eccles, 1987, 1993, 2005a, 2009, 2011; Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Eccles et al., 1998; J. Guo, Parker, Marsh, & Morin, 2015; Lykkegaard & Ulriksen, 2016; Meece, Wigfield, & Eccles, 1990; Musu-Gillette et al., 2015; Parsons et al., 1983; Wang & Eccles, 2013; Watt et al., 2012;
In the next section of this chapter, Eccles et al.’s expectancy-value model of achievement and choices is discussed. Research on essential constructs in the model, including ability beliefs, expectancies for success, and the components of subjective task values, is reviewed. Self-efficacy theory also is included in the discussion because it is closely linked to the expectancy-value model.

The Eccles et al. expectancy-value model of achievement motivation

Expectancy-value theories developed by Eccles, Wigfield and their colleagues (Eccles, 1987, 1993, 2005a, 2005b, 2009, 2011; Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Eccles et al., 1989; Eccles et al., 1993; Meece, Parsons, Kaczala, Goff, & Futterman, 1982; Meece et al., 1990; Parsons et al., 1983; Wigfield, 1994; Wigfield et al., 2002; Wigfield & Cambria, 2010; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992, 2000, 2002; Wigfield et al., 1998; Wigfield et al., 2004; Wigfield et al., 2009; Wigfield et al., 2016) are similar to Atkinson’s (1957) original expectancy-value model in that they highlight two important predictors of achievement behaviour: expectancy of success and task value. Eccles et al.’s model proposes that students’ achievement performance, effort, persistence, and choice of achievement tasks can be explained by their expectancy-related beliefs as well as the value they attach to the tasks.
However, the Eccles’ model differs from Atkinson’s expectancy-value model in some important respects. First, in the Eccles’ model, both the expectancy and value components are more elaborate and are linked to a broader range of psychological and socio-cultural factors. Second, instead of an inverse relationship between task value and probability for success, as proposed by Atkinson, the two constructs in Eccles’ model are assumed to be positively related. This means that task value plays a more important role in the Eccles’ model than in Atkinson’s original. Third, Eccles’ model is grounded in real-world achievement situations rather than laboratory-based research used in Atkinson’s. An adaption of Eccles and Wigfield’s theoretical model is depicted in Figure 3.1.
As can be seen in Figure 3.1, achievement behaviour is predicted by two general constructs: expectancy-related beliefs and task value. These components are influenced by a number of antecedent factors: task-specific beliefs (such as one’s ability beliefs and one’s perceptions of task difficulty), and individuals’ achievement goals, self-schemata, and affective memories. These factors, in turn, are influenced by individuals’ perceptions of the attitudes and expectations of socialisers such as parents, teachers, and peers, by their interpretations of their own previous achievement-related experiences, and by the cultural milieu (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002).
In the current study, the focus will be the three boxes on the right hand side of figure: expectancy of success, value of the activity, choice about future activity, and achievement on English tests. The two primary components in the expectancy-value model of achievement are discussed in the following sections.

Expectancy-related beliefs

Expectancy-related beliefs refer to a student’s response to the question: Can I do this task successfully? (Eccles, 2005a; Eccles et al., 1998; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992, 2002). These beliefs, consisting of ability beliefs and expectancies for success, concern a student’s sense of being able to succeed at different tasks or activities.

Eccles and her colleagues defined ability beliefs as students’ judgments of their own ability in a given domain. This definition is similar to those put forward by Marsh and colleagues (e.g. Marsh, 1990; Marsh et al., 2005) and Harter (e.g. Harter, 1982; Harter, 2006). Expectancies for success refer to students’ beliefs about how well they will do on up-coming tasks. Unlike ability beliefs that are conceived as broad beliefs about present competencies in different areas (e.g., How good are you at English?), expectancies for success are considered as more specific beliefs referring to students’ beliefs about their chances of succeeding at a specific task in the future (e.g., How well do you expect to do in English this year?). These two types of beliefs are theoretically distinguishable. However, practically, they are highly related and have been treated empirically as the same construct (Durik, Vida, & Eccles, 2006; Eccles, 2009; Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Simpkins, Davis-Kean, & Eccles, 2006; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000).
These definitions are similar to definitions of related constructs in Bandura’s (1977) model of self-efficacy. In terms of expectancies, Bandura included the distinction between efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Efficacy expectations refer to students’ perceptions of how well they can accomplish a task. Outcome expectations, on the other hand, refer to students’ judgments or beliefs regarding the probability that a certain behaviour will lead to a certain outcome. Bandura noted that efficacy expectations are better predictors of performance and choice than outcome expectations. He noted that expectancy-value theorists have focused on outcome expectations. However, based on the definition of expectancy beliefs in Eccles and Wigfield’s model, expectancy for success refers to individuals’ beliefs about how well they will do on an upcoming task. It is clear that they are assessing students’ expectations for success rather than their outcome expectations.

Eccles and colleagues primarily measure ability and expectancy beliefs at the domain level, while self-efficacy measures are typically more task-specific than domain-specific (Pajares, 1996). It should be noted that when measuring competence-related beliefs, Eccles et al. ask individuals to rate how good they are at a certain activity, and also ask them to compare their abilities across different subject areas and with other individuals. That is, they make use of multiple measures to assess students’ competence-related beliefs. Self-efficacy measures, on the other hand, do not include the comparative items, but focus on students’ beliefs about their own capabilities on one task (Pajares, 1996).
Research shows that expectancy-related beliefs are positively related to academic performance (Bong, 2001; Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Fan, 2011; Meece et al., 1990). For example, Meece, Wigfield and Eccles (1990) reported that students’ beliefs about their mathematics competence and expectancies for success were important predictors of students’ subsequent mathematics performance, even after controlling for their previous mathematics performance. Xiang, McBride, and Bruene (2006) also found that students’ performance in sports activities was significantly predicted by their expectancy beliefs about different sports. To date, researchers have primarily focused on competence beliefs and achievement in primary school children and high school adolescents.

In the current study, the links between Vietnamese university students’ beliefs about their competence in English and their performance in an English test will be explored. University aged students would be expected to be more accurate in their assessment of their competencies than adolescents or children. University students would be expected to take into account teachers’ feedback about their competencies during previous courses, and their success and failure experiences (Denissen, Zarrett, & Eccles, 2007; Harter, 1982; Marsh & Craven, 2006; Nicholls, 1979; Parsons & Ruble, 1977; Stipek & Hoffman, 1980).

Before leaving the discussion of expectancy, a discussion of self-efficacy theory is included because of its similar focus on expectancy.

**Self-efficacy theory**
Self-efficacy is a major construct of Bandura’s (1977) social cognitive theory of motivation. Bandura (1986) defines self-efficacy as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (p. 391). Self-efficacy perceptions are proposed as major determinants of individuals' choice of activities, effort exerted, and persistence. Students who believe in their capabilities to perform a task are likely to participate while those who hold low self-efficacy for accomplishing the task may give up quickly, even though they may be capable of doing it. In the face of failure, efficacious students work harder and persist longer than students who doubt their capabilities (Bandura, 1993, 1997).

As discussed previously, Bandura distinguished between two kinds of expectancy beliefs: outcome expectations and efficacy expectations. People can believe that a certain behaviour will lead to a certain outcome (outcome expectation), but may not believe that they can perform the behaviours necessary to produce that outcome (efficacy expectations). For example, students studying English can believe that practising will improve their speaking skill, but they may hold a negative efficacy expectation, that is, they cannot practise sufficiently hard to improve their English.

Research has consistently shown that self-efficacy beliefs are related to many behaviours, including effort and task persistence, self-regulatory strategies, course enrolment, and occupational choice (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003; Lane & Lane, 2001; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; Pajares, 1996; Pajares & Miller, 1994; Robbins et al., 2004; Schunk, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984; Schunk & Pajares, 2005; Valentine, DuBois, & Cooper, 2004; Wood & Locke, 1987). Hsieh and Schallert's (2008) investigation with South Korean students showed a strong link between self-efficacy and English

Bandura primarily focuses on how efficacy beliefs influence achievement behaviour. He devotes less focus to individuals’ valuing of a task. The influences of subjective values as well as expectancy beliefs are more systematically discussed and measured by expectancy-value model researchers. The following section focuses on the value side of the expectancy-value model.

**Task values**

The value side of Eccles et al.’s expectancy-value model refers to the question: Do I want to do this task and why? (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). Subjective task values concern individuals’ purposes or incentives for engaging in different tasks (Wigfield & Eccles, 1992; Wigfield et al., 2009). For example, students’ answers to the question may include reasons why they want to learn English: they are interested in doing it; they think it is important or useful to them for their future career; or they want to please their parents. If individuals do not have reasons or incentives for doing a task, they may decide not to engage in that task even when they think they are competent to do it. Eccles and Wigfield (2002) have identified four subjective values: *attainment value*, *intrinsic value*, *utility value*, and *cost*. 
Attainment value refers to the importance of being good at a task. This definition is similar to Battle’s (1965) definition. Attainment value also has been defined as the extent to which a task provides the opportunity for individuals to confirm or disconfirm central aspects of their self-schemata (Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). For example, a man may wish to excel in soccer because he sees physical prowess as an important aspect of his masculinity.

Intrinsic value is the enjoyment individuals experience as they engage in the task. It is conceptually analogous to notions of intrinsic motivation defined by Ryan and Deci (e.g., Ryan & Deci, 2000) and the interest construct discussed by Tobias (1994) and Alexander, Kulikowich, and Jetton (1994). When a task has high intrinsic value for students, they will engage in it (Wigfield & Eccles, 1992).

Utility value refers to the usefulness of the task in terms of its fit with an individual’s current and future goals. For example, a Vietnamese university student may not be interested in English, but perseveres with the course because he needs it to graduate or because he thinks it will help him to get a good job. The English course has a high utility value for him. In this sense, utility value can be seen as an extrinsic reason for engaging in a task (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

Cost is the perceived negative aspects of doing a task. These include the amount of effort required to complete the task, time taken away from engaging in other activities, and anticipated emotional costs (Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). For example, a university student may perceive that too much effort and time is required for him to master the English language. He may choose to move his attention to other subjects.
Although cost has been the least studied of the subjective task values, it has been shown to play a role in choice behaviours. A. Battle and Wigfield (2003) found that students’ intentions to enrol in graduate school were negatively predicted by their perceptions of the psychological costs of attending graduate school.

Eccles and Wigfield’s research has demonstrated that the three value components (attainment value, interest value, and utility value) are empirically distinct from one another (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995), and from the expectancy component (Eccles et al., 1993). Students make judgments about importance, interest, and utility for a task. For example, students may report high levels of utility value for English, but are not interested in studying it.

**Expectancy beliefs and value attached to the task**

Research shows that expectancy and task value components are positively related (Bong, 2001; Lawanto, Santoso, & Liu, 2012): students tend to value those tasks in which they think they will do well and attach less value to tasks in which they think they will be less successful (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wigfield et al., 1997; Wigfield, Klauda, & Cambria, 2011). These findings contrast with the argument put forward by Atkinson (1957), that expectancy and task value beliefs are inversely related, that is, that students put little value on tasks they can accomplish easily.

Students’ beliefs about their ability and their expectancies for success are significant predictors of their achievement. In terms of intentions and decisions to take courses, subjective task values have been shown to be stronger predictors of behaviour
than expectancy-related beliefs (Eccles, 2005a; Meece et al., 1990; Simpkins et al., 2006; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). As such, it is important to look at both expectancy-related beliefs and task values to understand students’ choices and achievement.

**Gender differences in expectancies and values**

Research has demonstrated that females are more likely to underestimate their ability than males, particularly in gender-role stereotyped domains. These differences emerge as early as kindergarten (Entwisle & Baker, 1983; Frey & Ruble, 1987). Gender differences in self perceptions of ability may be due to a response bias (Wigfield, Eccles, MacIver, Reuman, & Midgley, 1991), that is, males tend to be self-congratulatory while females tend to be modest (Parsons, Adler, & Meece, 1984; Wigfield, Eccles, & Pintrich, 1996). However, these differences do not occur consistently (e.g., Schunk & Lilly, 1982). If gender differences in students’ competence beliefs do exist, these differences may influence students’ performance and choice. Numerous studies have shown individuals’ competence beliefs to be strong predictors of their achievement. Schunk, Pintrich and Meece (2008) note there should be more research on gender differences in expectancies.

When gender differences in beliefs about ability emerge, they tend to follow the gender-role stereotyping of the activity. Males hold higher competence beliefs than females for mathematics, and sports, two activities seen as masculine, while females have greater ability beliefs for activities usually stereotyped as feminine, such as reading, English, music, arts, and social studies (Eccles & Harold, 1991; Eccles et al., 1993; Eccles et al., 1998; Jacobs et al., 2002; Parsons et al., 1983; Watt, 2004; Wigfield
et al., 1991). Watt’s (2004) study found that females held higher competence beliefs than did males for English, while males held greater competence beliefs for mathematics. In Jacobs et al. (2002), males’ competence beliefs in language arts and mathematics were declining more rapidly over the course of schooling than females’ competence beliefs, leaving females with higher self- perceptions of competence in these subjects.

Less research has been conducted on gender difference in the value component of the expectancy-value model. Most of the research done by Eccles and colleagues has shown gender-role stereotypic differences in the value students place on different subjects (Eccles et al., 1989; Wigfield et al., 1991). Females put greater value on English than do males, while males value sports more than females. One study showed that males and females value mathematics equally (Jacobs et al., 2002). However, females appear less interested in mathematics-related scientific and engineering areas than males.

In the current study, the researcher expects that if there are gender differences in the value placed on studying English, they will favour females. This is because language has a female gender-role stereotype attached to it. However, gender differences may not be evident with utility value because both males and females would be expected to see the importance of English in terms of the economic development in Vietnam, and at a more personal level, their own employment prospects.

This chapter has examined the expectancy-value model of motivation. To what extent do students’ expectancy of success on a task and the values they attach to
completing the task affect performance on the task and choice of achievement-related activities? There has been very limited study of Vietnamese students’ motivation to study English, and to the researcher’s knowledge, there has been no research in Vietnam framed within the expectancy-value theory. Eccles and her colleagues (for example, Wigfield et al., 2016) have called for examination of the expectancy-value model in non-Western cultures. Does the model provide a useful way to understand students’ motivation in an Asian context? In the next chapter, the rationale for the methodology adopted for the study is presented. Then the participants and the methods of data gathering are described in detail.
Chapter Four
Methodology

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the research design and methodology of the current project. First, it provides a description of the research sites. The researcher has adopted a mixed methods approach containing both quantitative and qualitative elements to elicit data from students and lecturers. To enhance the study’s reliability and validity, three types of data collection are used to cross-check the findings: student survey, student focus-group interviews, and lecturer individual interviews. Ethical clearance for collecting data is described.

Sampling issues

Research sites

The research sites of the current study are three universities in Ho Chi Minh City in the south of Vietnam. As discussed in Chapter Two, Vietnam has a highly centralised higher education system (Do, 2014). The three universities operate under the centralised government authority, MOET (Ministry of Education and Training). They recruit students based on students’ results in an annual entrance examination conducted by MOET. Each university is assigned a quota of students that they can receive in a year based on their infrastructure and staff availability.
The universities were selected for the current project on the following criteria: they had high numbers of non-English major students studying English; students came from a wide area in the south of Vietnam; and the universities offered relatively easy access for the researcher who needed to spend considerable time at each university.

The three universities differed in terms of prestige, determined by the scores of students on the entrance examinations. MOET holds a common university entrance examination for all universities in Vietnam. University 1 usually takes the students with the highest entry scores. University 2 takes students with middle ranging entrance scores. Both are government universities. University 3 is a private university which takes students who score less well in the entrance test.

These universities offered undergraduate and postgraduate training in different majors including economics, law, accounting, finance, information technology, engineering, mathematics, and others. MOET requires that all students study a foreign language in addition to their discipline study (N. Nguyen, 2012). Foreign languages include English, French, Chinese, and Russian. The students of the three universities were not studying English as a major. They all chose English as their compulsory foreign language.

As described in Chapter Two, English is the compulsory foreign language chosen by most university students (H. V. Van, 2010). English-major students must sit an English test included in the national university entrance. However, non-English major students majoring in fields such as economics, accounting, finance, and law do not have an English test as part of their entrance examination. The English program
designed for them when they start at the universities is at an elementary level (L. H. Tien, 2013). All universities follow a similar curriculum stipulated by MOET. Final marks for English are given on a scale of one to ten. The final mark may include a small mid-semester component in addition to the final test.

The three universities have a spread of students across demographic groups. They are located in Ho Chi Minh City, the largest city of Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh City is the home to a large number of universities. These universities attract students from both urban and rural areas in the south of Vietnam.

It should be noted that the researcher has worked as a teacher of English at all three of the universities in the current study. There are advantages in conducting research at institutions where researchers are employed (e.g., Hollander, 2004; Taylor, 2011). According to Marshall and Rossman (2011), choosing a familiar research site is pivotal in facilitating data collection. It is easy to find research participants and to build relationships with them and to access necessary documentation. The researcher was welcomed by the leaders of the universities when he contacted them by email, asking permission to conduct the research.

**Selection of Participants**

**Student participants for the survey**

Potential participants to complete the questionnaire were selected using the English classroom as the sampling unit. Such a sampling procedure is widely used by
Eccles and Wigfield and their colleagues. For example, they have used mathematics classrooms as the sampling unit for their studies (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Meece et al., 1990).

An information letter and a consent form were sent to the Deans of the Department of English at the three universities seeking their permission to approach staff members and students (the letter and consent form are shown in Appendix 8). The Deans were asked to identify suitable classes and lecturers, such that there was an approximately equal number of male and female students. Gender balance was important because it was expected that gender differences in expectancies of success in English and the value placed on developing competence in English would emerge. The Deans were asked to forward an information letter, a copy of the survey, and a consent form to be interviewed to the staff they had identified (the letter, consent form are shown in Appendix 9 and the survey is shown in Appendix 1).

When the EFL lecturers had indicated their consent to participate in the study, the researcher met the EFL lecturers and asked their permission to have five minutes at the start of a lecture to introduce the study. The surveys were distributed with an information letter to students. The information letter stated that completing the survey was a voluntary activity. If students chose to allow the researchers to access their final English scores by providing their student number (one of the items on the survey), then they could be identified. Students were asked to complete the survey after class and return completed surveys in a designated box located outside the English staffroom.
Surveys were returned by 1235 participants. This represents 100% return rate. Of these, 28 were discarded as evidence suggested that they were not completed in a serious manner or non-completion of substantial sections. Of these 28 discarded surveys, 2 came from University 1, 12 came from University 2, and 14 came from University 3. The final total number of useable returned surveys was 1207 students (556 males and 651 females). Of these, 394 students (32.6%) were from University 1, 402 students (33.3%) were from University 2, and 411 students (34.1%) were from University 3. They were not English-major students. Their university majors were business-related including economics, business administration, finance and banking, political economics, and business law.

Before entering university, 97.1% of these first year non-English major students had studied English for five to more than eight years in primary schools (year 1 to year 5), secondary/middle schools (year 6 to year 9) and high schools (year 10 to year 12). Their ages ranged from 18 years to over 23 years, with the majority (67%) aged between 18-19 years. Most of the students (83.3%) came from high schools in the countryside, while 16.7% came from high schools in a city.

Participants were asked to indicate the opportunities they had to use English before they came to university (with 1 indicating no opportunities and 6 indicating many opportunities). 71.4% chose 1 or 2, 23.8% chose 3 or 4, and 3.7% chose 5 or 6. This indicated that most participants had few opportunities to practise English before they came to university.

Student participants for the focus group interview
Students completing the survey were invited to participate in a focus group interview. Those students who were willing to participate in a group interview completed the consent form (asking for phone number and an email address) and put it in in a designated box located outside the English staffroom. Because there were more volunteers to be interviewed than could be accommodated, the researcher selected those students whose available times matched those of other volunteers. Volunteers not chosen to participate in a group interview were contacted to let them know that they could not be interviewed because their availability did not match the availability of others. They were thanked for volunteering. Given the large number of students indicating a willingness to be interviewed, it can be argued that the interview participants are generally representative of the sample as a whole.

A total of 72 students (36 males and 36 females) were interviewed. To allow males and females to talk openly about learning English, interview groups were separated into male and female groups. The students were placed into 12 focus groups. There were four interview groups, two male groups and two female groups at each university. Each group included six students, as suggested by Creswell (2012) and Morgan (1997), because small groups of students make students more comfortable to talk about the topics of the interview.

**Teacher participants for individual interview**

As noted earlier, an information letter and a consent to be interviewed form were sent to EFL lecturers along with the request to distribute the questionnaire to their
students. Lecturers would return a signed consent form if they wished to participate in the individual face to face interview, using a designated mail box in the staff common room. The consent form asked for a phone number or an email address so they could be contacted to arrange interview times. Selection for interview was made on a first-to-offer basis. The researcher contacted lecturers to arrange a suitable time for an interview. Those who were not selected for interview were contacted to thank them for their generous offer. A total of nine teachers (three from each university) were selected.

**Research design**

This research study explored the following questions:

1. What factors predict students’ performance on the end-of-semester English test?

2. What factors predict students’ willingness to undertake additional study in English, either concurrently with their university students or after graduation from university?

3. To what extent is students’ sex a factor in performance on the English test and willingness to take extra English courses?

4. If the study exposes inadequacies in the operation of English courses in universities in Vietnam, how might these courses be improved?

To answer the research questions, a mixed methods approach was employed using the strengths of accumulating both quantitative and qualitative data (Creswell, 2008). According to mixed methods researchers (e.g., Creswell, 2011), one of the major purposes of conducting mixed methods research is to triangulate different data sets
(quantitative and qualitative data) to answer the research questions. As a result, the validity of findings of the study is increased. Collecting more than one data set (qualitative or quantitative data) allows a researcher to reveal more aspects of reality than would be possible with one data set (Creswell & Clark, 2007). Use of a mixed method approach increases the researcher’s knowledge of the phenomenon under investigation (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010). As Creswell (2012) argues, use of a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods provides “a better understanding of the research problem and question than either method by itself” (p.535).

In the current study, the mixed methods design called a two-phrase model (Creswell & Clark, 2011) was employed. The design consisted first of collecting quantitative data and then collecting qualitative data to explain, refine, extend and elaborate on the quantitative data. Quantitative data were gathered through survey (student survey), while qualitative data were gathered through focus group interviews with students and individual face-to-face interviews with lecturers. Both types of data gathering provide useful data, and when used together, should provide enhanced understanding of the expectancy beliefs and value beliefs of first year Vietnamese university students studying English as a foreign language.

The quantitative approach has been used extensively in expectancy-value research (e.g., Ghazalia & McPherson, 2009; González-Moreno, 2010; Jacobs et al., 2002; McPherson & O’Neill, 2010; Wigfield et al., 1991). This approach provides the opportunity to gather data from a large number of people and to generalize the results (Creswell, 2012). For the current study, examining students’ motivation to learn English is enhanced with the investigation of a relatively large number of students’ ability-
related and task-value beliefs about learning English. The quantitative survey (student survey) was the major means of data collection.

The Expectancy-value model used in the current research has been developed and applied for the most part in the Western world. This is the first time this model has been used as a theoretical framework to examine students’ motivation to study in Vietnam. Will the model be useful in understanding students’ motivation in a non-Western country? Are there factors not included in the original model that affect students’ motivation in a non-Western country situated in Asia? Semi-structured interviews with students and lecturers were included in the current research, in addition to a quantitative survey to students, to look for influences on Vietnamese university students’ English-related choices and performance that may not have been captured in the survey developed in Western countries.

The intention of the current study is to explore the processes underlying the key elements of the expectancy-value model in a Vietnamese context. When combined, quantitative and qualitative data can complement each other. “We have a very powerful mix” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 42). As explained by Wellington (2000, p. 19), “quantitative data provide structure” while qualitative data “give richness and colour.” A mixed methods approach can provide a more informative picture than either method by itself (Hubbard, 2005). Thus, the mixed method adopted in the current study was designed to help the researcher provide insightful and comprehensive responses to the research questions.
Quantitative method

Numerous expectancy-value studies have used a quantitative approach to data gathering (e.g., Ghazalia & McPherson, 2009; Jacobs et al., 2002; McPherson & O’Neill, 2010; Wigfield et al., 1991). The quantitative component of data collection for the current study (student survey) was designed to assess students’ self-perceptions (ability/expectancy beliefs), values (importance, intrinsic, utility, and family values), and task perceptions (difficulty and effort required) in relation to learning English. The survey was completed by a large number of students, thereby enhancing the generalisability of the results.

Survey

It took approximately 20 minutes for students to complete the survey. They were not required to include their names but they were asked to provide their student number so the researcher could access their English test results. The survey is reproduced in Appendix 1.

The survey consisted of three parts, with 38 items in all. The first part included six demographic items to elicit background information, English learning history, opportunities to speak in English, and location of their high school (city, close to city, remote).

Items in the second part were designed to measure the major constructs that predict academic performance and choices in Eccles’ and colleagues’ expectancy-value model that has been the focus of much theoretical and empirical work (Eccles &
Wigfield, 1995; Parsons et al., 1983; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). These constructs are students’ expectancy/ability beliefs and task values. Task values include attainment (importance) value, intrinsic (interest) value, utility (usefulness) value, and cost (perceived difficulty and effort required) (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000).

In addition to the original expectancy and value measures, items specific to the Vietnamese context were added to the questionnaire. The researcher developed another value measure that he named *Family value*. There is considerable research demonstrating that Asian students want to be successful in their studies at least in part to please their parents and bringing honour to the family (Chao, 1996; Chow & Chu, 2007; Fuligni & Zhang, 2004; Hau & Salili, 1996; Urdan, 2004).

Items for expectancies and values (importance, interest, utility, and cost) were adapted from those developed by Eccles and colleagues (see Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000) with some re-wording to suit the current study (e.g. English instead of mathematics). Eccles’ and Wigfield’s items have been adapted widely and modified by researchers to investigate students’ expectancy-related beliefs and tasks values in different school subjects (see Crombie et al., 2005; Durik et al., 2006; McPherson & O’Neill, 2010; Simpkins et al., 2006; Steinmayr & Spinath, 2007, 2009; Watt, 2000, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008; Xiang, McBride, & Guan, 2004; Xiang, McBride, Guan, & Solmon, 2003; Xiang et al., 2006). Eccles and colleagues have also used these items in their numerous studies to assess students’ expectancy beliefs and values pertaining to English, mathematics, sports, music and social activities (Eccles, O’Neill,
Eccles and Wigfield (1995) have reported internal consistency reliabilities for the subscales of perceived task difficulty, expectancy-related beliefs and perceived task values. The Cronbach alpha statistics for these subscales range from 0.62 to 0.92. Eccles & Wigfield items (see Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000) were used in the current study because they had been shown to have clear factor structures, discriminant validity, and generally good psychometric properties (Jacobs et al., 2002).

Modifications to the Eccles’ subscales in the current study included minor changes to grammar to make them appropriate to the university student context rather than to the school context (e.g., how easy instead of how good in the item “How good would you be at learning something new in math?”). In addition, the response options in the current study use six point Likert scales. For example, with the item “How useful do you think learning English will be for you when you get a job after graduating?” students choose a number between 1 and 6, with 1 indicating “Not at all useful” and 6 indicating “Very useful”. In the original Eccles and Wigfield scale (see Eccles & Wigfield, 1995), a seven point Likert scale was used. However, Anderson and Bourke (2000) have recommended use of an even number in a Likert scale to avoid participants’ excessive use of the middle number, thereby reducing the variability of responses.

For success expectancies, Eccles & Wigfield (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000) items measuring expected success “this year” were changed
to “this semester” to measure expected success in the near future. Participants in the current study were in their first semester at the university.

For intrinsic value, the Eccles and Wigfield item asking about interest in working on assignments was replaced by one question asking students how interesting it was to study English. In Vietnam, students tend to sit examinations rather than undertake assignments. The item asking how much students like “doing” the subject was changed to how much students like “learning” English. In addition, one new item was added asking how much students like studying English compared with studying other university subjects.

Effort required to complete tasks was measured by four items in the Eccles and Wigfield measures. Three of these items were modified and used in the current study. The item asking how hard students have to study for maths tests to get good grades was modified by replacing “tests to get good grades” with “to do well in English tests,” a more familiar wording for Vietnamese students. Their item “How hard do you have to try to get good grades in math?” was omitted because of overlap with the previous item.

The stem “To do well in math I have to work . . . 1 (much harder in math) to 7 (much harder in other subjects)” was modified by use of the stem: “To do well in English do you have to work harder than you do in other university subjects?”, with anchors ranging from 1 (not at all hard) to 6 (very hard). This modification made the item clearer to Vietnamese students.

Adding a new construct, family value, to the expectancy-value model
The expectancy-value theory has been developed in the western world. Its developers recommend that it be examined within different cultures (Wigfield et al., 2016). Do the constructs of competence-related beliefs and subjective task values operate in a similar fashion in non-Western cultures? Wigfield and colleagues (2004) pointed out that additional constructs may be added to the model, and existing constructs of the model may be adapted to understand relationships among the constructs in different cultures. The current study uses the expectancy-value model in a Vietnamese collectivist culture.

The Vietnamese culture is described as a collectivist culture (L. D. Nguyen & Mujtaba, 2011; M. Nguyen & Truong, 2016; Vo, 2015). The importance of collective action in Vietnam is often traced back to harvesting the rice-crop. Vietnam is situated in the tropics and is subject to heavy rain, major storms, and flooding. Vietnamese people learned to work together to protect their rice crops (N. T. T. Phan & Locke, 2016). From these early days, a strong sense of community cohesion typifies Vietnam. According to Hofstede (1984, 1986), in a collectivist culture, individuals’ actions and beliefs are determined to an extent by the community to which they belong, be that a family or a village or a social class. As collectivists, Vietnamese people seek harmony in the community and see “… human relationships as the foundation of ethics” (Hy, Howard, Nguyen, & Lilleleht, 2005, p. 4)

China dominated Vietnam for nearly a thousand year (P. L. Huong & Fry, 2004a). Vietnamese culture received and adapted Buddhist and Confucian teachings (L. T. Tran & Marginson, 2014; Welch, 2010). In a Confucian-based culture, filial piety is a
virtue - children are expected to love and respect their parents. It is widely believed that children are indebted to their parents for giving them life and making sacrifices to raise them. It is the duty of children to obey their parents, and to take care of them when they are old (W. W. Chen, 2016; T. H. Nguyen, 2002). One way for children to show filial piety towards their parents is to study hard and thereby achieve success. Academic success brings honour to the family and make their parents proud of them (Chao, 1996; Chow & Chu, 2007; Fuligni & Zhang, 2004; Hui, Sun, Chow, & Chu, 2011; Urdan, 2004). The core values of showing respect, obedience, and gratitude remain to this day (T. Phan, 2004). Filial piety is a strong cultural value in Vietnam. It often appears in Vietnamese sayings and proverbs. For example:

*Công cha như núi Thái Sơn*

*Nghĩa mẹ như nước trong nguồn chảy ra*

*Một lòng thờ mẹ kính cha*

*Cho tròn chữ hiểu mới là đạo con*

*My father’s labour is as big as the Thai Son Mountain*

*My mother’s love is like water flowing from the source*

*With all my heart I respect and honour my parents*

*to uphold filial piety is my duty as their child*

Another cultural value of Vietnam that has been influenced by Confucian teaching is Vietnamese people’s respect for knowledge and respect for teachers. This cultural value is discussed in Chapter Two. Another cultural value is appreciation of effort. In a Confucian-based culture, success tends to be attributed to hard work (Salili
& Hau, 1994). Teachers and parents often say “có công mà sạt có ngày nên kim” (diligence is the mother of success) to encourage students to learn.

Given the strong family networks in Vietnam, a Family values construct was added to the expectancy-value model. The subscale included four items about wanting to be successful in English to show appreciation of the family, not wanting to bring shame upon the family, and wanting to please the family. These items were measured on 6-point Likert scales anchored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) for consistency with the other items in the questionnaire. The items are shown in Table 4.1. Table 4.1 shows all expectancy and value items in the questionnaire and the original items from which they were adapted.
Table 4.1 *Item Descriptions for English-Related Attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eccles’ &amp; colleagues’ items</th>
<th>Items used in the current research</th>
<th>Anchors</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability/Expectancies for success</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to other students, how well do you expect to do in math this year? (much worse than other students, much better than other students)</td>
<td>Compared to other students in your English class, how well do you expect to do in English this semester?</td>
<td>1 (Much worse than others) – 6 (Much better than others)</td>
<td>Eccles &amp; Wigfield (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do you think you will do in your math course this year? (very poorly, very well)</td>
<td>How well do you expect you will do in your English course this semester?</td>
<td>(1) Not well at all – (6) Very well</td>
<td>Eccles &amp; Wigfield (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How good at math are you? (not at all good, very good)</td>
<td>How are you good at English?</td>
<td>(1) Not at all good – (6) Very good</td>
<td>Eccles &amp; Wigfield (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were to order all the students in your math class from the worst to the best in math, where would you put yourself? (the worst, the best)</td>
<td>If you were to order all the students in your English class from the lowest performing to the highest performing, where would you put yourself?</td>
<td>(1) Among the lowest performing – (6) Among the highest performing</td>
<td>Eccles &amp; Wigfield (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have you been doing in math this year? (very poorly, very well)</td>
<td>How have you been doing in English this semester?</td>
<td>(1) Very poorly – (6) Very well</td>
<td>Eccles &amp; Wigfield (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How good</strong> would you be at learning something new in math? (not at all good, very good)</td>
<td>How easy would it be for you to learn something new in English?</td>
<td>(1) Not easy at all – (6) Very easy</td>
<td>Wigfield &amp; Eccles (2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Eccles’ & colleagues’ items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items used in the current research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perceived task value

#### Interest Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general, I find working on math assignments (very boring, very interesting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much do you like doing math? (not very much, very much)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Attainment Value/ Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to other university subjects, how much do you like English?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the amount of effort it will take to do well in advanced high school math courses worthwhile to you? (not very worthwhile, very worthwhile)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Eccles’ & colleagues’ items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Anchors</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that, to me, being good at solving problems which involve math or reasoning mathematically is (not at all important, very important)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>To me, being good at English is (1) Not at all important – (6) Very important</td>
<td>Eccles &amp; Wigfield (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it to you to get good grades in math? (not at all important, very important)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>How important is it for you to get good grades in English? (1) Not at all important – (6) Very important</td>
<td>Eccles &amp; Wigfield (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to most of your other activities, how important is it for you to be good at math? (not at all important, very important)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Compared to other university subjects, how important is it for you to be good at English? (1) Not at all important – (6) Very important</td>
<td>Wigfield &amp; Eccles (2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Utility Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Anchors</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How useful is learning advanced high school math for what you want to do after you graduate and go to work? (not very useful, very useful)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>How useful do you think English will be when you get a job after graduating? (1) Not at all useful – (6) Very useful</td>
<td>Eccles &amp; Wigfield (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How useful is what you learn in advanced high school math for your daily life outside school? (not very useful, very useful)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>How useful is English in your daily life outside university? (1) Not at all useful – (6) Very useful</td>
<td>Eccles &amp; Wigfield (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some things that you learn in school help you do things better outside of class, that is, they are useful. For example, learning about plants might help you grow a garden. In general, how useful is what you learn in math? (not at all useful very useful)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Some things that you learn in university are useful outside university. For example, learning about plants might help you grow a garden. How useful is what you learn in English class outside</td>
<td>Wigfield &amp; Eccles (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccles’ &amp; colleagues’ items</td>
<td>Items used in the current research</td>
<td>Anchors</td>
<td>Adapted from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to most of your other activities, how useful is what you learn in math? (not at all useful very useful)</td>
<td>Compared to other university subjects, how useful is what you learn in English class?</td>
<td>(1) Not at all useful – (6) Very useful</td>
<td>Wigfield &amp; Eccles (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Will you bring shame on your family if you do not pass your English course?</td>
<td>(1) Strongly disagree – (6) Strongly agree</td>
<td>Newly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Is doing well in English an important way to show appreciation for your family?</td>
<td>(1) Strongly disagree – (6) Strongly agree</td>
<td>Newly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>How important is it for you to do well in English to please your family?</td>
<td>(1) Not at all important – (6) Very important</td>
<td>Newly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Do you work hard in English to make your family proud of you?</td>
<td>(1) Strongly disagree – (6) Strongly agree</td>
<td>Newly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived task difficulty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task difficulty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eccles’ &amp; colleagues’ items</strong></td>
<td><strong>Items used in the current research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item No.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stem</strong></td>
<td><strong>Anchors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adapted from</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, how hard is math for you? (very easy, very hard)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>In general, how hard is English for you?</td>
<td>(1) Very easy – (6) Very hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to most other students in your class, how hard is math for you? (much easier, much harder)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Compared to other students in your class, how hard is it for you to learn English?</td>
<td>(1) Much easier – (6) Much harder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to most other school subjects that you take, how hard is math for you (my easiest course, my hardest course)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Compared to other university subjects that you take, how hard is English?</td>
<td>(1) My easiest course – (6) My hardest course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How hard would you have to try to do well in an advanced high school math course? (not very hard, very hard)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>How hard do you have to study to do well in your university English course?</td>
<td>(1) Not hard at all – (6) Very hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How hard do you have to try to get good grades in math? (a little, a lot)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used because it was redundant with the next included item (item 34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How hard do you have to study for math tests to get a good grade? (a little, a lot)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>How hard do you have to study to do well in English tests?</td>
<td>(1) Not hard at all - (6) Very hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do well in math I have to work (much harder in math than in other subjects, much harder in other subjects than in math)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>To do well in English do you have to work harder than you do in other university subjects?</td>
<td>(1) Strongly disagree – (6) Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Numerous expectancy value studies have used students’ intention to enrol in a course as a dependent variable (Crombie et al., 2005; Simpkins et al., 2006; Watt, 2006; Watt, Eccles, & Durik, 2006). Eccles, Wigfield, and colleagues’ work has shown that expectancies for success and perceived task values predict achievement and achievement-related choices as course enrolment (e.g., Eccles, 1985; Meece et al., 1990; Parsons et al., 1984; Parsons et al., 1983).

Item 35 in the survey assessed students’ willingness to take English classes outside university. This item was worded “You are required to study English while you are at university. In addition to the English classes you must attend, how likely are you to enrol in additional English classes that are run outside the university?” Students responded using a 6 point Likert scale ranging from Not likely at all (1) to Very likely (6).

Motivation scholars have argued that subjective task values, such as intrinsic motivation and learning goals, are important predictors of present and long-term participation in different academic activities (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). Item 36 assessed students’ likelihood of taking English classes after they graduated from university. Students responded using a 6 point Likert scale ranging from Not likely at all (1) to Very likely (6).

Item 37 asked students to predict how well they thought they would perform on their examinations in their university English class. Students responded using a 6 point Likert scale ranging from Very poorly (1) to Very well (6). This was a “surrogate”
achievement measure. If only a small number of students allowed the researcher to access their English results, this item would act as a quasi-achievement score. In the event, all the students who completed the survey allowed the researcher to link their survey data with their English scores.

Students’ grades or test scores are used as a measure of achievement in expectancy-value research (Bong, 2006; Sideridis, 2006; Trautwein et al., 2012; Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994). In the current study, students’ semester marks in English were used as achievement data. The final item, Item 38, was a request for students to allow the researcher to access their English scores by providing their student number. The wording was as follows:

We ask your permission to access your final mark in this English class. If you are happy for us to do this, please provide your student number here: __________

Translation of survey into Vietnamese

The survey was first written in English, and then translated into Vietnamese. Back-translation (Green & White, 1976) was employed to confirm accuracy and to make any adjustments. The process began with the researcher and two other PhD candidates in Australia who were native Vietnamese speakers independently translating the original English into Vietnamese. They then met to compare the translations. All translated items agreed closely in meaning, with some minor differences in terms of word choice. The three translators worked together to complete the survey.
The Vietnamese version of the survey was then independently translated back into English by three Vietnamese university lecturers teaching EFL in Vietnam. Their translations were carefully compared with the original English version. All items were similar in meaning to the original, although there were some minor differences in words used.

Then the Vietnamese version of the survey, the original English version, and the three English translated versions were carefully examined by the two PhD candidates in Australia. They were Vietnamese and had worked as EFL university lecturers in Vietnam. They reported all the items were similar in meaning but there were some differences in terms of word choices. Adjustments in words were made in the Vietnamese version for consistency.

**Piloting testing of the survey**

Pilot testing is a means of reducing problems that might occur when a survey is used for research (Anderson & Bourke, 2000). The final Vietnamese version was piloted with 56 first year non-English major students (29 females and 27 males) at a university in Vietnam. These students were from one of the three selected universities but were not students in the main sample of the study. Trialing the survey would show if instructions and items were clear to students and if students could complete the items within the anticipated time (20 minutes). Did any items cause embarrassment or confusion to students?
Chapter Four: Methodology

After obtaining consent from the Dean of the Department of English of the university, the lecturer of the English class, and the students, the students completed the survey. The pilot trial showed that these students did not have any problems understanding and responding to the survey. The pilot study also showed that the survey could be completed in about 20 minutes. Therefore, the survey was accepted as the final Vietnamese version. (see Appendix 1)

Qualitative method

The expectancy-value model has been used extensively in quantitatively-based research studies. However, to the researcher’s knowledge, this model has not been used previously with Vietnamese students. Would there be aspects of Vietnamese culture that influence students’ expectancy for success and the values they embrace, aspects not incorporated into the current expectancy-value model developed in a Western context? Given a new non-Western context, it was important to talk with students and lecturers about their experiences studying and teaching English in Vietnamese universities. Would factors particular to the Vietnamese context emerge, factors that exert a significant impact on students’ motivation to study English?

Focus group interviews with students

Focus groups have a long history as a qualitative research technique in the social sciences (Bogardus, 1926; Merton, Lowenthal, & Kendall, 1990; Morgan, 1997). The use of focus groups has increased in different disciplines (Gaiser, 2008). The benefit of focus groups is “their relative efficiency in comparison to individual interviews, at least
in terms of gathering equivalent amounts of data.” (Morgan, 1997, p. 13). A focus group is defined as “a group of individuals selected and assembled by researchers to discuss and comment on, from personal experience, the topic that is the subject of the research” (Powell & Single, 1996, p. 499). Focus groups can be used in three ways (Morgan, 1997). First, they can be used as a “self-contained” method in which focus groups are the only means of data collection. Second, they can be used as supplementary sources of data, for example, to generate survey questionnaires. Finally, they can also be used in multi-method studies where a combination of several methods is used to gather data. This last approach is known as “triangulation” (J. Cho & Trent, 2006; Mathison, 1988).

In the current study, interviews with small groups of students and lecturers would provide qualitative data that should complement and extend the quantitative data.

According to Krueger and Casey (2009), focus groups are suitable as a tool to elicit participants’ beliefs, attitudes, and experiences of a social issue. In the current study, focus groups were used to gain an understanding of Vietnamese university students’ perception of their ability to learn English, the values they attach to learning English, social factors that affect their motivation to learn English, and their experiences of their English classes.

A focus group gives an opportunity to participants to share their views about studying English. It should be noted that, in the current study, many students who completed the survey indicated their willingness to participate in focus groups. Obviously Vietnamese students welcomed the opportunity to talk with their peers about studying English.
Focus groups enable participants to question one another and to explain themselves to one another. As Morgan & Krueger (1993) note, such interaction produces valuable data on the extent of agreement and disagreement among participants. Focus groups are expected to provide insights into the behaviours and motivations of Vietnamese university students.

A semi-structured interview was chosen because this type of interview not only allows the researcher to build a frame of pre-determined questions but also provides the opportunity for probing and asking follow up questions (Creswell & Clark, 2007; Kvale, 1996). Semi-structured interviews allow flexibility and give informants the freedom to express their views (Burns, 2000).

In the current study, the interviews were semi-structured so that the same sets of questions would be posed to each focus group to compare information across male and female groups. Also, the interviewer was able to modify questions, explain areas of confusion, ask follow-up questions, and probe responses. The list of questions asked in the focus groups is shown in Appendix 2. These questions were based on the theoretical framework (expectancy-value theory) which focused on probing students’ beliefs about their ability to study English successfully, reasons why it was important for them to study English, and their experiences of English classes. Focus group interviews were audio recorded for the purposes of transcription. Each interview lasted for approximately 30 minutes, and was conducted in a meeting room provided by the university. To make it easy for students, the language used in the interviews was Vietnamese. However, participants could use English words or phrases if they chose to.
Individual interviews with lecturers

A focus group was deemed not suitable for lecturers for two reasons. First, lecturers were busy and there were only a few times when they could meet for an interview. It was difficult to arrange a place and time that satisfied a group of lecturers. Second, given the diverse characteristics of lecturers (e.g., age, teaching experience), a focus group might limit the time for each lecturer to discuss their own experiences of teaching English. Therefore, individual semi-structured interviews were undertaken with lecturers.

The individual interviews contained a set of questions about lecturers’ views of their students’ ability to study English and the reasons their students study English. The interview questions are provided in Appendix 3. The data provided by these lecturers were used to triangulate the data provided by students in focus groups. The interview questions posed to lecturers were similar to those posed to students.

The interview took about 20 minutes, a suitable time for busy lecturers, and was conducted in a meeting room provided by the university. All interviews were tape-recorded with the consent of the interviewee. Interviews were conducted in Vietnamese. However, they could use English words or phrases during the interview.

Overview of data analyses

The current research consisted of two phases of data analysis: quantitative data analysis and qualitative data analysis.
Quantitative data analysis

Data from the questionnaire were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 22 for analysis. Virtually all the participants completed all items in the survey and allowed the researcher to access their English marks. Relationships among students’ expectancy to do well in English, intrinsic value of English, utility value, importance value, family values, students’ sex, choice to take additional English classes, and scores on English tests were examined using structural equation modelling (SEM).

Structural equation modelling (SEM) combines factor analyses with regression or path analyses (Byrne, 2010). SEM allows a researcher to specify and estimate complicated path models, with intervening variables between independent and dependent variables. SEM also incorporates latent factors. The statistical model of SEM is represented in a set of covariance matrices. The relationships among theoretical constructs (latent constructs) are shown by regression and path coefficients.

Researchers use SEM for two purposes. First, SEM allows researchers to obtain estimates of the parameters of the model, that is, factor loadings, variances and covariances of the factors, and the residual error variances of the observed variables. Second, SEM allows researchers to assess the fit of the proposed model to the data. Is the proposed model a good fit of the data?

Many expectancy-value studies use students’ grades or test scores as a measure of achievement (Bong, 2006; Sideridis, 2006; Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994). In the
current study, students’ combined scores on a mid-semester test (30%) and a final test (70%) were used as a measure of achievement. All three universities follow the same format. The mid-semester test included a small exercise of listening and speaking in the classroom. The final test was the main component of testing and used multiple choice testing of grammar and written comprehension questions. The end-of-semester test of each university is shown in Appendix 5. The final semester mark was weighted by the mark of the mid semester test (30%), and the mark of the final test (70%). The English tests are very similar across the three universities because of the highly centralised English programs in Vietnamese universities.

As discussed in Chapter Two, Vietnam has a highly centralised education system under the control of the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET). For English programs in primary, secondary and high school levels, MOET develops its own English textbooks and curricula. At the university level, universities are allowed to choose their own teaching and learning materials. However, they must follow a state-mandated curriculum as stated in the Vietnamese Education Law 2005. MOET defines the curriculum framework as the core program for each field of education. Based on this core framework, the universities design their English program guaranteeing to provide the minimum number of hours of teaching stipulated by MOET and the graduation standards. The three universities in the current study all require that non-English major students undertake approximately 360 periods, with 45 minutes each period, for the whole English course. All three universities require students to pass standardized tests of English proficiency (TOEIC) prior to their graduation (with minimum scores of 500 out of 990).
In the current study, University 1 and University 2 used the same English textbook *New Edition Market Leader (Elementary level)* produced by Pearson (Cotton, Falvey, & Kent, 2007) while University 3 used *New Cutting Edge (Elementary level)* by Pearson (Cunningham, Moor, & Eales, 2005) for their first year students.

The teaching method in all three universities follows a similar method, predominantly a Grammar Translation method as discussed in Chapter Two. It is common for the same English teachers to teach across universities. For example, the current researcher has worked as an English teacher concurrently at the three participating universities.

For the final English test, the multiple choice format is similar across the three universities. The English tests are provided in Appendix 5. The marks are given on a scale of one to ten. The current researcher has extensive experience as a teacher in the Vietnamese university system. He has checked the three tests carefully and is confident that they share a similar level of difficulty. In addition, the current researcher asked two other English teachers at Vietnamese universities to compare the three tests for level of difficulty. They also concluded that the tests share a similar level of difficulty. Letters from these two teachers are provided in Appendix 6.

Given these similarities in teaching English and testing English in the three universities, it was decided to conduct analyses on the sample as a whole, across the three universities, rather than separately by university.
Qualitative data analyses for focus groups with students and individual interviews with teachers

The audio-recordings of the interviews were transcribed, and copies were sent to interviewees for comment before being translated into English. The English translation was checked by a bilingual native English speaker to ensure that the translation was faithful to the Vietnamese original. Confidentiality was maintained by giving the interviewee a pseudonym.

The researcher made a decision to use manual coding of interview data rather than use a qualitative analysis software package such as NVivo. The manual coding process undertaken allowed a more rigorous interrogation of data because he controlled the segmenting process.

The researcher adopted a two cycles approach to coding, “first cycle coding” and “second cycle coding” (Saldana, 2009). Saldana (2009) defines a code as “a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data” (p. 3). The first step of coding consisted of data reduction, as described by Coffey and Atkinson (1996), “the addition of simple, broad analytic categories or codes … used to reduce the data to manageable proportions” (p. 28).

For the first cycle coding, the approaches used were “provisional coding” and “structural coding” (Saldana, 2009). With provisional coding, based on relevant literature, the study’s conceptual framework and a tentative start list of codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994) have been predetermined. This tentative start list was used to simplify
the data. The researcher read through the focus group transcripts several times to gain an overall sense of the interviews and then responses were collated within each of the 12 interview groups. In a similar way, for the individual interviews with lecturers, the researcher also read through the transcripts and responses then were collated. The data were then analysed by developing codes for the interview transcripts.

Structural coding was used to focus on answering the research questions directly. This approach is more appropriate for interview transcripts than other data sources such as field notes (Saldana, 2009). This type of coding requires the application of a content phrase that represents a topic of inquiry to segments of data relating to a specific research question. In the case of the current study, these segments of data were often linked to the interview questions which were, in turn, derived from the research questions. These topic coded text segments can form the basis for further qualitative analysis within and across topics.

The second cycle coding adopted a “focused coding” approach to reorganize and reanalyse data coded through the first cycle coding method (Saldana, 2009). At this stage, the researcher re-examined the tentative categories to determine how they were linked. As the researcher continued to read and mark interview transcripts, other passages emerged and connected to the same categories. Some categories that seemed promising early in the process lost their usefulness while new ones emerged. Strauss and Corbin (1990) refer to this process as axial coding. During the coding, the researcher decided whether the initial coding categories identified in interview transcripts had to be revised. To check for accuracy, he referred to the audiotape. Responses were analysed using constant comparative analytic procedures (Glaser &
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Strauss, 1967), keeping the research questions in mind. The result was sets of concepts that were then grouped into categories in terms of the key factors in the expectancy-value model.

**Ethics clearance**

Before the commencement of the data collection, the researcher submitted an ethics application to the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) of the University of Newcastle and obtained the approval from HREC. The research approval number was **H-2013-0296** (see Appendix 7).

Upon HREC approval of the proposed research, a research information letter and a consent form (see Appendix 8) were sent to the Deans of the Department of English at the target universities to seek their permission to approach staff members and students. When the Deans signified their consent, they were asked to forward a set of letters to selected EFL lecturers. The letters contained a copy of the student survey (see Appendix 1) a research information letter, and a consent form (see Appendix 9) asking their permission to distribute the student survey in their class and inviting them to participate in the individual interview. Upon lecturers’ consent, the student survey, a research information letter, and a consent form (detaching the consent form from the survey for students interested in the focus group interviews) were distributed to students (see Appendix 10). Students’ return of the completed survey was taken as their consent to participate in the study, as stated in the research information letter. Those students who were willing to participate in a group interview were asked to complete the consent form and return it to the researcher.
Conclusion

In summary, this chapter has elaborated methodological details of the current study. The decision to use a mixed method approach to reach a holistic understanding of Vietnamese higher education students’ motivation to study English and their experiences of English classes in Vietnam has been presented. Quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis were discussed. In the following two chapters, the findings from the three data sources will be presented and analysed.
Chapter Five

Analysis of quantitative data

Introduction

In Chapter Four, Byrne (2010) describes structural equation modelling (SEM) as a confirmatory approach to multivariate analysis of a theory. The causal processes represented in the theory can be represented by a series of structural equations. Further, a pictorial diagram can aid in the conceptualisation of the theoretical model. Empirical support for the hypothesised model can be established and then employed to determine the extent to which the hypothesised model is consistent with the data. Goodness of fit criteria then are used to test the plausibility of the hypothesised relations among the variables. SEM is an improvement on other statistical techniques such as multiple regression and path analysis. For example, a multiple regression does not explore possible relations among dependent variables, and it allows for unequal weightings of multiple indicators of a latent construct (Holmes-Smith, 2008).

SEM is conducted in two parts. First, a measurement model is produced. This shows indicator variables as effects of underlying latent variables. Second, a structural model is produced. This shows the predictive relationships among variables, both latent and manifest. The fit of the model to the data then is measured by appropriate fit indices.

Eccles’ expectancy-value model of motivation formed the theoretical model for the current SEM. Eccles and her colleagues argue that students’ achievement in a
particular domain, and the adaptive strategies they employ when they work in the
domain, are the result of their expectancy of success in the domain and the value that
they place on it. Over the years, a number of different values have been added to the
model. These include *interest value* (do students find the domain interesting), *utility
value* (do students consider the domain to be useful), *importance value* (do students
place importance on this domain), and *cost value* (do students consider the effort they
must expend to be successful – usually considered as a negative rather than a positive
value).

A new value called *family value* was introduced in the current study. Given the
strong family structure in Vietnam, a result of its Confucian heritage and collectivist
orientation, it was proposed that students’ motivation to learn and the study strategies
they used would be influenced by their respect for their parents and their wish to make
their parents proud of them.

The current study used the expectancy-value model to explore the motivation of
Vietnamese university students to study English as a foreign language. These students
were not majoring in English. They were studying business-related majors. All
university students in Vietnam are required to study English in addition to their
discipline majors. They must pass the English subject to graduate. The dependent
variables for the study were students’ performance on the end-of-semester English tests
and their willingness to take additional English classes (concurrently with their
university studies and after graduation). The researcher wanted to examine for sex
differences in all the variables because previous expectancy-value research has shown
significant differences between male and female students.
The principle of parsimony was used in the SEM analysis (Vandekerckhove, Matzke, & Wagenmakers, 2015). A parsimonious model is one that provides a desired level of explanation with as few predictor variables as possible. The SEM measurement model produced included the fewest possible number of indicator variables required to identify the latent constructs.

**Structural Equation Model (SEM)**

A parsimonious Structural Equation Model (SEM) was fitted to the current data using *IBM SPSS AMOS V23.0 ©*. As noted, the principle of parsimony balances goodness-of-fit against complexity (Vandekerckhove et al., 2015) to develop an acceptable model. In the measurement model, the latent constructs (or factors) representing the influence of Family (*family value*), Expectations for success (*expectancy*), Interest (*interest value*), Utility (*utility value*), and Intention of Additional Study of English (*future*) are associated with their respective indicator (or observed) variables, representing the most statistically significant survey items associated with each variable. Chapter Four contains a detailed description of all items in the survey and their six-point Likert response scales.

Two *value* variables of the original expectancy-value model, *cost value* and *importance value*, do not appear in the final fitted model. The items in the *importance value* variable share considerable overlap with items in the *utility value* variable. Using the principle of parsimony, items that added unnecessary complexity to the model were removed from the SEM. The *cost value* variable showed no significant associations with
other variables in the model and so was removed from the analysis. It is difficult to speculate why cost value did not contribute to the model. It is well established that students from Confucian-based cultures (like Vietnam) are more likely to attribute success to working hard and to attribute failure to not working hard than students from Western countries. Perhaps Vietnamese students view effort differently from students in Western countries. Further research in this area might provide more clarity on this matter.

The new construct, family value, was added to the expectancy-value model. Where to position family value within the structural model? In Chapter Three, Eccles and Wigfield (2002) pointed out that students’ expectancy beliefs and the value they attached to tasks would be influenced by antecedent factors. Attitudes and values of parents, shaped by the surrounding cultural milieu, would be antecedent factors. As such, the researcher decided to develop a three level model. It was anticipated that family value would influence other values (especially utility value) which in turn would influence willingness to take additional courses in English. If students wish to honour their families by achieving well at university and getting a good job on graduation, then one would expect that these students would endorse the utility value of studying English because it would heighten their chances of getting a good job on graduation.

As noted in Chapter Four, the SEM will be conducted with the full sample of 1207 students (almost equal numbers of male and female students). It was established in Chapter Four that there was sufficient similarity in the nature of the first year English courses across the three universities, especially the level of difficulty of the examinations and the multiple-choice nature of the examinations, to warrant working
with the whole sample, not three separate university samples. This decision provided the researcher with a large sample size, highly desirable when conducting a SEM analysis.

The final fitted model is presented in Figure 5.1. The model shown in Figure 5.1 shows the structural relationships but does not include the individual items associated with the latent variables because it produces a rather crowded model that is not easy to read. The full model is included in Appendix 4.

For descriptive purposes, factor scores were imputed for the latent variables from the indicators associated with each, following the approach recommended by Rowe (2006). The result is a set of factor scores proportionally weighted so as to retain meaning on the same six-point Likert scale used with the related items in the survey. Table 5.2 presents descriptive statistics (where appropriate) for the five latent variables and the two observed variables of Sex and Final Mark. Table 5.3 presents the intercorrelations among the observed and latent variables.

The parameter estimates and fit statistics for the structural model are presented in Table 5.1. The principles in the reporting of the SEM analysis follow those of McDonald and Ho (2002). As noted previously, the measurement model included the fewest possible number of indicator variables required to identify the latent constructs in a satisfactory manner. The structural part of the model shows only statistically significant paths representing the interrelationships between the two observed variables (Sex and Final Mark) and the five latent variables. It should be noted that there was
very little missing data in the large data set (more than 1200 participants), an advantage when using SEM.

The strength of the path weights in the structural model (shown as standardised estimates), presented in Table 5.1, are evaluated using Cohen's (1988) conventions to interpret effect sizes. Accordingly, correlation coefficients around .10 are taken to represent a weak or small associations; correlation coefficients around .30 are considered to be moderate; and correlation coefficients of .50 or larger are considered to represent a strong or large correlation. Figure 5.1 shows the final fitted model showing relationships among with latent constructs and observed variable. Standardised path coefficients are shown as well as $R^2$ statistics that show the total amount of variance explained by prior variables.

![Figure 5.1 Path diagram for final fitted model showing standardised coefficients](image-url)
There is a direct effect of sex on *expectancy* (.18), on *interest value* (.12), and on *utility value* (.17). Examining the effect of sex on *future* (willingness to take additional English classes), there is a direct effect (.17) and three indirect effects. The first indirect effect is via *utility* (.17 x .42 = .07). The second small indirect effect is mediated via *interest* and *utility* (.12 x .32 x .42 = .02). The third small indirect effect is mediated via *expectancy, interest, and utility* (.18 x .63 x .32 x .42 = .02). The total effect of sex on *future* therefore is a small .20 (the sum of the direct and indirect effects). Examining the effect of sex on *final mark*, there is a direct effect (.17) and an indirect effect via *expectancy* (.18 x .50 = .09). The total effect of sex on *final mark* therefore is a small to moderate .26.

Examining the effect of *family value* on *future*, there is an indirect effect via *utility value* (.22 x .42 = .09) and there is a second small indirect effect mediated via *interest value* and *utility value* (.15 x .32 x .42 = .02). The total effect of *family value* on *future* therefore is a small .11. There were no direct or indirect effects of *family value* on *final mark*.

Examining the effect of *expectancy* on *future*, there is an indirect effect mediated via *interest value* and *utility value* (.63 x .32 x .42 = .08). Examining the effect of *expectancy* on *final mark*, there is a strong direct effect of .50. The total effect of *expectancy* on *final mark* therefore is a strong .58. Examining the effect of *expectancy* on *interest value*, there is a strong direct effect of .63. Examining the effect of *expectancy* on *utility value*, there is a small indirect effect via *interest* (.63 x .32 = .20).
Examining the effect of *interest value on future*, there is a small indirect effect via *utility value* (.32 x .42 = .13). There is no direct or indirect effect of *interest value* on *final mark*. There is a moderate direct effect of *utility value* on *future* (.42).

$R^2$ values are shown in Figure 5.1. The $R^2$ values represent the total proportion of variance explained in the dependent (or endogenous) variables by the prior variables to which they are linked with significant paths. $R^2$ for *expectancy* is .03; $R^2$ for *interest value* is .46; $R^2$ for *utility value* is .23; $R^2$ for *future* is .20; and the $R^2$ for *final mark* is .31. It should be noted that *Sex* and *Family value* have no prior variables linked to them in the model, that is, they are exogenous variables. As such, they have no $R^2$ values reported.

There is more examination of the SEM path model in Chapter Seven when the interview data and the statistical data are combined to address the research questions of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Stand. estimates</th>
<th>Description of path</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest &lt;- Family</td>
<td><strong>.15</strong></td>
<td>Small positive association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility &lt;- Family</td>
<td><strong>.22</strong></td>
<td>Moderate positive association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect &lt;- Sex</td>
<td><strong>.18</strong></td>
<td>Small positive association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest &lt;- Expect</td>
<td><strong>.63</strong></td>
<td>Strong positive association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest &lt;- Sex</td>
<td><strong>.12</strong></td>
<td>Small positive association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility &lt;- Sex</td>
<td><strong>.17</strong></td>
<td>Small positive association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future &lt;- Sex</td>
<td><strong>.10</strong></td>
<td>Small positive association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance &lt;- Sex</td>
<td><strong>.17</strong></td>
<td>Small positive association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance &lt;- Expect</td>
<td><strong>.50</strong></td>
<td>Strong positive association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter Five: Analysis of quantitative data

#### Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Stand. estimates</th>
<th>Description of path</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement model</th>
<th>Item description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i12VFam</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i31VFam</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i32VFam</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i7Ex</td>
<td>Expect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i13Ex</td>
<td>Expect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i18Ex</td>
<td>Expect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i9VInter</td>
<td>Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i22VInter</td>
<td>Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i25VUti</td>
<td>Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i28VUti</td>
<td>Utility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measuring model fit

There are two approaches to measuring the fit of a model: assessment of absolute fit and assessment of comparative fit. In the current study, the focus was on absolute fit, that is, the ability of the model to reproduce the actual covariance matrices. Because there is no single answer to the question of the extent to which the data fit the model, the more criteria that a model satisfies in terms of various fit statistics, the more confidence one can have in the model (Holmes-Smith, 2008). The four fit statistics used in the current SEM were the Chi-square Test of exact fit, the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), and the Normed Fit Index (NFI).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Stand. estimates</th>
<th>Description of path</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i27VUtil</td>
<td>&lt;--- Utility</td>
<td>How useful do you think English will be when you get a job after graduating?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i30VUtil</td>
<td>&lt;--- Utility</td>
<td>Compared to other university classes, how useful is what you learn in English class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i35</td>
<td>&lt;--- Future</td>
<td>You are required to study English at university. In addition to the English classes at university, how likely are you to enrol in additional English classes that run outside the university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i36</td>
<td>&lt;--- Future</td>
<td>How likely are you to enrol in English classes when you graduate from university?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level; ** Significant at 0.001 level

$\chi^2 (95) = 262.39, p < .000; \text{GFI} = .973; \text{NFI} = .95; \text{RMSEA} = .038$
For the chi-square test, a small and non-significant chi-square suggests “good” model fit. However, the chi-square test is not a good indicator of model fit with large sample sizes (the sample size in this study was in excess of 1200). This is because, with large sample sizes, very minor differences between the covariance matrix that was entered and the matrix implied by the model can produce a significant chi-square. This means that the model could be rejected when in fact it may be a good model (Byrne, 2010). The chi-square in the current SEM, with 95 degrees of freedom, was 262.39 ($p < .000$).

The RMSEA is another absolute fit index. It measures how well the model with unknown but carefully selected estimates of parameters fits the population covariance matrix, if it were available. The RMSEA is a measure of this discrepancy and is expressed per degree of freedom, taking into account the number of estimated parameters (Byrne, 2010). Smaller RMSEA values represent a better fit to the data. Values below 0.05 indicate a good fit to the data. The RMSEA value in the current study was .038.

The goodness of fit index (GFI) is a measure of the fit between the hypothesized model and the observed covariance matrix. The GFI ranges between 0 and 1, with a value of over .9 generally indicating acceptable model fit. In the current study, the GFI was .973.

The NFI is also known as the Bentler-Bonett normed fit index. The fit index varies from 0 to 1, where 1 is ideal. The NFI equals the difference between the chi-square of the null model and the chi square of the target model, divided by the chi-
square of the null model. An NFI of .90, for example, indicates the model of interest improves the fit by 90% relative to the null or independence model. The NFI in the current study is .95, that is, close to the ideal score of 1.0.

Given these goodness of fit results for the Chi-square, the RMSEA, the GFI, and the NFI, it was concluded that the model was a “good” fit for the data. The two dependent variables, willingness to take extra courses (future) and final mark, have $R^2$ values of .20 and .31 respectively. One can conclude then that the expectancy-value model (including the new construct of family value) is an informative way to understand Vietnamese university students’ motivation to learn English, and their achievement on an English test.

**Table 5.2 Descriptive statistics and variance ($R^2$) values for the latent and observed variables in the study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$Min$</th>
<th>$Max$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$S.D$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family value</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest value</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility value</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Mark</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2$ derived from the indicator variables shown in the final fitted model
Table 5.3 Inter-correlations among observed and latent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Final Mk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
1200 > N < 1207

There will be a further discussion of the SEM analysis in Chapter Seven when the qualitative data is added to the quantitative data. However, at this point, it should be noted that the SEM analysis does provide support for Eccles’ and Wigfield’s expectancy-value model. In particular, expectancy of success predicts achievement while utility value predicts choice of achievement-related activities. Expectancy also is a strong predictor of interest value. Sex had both direct and indirect effects on expectancy, interest value, utility value, future (willingness to take additional English courses), and final mark. The new family value variable was a direct predictor of interest value and utility value and an indirect predictor of future (willingness to take extra courses).

Limitations of Structural Equation Modeling

At the end of this chapter, it important to acknowledge the limitations of SEM analyses (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Tomarken & Waller, 2005). In the current study, all the numerical data (except final mark) were gathered at the same time via a survey. At the end of the survey, students gave permission to the researcher to access the results of
their English test. Essentially, what is available for analyses is a set of covariance matrices. Any proposed causal model that shows links among variables were gathered at one time point must be accepted with caution. It is possible that another SEM model incorporating different variables and different causal paths would have shown a similar level of fit with the data. Even when the current model is accepted, different ways of identifying the latent variables might have produced different results.

The selection of goodness of fit indices that test the fit of the data to the proposed model also can be problematic. As Tomarken and Waller (2005, p. 54) point out, “… conventional rules of thumb and guidelines used by researchers for the selection and interpretation of fit indices are often erroneous or oversimplified.” In the current study, several goodness of fit indices were employed to reduce the chance of inaccurate findings and care was taken to select the most appropriate fit statistics.

In the next chapter, the results of the interview data are presented. Then in Chapter Seven, the quantitative data and the qualitative are combined to answer the research questions.
Chapter Six

Qualitative findings

Introduction

In Chapter Five, the findings of a survey completed by 1207 Vietnamese students from three universities were analysed and presented. In this chapter, the results from the focus group interviews with students and individual interviews with lecturers of English at three universities in Ho Chi Minh City in Vietnam are presented, with the findings from focus groups with students presented before those from the individual interviews with lecturers. The approach to analysing qualitative data is detailed in Chapter Four.

Given that this is the first time the expectancy-value model, developed in a Western context, has been used to explore Vietnamese students’ motivation to study English, are there factors not included in the original model that influence students’ motivation in an Asian country? The purpose of the qualitative component of the current study was to extend and clarify the findings of the quantitative component. This would allow a comprehensive understanding of university students’ motivation to learn English in Vietnam.

It should be noted that, to observe confidentiality, the names of student and lecturer participants are pseudonyms.
Focus group interviews with students

The participants were drawn from 1207 students from three universities in Ho Chi Minh City who completed the survey and who volunteered to participate in the focus group interviews. It should be noted that there were many more volunteers than could be accommodated in the focus groups. There were 72 students (36 males and 36 females), 24 from each university. They were allocated to 12 groups. Each group consisted of all female or male students to allow males and females to talk openly. There were six students in each focus group, a number recommended by Creswell (2012) and Morgan (1997). The small number of students encourages participants feel comfortable discussing the topics of the interview. Table 6.1 provides a summary of the focus groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results from the focus group interviews with students are presented in three parts. Part 1 focuses on students’ perceptions of their ability to learn English, and factors influencing their motivation to learn English. Part 2 focuses on their perceptions of gender differences and similarities in studying English. Part 3 focuses on what they see as factors that enhance learning and factors that decrease learning English in universities in Vietnam.

**Part 1: Expectancy of success and motivation to study English**

**Expectancy of success**

When asked to rate their confidence in learning English on a scale of 1 to 10, thirty-one male students ranked themselves between 5 and 8 (while one male ranked himself at 4), indicating that the majority of male students perceived their ability to be average or above average. The 32 female students ranked themselves between 6 and 9. These data indicate that females had slightly higher perceptions than males of their ability to learn English.

Examples from groups 3 and 7 (female groups) were Lan and Hang who had the highest self-ranking of ability at 9 and 8 respectively:

*Lan: I think I will put myself at 9. I feel pretty confident in English.*

*Interviewer: That sounds interesting.*

*Lan: Well, I learn it better than the other subjects. (Group 3)*

*Hang: I will say 8. For me, English is the easiest subject compared to the others at university. (Group 7)*
Lan and Hang believed that they could do well in English compared to their performance in other subjects.

The responses from male students indicated confidence in their English ability as mentioned by Nam (Male group, group 1):

*Nam:* Well, for me, I would rate me at 8. I feel I can study English well.

The students’ responses showed high self-perceptions of their ability to speak English. This response is given by male and female students. For example, Thuy (group 11, female group), Nhung, and Hien from group 8 (female group) saw themselves as good at English.

*Thuy:* Probably, I’ll put myself at 7. I feel confident in learning English. I can communicate in English with my teacher and classmates in English classes. (Group 11)

*Nhung:* I think it should be an 8. I do not have very many problems in communicating with a foreigner in English. So I feel my English is good enough to rate myself at 8. (Group 8)

*Hien:* I agree with Nhung that it’s not very difficult to speak English. I feel confident to speak English in the class. So I will rank myself as a 7, meaning fairly well. (Group 8)

Tung, from group 9 (male group), was the only one who ranked his ability at 4 out of 10. He considered himself not competent in English.
Tung: I think I’m about 4. I feel I’m not good at it. I have learned English for over 6 years since I was in class 6, but even now I can’t speak it. (Group 9)

Both male and female students usually attributed their competence in English to the effort they put into learning it.

Hai: I’ll rank myself at 7 out of 10. I think I can do it well at the university. If I put in time and effort, I can study it well (group 5, male group)

Tu: For me, everything is possible as long as we try. I believe if I try, I can study English successfully at university. (Group 9, male group)

Hue: I feel confident in English. It seems to make sense that if you work hard, spend more time for it, you can study it well. To me, to be good at English requires effort. (Group 4, Female group)

Three students (2 females and 1 male) reported that their confidence in English was boosted by attending extra English classes outside the university.

Phong: I had to struggle with studying English when I was in high school. When I entered University, I decided to enrol in an extra English class in a language centre in the evening. I feel more confident learning English now. (Male group, group 5)

Hoa: I’m lucky that my uncle has an English language center, so I attend English classes there in the evening. I think this helps me a lot in studying English at the university. I am pretty confident in studying English. (Female group, Group 12)
Attributing success to the effort expended is characteristic of many Asian cultures. Students in Asian countries tend to think that ability can be increased through effort. They believe that ability is strongly linked with effort (Salili & Hau, 1994).

**Self-perception of being good at English**

Self-perception of being good at English was mentioned as a reason for studying hard in English. This is similar to the *expectancy of success* component in the Expectancy-value model. Eccles and her colleagues argue that high expectations of success affect students’ academic performance and future choices. Expectancy of success was raised in the interviews by twice as many female students (n=13) as male students (n=6). Students stated that previously they had good grades in English and were confident in their ability to do well in their English studies at university.

*Yen: It’s just a feeling that I can learn it. I don’t have any difficulties in English classes.*  (Female group, group 11)

*Linh: When I was in high school, I got good grades in English. I think I can cope with English at university. That’s one of the reasons for me to spend time learning this subject.*  (Female group, group 7)

*Khoi: For me, English is a subject that I see myself doing well at university. It’s a chance to gain high marks at university.*  (Male group, group 10)

**Self-perception of being poor at English**

A self-perception of not being good at English was raised by some students (n=8) as the reason for not studying hard in English classes.
Huy: I don’t think I can do well in class. I don’t enjoy learning English very much. You can be good at some things but you can’t be good at all things. English is not my strength. (Male group, group 2)

Luan: I don’t learn English very well. It’s just ok. I see it’s not for me. (Male group, group 10)

Huong: It’s not easy to learn English. I have to struggle to cope with it. Honestly, I don’t want to learn English (Female group, group 4)

Motivation to study English

Enhancing future job opportunities

In response to the question ‘What is the value for you in studying English’, the most common reason given by 72 students was that English was necessary to get a good job in the future (68 responses, more than 90% of participants’ responses). Learning English to prepare for future jobs was cited equally by students in the three universities and equally by both male and female students. Students explained that there were increasing numbers of foreign companies investing in Vietnam. This offered good opportunities for job seekers to obtain a well-paid job. One of the compulsory criteria of these foreign companies was competence in English.

Hoang: English has a really important role in getting a job. As you know, foreign companies in Vietnam, like American or Singapore companies, offer well-paid salaries. But if you want to work for them, you must know English (Male group, Group 2)
Quang: There are more and more foreign companies investing in Vietnam. It is easier to have an opportunity to work in these companies if you are competent in English. (Male group, Group 2)

Phuong: Yes, because I want to work for a foreign company in Vietnam, and of course I need English.
Interviewer: Do you want to work with foreigner companies because you are interested in English?
Phuong: Well, not really. It’s just because I’d like to work in a professional environment, like a big foreign company. (Female group, Group 12)

Thanh: Not just for me, I think English is important for all students when they apply for a job after graduating. If you read job advertisements in the newspapers, you will see that most of them require applicants to have good command of English. It is one of the necessary criteria to be selected (Female group, group 3)

Loan: After graduating from the university, if you don’t know English, you can only work for Vietnamese companies, and lose the opportunities to work for a foreign company. Even then, I see that many Vietnamese companies require you to know English. So English is a must if you don’t want to be unemployed. (Female group, group 11)

Becoming competent in English to enhance career opportunities was the most important reason to study English. As many students noted in the interviews, Vietnam in its push to improve economically, is encouraging foreign investors. Foreign firms use English as their medium of communication (N. Nguyen, 2012). In terms of Eccles’ expectancy-value theory, studying English in the hope of obtaining a well paid job fits the utility value construct (Parsons et al., 1983; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000).

English as a course requirement
Another reason for learning English was because it was a mandatory subject at university. Students could not graduate if they did not pass the English examinations. This response was given equally by male and female students.

_Nghia: English is compulsory at the university so I try to study it. I need it to graduate in the future. (Male group, group 5)_

_Ngoc: The university requires all students to study English. I learn English to pass the exams now and in the future to get the certificate of TOEIC 500 [International English testing scores] before graduation as required by the university. (Female group, group 4)_

_Tuan: English is a mandated part of my course at the university, so I learn it. (Male group, group 9)_

English as a course requirement reflects the utility value construct in the expectancy-value model (Eccles, 2009; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). Students engage in the task because it fits their current or future goals. Students were studying English to fulfil the requirements of their university program.

Similar to the number of students indicating that they studied English because they needed it to graduate, Interest in English was cited by 26 students as the reason they worked in their English classes.

**Interest in English**
More than one third of students indicated that interest in English motivates them to study English. This response was given more often by females (16 responses) than males (10 responses). Of the 26 students who indicated that interest in English as a reason for them to study, 6 students (4 females and 2 males) said they found English more interesting than other university subjects.

Thu: I think English is more fun than some other subjects. For example, Philosophy [this is a compulsory course in Marxist/communist ideology] is very boring and it makes me go to sleep. English classes have fun activities like playing games and listening to English songs. We have opportunities of interactions, for example, talking together in English, not just sitting and listening to the lecturer like in Philosophy classes, so I like English (Female group, group 12)

Bao: I study English because compared with some other subjects, I like English.
Interviewer: Why’s that?
Bao: Well, I feel that teachers of English tend to be more friendly, and caring about students, so I feel relaxed and comfortable in English classes. (Male group, group 1)

These responses show that interest in English is the result of interesting activities organised in the English classes and opportunities for interactions in the classroom. Also students mentioned caring and friendly English lecturers.

The response from 20 respondents (of the 26 respondents) was that they study English because they found English intrinsically interesting.

Kim: I like English and enjoy learning it. (Female group, group 7)
Cuc: For me English is fun. I like studying English.
Interviewer: Why do you find it fun?
Cuc: Well, in general, I like languages. English is interesting. It gives me a feeling of fun. (Female group, group 4)

Hop: I think English is cool. It’s one of the subjects that I like to learn.
(Male group, group 9)

English interest fits the interest value component of the expectancy-value model.

Honouring the family

Pleasing family, making parents proud, bringing honour to family

Honouring the family (including pleasing one’s family, making parents proud, bringing honour to the family, and parents as socialisers) was a common reason for study in English classes (24 responses). This response came from females and males. For example, Le stated that she tried to do well in English so her parents would be proud of her:

Le: My dad gave me an English dictionary because I achieved highly when I was in Grade 11. I feel good when I read what my father wrote in the front page of the dictionary, that “Mum and I are proud of you.” If I learn English well, my parents will be proud of me. So I try hard to learn it.
(Female group, group 3)

Lam: In my village, just a few students could pass the university entrance test to study here [Ho Chi Minh city]. So when I passed it, some of our
neighbours congratulated me and my parents. I could see how happy my parents were. It’s such a good feeling to bring honour to your family. I always study all subjects, of course, including English, to bring honour to my family, and make my parents happy and proud of me. (Male group, group 1)

Hong: I think my parents are my strongest motivation to study English. They work hard to have enough money to give me the best conditions to study. I study it [English] well to please them. (Female group, group 12)

One student indicated that there was a lot of stress involved in trying to please his family.

Ho: My parents have to work hard in the countryside to make money to support my study here. It’s expensive to take extra English courses in the language centers in Ho Chi Minh city, but they keep encouraging me to study. It’s my parents’ sacrifice that makes me try to study English. Honestly, I don’t study English well. The more I want to please my parents, the more stressed I get about English and the more guilt I feel because I’m not doing well.

Interviewer: Is it because, as you say, you don’t study English well, that you feel stressed?

Ho: I want to please my parents, to make them happy. It’s like I’m obligated to learn for them, not for me. So I feel stressed, I can’t study it [English] well as I want to. (Male group, group 6)

Parents as socialisers
Some students (n=7) stated that their family’s positive attitude to English influences their motivation to study it. For example, Huyen said that her parents saw English as important. They provided a support system at home including practising English at home with her and paying tuition fees for Huyen to attend extra English classes. Huyen, herself also valued English and put her time into studying it. The ways in which parents helped their children to study English because they saw it as important for their children’s future was an interesting new theme that was not part of the family value construct in the expectancy-value model.

**Huyen:** *My parents often say to me that English is important. They support me with tuition fees to study extra English classes outside university. Thanks to my parents, I understand how important English is. Actually, I consider it as important as my major at university. So I spend time on English. At home, sometimes my mum and I talk in English to help me improve my English speaking skills.* (Female group, group 8)

**Tuyet:** *My mother is working for a Japanese company in Ho Chi Minh City. She often says to me that in her company, those who are good at English can easily have opportunities to obtain good positions. My mother is interested in English. She has asked me to study extra English classes in the language centre since I was in secondary school. I have become interested in English since then. My mother is right that English may secure me a better future with a good job.* (Female group, group 3)

**Kiet:** *My father is a fan of English. He often takes me with him to an English speaking club organized every Sunday at the Youth’s Cultural House of Ho Chi Minh City. He says English is fun and useful. My father is the initial source that makes me interested in English and aware the importance of English* (Male group, group 5)
When parents show an interest in and value for a subject, they provide support that should buttress a student’s own valuing of the subject (Eccles et al., 1993). Students often value what their parents value. This may be particularly true in Asian countries like Vietnam.

**Personal development**

Only four students indicated that they were motivated to study English for their own personal development. They remarked that English is a means of international communication. Competence in English brings knowledge of the world through the internet, books, and documents:

*Minh: The reason for me to learn English is because English is the main medium of communication. Being good at English makes it easier to access great sources of knowledge of the world, like books, internet, televisions, and so you can develop yourself. (Male group, group 6)*

*Uyen: Having a good command of English will help you to improve yourself. Most learning materials, books, and documents are in English. If you know English then you have a very good opportunity to access these sources of knowledge. (Female group, group 11)*

**Lack of motivation to study English**

**Interest in university major rather than in English**

More than one third of students (n=33) reported that they had more interest in studying their university major than in studying English.
Xuan: English is ok for me. But I think I like business more because it’s my major at the university. I spend time studying for my major rather than for English. (Female group, group 12).

Vinh: I have more interest in Marketing.
Interviewer: So you don’t like English?
Vinh: It’s not that bad, just a kind of lack of interest in it. My focus is more for my field major. (Male group, group 5)

Khanh: I’d like to focus more on my major at the university. In order to be competent in English, it takes time to learn, not a few months, but a few years. (Male group, group 2)

Nhi: I like to work with numbers, like Finance. I learn English just enough to pass the exams. You don’t have time and brains to learn all subjects. I need time for my Finance major (Female group, group 7)

These students admitted that they did not spend a lot of time on their English studies. There were two reasons proffered for this. First, they were more interested in other areas of study, like their university major. Second, they felt they could not devote much time to studying English because it was important to devote their time to studying their major. Students’ responses reflect the cost value of Eccles’ expectancy-value model, that is, what students have to give up in order to study English.

**Questioning the value of English**

One student questioned the importance of English.
Hoan: Many people say English is important, but I don’t think so. If you want to be successful working in a company, you need good knowledge of business. It’s not English. English is just a medium of communication. Frankly speaking, I would rather spend time with my Business major, not English. (Male group, group 6)

**Lack of interest in English**

Lack of interest in English was raised by some students. These responses came more frequently from male students than from female students. Loc, for example, explained that English was boring because he did not understand the grammar lessons. An was not interested in English because she found it boring.

Loc: English is not my favourite. I find it boring. Sometimes some grammar points make me confused. (Male group, group 1)

An: I don’t like English very much. It’s boring. (Female group, group 8)

**Part 2: Gender differences and similarities in studying English**

**Usefulness**

Female and male students held the same utility value in terms of studying English as a means of entering professions after graduation. This attitude was raised by more than two thirds of students (n=55) in the focus groups. An example from group 3 was Mai, who saw no gender differences in terms of the usefulness of English for students’ professional prospects:
Mai: For me, if we think of the long term future, when we finish university and go to work, we will see that English is important for a job. I don’t see any differences between females or males in the importance of learning English for future jobs. (Female group, group 3)

Similarly, Nhat did not consider the study of English to be more suited to female than male students. English was useful for both.

Someone may think that English is a subject for girls, and it’s useful for girls. I don’t think so. I think English is useful and important for both female and male students if they want to work for a foreign company in Vietnam after graduating from the university. They all need English. (male group, group 10)

Performance

The majority of students (n=51) believed that females were likely to achieve higher than males in English tests. Most of students attributed this to hard work, and tenacity rather than natural ability. Some frequently expressed comments included:

Tan: I think the difference is that in general females learn English better than males. They tend to achieve higher scores in English in class.
Interviewer: Why’s that?
Tan: I guess that’s because females tend to be more diligent than males. English requires you to work hard and consistently for a long time doing the grammar exercises, learning new words. Females can deal with such a big workload because they tend to be more self-disciplined, I mean more tenacious in studying. (Male group, group 1)

Ngoan: Females tend to learn English better than males.
Interviewer: Why’s that? Do you think females are naturally better than males in English?

Ngoan: I don’t think females are naturally gifted in ability to learn English. They are likely to have higher marks in English because I think they put in more effort, have more time for it. (Female group, group 7)

Only one student believed that females have a greater natural ability to learn English. She explained that females have a natural ability to learn languages while males did better with science subjects:

Tuyen: For me, females achieve higher than males in English. Perhaps because females were born with more ability to learn language than males. Males tend to be good at natural sciences like maths, or experimental work like chemistry, while social sciences like languages are likely to be females’ strength. (Female group, group 11)

Part 3: Learning English at university

This section presents students’ perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of studying English and their suggestions for ways in which the teaching of English could be improved.

Focus on grammatical rules, memorisation, and written exercises

More than one third of students remarked that teaching focused on grammar and rote learning. This approach reduced their motivation. There were few interactions between students and lecturers, and there was very little time allocated to practising oral English. Some frequently expressed comments included:
Tien: English speaking skills are more relevant for work after graduation. Unfortunately, the English lecturers at university focus on grammar and comprehension reading exercises in the textbook. Only a few students can interact orally in English. The class is so boring. I can see some students are not paying attention in the lecture. Sometimes, they take out the materials of the other subjects to learn. (male group, group 1)

My: During secondary school [year 6-9] and high school [year 10-12], our teachers mainly taught grammar and vocabulary. Even after such a long time of learning English, we can’t use it in real life at all. Now at the university, we again have very limited oral English practical work in class. Most of the time is just for listening to the lecturer to learn grammar, vocabulary, and do written exercises. It’s really boring. This makes me frustrated because it doesn’t help me to develop English speaking and listening skills which are relevant for our future jobs. (female group, group 11)

Binh: The lecturer focuses on vocabulary, grammar, and doing exercises in the course book. There is a lot of rote learning. We rarely have opportunities to practise speaking and listening skills. I don’t think that focus is useful for our goal of learning English for communication. We need to be able to use the language to work in the future. It is wasting time if we learn it but we can’t use it. Grammar and reading exercises are only useful for the examination. (male group, group 10)

These responses show frustration with written exercises and memorisation, with little or no practice in speaking English.

Focus on communicative language activities
Students’ motivation to learn English was increased when they engaged in oral activities. Students said that being able to speak confidently in English would be useful for future professions and in life outside university.

Ly: When I was in high school, teachers asked us to work on grammar. So we might be good at grammar, but our speaking was bad. For me, one of the benefits of learning English at university is that our lecturer focuses on teaching English communicatively. My lecturer doesn’t just teach us grammar. She gives us a lot of oral English activities. For example, we are asked to present orally the topics in the English course book, in front of the class, and discuss with each other and lecturer about that topic. I feel my speaking is improving. Basically, I am motivated to learn English at university because speaking is necessary for our jobs in the future. (female group, group 3)

Duc: My lecturer encourages us to speak English. She asks us to use English for all interactions in class. At first, it’s hard but we are all eager to do it. I think it’s meaningless if you learn a language but you can’t use it orally in real life, particularly to use it in our work after graduation. My lecturer organizes some fun activities like playing games to make us speak more easily. Many people in my class are excited about learning English. (male group, group 9)

Vu enjoyed studying English because his lecturer focused on English speaking skills. He has developed confidence in his ability to study English:

Vu: I have studied English for 6 years but I could only use it a little bit. I felt I could never study this language successfully. But since I entered the university, I have changed my attitude. My lecturer gives us many English speaking activities. Although I have just studied English at university for a few months, I can see my English speaking skills are developing. I feel more
confident in learning it. I decided to spend more time practising English orally. Some of my classmates and I actually formed a group for speaking English. We have a rule that when we meet each other we must speak in English only. (male group, group 6)

Influences of lecturer on students’ motivation to learn English

The English lecturer was mentioned by 80% of students (n= 57) as the most significant influence on their motivation to learn English. They described positive and negative aspects of relationships with lecturers.

Positive relationships between lecturer and students

Of the 57 respondents, more than 50% of students (n=29) indicated that they felt motivated to learn English when their lecturer established a close rapport with them. The lecturer did not exert stern control but rather provided support, care, and friendliness. These students were confident to interact with their lecturer, motivated to participate in the class activities, and found their English classes enjoyable.

Tra: He [lecturer] is very friendly and supportive, so if we don’t understand anything in the lesson, we feel free to ask him without hesitation. He’s always willing to give detailed instruction and is patient, explaining things in different ways until we all understand the lesson. He is close to us. I think he cares about everyone in the class. So we all enjoy his class. (female group, group 12)

Lua: Our lecturer cares for us. She often talks with us to see what she can do to assist us to learn English. We always receive good support from her. We feel secure to ask questions because she is very friendly. In general, we
have a good rapport with her. We feel comfortable to participate in her class activities, so the class is fun. (female group, group 7)

Ky: My lecturer is fairly democratic. She’s not controlling. She respects us. She often encourages us to raise questions as well as to share with her our difficulties in learning English so that she can help us learn better. We feel confident and comfortable in her class because we don’t worry about making mistakes. She’s always willing to help. (male group, group 10)

Negative relationships between lecturer and students

In contrast, some students’ responses (30%) indicated that a negative relationship between the lecturer and students undermined their motivation. Students described feeling ignored, worried about humiliation. Lecturers were distant, unfriendly, unhelpful, strict, and dominating.

Chinh: Even when we don’t understand the lecture, we are scared to raise questions because she [lecturer] appears to be annoyed. She’s not very friendly and helpful. Slow students are often ignored in her class. She is distant from students. Just a few good students can keep up with her in the lecture. So the class is very boring and stuffy. We just want her lesson to finish. (male group, group 2)

Lai: My lecturer is very strict and domineering. We don’t dare to express our ideas. We are worried that if our ideas do not fit with what she thinks, then she ridicules you and the class laughs at you. You know, that’s embarrassing. (female group, group 8)

Hy: There is no understanding between us [lecturer and students]. There is no dialogue. She [lecturer] doesn’t care what we need. If we don’t understand
her lecture we don’t dare to ask her to clarify it. If you ask questions, the way she responds may hurt you. You won’t get a constructive or helpful answer from her, but rather something that makes the class laugh at you. We keep silent and do more reading to understand the lesson by ourselves. (female group, group 4)

The lecturer as a facilitator of learning

Students were asked how English classes could be improved. Most indicated that the traditional role of a lecturer as the sole provider of knowledge was less important these days because students could access knowledge from a variety of sources.

Nhan: She [lecturer] just reads her power-point slides, repeating everything in the course book. Then she gives the answer key to exercises given in the book. In fact, we can read those things in the course book and do exercises by ourselves at home. (male group, group 2)

Lien: The lecturer talks most of the time in the class. It is likely that we will have no contribution to the lesson. We just sit and listen to the lecturer. This way is not very effective in helping us develop our oral English communication skills because we don’t have opportunities to practise using it. (female group, group 8)

Instead, a majority of students wanted the lecturer to act as a facilitator, fostering a stimulating classroom where students could practise their English skills rather than providing knowledge. A lecturer should provide appropriate activities to engage students in learning English. One student suggested that the lecturer should provide opportunities for English practice by using language games.
Viet: My lecturer often asks us to play games to learn English. We feel excited and comfortable speaking English when we play these games. We don’t worry about mistakes. We just try to speak fast so that we can win. Lecturers should provide us opportunities to practise speaking by using games. We can’t speak English if we just sit and listen to him [lecturer] lecturing about grammar or vocabulary. (male group, group 9)

Students recommended communicative activities such as talking to foreigners, oral presentations, group work, and watching video clips and then discussing them. They enjoyed participating in these activities. These activities provide opportunities for them to speak English.

Man: My lecturer asked us to work in groups. Each group chose a topic in the English course book, for example, our group chose the topic Human resources. Then we went to “Khu Pho Tay” [Western people’s region or backpackers’ area. Many foreigners who visit Ho Chi Minh City stay in this area] to make friends with foreigners there and practised speaking English to them. We focused on talking about human resources. We then had a presentation in front of the class to talk about our experience of the field trip and what we learned about human resources. We all like participating in these activities. It’s fun and these activities really help us improve our speaking skills. (female group, group 4)

Bo: My lecturer sometimes shows a short video clip about a topic. Then he asks us to work in groups, discussing the topic. I think the lecturer should organise these activities in class to encourage students to speak English and to make the class fun. (male group, group 5)

Some students (n=7) indicated that they wanted their lecturer to provide guidance, experience, and appropriate skills to promote their learning.
Hau: Only having time in class is not enough for us to be competent in English. We need to study a lot more by ourselves. It will be useful if lecturers provide us with guidance, share their experiences about learning English, and teach us skills so that we can learn independently. (male group, group 10)

Hong: Lecturers should recommend some good resources like websites and materials and give us advice about how to learn so that we can study by ourselves outside the classroom. Since time in class is limited, most of the time we study English should happen outside the class. (female group, group 12)

Lecturers’ feedback

Quite a few students (n=15) spoke about the importance of lecturers’ feedback. Constructive feedback from lecturers raised their motivation. Lecturers’ constructive and clear feedback helped them apprise their strengths and weaknesses, built up their confidence in learning, and encouraged them to put more effort into improving their weaknesses.

Nam: She [lecturer] often takes notes when we have our groups’ oral presentations and gives us clear comments after our presentation. We are excited to get her feedback. She points out what is good and what needs to be improved. Her feedback is always encouraging. For mistakes, she often says mistakes are part of learning and it’s good to learn from them. I think a lecturer’s clear and constructive feedback is necessary to motivate students to learn. We feel motivated to learn in her class. We aren’t scared of mistakes but try to improve our weaknesses based on her feedback. (male group, group 1)
Loan: I have a good feeling about the lecturer’s feedback. It’s cool to read her compliments on what we have done well. It makes you more confident in learning. It’s also good to read her comments on mistakes. For example, she often circles the errors in our writing paragraphs and next to those errors are her suggestions for corrections. Her feedback helps us to avoid the same kinds of mistakes in the future. I think informative feedback from lecturers makes us learn better. (female group, group 11)

An said that lack of sufficient and clear feedback from the lecturer reduces her motivation.

An: Her feedback is very short and confusing. For example, on my comprehension reading exercise, with the right answers, she just wrote ‘OK’ or just a ‘stick’ next to it. For the wrong answers, she just put a question mark there. Sometimes, I didn’t know why it’s wrong. It’s very confusing. I don’t want to do those exercises. She doesn’t appreciate how hard we work. Detailed and constructive feedback from lecturers is important. Students will be more motivated to learn because they see that the lecturer appreciates their effort through providing careful feedback. Students also extend their knowledge by learning from the mistakes if the lecturer gives clear information about mistakes. (female group, group 8)

Lecturers’ knowledge of English

A small number of students (n=4) said that lecturers’ good command of English inspired them to learn English.
Quy: Some lecturers [of English] can speak English fluently. I admire them. It would be cool if in the future we can use English confidently like them. We all want to learn English in their classes. (male group, group 2)

Cuc: I feel more motivated to learn English at the university than at secondary schools because the lecturer has good knowledge of English. She can speak English fluently so she can help us to learn it. (female group, group 4)

In contrast, two students said they were not interested in engaging in class activities because of their lecturers’ lack of English competence. The lecturer often switched to using Vietnamese because she was not confident in speaking English. The lecturer’s frequent use of Vietnamese took away opportunities for students to be exposed to English.

Tien: At first when I entered university, I was very excited about learning to speak English. Unfortunately, I have been disappointed because the lecturer’s English pronunciation is not clear. She doesn’t speak English fluently so she often switches to Vietnamese when she needs to explain something complicated. We don’t have opportunities to be exposed to English if the lecturer speaks too much Vietnamese. (male group, group 1)

My: To be honest, our English class is very boring. I see many of us are not interested because the lecturer is not confident in using English. She often uses Vietnamese. I think lecturers should improve their English speaking skills if they are to teach us English. (female group, group 11)

Interviews with lecturers
To complement students’ survey data and focus group interview data, individual interviews with lecturers at the three universities were conducted. The purpose was to obtain another perspective on the factors that influence students’ motivation to study English, and differences and similarities in motivation between male and female students.

There were nine lecturers (4 male and 5 females), three from each university, who participated in individual interviews. All of them held Masters degrees (Applied Linguistics or TESOL). Their teaching experience ranged from three years to 15 years. Table 6.2 provides a brief description of these lecturers:

Table 6.2 Distribution of lecturers by university, gender, qualifications, and teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Master (Applied linguistics)</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Master (TESOL)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Master (TESOL)</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Master (Applied linguistics)</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Master (Applied linguistics)</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Master (TESOL)</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Master (TESOL)</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Master (TESOL)</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Master (TESOL)</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interview responses are presented in three parts. Part 1 focuses on lecturers’ comments about students’ confidence and motivation to learn English. Part 2 focuses on
lecturers’ perceptions of gender differences in studying English. Part 3 focuses on how English is taught in universities in Vietnam.

**Part 1: Expectancy of success and students’ motivation to learn English**

**Expectancy of success**

All lecturers (n=9) thought that most students had an “average” or “above average” level of expectancy of success in English. Some lecturers observed that those students who could speak English well were more confident in their ability to learn English, and consequently more motivated to participate in the classroom activities. In contrast, those students who could not speak English very well were less confident and consequently tended to avoid activities in class. This observation from lecturers supports the findings of focus group interviews with students. That is, those students who could speak English well had high expectations for success on the examination and tended to enjoy the classes.

*Mr Toan* (a pseudonym): Sometimes we have a few outstanding students in class. This semester, there are three students in my class who can speak English very well. They are very confident in learning this subject. So they are very motivated to participate in all the activities in class. However, most students are moderately confident in their ability. Their confidence is at average or just a bit higher than that. You can see a trace of nervousness when they are asked questions that require them to answer orally. They can’t speak English very well so they tend to keep quiet and avoid participating in the class activities.
Some lecturers observed that for many students who were not confident in English, their lack of confidence was the result of little exposure to English. These students were from small cities or the countryside where they did not have opportunities (except in the classroom) to access English during their high school years.

Ms Thu (a pseudonym): Many students come from rural areas or small cities and don’t have a lot of opportunities to access English during their time at high schools. It’s not like Ho Chi Minh City. Where they come from, there aren’t good language centres and very few foreigners. The English classroom was the only place where they could be exposed to English. With that limited exposure to English, they struggle with learning English at the university. They were likely not very confident. They probably think they can’t achieve highly but they can pass the subject if they try.

**Students’ motivation to learn English**

All the lecturers indicated there were multiple reasons for students’ motivation to study English. Preparing for a future career was the most important one. The second was the compulsory nature of English: students could not graduate if they could not pass the English tests. The influence of the family was identified by four lecturers as one of the important influences on students’ decision to persist with their English studies. Another factor was the two-way link between success and motivation: successful students tend to be the more motivated and more motivated students tend to do well on tests. Three lecturers also indicated that interest in English itself motivated some students. These results triangulate with the results from the students’ quantitative
and qualitative data: that utility value (to graduate and then to get a good job) is the overriding impetus for most students to study English.

For example, Mr Phuoc (a pseudonym) pointed to future jobs and compulsory subjects as the two reasons that motivate students to learn English.

Phuoc: Competence in English is a good way for them to get a good job in the future. At the university level, many students have plans for their future professions. So they learn English. As you know, English is compulsory at university. I think that’s also one of reasons that makes students study this subject.

Ms Lan (a pseudonym) identified future career, expectancy of success, and interest as reasons for students engaging in their English studies.

Ms Lan: Students try to learn English because it’s useful for them to find a good job. Besides, I see that some of them are interested in English, so they study it. Some students know they are good at English and so they invest their time in this subject.

Some lecturers indicated that parents recognised the importance of English in securing better jobs for their children, and so they support and help their children to learn English.

Ms Hoan (a pseudonym): I think parents play an important role here in motivating their children to choose to learn English and persist in their efforts to learn this language. A lot of parents know that English proficiency will provide more opportunities for their children to get a good job. They support and frequently encourage their children to learn.
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Ms. Yen (a pseudonym): *For many families, having a child study at the university is their pride and happiness because they think it’s a ticket to secure a better life for their children. One of my friends in An Giang [a rural area in Vietnam] said that their generation was poor. They didn’t want their only son to be a poor farmer like them. They are working hard to give their son the best support to learn at the university. Many of them understand that English is a key condition for their children to get a good job with a foreign company. So they push their children to learn.*

One lecturer pointed to some parents’ lack of understanding about the importance of English for their children at university and after they graduate. As a result, some parents did not encourage their children to learn English.

Ms Thao (a pseudonym): *I think the family is a first place to encourage children to learn. Parents who are unaware of the value of English for future careers or don’t know that English is compulsory [at university] may not appropriately guide and encourage their children to learn it. Non-English major students may not exert themselves to try to learn English.*

Part 2: Gender differences- achievement and interest

Six of the nine lecturers indicated that female students tended to learn English better than male students. Males and females have different approaches to studying. Females were more diligent and meticulous students. Males were less inclined keep working on the small details of studying English. These comments from lecturers are similar to those made by students in the group interviews.
Mr Phuong (a pseudonym): Females can achieve higher in English than males because they do their learning differently. If I check whether they (students) have done their homework, I can guess that most of the females will have done it but not so for the males. Males are less diligent in their studying. They don’t persevere consistently with the meticulous stuff.

Five lecturers indicated that females more than males found English an interesting subject. Of these, three believed that females were more intrinsically interested in English than males:

Ms Thu (a pseudonym): For me, female students are more interested in English. When I give exercises or organise activities in the classroom, I often see that females are more excited about participating in those activities.

Two lecturers believed that sex-stereotyped attitudes of students were likely to influence choice of subject and interest in the subject. Females tended to see English as an appropriate subject for them, so they chose to study English harder than males and they were more interested in English. In contrast, males tended to see natural science subjects such as mathematics, physics, or chemistry as more appropriate, so they paid less attention to English. As a result, they were less interested in English than females.

Ms Lan (pseudonym): It’s probably because of the view of society. People often think that English is a female subject, and natural science subjects like mathematics or physics are male subjects. As a result, more females choose to study English than males. In a class of about 50 English major students at the University of Social Sciences and Humanities, you can see about 43 of them are females. Females tend to be more interested in learning English than males.
Ms Yen (a pseudonym): *Female students enjoy learning English more than male students because they think it is a suitable subject for them. Meanwhile, male students often view mathematics-related domains as suitable subjects for them. That’s why there’s a lot more males than females in Information Technology major classes and a lot more females than males in English major classes.*

Ms Yen pointed out that these sex-stereotyped views needed to change to make more males keen to learn English.

*Ms Yen (a pseudonym): Because males think English is a feminine subject, they pay less attention to it. It’s necessary to change their view to make them more interested in English.*

**Part 3: Teaching English at the university**

**Communicative focus and ways to improve speaking skills**

Of the nine lecturers participating in the interviews, two indicated that a focus on communicative language activities was important to motivate students. They said that students wanted to learn to speak English. Students enjoyed doing speaking activities but were unenthusiastic when they were required to do written exercises. This finding supports the focus group interview data, that students wanted to learn English oral skills. They saw speaking skills as important and useful for them when they graduated. They felt they had achieved something when they could speak English confidently.
**Ms Hoan (a pseudonym):** Many students enjoy learning to speak English. They look sleepy and sluggish when they have to do too many written exercises. It’s good to give them some time with speaking tasks. Group discussions, oral presentations, and speaking games make the class more interesting because they are excited about participating in speaking activities.

**Mr Chien (a pseudonym):** I had an opportunity to attend a workshop showing lecturers how to use Communicative Language Teaching methods by the RMIT university [an Australian university]. I try to use those games and activities I have learned from the RMIT lecturer in my class. Students like these speaking activities. Last time, when I entered the class, they smiled and asked “Teacher, what are the games for today?” You know, it’s a good feeling when students are interested in your lecture. I think they want to learn speaking skills.

Hoan recommended establishing an English-speaking club at the university and assigning some English speaking areas on campus to provide more opportunities for students to practise English speaking.

**Ms Hoan (a pseudonym):** It will be good if there was an English-speaking club at the university... I think we should designate some English speaking areas on campus. Students who are interested in practising their speaking skills can come there at any time suitable for them to meet some other people who are also interested in speaking skills. This provides them with very good opportunities to talk in English.

Chien noted that students could learn the easier sections of the textbook by themselves. That would leave more class time to devote to oral practice. Smaller class sizes would make it easier for students to learn English. Including a spoken component in the end-of-semester English test also would be desirable.
Mr Chien (a pseudonym): They can learn by themselves some easy parts [of the course book]. I choose only those things that are hard for them to learn. That way, I get more time for them to practise speaking. They like my way of doing this.... A smaller class size is necessary.... Lecturers will focus more on teaching speaking skills if we include a speaking test in the end-of-semester examination.

These findings fit with the focus group findings from students. That is, students want the lecturer to provide a nurturing learning environment where students can practise oral English. It is not necessary for the lecturer to deliver content that students can acquire easily by themselves.

Focus on grammar, memorisation, and written exercises

Most of the lecturers saw their role as transmitters of knowledge and the role of students as learners of the knowledge they transmitted. Their lectures focused on grammatical rules, vocabulary memorisation and written exercises. They did this to help students pass the examinations. This finding also confirms students’ claim that teaching focused on grammar rules and rote learning.

Ms Thao (a pseudonym): A lot of information needs to be covered.... I have to teach them a lot of new words, and make sure they can pronounce the words correctly.... In each lesson, there are many grammar rules that they need to know.... If they work hard to learn all that I teach, they will pass the English tests.

Mr Phuong (a pseudonym): Many of them do not know a lot of words. I have to teach them the meanings of the vocabulary in both Vietnamese and
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English. They must learn new words first to be able to understand the reading texts in the book…. Some grammar rules are complicated so I explain these grammar rules in Vietnamese so that they [students] can understand the lesson…. I call on one or two students to write their answers on the board so I can correct the mistakes. This way other students can learn to avoid similar mistakes.

These comments by lecturers confirm students’ comments that some lecturers often switch to Vietnamese in the classroom. Too much Vietnamese limited their opportunities to be exposed to English.

Summary

A qualitative component was added to the current study to complement the quantitative data and to explore aspects of learning English in universities in Vietnam that were not included in the quantitative data. The findings provide an insight into students’ expectancy of success in English, factors that increase their motivation to study English and factors that decrease it, and the decisions they make about how to study English. The findings supported the key elements of the expectancy-value model. The interview data also provided support for the important role of the family in students’ motivation and achievement: first, in terms of academic success bringing honour to the family; and second, encouraging their children to acquire English to enhance future job prospects.

The majority of students rated their ability to learn English as “average” or “above average”. Females were slightly more confident in their ability to learn English than males. Both males and females rated their English highly when they were fluent in
oral English. Students attributed their success in English to hard work and to taking additional English classes outside university. Not surprisingly, students who felt their English was good also indicated that they found English interesting. Lecturers also agreed that there was a connection between high performance and intrinsic interest.

Both students and lecturers agreed that females worked harder at their English studies than males. In addition to the harder work of female students, a few thought that females had a greater natural ability at languages than males.

The majority of students wanted to learn English, particularly speaking skills, because it enhanced their future professional opportunities. Also, students had to pass English examinations to graduate. Many students worked hard in English to please their parents, to make their parents proud, to bring honour to family, and because their parents valued English and helped them to learn English. Some were learning English because it meant they could learn from the vast array of information that was only available in English. Many students indicated that they found English interesting. Data from lecturers in general confirmed students’ responses.

Many students reported they could not devote a lot of time to English because they needed time for their university major. In terms of the teaching and learning environment, many students reported that teaching focused on grammar, memorisation, and written exercises. Both students’ and lecturer’s data indicated that students wanted opportunities to practise speaking English. To increase opportunities to speak English, there were suggestions for English-speaking clubs and English-speaking areas on
campus. More class time should be devoted to oral activities, with smaller class sizes, and end-of-semester test adding an oral English component.

Students’ motivation to learn English increased with lecturers’ use of interesting oral activities, good rapport between students and lecturers, useful and encouraging feedback, and lecturers’ good command of English. Students’ motivation was decreased with when there was a cold relationship between lecturer and students, lack of constructive feedback, lack of lecturers’ oral proficiency in English, and lecturers’ frequent use of Vietnamese.

Students wanted lecturers to create a nurturing environment, making use of interesting communicative activities to engage students in learning rather than acting as the sole transmitter of knowledge. Students wanted lecturers to provide guidance and skills so that they could learn independently.

In the next and final chapter, the quantitative and qualitative data are combined to answer the research questions posed by the current study.
Chapter Seven
Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

The current study is an examination of the motivation of Vietnamese university students (who are taking a non-English major) when they undertake their mandatory English classes. The expectancy-value model of motivation was used as its theoretical basis. To the researcher’s knowledge, the current study is the first time this theoretical model has been used with a Vietnamese sample. One might question the use of a theory of motivation developed in a western context in a non-western context. However, given the Vietnamese government’s deliberate attempts to forge closer ties with western countries, especially in the area of education as discussed in Chapter Two, use of the expectancy-value model can be justified. In addition, the researcher added the additional value of “family” to the model, given the Vietnamese context.

Gathering qualitative interview data, in addition to the quantitative survey data, was another way in which the usefulness of a western-developed model could be examined. The interviews with both students and lecturers were relaxed and relatively free-flowing. The researcher followed a pre-determined interview schedule but probed respondents’ answers if he wanted a greater understanding of responses. Participants were invited to make additional points if they felt important points were not raised by the interviewer.

Students and lecturers also were invited to comment more broadly on how English is taught in universities in Vietnam. This allowed the researcher to place the
expectancy-value model more fully within the Vietnamese context. It also should be noted that the researcher himself is Vietnamese who teaches English in Vietnamese universities. He is confident that the expectancy-value model provides a solid basis for analysis of Vietnamese students’ motivation and allows for future comparison of the current findings with research using this model in other Western and non-Western contexts using this model.

The following questions were posed in the study:

1. What factors predict students’ performance on the end of semester English tests?
2. What factors predict students’ willingness to undertake additional study in English, either concurrently with their university students or after graduation from university?
3. To what extent is students’ sex a factor in performance on the English test and on willingness to take extra English courses?
4. If the study exposes inadequacies in the way English is taught in universities in Vietnam, how might these courses be improved?

This chapter is organised in the following way. First, there is a short review of the government’s position on the role of English. Second, the survey findings and the interview findings are combined to answer the first three research questions that are based on the expectancy-value model of students’ motivation. Third, the limitations of the current study are noted, followed by suggestions for future research. Fourth, a set of recommendations are put forward to improve the teaching and learning of English in
universities in Vietnam. Fifth, there is a short conclusion to the Chapter and to the thesis.

The Vietnamese Government and the study of English

As explained in Chapter 2, the Vietnamese government, a communist government, has decided it is imperative that Vietnam engages with the non-communist international community as a means to grow the economy and raise the living standards of the Vietnamese people. This initiative began in 1986 and is known as its open door policy (doi moi) (Fry, 2009; Shapiro, 1997; Thinh, 2006). Part of this policy involves attracting foreign firms to establish offices or factories in Vietnam. The government also wants tourists to visit. Given that the international lingua franca of trade and tourism is English, the Vietnamese government expects its citizens to develop proficiency in English (Hang, 2009; Harbon et al., 2014; C. Pham, 2016; L. Phan et al., 2015). An employment requirement of almost all international companies with a presence in Vietnam is proficiency in English. In addition, Vietnamese wishing to work overseas or study overseas also must demonstrate proficiency in English (Hang, 2009; N. Nguyen, 2012; H. V. Van, 2013).

As a result, English is taught in many primary schools, in all high schools, and in all universities (Thinh, 2006; Vang, 2004). Even students who are not majoring in English at university are required to take English classes (N. Nguyen, 2012; H. V. Van, 2013). However, even though the government has initiated study of English throughout the educational system, most students’ proficiency in oral English remains low (T. T.
Tran, 2013a; Tuan & Mai, 2015; H. V. Van, 2013). The reasons for this lack of proficiency and ways in which it may be raised are discussed later in this chapter.

**Discussion of quantitative and qualitative findings**

The collection of a large data set with very little missing data allowed use of sophisticated statistical techniques. Structural equation modelling (SEM) was used to demonstrate causal relationships among variables. As explained in Chapter Four and Chapter Five, SEM combines factor analyses with regression or path analyses (Byrne, 2010). Working from a theoretical background (in the current study, the Expectancy-Value Model), researchers propose a model. They then obtain estimates of the parameters of the model, that is, the factor loadings, variances and co-variances of the factors, and the residual error variances of the observed variables. They then assess the fit of the proposed model to the data. Is the proposed model a good fit of the path model, showing causal relationships among multiple dependent and independent variables?

As demonstrated in Chapter Five, the SEM analysis produced a defensible model. The model was designed to explore the factors that affected students’ scores in English and their willingness to take additional courses in English. As such, the researcher argues that Eccles’ Expectancy-Value Model can be used to help understand the achievement and achievement-related choices of Vietnamese university students. There are a number of findings that are similar to findings in studies conducted in Western countries (e.g. Durik et al., 2006; Musu-Gillette et al., 2015; Simpkins et al.,
2006; Trautwein et al., 2012; Watt, 2006; Watt et al., 2012). In addition, there are findings that make sense particularly within the Vietnamese context.

In addition to numerical data, the researcher gathered extensive interview data with both students and English lecturers. These interview data were used to complement the quantitative data as well as to extend them. Given this first use of the expectancy-value model in a Vietnamese higher education context, it was important to examine students’ experiences of studying English in university. Even though great care had been taken with the translation (and back-translation) of the expectancy-value survey into Vietnamese (see Chapter Four for a description of this procedure), careful questioning of students and lecturers about their English classes was an important addition to the study.

As well as providing support for the expectancy-value model (examined in the SEM analyses), the interview data in particular provided students’ descriptions of their English classes and suggestions for ways in which classes might be improved. This information is explored in later in this chapter when recommendations for improving the teaching of English are presented. Finally, as noted previously, the researcher is Vietnamese and teaches into English classes similar to those examined in the current study. As such, he brings local knowledge and local language to the study.

**Expectancy of success on the English test**

Students’ expectancy of success in the end-of-semester English test strongly predicted their mark in the test and their level of interest in studying English. The link
between expectancy of success and interest makes sense. Students who do well in a subject tend to find it interesting while students who do not do well tend to find it boring. The experience of success is a great motivator. In addition, once students start to develop mastery of a subject, its more interesting elements begin to emerge. There will be more discussion of interest value later in this chapter. One of the lecturers commented on the two-way relationship between success (and expectancy of success) and interest:

Besides, I see that some of them are interested in English, so they study it. Some students know they are good at English so they invest their time in this subject.

The link between expectancy of success and actual performance has been demonstrated on numerous occasions in Western contexts (for example, Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Meece et al., 1990; Trautwein et al., 2012). The strength of the relationship between expectancy of success and mark on the test was particularly strong in the current study. This result may be attributed to two factors. First, the participants were university students. Older students tend to be more accurate in their predictions of academic performance than younger students (Denissen et al., 2007; Wigfield et al., 1997). Younger students can confuse “wishful thinking” with knowledge of past performance. Second, but linked with the first factor, participants in the study have been taking English classes for years (in high school and in university) and as a result they have many test results to use in making their predictions.

In the interview data, most females expected to do better on the test than most males. Both males and females attributed high marks in the test to the effort they put into studying. A focus on effort, more than a focus on ability, characterises students
from a Confucian background (Salili & Hau, 1994). It was interesting to note that some students attributed their good performance to taking additional English classes outside the university classes.

**Utility value of English**

Eccles and her colleagues included different values to the *value* component of the Expectancy-Value Model, including interest, utility, importance, and cost (as a negative value in terms of the effort required to do the task). In the current study, *utility value* emerged strongly in terms of choice of achievement activities. Students see that proficiency in English will help them get a good job when they graduate from university. *Utility value* was a significant predictor of students’ willingness to take additional courses in English, either concurrently with their university studies or after they graduated from university. The importance of *utility value* in the current study is similar to findings from other studies in non-English speaking countries. That is, non-English major students were motivated to learn English for reasons of utility (e.g., Bradford, 2007; J. F. Chen, Warden, & Chang, 2005; Hayes, 2016; Kim, 2010). Ryan and Deci (2000) describe the motivation of non-English students to study English as extrinsic motivation. It is interesting to note that expectancy of success on the university examination did not predict willingness to take additional courses in English. Eccles and colleagues have found that expectancy-related beliefs are not strong predictors of student academic choices. Rather, task values (utility value, importance value, and interest value) are stronger predictors of students’ intentions and decisions to take courses (Eccles, 2005b; Simpkins et al., 2006).
Obtaining a good job is the ambition of most young Vietnamese. Vietnam is a poor country economically with limited social services. There are no government payments to the unemployed and there are no old-age pensions (except for some pensions for government officials). Many university students come from poor rural areas. There is a strong incentive for them to study hard to get into university, to graduate, and to find a well-paying job. In addition to their own lives, a well-paying job means that they can help support their families. Proficiency in English heightens their chances of success (Hang, 2009; Thinh, 2006).

In the SEM, utility value was predicted by interest value, family value, and sex, though the three path weights were moderate rather than strong. These relationships will be discussed in later paragraphs.

The interviews with students reinforce the importance of English as a means to getting a good job. Over 90% of the 72 students interviewed indicated that they that worked hard in English to get a good job. This response was common across the three universities and with both male and female students. Students also indicated that they had to pass the English tests to graduate from university. Lecturers agreed that getting a good job was the motivation for most students to study English.

**Interest value of English**

*Interest value* was not a direct predictor of students’ achievement or their willingness to take additional study in English. However, there was an indirect path of *interest value* to students’ willingness to take further study via *utility value*. The strong
path between expectancy of success and *interest value* has been discussed previously in this chapter.

Given the current state of the study of English in Vietnam, it is not surprising that *interest value* did not directly predict students’ achievement in English or their willingness to take further study in English. Even though the government mandates that English is taught throughout high school and university (even when students are majoring in other disciplines, as is the case with participants in the current study), levels of English proficiency remain low, especially oral proficiency (Hang, 2009; Huy & Hamid, 2015; Ngo et al., 2015; T. T. Tran, 2013a; Tuan & Mai, 2015; H. V. Van, 2013; P. T. T. Van, 2012). One of the causes is the way English is taught in high schools and universities. Trang and Baldauf Jr. (2007) argue that many Vietnamese non-English major students do not find English interesting. They were more interested in the major discipline study.

As noted earlier, English classes in Vietnam are dominated by grammar exercises and comprehension exercises (Canh & Barnard, 2009; Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012; T. Q. Tran & Duong, 2015). Very little time is devoted to developing communicative competence. Classes are very large (Canh & Barnard, 2009; T. T. Dang, 2010). The English classes at university (the basis of the current study) usually contain about 50 – 70 students. High school classes would also be large, though not as large as university classes. The Confucian heritage of Vietnam results in teacher-oriented classrooms, with teachers controlling what occurs and students respecting and not questioning teachers’ directions and knowledge (Luan, 2015; T. T. Tran, 2013b).
Teachers’ lack of attention to conversational English may be attributed to a number of factors. First, teachers feel it important to concentrate on preparing students for examinations that assess grammar and comprehension in reading and writing (Canh, 2001; Harbon et al., 2014). Second, as noted above, teachers are used to classes where they do most of the talking and students are expected to listen. Third, the large numbers of students result in lecture-style classes not conducive to practice in oral English. Fourth, many teachers may themselves lack communicative competence in English and tend to avoid oral activities (Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012; H. V. Van, 2013). It is not surprising, then, that there is little attention to developing students’ ability to speak with ease in English. Many students are bored during English classes. For most students, intrinsic interest in English as a vibrant expressive language does not develop. Interest in English appears to be confined to the high performing students.

In the interview data, approximately 36% of students indicated that they found English an interesting subject to study. More females than males found English interesting. Given that English was not the major of the participants, it is perhaps not surprising that there was not a lot of interest in it, apart from the students who did well in English. Many students indicated that they used their available study time for their major. Some students indicated that their interest in English was generated by the way it was taught: a relaxed atmosphere that encouraged students to talk in English and enjoyable activities like playing games and listening to English songs. This indicates that there are English classes taught in a more relaxed way where communicative competence is encouraged.
A few students noted that command of English would open up a wider world for them – via the internet, books, and movies. Then they would be able to learn for themselves.

... English is the main medium of communication. Being good at English makes it easier to access great sources of knowledge of the world, like books, internet, television ... you can develop yourself.

...helps you to improve yourself. Most learning materials, books, and documents are in English. If you know English you have a very good opportunity to access these sources of knowledge.

The interest value of English will be explored further at the end of this chapter when a set of recommendations to improve the teaching and learning of English in universities in Vietnam is introduced.

Family value and the study of English

The current study introduced a new family value to the Expectancy-Value Model. This measured students’ motivation to make their parents proud of them, not to bring shame on their family. This value was added because there is much research into the strong connections among family members that characterise Confucian based cultures like Vietnam (W. W. Chen, 2016; Chow & Chu, 2007; Fuligni & Zhang, 2004; Hui et al., 2011). Like a number of Asian countries, Vietnam has been described as a “collectivist” culture (L. D. Nguyen & Mujtaba, 2011; M. Nguyen & Truong, 2016; Vo, 2015). Importance is attached to maintaining harmonious relations with other people in
the community, particularly important members like parents and teachers. Young people are expected to honour parents and teachers by following their directions.

In Chapter Three, Eccles and Wigfield (2002) argued that a student’s expectancy beliefs and the value she attached to tasks would be influenced by a number of antecedent factors such as her achievement goals, self-concept, and emotional responses to academic work. These factors in turn would be influenced by more distal factors such as the attitudes and values of her parents and the general cultural milieu in which she has grown up (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). Given the non-Western context of Vietnam, it is interesting to consider how this cultural milieu may impact on students’ motivation and behaviour.

In the SEM, family value predicted utility value directly. Family value also predicted interest value that in turn predicted utility value. Students who endorse the importance of studying to make families proud of them also want to do well in English as a means of getting a good job. In addition, students who want to make families proud of them also indicate an interest in English. These attitudes may characterise diligent and enthusiastic students from supportive families. They are approaching their studies in a positive manner (hence finding English interesting) and with a clear long term goal of getting a good job.

It is interesting to consider the family in Vietnam from the perspective of socio-economic status (SES). Definitions of SES vary. A common definition would indicate that SES shows one’s position within a hierarchical social structure. SES depends on a combination of variables, usually including at least some of the following: occupation,
income, education, wealth, and place of residence. In many western countries, including Australia, there is concern about the “achievement gap” between students from high SES backgrounds and low SES backgrounds (e.g., Berger & Archer, 2016; Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; Sirin, 2005; Strenze, 2007). This gap appears in the early years of schooling and increases as students move through school. The result is that more high SES students enter university than low SES students and also complete university. There are many explanations for the gap. Many argue that the main cause is inadequate funding of education in poor areas. Though no doubt this is an important factor, there are other factors at work as well.

SES traditionally has been an area of sociological research. In the United States, sociologists like Murray (2012) and Putnam (2000) have argued that that a break-down in traditional family structure in low SES areas has had a negative impact on the educational outcomes of children and adolescents. A strong family structure with an emphasis on the importance of education as means of obtaining a good job now is more characteristic of high SES areas than low SES areas. High SES parents are keen for their offspring to succeed (like they did) in school and spend considerable time and energy helping them to succeed.

In low SES areas, on the other hand, there are many single-parent households living on parental allowances and unemployment benefits. Here, there is considerably less emphasis on education as a means of “getting ahead.” Long term goal setting (for example, considering possible jobs and plotting a way to get there) is less pronounced. In some low SES areas, children will have had little exposure to adults in full-time employment.
There have been few studies that have examined the effect of SES on students’ motivation to learn. However, one recent study was conducted by Berger and Archer (2016). They analysed Australian students’ achievement goals by SES. The achievement goals were a mastery goal (*I want to master or understand what I’m learning*), a performance-approach goal (*I want to get better results than the other students in the class*), and a performance-avoid goal (*I don’t want to get worse marks than the other students in the class*). Students from high SES backgrounds endorsed all three achievement goals more strongly than students from low SES backgrounds. Berger and Archer concluded that, given this weaker focus on school as a place of academic endeavour, it is not surprising that low SES students in Australia are less likely to complete high school and less likely to enter university.

In Vietnam, however, there is little evidence of differences in attitude to education between high and low SES families. The traditional family structure remains strong throughout Vietnam. Teachers and parents are treated with respect (T. H. Nguyen, 2002; T. Phan, 2004). As noted earlier, many students in universities in Vietnam come from poor rural backgrounds. They study hard to pass the entry examinations for the prestigious state universities. Parents from the comparatively small group of wealthy Vietnamese usually pay for their children to study overseas. Parents who are poor themselves are keen for their children to succeed, to find a well-paying job. In an economically poor country with no safety nets for unemployed people, the impetus to gain good employment is pronounced. Students who obtain well-paying employment can help to support their parents in their old age.
The interview data showed approximately 36% of students mentioned pleasing their family as one of the reasons they study hard in English. A number indicated that they came from poor backgrounds and were aware of the sacrifices their parents were making to allow them to go to university. They wanted to do well and thereby obtain a good job as a means of repaying their parents’ sacrifice. At times this motivation to please one’s parents was a strain. One young man indicated that he wanted to do well in English to please his parents but he was finding English difficult. He was stressed about his poor marks not only because they affected his own progress but also because he was upsetting his parents:

Student: My parents have to work hard in the countryside to make money to support my study here. It’s expensive to take extra English courses in the language centres in Ho Chi Minh City, but they keep encouraging me to study. It’s my parents’ sacrifice that makes me try to study English. Honestly, I don’t study English very well. The more I want to please my parents, the more stressed I get about English and the more guilt I feel because I’m not doing well.

Interviewer: Is it because you don’t do well in English that makes you stressed?

Student: I want to please my parents, to make them happy. It is like I’m obligated to learn for them, not for me. So I feel stressed. I can’t study it as well as I want to.

Lecturers commented on the role of parents in students’ attitude to study. It should be noted that in Vietnam almost all students move directly from high school to university. Mature age entry to university is rare.
I think parents play an important role in motivating their children to choose to learn English and to persist in their efforts to learn this language. A lot of parents know that English proficiency provides more opportunities for their children to get a good job. They support and encourage their children to learn.

For many families, having a child study at university is their pride and happiness because they think it’s a ticket to secure a better life for their children. One of my friends in An Giang [a rural area in Vietnam] said that their generation was poor. They didn’t want their only son to be a poor farmer like them. They are working hard to give their son the best support to learn at the university. Many of them understand that English is a key condition for their children to get a good job with a foreign company. So they push their children to learn.

A number of students also pointed out that their parents saw proficiency in English as a way out of poverty for their children. They encouraged them to study English. They made a point of speaking in English at home. They took them to clubs where English was spoken. They paid for them to take extra English classes. Again, what is notable here is that it is parents from low SES backgrounds who are helping their children to plan long term goals and to use strategies (like extra English classes) to reach those goals. This sort of behaviour is more common among high SES parents in Western countries.
Gender/sex and the study of English

In the SEM, students’ sex directly predicted expectancy to do well, *interest value, utility value*, willingness to take extra English classes, and final score on the test. There also was an indirect effect of sex on final mark via expectancy to do well. There also was an indirect effect of sex on willingness to take extra English courses via *utility value*. These findings demonstrate that females not only do better on the final test than males, but also they are more willing to take additional English classes.

These findings support the findings of studies in Western countries using the expectancy-value model that females tend to do better in academically than males and display more adaptive strategies in educational contexts. The focus of the current study is language. Females traditionally do better in language-oriented studies than males. Females also are considered to be more conscientious students than males. As such, the current results are similar to many western studies using the expectancy-value model (for example, Eccles et al., 1993; Jacobs et al., 2002; Watt, 2004). Lecturers agreed that female students are more diligent than male students. For example:

*Females achieve in English higher than males because they do their learning differently. If I check whether they (students) have done their homework, I can guess that most of the females will have done it but not so for the males. Males are less diligent in their studying. They don’t persevere consistently with the meticulous stuff.*
The interview data with students also provide support for the SEM analysis. Most students agreed that females did better than males at English because they were more self-disciplined. They worked harder. Some students indicated that “natural ability” also was at play: females tend to be better with language tasks while males are better at mathematical and scientific tasks.

**Limitations of the study and areas for future research**

**Limitations**

There are a number of limitations to the current study. First, data were gathered from students and English lecturers at three universities in Ho Chi Minh City in Vietnam. To what extent can the findings be generalised to other universities and other major cities in Vietnam? Primarily because of the Vietnam War, the southern part of Vietnam has had more exposure to English than the northern part (Thinh, 2006). Hundreds of thousands of English-speaking soldiers were based in southern Vietnam. Since the end of the war, the southern part of Vietnam has continued to have greater exposure to the English-speaking world than the northern part. As a result, it is likely that students’ proficiency in English will be less advanced in northern Vietnam than southern Vietnam. Given that proficiency in English has strong links with interest in English, it also is likely that interest in English would be lower in northern Vietnam.

Second, the major source of data was a survey containing a set of items with Likert responses. There was no section on the survey where students could write comments about their motivation to study English. It is possible that other factors influencing students’ motivation to study English may not have come to light. In
addition, students were not observed in their English classes - to check that their behaviour matched their responses in the survey. A small number of English lecturers were interviewed about their classes and their students, but again there was no observation of their classes to check for accuracy. However, as noted earlier, the researcher is Vietnamese who lectures in English in classes similar to those described in the current study. His first-hand knowledge of the English classes and students who study in them has been an important addition to the study.

As described in Chapter Six, 72 male and female students were interviewed in group situations using the main aspects of the expectancy-value model as question prompts (allowing for a comparison of the survey data with students’ oral reports of their attitudes towards studying English). They represent a small proportion of the 1200 students who completed the survey. It should be noted, however, that many students volunteered to be interviewed. The researcher made a decision about whom to interview based on who volunteered first and finding suitable times for interviews. As such, it is unlikely that the students who were interviewed were different from the students who were not interviewed. It can be assumed that their responses are representative of the broader sample of the study.

Finally, as noted in Chapter Five, the limitations of SEM analyses (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Tomarken & Waller, 2005) should be acknowledged. In the current study, all the numerical data, except for the final test mark, were gathered at the same time. At the end of the survey, students gave permission to the researcher to access their mark. Essentially, then, what was available for analyses in the SEM was a set of covariance matrices. Any proposed model that show causal links among variables that
were gathered at one time point must be accepted with caution. It is possible that another SEM model incorporating different variables and different causal paths would have shown a similar level of fit with the data. Even when the current model is accepted, different ways of identifying the latent variables might have produced different results.

In addition, the selection of goodness of fit indices that test the fit of the data to the proposed model in the SEM analysis can cause problems. Tomarken and Waller (2005, p. 54) point out that “… conventional rules of thumb and guidelines used by researchers for the selection and interpretation of fit indices are often erroneous or oversimplified.” In the current study, several goodness of fit indices were employed to reduce the chance of inaccurate findings.

**Future directions for research**

Given the possibility of differences in competence in English between north and south Vietnam, as noted in the previous section, it would be useful to examine the motivation to study English of university students in the northern part of Vietnam, using the expectancy-value model as a theoretical framework. Future research also could include an observational component. In the current study, students described the nature of their English classes during the interviews. It would add weight to the findings if English classes had been observed.

A longitudinal study of Vietnamese students’ motivation to study English would be a useful initiative. As noted in the limitations sections, conclusions from studies that
present causal models using data collected at one time point must be accepted with caution. A longitudinal study could follow students as they move through their university programs. The current study collected data from first year university students only.

The new family value variable made a significant contribution to the expectancy-value model that predicts students’ achievement and willingness to undertake more study of English. It would be useful to use this variable in future research in Vietnam. Also, it would be interesting to undertake additional research about the nature of families in Vietnam, the Confucian impetus to maintain family honour, and socioeconomic status. It was argued in the current study that SES differences in students’ achievement and attitudes to schooling - that dominate much concern and research in the western world – do not appear to operate in the same way in Vietnam. Here, parents from poor backgrounds are very keen for their children to succeed in school (to escape poverty) and devise strategies to help their children achieve (for example, finding ways for them to practise English).

There is renewed interest in the “cost” value of within the expectancy-value model. “Cost” value now is conceived as having multiple dimensions (e.g., Karabenick, August 2016; Wigfield, August 2016). There is the original meaning of How much effort will I have to expend to do the task? There also may be an ego-related cost: how embarrassed will I feel if I fail this task? There also may be a socially-related meaning of How much time with family and friends will I have to give up to do the task? It would be interesting to explore these different dimensions of “cost” with university
students in Vietnam. To what extent are different dimensions of “cost” salient with Vietnamese students?

**Recommendations to improve English teaching in universities**

Both the statistical data and the interview data indicate that most students study English for its utility value: they must pass the English course to graduate and they assume that the likelihood of their getting a desirable job is enhanced with high levels of competence in English, especially communicative competence. However, the data in the current study suggest that most English courses will not produce communicative competence. The interview data produced many descriptions of boring English classes focused on grammar and written comprehension exercises, with little time devoted to practising oral English. At times, the lecturer had poor English skills and spent a lot of time speaking in Vietnamese. Here are some examples of students’ comments:

*She just reads her power-point slides, repeating everything in the course book.*

*Then she gives the answer key to exercises given in the book. In fact, we can read those things in the course book and do exercises by ourselves at home.*

*The lecturer talks most of the time in the class. It’s likely that we will make no contribution to the lesson. We just sit and listen to the lecturer. I think this way is not very effective in helping us develop our oral English communication skills because we don’t have opportunities to practise using it.*
At first when I entered university, I was very excited about learning to speak English. Unfortunately, I have been disappointed because the lecturer’s English pronunciation is not clear. She doesn’t speak English fluently so she often switches to Vietnamese when she needs to explain something complicated. We don’t have opportunities to be exposed to English if the lecturer speaks too much Vietnamese.

Our English class is very boring. Many of us are not interested because the lecturer is not confident in using English. She often uses Vietnamese language. I think lecturers should improve their English speaking skills if they are to teach us English.

There were some instances of students enjoying their English classes. This typically happened when more oral activities were introduced.

My lecturer asked us to work in groups. Each group chose a topic in the English course book. For example, our group chose the topic “Human resources.” Then we went to ‘Khu Pho Tay’ [the area of Ho Chi Minh City where a lot of tourists stay] to make friend with foreigners and practise speaking English with them. We focused on talking about human resources. We then had a presentation in front of the class to talk about our experience of the field trip and what we learned about human resources. We all like participating in these activities. It’s fun and these activities really help us to improve our speaking skills.
My lecturer sometimes shows a short video clip about a topic. Then he asks us to work in groups, discussing the topic. I think lecturers should organise these activities to encourage students to speak in English and to make the class fun.

Given the information that has emerged about the nature of English classes, five recommendations to improve English classes are presented.

**Recommendation 1:** Change the content of the end-of-semester examinations.

The end-of-semester English examinations focus almost exclusively on grammar exercises and written comprehension exercises. There may be a small oral component in the mid-semester tests that is added to the final test, but the bulk of assessment is grammar and comprehension of written texts. Given the nature of the assessment, it is not surprising that lecturers focus on those aspects (Canh & Barnard, 2009; Harbon et al., 2014). As the saying goes, *assessment is the tail that wags the dog.* If students want to develop communicative competence, then there should be assessment of their oral English in addition to assessment of their written English.

**Recommendation 2:** Change the role of the English lecturer and the English class.

Currently, in most classes, the lecturer dominates proceedings. This situation is the result of a number of factors: a Confucian heritage where teachers are revered and considered to have all the necessary knowledge that they will pass on to students (Luan, 2015; T. T. Tran, 2013b); lecturers under pressure to prepare students for examinations
focusing on grammar and written comprehension (Canh & Barnard, 2009); large class sizes where it is difficult to undertake oral activities that might involve group work; and lecturers with inadequate oral English who do not feel confident enough to allow their students to participate in oral activities (Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012).

Given students’ easy access to English textbooks and internet sites that teach the English language, the role of the English lecturer should change. They do not have to spend large amounts of time at the front of the class explaining points of English grammar and going through comprehension exercises. Instead, they should be arranging activities where students can practise oral English with each other.

**Recommendation 3**: Spread the practice of English outside English classes.

Practising conversational English should not be restricted to English classes. Students should be encouraged to practise speaking in English as often as possible. For example, areas within the university campus could be designated as English-only places during certain times of the day. Students could go to parts of the city frequented by tourists and engage the tourists in conversation (this activity was carried out by one lecturer, as noted above). Students should be encouraged to attend English-speaking clubs.

**Recommendation 4**: Improve the oral fluency of English lecturers.

Lecturers who lack communicative competence in English should be provided with opportunities to improve it. As noted in Chapter Two, English lecturers are
expected to cope with high workloads and large class sizes. They have very little time to improve their communicative competence. If the Government acknowledges that current practices are not producing graduates with the oral fluency in English necessary to get jobs with foreign companies operating in Vietnam, then the Government and the universities should provide opportunities and time for lecturers to improve their oral English.

**Recommendation 5**: Provide lecturers with effective strategies to increase students’ sense of competence and interest in English.

If the nature of English classes is changed with the addition of more oral activities, then it is possible that students’ interest in English will increase. English would become more than a boring set of grammar exercises. As the SEM analysis indicated, there are significant links among expectancy of success, interest in the subject, and performance. Lecturers should take care to provide encouraging constructive feedback to their students. Vietnamese students hold great respect for their lecturers. As indicated in Chapter Six, they are greatly encouraged by useful and positive feedback from lecturers. Even if students are experiencing trouble with their English tasks, lecturers should emphasise that improvement is possible with effort and use of effective strategies.

Building lecturer-student rapport can increase students’ confidence in learning English and enhance their motivation. N. T. L. Nguyen (2015) argues that lecturers’ care, friendliness, and support motivated Vietnamese students to learn English. Phothongsunan (2014) research with Thai university students showed that lecturers
could increase students’ motivation to learn English by respecting and encouraging students. With Taiwanese students, Chen and Lin (2009) showed that students who felt cared for by their lecturer also felt more interested in learning English. Vietnamese students would be willing to become more active participants in the classroom if they felt their lecturers supported them to do so.

Lecturers should design strategies that increase students’ expectancy of success. They need to incorporate levels of difficulty and complexity into tasks so that it is possible for students to experience success. Tasks should be challenging but achievable with a reasonable expenditure of effort. Lecturers should provide accurate but constructive feedback to students to help them develop positive perceptions of their competence.

Conclusion to the study

The current study has examined the motivation, achievement, and achievement-related choices of Vietnamese university students as they study English. These students were studying in areas other than English but are required to take English classes for three years during their programs. A large sample of students from three universities in Ho Chi Minh City completed a survey based on the expectancy-value model of students’ motivation to learn. Students allowed the researcher to access their end-of-semester English marks. This is the first time that the expectancy-value model has been used to examine the achievement and achievement-related choices of Vietnamese university students.
The statistical analyses (using structural equation modelling) provided support for previous research using the expectancy-value model. That is, expectancy of success was the strongest predictor of achievement while value, in this case, utility value, was the strongest predictor of the choice to undertake extra English courses. Structural equation modelling allowed the researcher to test a three stage path model that provided evidence of both direct and indirect effects of constructs (both latent and manifest) on achievement and choice of activities.

A new construct was added to the expectancy-value model in the current study. Family value was added as an antecedent variable to other value constructs and expectancy because research has shown that the strong Vietnamese family structure, based on the Confucian tradition of honouring one’s parents and bringing honour to one’s family, influences students’ behaviour. Family value did make a significant contribution to the model predicting both utility value and interest value. The addition of this construct to a model developed in a Western context provides an expanded model that helps to make sense of students’ motivation in a non-Western context.

In addition to the survey data, a large amount of interview data was gathered in the current study. Interviews were conducted with both students and English lecturers. Analysis of these data not only provided further insight into the expectancy-value model, but also provided a picture of the current state of English teaching in universities in Vietnam. With some exceptions, the picture that emerged was one of boring classes focused on grammar and written comprehension exercises. Very little time was assigned to practice in speaking conversational English. Given that most students wanted good
conversational English to enhance their job prospects, students were unhappy with the absence of this practice.

As a result, a set of recommendations to improve the teaching of English in universities in Vietnam has been provided. The recommendations include adding a major oral English component to the examinations, changing the focus of English classes, opening up more spaces at the university for the practice of English, improving the oral English of lecturers, and introducing strategies into English classes that should add more interest to the classes and enhance students’ sense that they are growing in competence in English.

As explained in the earlier chapters of this thesis, Vietnam has a turbulent history of foreign domination and war. The devastating Vietnam War finished in 1975, leaving the country exhausted and in disarray. In 1986, the communist Vietnamese Government embarked on an ambitious program of economic growth, based on a determination to pull the Vietnam out of poverty by joining the international community. Part of that program was a move to introduce the study of English to primary, secondary, and tertiary education because English was the international language.

This study and other studies have demonstrated that current practices in teaching English in Vietnam are not producing a high level of communicative competence. This is of concern because it is communicative competence that university graduates need to get desirable jobs in Vietnam and the chance to work and study overseas. However, given the resilience, flexibility, and far-sightedness of the Vietnamese people, the
researcher anticipates that the Government, when it concludes that current methods of teaching English are not effective, will move to improve them.
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Appendix 1

Survey for Student (English version)
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Research Project:

An investigation of the motivation of male and female Vietnamese university students to learn English in the light of the expectancy-value model of academic motivation

QUESTIONNAIRE

Your answers will be treated in the strictest confidence. No individuals or institutions will be identified in any report of the project.

Please complete all parts of the questionnaire.
I. PART 1

Personal details:

Please answer the following questions by ticking the appropriate box.

1. What is your gender:  Male □  Female □

2. What is your age at your last birthday?
   Under 18 years □  18-19 years □  20-21 years □  22-23 years □  Over 23 years □

3. What is your major in university:
   Economics □  Business Administration □  Finance/Banking □
   Political Economics □  Business Law □
   If other, please specify ________________

4. How long have you been learning English? (Include the time you studied at secondary and high school)
   Approximately 1-4 years □  Approximately 5-8 years □  Over 8 years □

5. You went to high school in:
   A city □
   Countryside close to cities and towns □
   Remote countryside far away from cities and towns □
Please answer the following question by circling the appropriate number.

6. Before you came to university, how often did you have opportunities to use English with your teachers, friends, or foreigners outside the classroom?
   No opportunities 1 2 3 4 5 6 Many opportunities

II. PART 2

Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number.

7. Compared to other students in your English class, how well do you expect to do in English this semester?
   Much worse than others 1 2 3 4 5 6 Much better than others

8. How are you good at English?
   Not at all good 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very good

9. How much do you like learning English?
   Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very much

10. To me, being good at English is:
    Not at all important 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very important

11. How well do you expect you will do in your English course this semester?
    Not well at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very well

12. Will you bring shame on your family if you do not pass your English course?
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

13. How easy would it be for you to learn something new in English?
    Not easy at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very easy
14. Compared to other university subjects that you take, how hard is English?
   My easiest course  1 2 3 4 5 6  My hardest course

15. If you were to order all the students in your English class from the lowest performing to the highest performing, where would you put yourself?
   Among the lowest performing  1 2 3 4 5 6  Among the highest performing

16. How have you been doing in English this semester?
   Very poorly  1 2 3 4 5 6  Very well

17. To do well in English do you have to work harder than you do in other university subjects?
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 4 5 6  Strongly agree

18. Students usually are better in one subject than in another. For example, you might be better in English than you are in mathematics. Compared to other subjects you take, how good are you in English?
   A lot worse than other subjects  1 2 3 4 5 6  A lot better than other subjects

19. In general, how do you find English classes?
   Very boring  1 2 3 4 5 6  Very interesting

20. Is doing well in English an important way to show appreciation for your family?
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 4 5 6  Strongly agree

21. In general, how hard is English for you?
   Very easy  1 2 3 4 5 6  Very hard

22. Compared to other university subjects, how much do you like English?
   Not at all  1 2 3 4 5 6  Very much

23. Is the effort it will take for you to do well in English worthwhile?
   Not worthwhile at all  1 2 3 4 5 6  Very worthwhile
24. Compared to other university subjects, how important is it for you to be good at English?
   Not at all important 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very important

25. Some things that you learn in university are useful outside university. For example, learning
    about plants might help you grow a garden. How useful is what you learn in English class
    outside university?
   Not at all useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very useful

26. How hard do you have to study to do well in your university English course?
   Not hard at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very hard

27. How useful do you think English will be when you get a job after graduating?
   Not at all useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very useful

28. How useful is English in your daily life outside university?
   Not at all useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very useful

29. How important is it for you to get good grades in English?
   Not at all important 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very important

30. Compared to other university subjects, how useful is what you learn in English class?
   Not at all useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very useful

31. How important is it for you to do well in English to please your family?
   Not at all important 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very important

32. Do you work hard in English to make your family proud of you?
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

33. Compared to other students in your class, how hard is it for you to learn English?
   Much easier 1 2 3 4 5 6 Much harder
34. How hard do you have to study to do well in English tests?
   Not hard at all  1  2  3  4  5  6  Very hard

III. PART 3

Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number (except question 36).

35. You are required to study English at university. In addition to the English classes at university, how likely are you to enrol in additional English classes that run outside the university?
   Not likely at all  1  2  3  4  5  6  Very likely

36. How likely are you to enrol in English classes when you graduate from university?
   Not likely at all  1  2  3  4  5  6  Very likely

37. How well do you think you will perform in your English studies this year?
   Very poorly  1  2  3  4  5  6  Very well

38. We ask your permission to access your final mark in this English class. If you are happy for us to do this, please provide your student number: ________________

Thank you for answering this questionnaire. All your answers are confidential. Please return this questionnaire in the designated box located outside the English staffroom.
Survey for student (Vietnamese version)

Khoa Giáo Dục và Nghệ Thuật

Trường Giáo Dục
Khoa Giáo Dục và Nghệ Thuật
Đại Học Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Dự Án Nghiên Cứu:
Nghiên Cứu Về Động Lý Học Tiếng Anh Của Sinh Viên Nam Và Nữ Bộ Dãy Học Ở Việt Nam Duối Sự Soi Dẫn Của Thuyết Động Lý Học Năng Lực - Giải Trí

Bản Câu Hỏi Khảo Sát

Tất cả các câu trả lời của bạn đều được bảo mật tuyệt đối. Không một ai nhận hay có số giáo dục nào được thể hiện trong bài câu hỏi nào từ dự án.
Vui lòng trả lời tất cả các phần của bản câu hỏi khảo sát.
I. PHẦN I

Thống tin cá nhân:

Vui lòng trả lời các câu hỏi sau bằng cách đánh dấu chon vào ô thích hợp:

1. Giới tính của bạn? 
   Nam □ 
   Nữ □

2. Bạn bao nhiêu tuổi?
   Đưới 18 tuổi □ 
   18-19 tuổi □ 
   20-21 tuổi □ 
   22-23 tuổi □ 
   Trên 23 tuổi □

3. Chuyên ngành của bạn ở đại học là gì?
   Kinh tế học □ 
   Quản trị kinh doanh □ 
   Tài chính - Ngân hàng □
   Kinh tế chính trị □ 
   Luật kinh doanh □
   Nếu thuộc ngành khác, vui lòng ghi rõ: __________________________

4. Bạn đã học tiếng Anh được bao lâu? (bao gồm cả thời gian bạn học tại trung học cơ sở và trung học phổ thông)
   Khoảng 1-4 năm □ 
   Khoảng 5-8 năm □ 
   Trên 8 năm □

5. Bạn học trung học phổ thông ở:
   Một thành phố □
   Vùng nông thôn gần thành phố hoặc thị trấn □
   Vùng nông thôn xa thành phố hoặc thị trấn □

Vui lòng trả lời các câu hỏi dưới đây bằng cách khen nhận tốt số thích hợp.
6. Trước khi bạn học đại học, bạn thường xuyên có cơ hội sử dụng tiếng Anh với giáo viên, bạn bè, hoặc người nước ngoài ngoài giờ học như thế nào?

Không có cơ hội 1 2 3 4 5 6 Nhiều cơ hội

II. PHẦN 2

Với bạn trả lời các câu hỏi dưới đây bao gồm cách khoảnh khắc số thích hợp.

7. So với các bạn sinh viên khác trong lớp tiếng Anh của bạn, bạn nghĩ rằng trong học kỳ này bạn học tiếng Anh tốt như thế nào?

Yếu hơn các bạn khác nhiều 1 2 3 4 5 6 Tốt hơn các bạn khác nhiều

8. Bạn học tiếng Anh tốt như thế nào?

Không tốt chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất tốt

9. Bạn thích học tiếng Anh nhiều như thế nào?

Không thích chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Thích rất nhiều

10. Theo tôi thì việc giỏi tiếng Anh:

Không quan trọng chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất quan trọng

11. Bạn nghĩ rằng trong học kỳ này bạn sẽ học khóa học tiếng Anh của bạn tốt như thế nào?

Không tốt chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất tốt

12. Có phải bạn sẽ muốn lại xảy ra cho gia đình mình nếu như bạn không để khóa học tiếng Anh của bạn?

Hoàn toàn không đồng ý 1 2 3 4 5 6 Hoàn toàn đồng ý

13. Đối với bạn việc học một vần đề gì đó mới trong tiếng Anh dễ như thế nào?

Không dễ chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất dễ
14. So với các môn học khác bạn học ở đại học, đối với bạn tiếng Anh khó như thế nào?
Môn học dễ nhất của tôi  1 2 3 4 5 6 Môn học khó nhất của tôi

15. Nếu bạn phải sắp xếp tốt cao các sinh viên trong lớp tiếng Anh của bạn theo thứ tự từ học yếu nhất đến học tốt nhất môn tiếng Anh, bạn sẽ xếp bạn ở vị trí nào?
Một trong những sinh viên học yếu nhất  1 2 3 4 5 6 Một trong những sinh viên học tốt nhất

16. Ở học kỳ này, bạn đang học tiếng Anh đến nay như thế nào?
Rất tệ  1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất tốt

17. Để học tốt tiếng Anh có phải bạn phải học nơ vật và nhóm là các môn học khác ở đại học không?
Hoàn toàn không đồng ý  1 2 3 4 5 6 Hoàn toàn đồng ý

18. Một số sinh viên học tốt môn học này hơn môn học kia. Ví dụ, bạn có thể học tốt môn tiếng Anh hơn môn toán. So với các môn học khác bạn học ở đại học, bạn học tiếng Anh tốt như thế nào?
Học tiếng Anh tốt hơn nhiều so với các môn học khác  1 2 3 4 5 6 Học tiếng Anh tốt hơn nhiều so với các môn học khác

19. Nên chúng, bạn nhận thấy lớp tiếng Anh như thế nào?
Rất buồn chán  1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất thú vị

20. Có phải việc học tốt tiếng Anh là một cách bạn thấy thoải mái khi kể đối với gia đình bạn không?
Hoàn toàn không đồng ý  1 2 3 4 5 6 Hoàn toàn đồng ý

21. Đối với bạn, nhìn chung tiếng Anh khó như thế nào?
Rất dễ  1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất khó
22. So với các môn học khác bạn học ở đại học, bạn thích tiếng Anh nhiều như thế nào?
Không thích chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Thích rất nhiều

23. Sự nỗ lực mà bạn phải bỏ ra để học tốt tiếng Anh có đáng công không?
Không đáng công chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất đáng công

24. So với các môn học khác bạn học ở đại học, theo bạn học tốt môn tiếng Anh thì quan trọng như thế nào?
Không quan trọng chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất quan trọng

25. Một số thứ bạn học ở đại học giúp bạn giải quyết các việc ngoài trường đại học, có nghĩa là chứng hữu ích. Ví dụ, học về giao thông có thể sẽ giúp bạn khám sóc một khu vườn. Nhìn chung, những gì bạn học ở lớp tiếng Anh hữu ích như thế nào cho bạn trong các công việc ngoài trường đại học?
Không hữu ích chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất hữu ích

26. Để học tốt môn tiếng Anh của bạn ở đại học bạn phải học vất vả như thế nào?
Không vất và chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất vất và

27. Bạn nghĩ học tiếng Anh sẽ hữu ích cho bạn như thế nào khi bạn nhận được một công việc sau khi tốt nghiệp đại học?
Không hữu ích chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất hữu ích

28. Tiếng Anh hữu ích cho bạn như thế nào trong cuộc sống mỗi ngày bên ngoài trường đại học?
Không hữu ích chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất hữu ích

29. Đối với bạn, việc có được điểm tốt ở môn tiếng Anh thì quan trọng như thế nào?
Không quan trọng chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất quan trọng
30. So với các môn học khác bạn học ở đại học nhưng giờ bạn học ở môn tiếng Anh hiểu ich như thế nào?
   Không hiểu ich chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất hiểu ich

31. Theo bạn việc học tốt môn tiếng Anh nhằm vui lòng gia định bạn thì quan trọng như thế nào?
   Không quan trọng chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất quan trọng

32. Có phải bạn học chăm chỉ môn tiếng Anh để gia định bạn tự hào về bạn không?
   Hoàn toàn không đồng ý 1 2 3 4 5 6 Hoàn toàn đồng ý

33. So với các bạn sinh viên khác trong lớp tiếng Anh của bạn, đối với bạn tiếng Anh khó như thế nào?
   Đè hơn nhiều so với các sinh viên khác 1 2 3 4 5 6 Khó hơn nhiều so với các sinh viên khác

34. Đè làm tốt các bài thi tiếng Anh bạn phải học và như thế nào?
   Không vượt và chút nào 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất vượt và

III. PHẦN 3

Vui lòng trả lời các câu hỏi dưới đây bằng cách khoanh tròn số thích hợp.

35. Môn tiếng Anh là môn bắt buộc ở đại học. Bên cạnh những lớp tiếng Anh bắt buộc này, khả năng xây ra việc bạn tham gia học thêm các lớp tiếng Anh được tổ chức ngoài trường đại học là như thế nào?
   Không có chút nào khả năng xây ra 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất có khả năng xây ra

36. Khả năng xây ra việc bạn tham gia học thêm các lớp tiếng Anh khi bạn đã tốt nghiệp đại học?
   Không có chút nào khả năng xây ra 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rất có khả năng xây ra
37. Bạn nghĩ bạn sẽ làm bài thi môn tiếng Anh tốt như thế nào ở học kỳ này?
Rất tốt 1 2 3 4 5 0 Rất tốt

38. Chúng tôi mong bạn cho phép chúng tôi truy cập điểm tiếng Anh cuối kỳ của lớp học tiếng Anh này. Nếu bạn vui lòng cho chúng tôi biết điểm, làm ơn viết mã số sinh viên của bạn ở đây: ________________

Cảm ơn bạn đã trả lời bài câu hỏi khảo sát này. Tất cả câu trả lời của bạn đều được bảo mật. Việc lộ nhanh lại bản câu hỏi khảo sát này vào hợp đồng được thiết kế đặt bên ngoài văn phòng tiếng Anh.
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FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND ARTS

Dr Jennifer Archer
School of Education
Faculty of Education and Arts
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Phone: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR STUDENT

An investigation of the motivation of male and female Vietnamese university students to learn English in the light of the expectancy-value model of academic motivation

Document Version 2; dated 25 September 2013

The transcription policy will be explained prior to the commencement of the interview

Date: _________________
University: _________________
Interviewer: _________________
No. of students attending: _________________
Male group ☐ Female group ☐

Introduction:

Thank you for taking time to talk with me today.

We are working on a research project to examine the motivation of Vietnamese university students for learning English and gender differences in motivation. This focus group will help us understand students’ motivation. Hopefully, greater understanding of students’ motivation may result in enhanced strategies for teaching English in universities in Vietnam.
My purpose in talking with you today is to learn more about your beliefs about learning English.

There are no wrong answers but rather differing points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view even if it differs from what others have said.

I would like to audio tape our conversations today. Anything you tell me is confidential. Nothing you say will be personally attributed to you in any reports that result from this interview. All reports will be written in a manner that no individual comment can be attributed to a particular person. We do ask that you do not share specific comments made by any individual.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR STUDENTS

1. How confident are you that you will do well in your English class? (How good at learning English do you rate yourself on a scale of 1-10?) Why do you say that?
2. What is the value for you in studying English? For example, because you want a good job? because you enjoy studying English? because you are a high achieving student who wants to do well at all subjects? because you want to please your family?
3. Do you think males and females behave differently in English classes? If you think they do behave differently, what do they do differently? Why do you think they act like that?
4. What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of studying English at university?
5. As an English language learner, do you have suggestions that you think teachers of English at your university should be doing to make your English study more effective?

Summary and closure:

That is all my questions. Do you have anything more that you would like to add?

Thank you very much for your participation.
Interview shedule for students (Vietnamese version)

KHOA GIÁO DỤC VÀ NGHỆ THUẬT

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Trưởng Giáo Dục
Khoa Giáo Dục và Nghệ Thuật
Đại Học Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Điện thoại: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

KẾ HOẠCH PHỒNG VĂN DÀNH CHO SINH VIỆN

Nghiên Cứu Về Động Lực Học Tiếng Anh Của Sinh Viên Nam Và Nữ Bắc Đại Học
Ở Việt Nam Dưới Sự Sơ Dẫn Của Thuyết Động Lực Học Năng Lực - Giá Trị

Tài Liệu Phản Bản; Ngày 25 Tháng 9 Năm 2013

Chính sách viết nội dung phỏng vấn ra giấy sẽ được giải thích cho người tham gia phỏng vấn trước khi bắt đầu phỏng vấn.

Ngày: ____________________
Đại học: ____________________
Người phỏng vấn: ____________________
Số sinh viên tham gia phỏng vấn: ____________________
Nhóm nam ☐   Nhóm nữ ☐

Giới thiệu:

Cảm ơn các em vì đã bắt chước thời gian để nói chuyện với tôi hôm nay.

Chúng tôi đang thực hiện dự án nghiên cứu về động lực học tiếng Anh của sinh viên Việt Nam ở bậc đại học và những khác biệt về động lực giữa nam và nữ. Buổi phỏng vấn hôm nay giúp chúng tôi hiểu về động lực của sinh viên. Hy vọng rằng việc hiểu hơn về động lực của sinh viên sẽ giúp dựa ra được những chiến lược cho việc giảng dạy tiếng Anh tại các trường đại học ở Việt Nam.
Mục đích của tôi trong buổi nói chuyện với các em hôm nay là để biết thêm về những suy nghĩ của các em trong việc học tiếng Anh.

Không có câu trả lời nào sai, nhưng là quan điểm khác nhau mà thôi. Các em vui lòng mạnh dạn chia sẻ quan điểm riêng của các em ngay cả khi các em có những ý kiến khác biệt với các ý kiến mà các bạn khác chia sẻ.


Các em có câu hỏi nào trước khi chúng ta bắt đầu không?

CÂU HỎI PHÒNG VÁN DÀNH CHO SINH VIÊN

1. Các em tự tin như thế nào về việc các em sẽ học tốt trong lớp tiếng Anh của các em? Dựa trên thang điểm từ 1-10, em đánh giá khả năng học tiếng Anh của mình ở mức nào? Tại sao các em nói như thế?


4. Theo các em cái gì là những thuận lợi và khó khăn trong việc học tiếng Anh ở đại học?

5. Lại sinh viên học tiếng Anh, các em có nghĩ gì mà các em nghĩ rằng giảng viên tiếng Anh ở đại học nên làm để giúp việc học tiếng Anh của các em hiểu quả hơn?

Tóm tắt và kết thúc:

Đó là tất cả những câu hỏi của tôi. Các em có muốn nói thêm gì không?

Cảm ơn các em rất nhiều vì đã tham gia.
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Interview Schedule for lecturers (English version)

FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND ARTS

Dr Jennifer Archer
School of Education
Faculty of Education and Arts
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Phone: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR EFL LECTURER

An investigation of the motivation of male and female Vietnamese university students to learn English in the light of the expectancy-value model of academic motivation

Document Version 2; dated 25 September 2013

The transcription policy will be explained prior to the commencement of the interview

Date: _________________
University: _________________
Interviewer: _________________
Interviewee: _________________

Introduction:

Thank you for taking time to talk with me today.

We are working on a research project to examine the motivation of Vietnamese university students for learning English and gender differences in motivation. This face to face interview will help us understand students’ motivation. Hopefully, greater understanding of students’ motivation may result in enhanced strategies for teaching English in universities in Vietnam.

My purpose in talking with you today is to learn more about your thoughts and ideas about students’ motivation for learning English.
I would like to audio tape our conversations today. Anything you tell me is confidential. Nothing you say will be personally attributed to you in any reports that result from this interview. All reports will be written in a manner so that no individual comment can be attributed to a particular person.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

**SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR EFL LECTURERS**

1. Do you think that your students are confident about learning English in your English class? Why do you say that?
2. What do you think is the value for your students in studying English? For example, because they can have a good job? because they enjoy studying English? because they are high achieving students who wants to do well at all subjects? because they want to please their family.
3. Do you think males and females behave differently in English classes? If you think they do behave differently, what do they do differently? Why do you think they act like that?
4. What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages for your students to study English at university?
5. As a teacher of English, do you have suggestions for making English classes at university more effective?

**Summary and closure:**

That is all my questions. Do you have anything more that you would like to add?

Thank you very much for your participation.
KHOA GIÁO DỤC VÀ NGHỆ THUẬT

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Trưởng Giáo Dục
Khoa Giáo Dục và Nghệ Thuật
Đại Học Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Diễn thoại: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

KẾ HOẠCH PHÒNG VĂN DÀNH CHO GIÁNG VIÊN

Nghiên Cứu Về Động Lực Họp Tiếng Anh Của Sinh Viên Nam Và Nữ Bắc Đại Học Ở Việt Nam Dưới Sự Sơ Đa Của Thuyết Động Lực Học Năng Lực - Giá Trị

Tài Liệu Phần Bản 2; Ngày 25 Tháng 9 Năm 2013

Chính sách viết nội dung phỏng vấn ra giấy sẽ được giải thích cho người tham gia phỏng vấn trước khi bắt đầu phỏng vấn.

Ngày: ____________________
Đại học: ____________________
Người phỏng vấn: ____________________
Người được phỏng vấn: ____________________

Giới thiệu:
Cảm ơn thầy/cô vì đã bớt chút thời gian để nói chuyện với tôi hôm nay.

Chúng tôi đang thực hiện dự án nghiên cứu về động lực học tiếng Anh của sinh viên Việt Nam ở ba đại học và những khác biệt về động lực giữa nam và nữ. Buổi phỏng vấn trực tiếp này giúp chúng tôi hiểu về động lực của sinh viên. Hy vọng rằng việc hiểu hơn về động lực của sinh viên sẽ giúp dửa ra được những chiến lược cho việc giảng dạy tiếng Anh tại các trường đại học ở Việt Nam.

Mục đích của tôi trong buổi nói chuyện với thầy/cô hôm nay là để biết thêm về những suy nghĩ và ý kiến của thầy/cô về động lực học tập tiếng Anh của sinh viên.

Tôi muốn ghi âm lại buổi nói chuyện của chúng ta hôm nay. Tất cả những gì thầy/cô nói cho tôi đều được bảo mật. Không một điều gì thầy/cô nói bị quy vào cá nhân thầy/cô
một cách riêng tư trong tất cả các bài báo cáo kết quả từ buổi phỏng vấn này. Tất cả các bài báo cáo sẽ được viết theo cách thức mà không một ý kiến cá nhân nào có thể quy vào một cá nhân cụ thể.

Thầy/cô có câu hỏi nào trước khi chúng ta bắt đầu không?

CÂU HỎI PHÔNG VÂN DÀNH CHO GIẢNG VIÊN TIẾNG ANH

1. Thầy/cô có nghĩ rằng các em sinh viên tự tin về việc học tiếng Anh trong lớp tiếng Anh của Thầy/cô không? Tại sao Thầy/cô nói như thế?
3. Thầy/cô có nghĩ rằng sinh viên nam và nữ có sự khác biệt trong các hành động của họ đối với môn tiếng Anh trong lớp? Nếu thầy/cô nghĩ rằng họ hành động khác, họ hành động khác nhau ở những điểm gì? Thầy/cô nghĩ tại sao họ lại hành động khác như thế?
4. Theo thầy/cô cáí gì là những thuận lợi và khó khăn đối với sinh viên trong việc học tiếng Anh ở đại học?
5. Là một giảng viên tiếng Anh, thầy/cô có gợi ý gì để giúp các lớp học tiếng Anh tại đại học hiệu quả hơn?

Tóm tắt và kết thúc:

Đó là tất cả những câu hỏi của tôi. Thầy/cô có muốn nói thêm gì không?

Cảm ơn thầy/cô rất nhiều vì đã tham gia.
Appendix 4

Full fitted model showing standardized coefficients and factor loadings for items. Ex=Expect=expectancy of success; VInter=Inter= Interest value; VFam=Fam=Family value; Ut=VUt=Utility value; FinalMark= semester mark in English; Fut= Enrol Outside Uni= extra English course enrolment outside university; Enrol After Uni= extra English course enrolment after university
Appendix 5

End-of-semester Test of English (University 1)

I. PRONUNCIATION (10 points)
   A. Which word has a different stress pattern?
   1. A. activity  B. manufacture  C. technology  D. security
   2. A. privacy  B. database  C. etiquette  D. promotion
   3. A. environment  B. relationship  C. opinion  D. competition
   4. A. service  B. profit  C. campaign  D. logo
   5. A. industry  B. surveillance  C. employment  D. computer

B. Which underlined part is pronounced differently from the others?
   6. A. luxurious  B. bankrupt  C. punctual  D. business
   7. A. famous  B. yourself  C. impatient  D. information
   8. A. website  B. engine  C. courtesy  D. ignorance
   9. A. quiet  B. honest  C. hard  D. hierarchy
   10. A. store  B. research  C. diversify  D. good

II. VOCABULARY (15 points)
   Choose the option (A, B, C or D) that best completes each sentence.
   11. A company’s market ______ is the percentage of sales it has in a particular market.
      A. leader  B. research  C. share  D. scan
   12. We want our brand ______ to be young, fast and exciting.
      A. image  B. picture  C. logo  D. publicity
   13. A product that gives you a lot of features and is good quality in relation to its price offers good value for ______.
      A. money  B. price  C. cost  D. finance
   14. More and more people wanted to buy the new snack food. The company had to increase production to meet ______.
      A. demand  B. money  C. profit  D. responsibility
   15. If you need more information, ______ the company website.
      A. browse  B. collect  C. share  D. store
   16. My boss is really motivating and so ______ about his job.
      A. passionate  B. polite  C. luxurious  D. fashionable
   17. We collect information about our customers and store it on a ______.
      A. subject  B. research  C. record  D. database
   18. It was very ______ to be late for the meeting and not even apologise.
      A. impolite  B. emotional  C. formal  D. dishonest
   19. We have carried out a lot of market ______ over the past year.
      A. focus  B. research  C. development  D. loss
   20. I think that ______ is important so I am never late for a business meeting.
      A. hospitality  B. formality  C. punctuality  D. value
   21. Someone who works slowly and doesn’t do their job well is ______.
      A. impatient  B. unfriendly  C. inefficient  D. rude
   22. A product that is very expensive, comfortable and beautiful is ______.
      A. luxurious  B. timelessly  C. cheap  D. stuffy
   23. Companies with the biggest market share for a product, the ______, may compete with their rivals on quality, image, brand loyalty or price.
      A. market leaders  B. retailers  C. buyers  D. customers
   24. Supermarkets and other ______ sell goods directly to people who will use them.
      A. employers  B. teams  C. retailers  D. manufacturers
   25. If you say that a product is ______, you mean that it is reasonable in price.
      A. fashionable  B. stylish  C. inexpensive  D. hand-made

III. GRAMMAR (15 points)
   Choose the option (A, B, C or D) that best completes each sentence.
   26. The marketing department ______ within its budget.
      A. keeps  B. keeping  C. is keeping  D. is keep
   27. At the moment we ______ for a new brand name that suggests something about the product’s benefits and qualities.
      A. look  B. looks  C. looking  D. are looking
28. Carlos usually ______ in the main office, but today he ______ at home.
A. sit is working B. sits working C. sits is working D. sit are working
29. Do you use ______ surveillance equipment in your company?
A. any B. a C. an D. much
30. I can’t give you ______ advice on security.
A. any B. a C. an D. any
31. We have ______ information about shopping on the Internet.
A. an B. a C. any D. a lot of
32. I’m afraid we don’t have ______ leaflets here. If you go to their website, you can find ______ details there.
A. many any B. any some C. much much D. a some
33. The Sherrington collection is ______ the Allegro collection.
A. more expensive B. more expensive as C. more expensive than D. more expensive than
34. I think you should fly Virgin Atlantic. They are ______ and ______.
A. quicker more comfortable B. more quicker more comfortable than
C. quicker more comfortable as D. more quicker more comfortable
35. All the clothes are very good quality, but the Allegro collection is ______ quality.
A. the most highest B. the highest C. most highest D. the most high
36. The new design is ______ than the old one.
A. as worse as B. worse C. the worst D. more worse
37. ______ borrow your magazine to read?
A. Let me B. Could I C. I want to D. Please I
38. Ford ______ the first car in 1896, but he did not ______ the company until 1903.
A. built formed B. build formed C. built formed D. built form
39. When you ______ a student, did you ______ on the holidays?
A. were/ worked B. was/ work C. were/ work D. was/ worked
40. ______ they ______ production in the UK in 1992?
A. Do/ started B. Do/ start C. Did/ started D. Did/ start

IV. READING (40 points)

Part 1: Choose the best option (A, B, C or D) to complete the following passage (26 points)

The way of the wiki

In the Hawaiian language, wiki means ‘quick’. Wikipedia was (41) ______ by Jimmy Wales and Larry Sanger as a free online encyclopedia written by anybody who wants to contribute. Wales and Sanger were already working on an encyclopedia when in January 2001 they (42) ______ the Wikipedia website. The greatest (43) ______ was that any of its users could add or edit articles. At the beginning some academics criticized Wikipedia. They said it had a number of inaccuracies and therefore (44) ______ to recognize it as a reference work. But its extraordinary success showed that it was certainly good enough to (45) ______ the needs of millions of users. It may not be a true business idea because it probably does not make a lot of (46) ______, but it is certainly an idea that fills a (47) ______ in the market.

Wikipedia’s extraordinary (48) ______ shows that lots of basic information can be exchanged by people who know things because of where they live, their hobbies or their education.

Today, Wikipedia is active in about 100 languages, and its English-language edition has more than half a million (49) ______ about an enormous (50) ______ of subjects.

41. A. worked B. achieved C. developed D. entered
42. A. launched B. extended C. solved D. looked
43. A. creation B. innovation C. trend D. security
44. A. released B. accessed C. accepted D. used
45. A. meet B. respond C. fell D. check
46. A. benefit B. turnover C. money D. information
47. A. hole B. gap C. demand D. keyword
48. A. raise B. growth C. supply D. screen
49. A. articles B. notices C. texts D. users
50. A. sort B. award C. range D. page

Part 2: Read the following article and choose the best answer (A, B, C or D) to each question (14 points)

When developing a plan for a new business, the entrepreneur quite naturally wants to eliminate all risk. While it is impossible to avoid some risk, the goal is to minimize it as much as possible. How can we do this? Thorough research and
careful planning are the keys. There are two parts to good research. First, you must demonstrate that there is a need for the product or service you plan to offer. Are there enough people out there who would be willing to pay for it? Second, you must look at your competition. What do you have to offer that your competitors do not? Is your product or service of better quality in some way? Is it cheaper or more easily available? Is there a niche in the market that your competitors are not addressing? If what you have to offer is identical to what your competitors are offering, your business is not likely to be successful. These are some things to consider when evaluating how well you can measure up against the competition. Once you have evaluated a need for your product or service and determined how yours will be different from your competitors’, you are ready to begin the next part of your plan - financing.

51. What is this article mostly about?
   A. Financing new businesses
   B. How to price products
   C. The need for research
   D. The best marketing strategies

52. What does the author say about risk?
   A. We should try to reduce it.
   B. We must avoid it.
   C. It is the key to success.
   D. We can eliminate it with careful planning.

53. According to the article, what can lead to the failure of a new business?
   A. Offering a cheaper product
   B. Selling the exact same product as the competitors sell
   C. Selling only to a niche in the market
   D. Offering only services and not products

54. The word ‘demonstrates’ in line 3 is closest in meaning to ______.
   A. felt
   B. created
   C. removed
   D. shown

55. The word ‘addressing’ in line 7 is closest in meaning to ______.
   A. focusing on
   B. calling on
   C. giving up
   D. staying away from

Part 3: Read the following note and choose the best answer (A, B, C or D) to each question (10 points)

Jim,

I have decided to get a new computer for my home office, and I need your advice to help me select the right one. I have allocated a certain amount of money from my budget for this. I think it is enough for a completely new system including computer, monitor, printer, and scanner. I would like to continue using the software I already use, so I need a system that is compatible with my current system and software. However, I think I should get a different brand. I have had nothing but trouble with the computer I have now. It often shuts down without warning, and sometimes I can’t access my files. I haven’t been able to figure out the reason for these problems, and no one has been able to fix it for me.

I plan to go to some stores this Saturday and Sunday to search for my new computer. Would you be able to go with me? If not, I’ll call you before the weekend to get your advice. I have a big project coming up next month, so I would like to get my new computer up and running soon. Let me know if you can help me this weekend.

Janet

56. What does Janet want Jim to help her with?
   A. Finding money to buy a computer
   B. Accessing her files
   C. Choosing a new computer
   D. Repairing her computer

57. What does Janet plan to do this weekend?
   A. Call Jim
   B. Go on a date with Jim
   C. Look for a new computer
   D. Figure out the reason for her problems

58. When will Janet’s big project begin?
   A. Saturday
   B. Sunday
   C. Before the weekend
   D. Next month

59. The word ‘allocated’ in line 2 is closest in meaning to ______.
   A. earned
   B. designated
   C. borrowed
   D. removed

60. The word ‘access’ in line 5 is closest in meaning to ______.
   A. save
   B. write
   C. close
   D. open

V. BUSINESS COMMUNICATION (20 points)

Choose the most appropriate response (A, B, C, or D) to each question/statement.

61. **Woman:** Where will you stay when you’re in New York?
   **Man:** ______
   A. At a hotel downtown.

66. **Barry:** Why would you invest all your assets in one piece of property?
   **Rett:** ______
   A. There’s virtually no risk.
62. *Peter:* How much time will it take to complete the project?

*Anne:*

A. I haven’t finished it yet.
B. I don’t enjoy competition.
C. I estimate six months.
D. I don’t have a watch.

63. *Mary:* What is the price of this dress?

*Tom:*

A. That’s a good guess.
B. It’s under $75.
C. The cost of living is very high.
D. You have to pay taxes.

64. *Richard:* Where can I cash a check?

*Anne:*

A. Coins are heavier than bills.
B. I’d check his references if I were you.
C. The bank can do it for you.
D. I don’t know where your money is.

65. *Joe:* Can the accountant recalculate these figures?

*Susan:*

A. Yes, my calculator is broken.
B. No, he can’t draw a figure.
C. No, he won’t be in for the rest of the day.
D. Yes, they were paid this morning.

66. *All three of us loved there.*

67. *Stephen:* Why were only three of you present at the meeting?

*Tom:*

A. The president was very thankful.
B. I thought their presents were sufficient.
C. The others were out of town.
D. Ten of us are going with them.

68. *Nick:* Why can’t you finish this project on time?

*Joe:*

A. My watch is broken.
B. I’ve been sick.
C. It’s time to go.
D. I don’t know if it’s free.

69. *Russell:* Does anyone know whose address book this is?

*Sandy:*

A. I don’t know him well.
B. It looks like Allen’s.
C. I’m not sure where he lives.
D. He turned my copy in.

70. *Serensen:* Would you rather spend your vacation in Bermuda or the Bahamas?

*Richard:*

A. I sure would.
B. Either would be wonderful.
C. Yes, it’s an expensive trip.
D. We’ll paint and put new carpets in.

---

-THE END OF THE FINAL TEST-
END-OF-SEMESTER TEST

Duration: 75 minutes

I. PRONUNCIATION (10 points)
A. Which word has a different stress pattern?
1. A. curriculum B. certificate C. diplomacy D. education
2. A. biologist B. application C. inhabitant D. technology
3. A. inflation B. argument C. compliment D. maximum
4. A. consular B. domestic C. illegal D. substantial
5. A. maintain B. precede C. attract D. swallow

B. Which underlined part is pronounced differently from the others?
6. A. hurry B. gander C. pressure D. rash
7. A. promise B. deceive C. economize D. enterprise
8. A. eligible B. pipe C. appeal D. egotism
9. A. decelerate B. encourage C. expected D. attracted
10. A. proceed B. reject C. schedule D. wedding

II. VOCABULARY (15 points)
Choose the option (A, B, C or D) that best completes each sentence.

11. The customer complained that the assistant he spoke to had been most ______.
   A. polite B. courteous C. unhelpful D. friendly

12. The Kwik-Fit ______ is “You can’t get better than a Kwik-Fit fitter!”
   A. slogan B. saying C. soft sell D. feature

13. If you break the law, sometimes the punishment is that you have to pay a ______.
   A. tip B. fine C. wallet D. finance

14. Actors and musicians have many ______ before they perform in public.
   A. rehearsals B. orchestras C. roles D. stages

15. The dog suddenly started ______ at us.
   A. humming B. barking C. honking D. shouting

16. I’ve been working very hard all day and now I’m ______.
   A. exhausted B. mysterious C. enormous D. medical

17. Many people like the slow ______ of life in the countryside.
   A. step B. pace C. speed D. space

18. If they are not careful with their accounts, their business will go ______.
   A. poor B. bankrupt C. peniless D. broken

19. After a meal in a restaurant, you ask the waiter for the ______.
   A. receipt B. cheque C. prescription D. bill

20. The ______ reason why I don’t want to move is that I’m perfectly happy here.
   A. main B. big C. large D. great

21. I would really ______ your help with this assignment.
   A. respect B. take C. appreciate D. thank

22. The youths nowadays have many things to do in their ______.
   A. leisure B. entertainment C. fun D. amusement

23. The car had a(n) ______ tyre, so we had to change the wheel.
   A. bent B. flat C. cracked D. injured

24. Don’t touch that wire or you’ll get an electric ______.
   A. shock B. fire C. charge D. current

25. “Can you ______ me a favor, Bill?” Peter said.
   A. make B. get C. put D. do

III. GRAMMAR (15 points)
Choose the option (A, B, C or D) that best completes each sentence.

26. The soccer game won’t be postponed ______ it looks like rain.
   A. because B. even though C. but D. since

27. They study ______ because they try to get scholarships.
   A. harder and harder B. harder and harder C. more and more harder D. harder and more harder
28. Ann is ______ her elder sister in personality.
   A. B. more different than C. different from D. different with
   A. B. talked C. was talking D. has been talking
29. She ______ on the phone since I came in.
   A. B. more different than C. different from D. different with
   A. talks B. talked C. was talking D. has been talking
30. I don’t feel good. I ______ home from work tomorrow.
   A. am staying B. stay C. will have stayed D. going to staying
31. The robbers ______ the money when the police arrived.
   A. count B. was counting C. were counting D. arc counting
32. My back is sore because I forgot ______ before I exercised.
   A. to stretch B. stretching C. stretched D. stretch
33. ______ people are not happy with the class.
   A. Most of B. Everyone C. Many a D. A number of
34. You have to pay extra tax if you take too ______ with you.
   A. many luggages B. many luggage C. much luggage D. much luggages
35. Ann quit her job at the advertising agency, ______ surprised everyone.
   A. who B. which C. that D. it
36. The tanks and the soldiers ______ were stopped on the way to the Independence Palace had to wait for hours.
   A. who B. which C. that D. whom
37. Until you learn to relax more, you ______ your ability to speak English.
   A. don’t improve B. aren’t improving C. won’t improve D. haven’t improved
38. I think that this report will ______ late this afternoon.
   A. finish B. be finishing C. have finished D. be finished
39. I wish you ______ stop interrupting me whenever I speak.
   A. would B. will C. did D. might
40. She’s never met Jack, ______?
   A. is she B. has she C. isn’t she D. hasn’t she

IV. READING (40 points)

Part 1: Choose the best option (A, B, C or D) to complete the following text. (20 points)

School's Art Sale

Last Friday parents helped collect lots of money for a school by buying children's pictures. A primary school in Lichester used its classrooms as an art gallery for a day and (41) ______ parents to come and look. All the pupils (42) ______ a work of art and (43) ______ painting went on sale at £5. Hundreds of parents and relatives came and, together, they spent (44) ______ £2,000.

Now the school is (45) ______ of raising the exhibition bigger next year by also contacting businesses (46) ______ operate in the local area. One of the school—children’s parents first had the (47) ______ after going to (48) ______ exhibitions in her home country, South Africa.

The school has decided to (49) ______ the money to buy books and CD players. The Head Teacher said he was delighted to see the school (50) ______ full and he was very proud of the children.

41. A. hoped B. invited C. pleased D. wished
42. A. operated B. played C. performed D. produced
43. A. few B. some C. each D. all
44. A. over B. more C. close D. near
45. A. planning B. thinking C. considering D. wanting
46. A. what B. who C. which D. whose
47. A. memory B. idea C. habit D. choice
48. A. name B. likely C. similar D. equal
49. A. bringing B. add C. join D. lose
50. A. so B. too C. such D. enough

Part 2: Read the following passage and choose the best answer (A, B, C or D) to each question (10 points)

Softwind’s technical support staff provides free telephone assistance to registered Softwind users. In order to receive this free assistance, you must first register your product with Softwind. To do this, fill in the enclosed registration card, including the name of the retail outlet where you purchased this product. Softwind will then send you a personal identification number (PIN), which must be supplied to support staff whenever you request assistance. Registering your product will also enable us to send you timely information on updates and future releases. Before calling technical support, please try to find the answer to your question in the handbook that accompanies this product. In particular, we recommend that you check the section on frequently asked questions that begins on page 286.
51. Who were these instructions written for?
   A. Technical support staff  B. Software engineers  C. Retail sales personnel  D. Software customers

52. What information is necessary in order to register this product?
   A. The name of the store that sold the product  B. The user’s personal identification number
   C. The dates of future releases  D. The user’s forwarding address.

53. How can you receive a PIN?
   A. By requesting one from support staff  B. By telephoning technical support
   C. By mailing in the registration card  D. By signing up for one at a retail outlet.

54. What should you do first if you have a problem with the product?
   A. Read the manual  B. Change your PIN
   C. Telephone technical support  D. Request updated instructions.

55. The words “fill in” are closest in meaning to ______.
   A. put in  B. complete  C. send in  D. check

Part 3: Read the following article and choose the best answer (A, B, C or D) to each question (10 points)
People who travel frequently on business or for pleasure often suffer from some form of health problem, yet over half of these problems can easily be prevented. The most common ailment, a headache, can be avoided by taking along an ample supply of aspirin or other pain reliever. Another common affliction is motion sickness caused by the constant movement of a vehicle. Ginger capsules, sold in most health-food stores, have been found effective as a remedy. Other familiar problems include sunburn, which can be prevented by using an effective sunscreen, and insect bites, which can be controlled with use of a repellent spray or ointment. For every cuts and scratches, a first-aid kit containing bandages and antiseptic cream is recommended.

56. What is the best title for this passage?
   A. Frequent Travelers  B. Avoiding Travel Ailments
   C. Common Health Problems  D. Traveling for Business or Pleasure.

57. According to the passage, travelers are most commonly bothered by ______.
   A. sunburn  B. motion sickness  C. insect bites  D. headaches

58. In line 3, the word “affliction” can best be replaced by ______.
   A. result  B. experience  C. ailment  D. supply

59. According to the passage, what can be used to remedy motion sickness?

60. Which of the following is NOT mentioned in the passage as a solution to a health problem?
   A. Sunscreen  B. Cold cream  C. Repellent spray  D. Aspirin

V. BUSINESS COMMUNICATION (10 points)
Choose the most appropriate response (A, B, C, or D) to each question/statement.

61. Tom: “Is it all right if I use my bike?”
   Mary: “________”  A. I don’t care  B. Sure, go ahead.  C. Oh, forget it.  D. I accept it.

   David: “________”  A. Take care!  B. Many happy returns!  C. Have a good time!  D. I don’t understand.

63. Mary: “Would you like beer or wine?”
   Peter: “________”  A. No, I’ve no choice.  B. I couldn’t agree more.  C. I’d prefer beer, please.  D. Yes, I’d love to.

64. Kate: “Which hat do you like better?”

65. Bill: “Mum, I’ve got 600 on the TOEFL test.”
   Mrs. Smith: “________”  A. Good way!  B. You are right.  C. Oh, hard luck!  D. Good job!

VI. SENTENCE BUILDING (10 points)
Make complete sentences with the given words. Make changes if necessary

66. Last / summer / friend / Charles / invite / me / stay / him.

→
67. When Robert be boy he be fond chocolate.
68. The street on the store located has heavy traffic.
69. Three-quarters surface earth cover with water.
70. I write you three times last two months.

-THIS IS THE END OF THE TEST-
Appendices

End-of-semester Test of English (University 3)

FINAL TEST
YEAR 1 – SEMESTER 1
Duration: ___ minutes

I. PRONUNCIATION
A. Which underlined part is pronounced differently from the others?
1. A. biged  B. ball  C. value  D. terrice
2. A. behaviour  B. defame  C. creative  D. establish
3. A. facecast  B. seger  C. factory  D. shortage
4. A. rat  B. flu  C. bull  D. full
5. A. ear  B. taught  C. ground  D. shoulder

B. Which word has a different stress pattern?
6. A. disease  B. portion  C. asthma  D. stomach
7. A. conscious  B. homeless  C. aware  D. lazy
8. A. allergy  B. monument  C. impression  D. oven
9. A. presentation  B. contribution  C. disappointment  D. agriculture
10. A. budget  B. balance  C. lawyer  D. receipt

II. VOCABULARY
Choose the option (A, B, C or D) that best completes each sentence.
11. I think we're all very _____ in our family. We always talk about how we feel. We never hide things from each other.
   A. open  B. strict  C. neat  D. tidy
12. Neither of us are very _____ We hardly ever get A grades. We usually only get Cs.
   A. calm  B. patient  C. clever  D. kind
13. It's _____ to use and the instructions don't make things any easier. They're really hard to follow.
   A. thick  B. bright  C. complicated  D. reliable
14. I once _____ a medal in a running race at school. B. taught
   A. drew  B. kicked  C. scored  D. won
15. I try to keep _____ by going to the gym twice a week.
   A. fit  B. weak  C. homeless  D. lazy
16. It's a very _____ area. There are lots of factories there.
   A. curable  B. industrial  C. musical  D. physical
17. The room needs a good clean. It's very _____.
   A. selfish  B. dusty  C. keen  D. brief
18. The increase in traffic has caused a lot of _____, The new law will try to reduce it.
   A. back  B. appointment  C. pollution  D. line
19. I have a bad _____, I have to be careful when I stretch it.
   A. back  B. pollution  C. motorway  D. line
20. We were making a lot of _____ with the building, but the bad rain has stopped it.
   A. appointment  B. progress  C. budget  D. ease

III. GRAMMAR
Choose the option (A, B, C or D) that best completes each sentence.
21. Kelly and I _____ to the cinema every week.
   A. go  B. goes  C. went  D. are going
22. Sally's favourite actor is Brad Pitt, _______. Ginny prefers Clive Owen.
   A. neither  B. both  C. none  D. whereas
23. Mum and Dad _____ me a new mobile for my birthday last week, so do you want my old one?
   A. are giving  B. give  C. gave  D. have given
24. This MP3 player doesn't work very well. Can I have a _____ one, please?
   A. gooder  B. better  C. better than  D. more good
25. You should see the film The House Kepper. It's great. I _____ it about six times now.
   A. saw  B. see  C. have seen  D. was seeing
26. Someone threw a brick through my window while I _____.
   A. worked  B. have worked  C. was working  D. am working
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27. The __________ party I've ever had was for my 21st birthday when I invited 100 people.
   A. bigger than B. more big C. biggest D. most big
28. We have a gardener who comes every week, so we __________ worry about the garden.
   A. don't have to B. can C. not have to D. can not
29. It's quite hard to explain where it is. I ______ you a map, OK?
   A. will lead B. lead C. have lent D. lent
30. You __________ to apologise to her and say you didn't mean it.
   A. should B. ought C. can D. shouldn't
31. I'm __________ taking them. You have to finish the prescription.
   A. No stop B. Not stop C. Don't stop D. Stopping
32. We missed ______ last train into the city, so we had to get ______ taxi to our hotel.
   A. a/the B. /a C. the/a D. the/the
33. There are ______ cycle lanes where I live, but not ______.
   A. some/many B. some/much C. any/many D. any/much
34. Listen, I can't speak now. I ______. I'll ring you back.
   A. drive B. am driving C. drove D. have driven
35. The global soft drinks market ______ by three huge companies.
   A. is dominated B. are dominated C. dominates D. dominate

IV. READING

Part 2: Read the following passage and choose the best answer (A, B, C or D) to each question.

People who travel frequently on business or for pleasure often suffer some form of health problem, yet over half of these problems can easily be prevented. The most common ailment, a headache, can be avoided by taking an ample supply of aspirin or other pain reliever. Another common affliction, motion sickness caused by the constant movement of a vehicle. Ginger capsules, sold in most health-food stores, have been found effective as a remedy. Other familiar problems include sunburn, which can be prevented by using an effective sunscreen, and insect bites, which can be controlled with use of a repellent spray or cimicid. For every cuts and scratches, a first-aid kit containing bandages and antiseptic cream is recommended.

26. What is the best title for this passage?
   A. Frequent Travelers B. Avoiding Travel Ailments
   C. Common Health Problems D. Traveling for Business or Pleasure
27. According to the passage, travelers are most commonly bothered by ______.
   A. sunburn B. motion sickness C. insect bites D. headaches
28. In line 3, the word “affliction” can best be replaced by ______.
   A. result B. experience C. ailment D. supply
29. According to the passage, what can be used to remedy motion sickness?
   A. A moving vehicle B. Pains-killers C. Ginger capsules D. A first-aid kit
30. Which of the following is NOT mentioned in the passage as a solution to a health problem?
   A. Sunscreen B. Cold cream C. Repellent spray D. Aspirin

Part 1: Choose the best option (A, B, C or D) to complete the following text.

The number of ______ fathers has increased considerably in ______ years in Britain. We spoke to one such dad, Steve Barker, about how he copes with it all. Steve, 43, has ______ his two teenage sons since he and his wife split up two years ago. "It's no ______ difficult for a man than it is for a woman," says Steve. "It's a full-time job, whoever you are. Fortunately for me, my employers were very sympathetic in the first few months and they ______ me time off work to get myself organized.

As (46) ______ as the housework is concerned, I don't mind cooking, as I've always been ______ at that; it's the ironing I can't stand. Generally speaking, the boys and I get on very well ______ but of course, sometimes we have rows. That's when I really miss having someone there with me to help me out. I have had a couple of relationships in the last two years but they haven't worked out. That has to ______ with the fact that I put my kids before anyone ______ ______

41. A. alone B. only C. single D. unique
42. A. recent B. nowadays C. last D. latest
43. A. taken B. made C. grown D. brought
44. A. very B. more C. much D. at all
45. A. allowed B. offered C. suggested D. let
46. A. far B. well C. much D. soon
Put the given words in the correct order to make sentences.

51. Selling men’s hal/ at/ is/ /store/ /suits/ price
   A. Men’s suits half price is selling at the store.
   B. The store is selling men’s suits at half price.
   C. Selling men’s suits at half price is the store.
   D. Half price of men’s suits is selling at the store.

52. scientists/ widely/ neither/ they/ my/ are/ of/ parents/ read/ both/ but
   A. Neither of my parents are scientists, but they both read widely.
   B. Neither my parents are of scientists, but both they read widely.
   C. Both my parents are scientists, but neither of they read widely.
   D. Neither my parent are scientists, but both of they read widely.

53. Friday/ mine/ having/ on/ a/ at/ night/ of/ friend/ party
   A. A friend of mine is having a party on Friday night.
   B. A mine friend is having a party on Friday night.
   C. A friend of mine party is having on a Friday night.
   D. A friend of mine is having party a Friday night.

54. room/ share/ to/ two/ I/ students/ other/ a/ have/ with
   A. Two other students have a share a room with I.
   B. Two other students have share a room with I.
   C. I have to share other room with two students.
   D. I have to share a room with two other students.

55. stolen/ went/ was/ where/ bag/ I/ shopping/ my
   A. My bag went shopping when I was stolen.
   B. I was stolen my bag when I went shopping.
   C. My bag was stolen when I went shopping.
   D. My bag was stolen when I went shopping.

Part 2: Choose the best sentence (A, B, C, or D) that has a similar meaning to the first one.

56. I liked both the cameras on sale, but this one was cheaper.
   A. I liked both the cameras on sale, but this one was less expensive.
   B. I liked both the cameras on sale, but this one was expensive.
   C. I liked both the cameras on sale, but this one was more expensive.
   D. I liked both the cameras on sale, but this one was cheaper.

57. Maybe you should rub some cream on that rash.
   A. Why don’t you rub some cream on that rash?
   B. Why you not rub some cream on that rash?
   C. You don’t need to rub some cream on that rash.
   D. You ought to rub some cream on that rash.

58. Please be quiet.
   A. Please increase noise levels.
   B. Please don’t make a noise.
   C. Please not noisy.
   D. What’s that noise?

59. I really should do more exercise.
   A. I really better do more exercise.
   B. I really ought to do more exercise.
   C. I ought not to really do more exercise.
   D. I really good to do more exercise.

60. There aren’t any parking spaces.
   A. There are no some parking spaces.
   B. There are no parking spaces.
C. There are not some parking spaces.
D. There are some parking spaces.
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Confirmation of equivalence of examinations

9th May 2016

To whom it may concern,

Currently I am a full-time English language lecturer at the University of Economics and Law in Vietnam. I have been teaching English to students in a number of universities in Ho Chi Minh City in Vietnam since 2005.

Following personal communication, Mr Truong Cong Bang has requested that I judge the degree of similarity in the questions for the end-of-semester English language examinations administered at the three universities in Ho Chi Minh City involved in Mr Truong’s PhD research. I am writing this letter to this effect.

At the end of each semester, students are required to sit a final examination which focuses on pronunciation (including sound and stress pattern differentiation), grammar, and vocabulary items that were covered in the course but used in a new context in the examination. The examination also assesses students’ reading and business communication skills.

From my long experience with teaching English and testing students in English at universities in Vietnam, I can confirm that the end-of-semester examination questions at the three institutions bear strong resemblance in terms of test design and degree of difficulty. The only noticeable difference among the three examinations was the order of the test sections and the number of questions for each section.

Please feel free to contact me at Ngoanntb@uel.edu.vn should you want to discuss this further.

Best regards,

Nguyen Thi Bich Ngoan
Deputy Head of Department of Foreign Languages
University of Economics and Law- Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City.
Quarter 3, Linh Xuan Ward, Thu Duc Dist. HCM City.
Tel: 84.8.7244523
Email: Ngoanntb@uel.edu.vn
Dear Sir/Madam,

I work full-time as an English lecturer at the University of Economics and Law (Vietnam National University - Ho Chi Minh City). I am writing in response to Mr. Truong’s request for a letter relating to the similarities and differences in the end-of-semester examination questions among the three universities involved in Mr. Truong’s research study.

After thoroughly considering these examination papers, I would like to share my evaluation, as follows:

Tests focuses: The three tests focus on pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, reading, and communication.

Levels of difficulty: very similar levels of difficulty because the examinations are designed to assess students at similar levels of English language proficiency.

I can conclude that the questions used in the end-of-semester examinations at the three universities are very similar. If you would like me to provide more information, I can be reached at thudta@uel.edu.vn.

Yours sincerely,

Dao Thi Anh Thu
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Ethics Committee Notification of Expedited Approval

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

Notification of Expedited Approval

To Chief Investigator or Project Supervisor: Doctor Jennifer Archer
Cc Co-investigators / Research Students: Associate Professor Shen Chen, Mr Bang Truong
Re Protocol: An investigation of the motivation of male and female Vietnamese university students to learn English in the light of the expectancy-value model of academic motivation

Date: 27-Sep-2013
Reference No: H-2013-0296
Date of Initial Approval: 27-Sep-2013

Thank you for your Response to Conditional Approval (minor amendments) submission to the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) seeking approval in relation to the above protocol.

Your submission was considered under L2 Low Risk Research Expedited review by the Ethics Administrator.

I am pleased to advise that the decision on your submission is Approved effective 27-Sep-2013.

In approving this protocol, the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) is of the opinion that the project complies with the provisions contained in the National Statement on Ethical Conduct
in Human Research, 2007, and the requirements within this University relating to human research.

Approval will remain valid subject to the submission, and satisfactory assessment, of annual progress reports. If the approval of an External HREC has been "noted" the approval period is as determined by that HREC.

The full Committee will be asked to ratify this decision at its next scheduled meeting. A formal Certificate of Approval will be available upon request. Your approval number is H-2013-0296.

If the research requires the use of an Information Statement, ensure this number is inserted at the relevant point in the Complaints paragraph prior to distribution to potential participants. You may then proceed with the research.

## Conditions of Approval

This approval has been granted subject to you complying with the requirements for Monitoring of Progress, Reporting of Adverse Events, and Variations to the Approved Protocol as detailed below.

**PLEASE NOTE:**
In the case where the HREC has "noted" the approval of an External HREC, progress reports and reports of adverse events are to be submitted to the External HREC only. In the case of Variations to the approved protocol, or a Renewal of approval, you will apply to the External HREC for approval in the first instance and then Register that approval with the University's HREC.

- **Monitoring of Progress**

Other than above, the University is obliged to monitor the progress of research projects involving human participants to ensure that they are conducted according to the protocol as approved by the HREC. A progress report is required on an annual basis. Continuation of your HREC approval for this project is conditional upon receipt, and satisfactory assessment, of annual progress reports. You will be advised when a report is due.

- **Reporting of Adverse Events**

1. It is the responsibility of the person first named on this Approval Advice to report adverse events.
2. Adverse events, however minor, must be recorded by the investigator as observed by the investigator or as volunteered by a participant in the research. Full details are to be documented, whether or not the investigator, or his/her deputies, consider the event to be related to the research substance or procedure.

3. Serious or unforeseen adverse events that occur during the research or within six (6) months of completion of the research, must be reported by the person first named on the Approval Advice to the (HREC) by way of the Adverse Event Report form (via RIMS at https://rims.newcastle.edu.au/login.asp) within 72 hours of the occurrence of the event or the investigator receiving advice of the event.

4. Serious adverse events are defined as:
   - Causing death, life threatening or serious disability.
   - Causing or prolonging hospitalisation.
   - Overdoses, cancers, congenital abnormalities, tissue damage, whether or not they are judged to be caused by the investigational agent or procedure.
   - Causing psycho-social and/or financial harm. This covers everything from perceived invasion of privacy, breach of confidentiality, or the diminution of social reputation, to the creation of psychological fears and trauma.
   - Any other event which might affect the continued ethical acceptability of the project.

5. Reports of adverse events must include:
   - Participant's study identification number;
   - date of birth;
   - date of entry into the study;
   - treatment arm (if applicable);
   - date of event;
   - details of event;
   - the investigator's opinion as to whether the event is related to the research procedures; and
   - action taken in response to the event.

6. Adverse events which do not fall within the definition of serious or unexpected, including those reported from other
sites involved in the research, are to be reported in detail at the time of the annual progress report to the HREC.

**Variations to approved protocol**

If you wish to change, or deviate from, the approved protocol, you will need to submit an Application for Variation to Approved Human Research (via RIMS at [https://rims.newcastle.edu.au/login.asp](https://rims.newcastle.edu.au/login.asp)). Variations may include, but are not limited to, changes or additions to investigators, study design, study population, number of participants, methods of recruitment, or participant information/consent documentation. **Variations must be approved by the (HREC) before they are implemented** except when Registering an approval of a variation from an external HREC which has been designated the lead HREC, in which case you may proceed as soon as you receive an acknowledgement of your Registration.

**Linkage of ethics approval to a new Grant**

HREC approvals cannot be assigned to a new grant or award (ie those that were not identified on the application for ethics approval) without confirmation of the approval from the Human Research Ethics Officer on behalf of the HREC.

Best wishes for a successful project.

Professor Allyson Holbrook

**Chair, Human Research Ethics Committee**

*For communications and enquiries:*

**Human Research Ethics Administration**

Research Services  
Research Integrity Unit  
The Chancellery  
The University of Newcastle  
Callaghan NSW 2308  
T +61 2 492 17894  
F +61 2 492 17164  
[Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au](mailto:Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au)
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Letter of Information and consent form to Head of Department of English
(English version)

FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND ARTS

Dr Jennifer Archer
School of Education
Faculty of Education and Arts
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Phone: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Information Statement for the Research Project: Head of Department

An investigation of the motivation of male and female Vietnamese university students to learn English in the light of the expectancy-value model of academic motivation

Dr Jennifer Archer                  Associate Professor Shen Chen
Project supervisor                  Project Co-supervisor

Truong Cong Bang
Research student
Appendices

Document Version 2; dated 25 September 2013

Dear ....,

We seek your permission to allow your staff and students to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Dr Jennifer Archer from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle. The research is part of Truong Cong Bang’s studies for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education at the University of Newcastle, supervised by Dr Jennifer Archer and Associate Professor Shen Chen.

Why is the research being done?

The purpose of the research is to examine ability-related and task-value beliefs about learning English in first-year non-English major students at three universities in Ho Chi Minh City. Previous research has shown that students’ achievement, effort, persistence, and choice of achievement tasks can be explained by their expectancy-related beliefs as well as the value they attach to the tasks. It is hoped that the research will provide a model for improved teaching of English in universities in Vietnam.

The research is part of Truong Cong Bang’s studies for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education at the University of Newcastle.

Who can participate in the research?

We are seeking the participation of Vietnamese university students who are not majoring in English and are in the first year of their program, and lecturers who are teaching English to first year non-English major students at three universities in Ho Chi Minh City.

What choice do lecturers and students have?

Participation in this research is entirely their choice. Only those people who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not they decide to participate, their decision will not disadvantage in anyway and will not affect their course assessments or relationship with their educational institutions or its staff. Submission of the completed questionnaire constitutes implied consent. Participants can withdraw from the project until such time as the completed questionnaire has been submitted and the interview has been transcribed.

What will lecturers and students be asked to do?
The students will be asked to respond to a questionnaire after a class is finished. All documents have been attached to this letter. In addition, a smaller number of students will be asked to participate in an audio-recorded group interview with approximately five students. The interview will be conducted out of the class time, by Truong Cong Bang, in a room at the university, and at a time that suits all the students. The questionnaire should take about 20 minutes to complete. The group interview should last approximately 30 minutes in one session.

Students will be asked to allow Truong Cong Bang to access their final English results and link those results to their completed questionnaire.

Lecturers will be asked to allow Truong Cong Bang to introduce his research to students at the beginning of the class (about five minutes) and to participate in an audio-recorded face-to-face interview with Truong Cong Bang. The interview will be conducted by Truong Cong Bang, in a room at the university, and at a time that suits the lecturer. The interview should last approximately 20 minutes.

*What are the risks and benefits of participating?*

There are no obvious risks or benefits to participants in this research. We hope the results of the study will provide suggestions for ways to improve the teaching of English in universities in Vietnam.

*How will privacy be protected?*

Any information collected by the researchers during the interviews which might identify lecturers or students will be stored securely and only accessed by the Project Supervisor, Co-supervisor, and Truong Cong Bang, the student researcher, for research purposes except as requested by law. The data will be disposed right after all information is linked. All hard copies of the data will be disposed using a paper shredder, and soft copies will be removed from the researcher’s computer. Names will be removed from transcripts of interviews. The student researcher is the only one who will transcribe all interviews. Data will be retained for five years at the Callaghan Campus of the University of Newcastle. No individuals or universities will be identified in any reports and publications.

*How will the information collected be used?*

Information will be used in a thesis to be submitted for Truong Cong Bang’s degree, in papers published in academic journals, and presentations at conferences. A report will also be provided to participating universities. A summary of the results of the research will be provided to your university via email. Individual participants will not be identified in any reports arising from the project. Universities will not be identified.
If you are happy for your staff and students to participate in the study, please complete and return the Consent Form to the researcher Truong Cong Bang via email: Bang.Truong@uon.edu.au or post to the following address: Truong Cong Bang, Department of English, University of Economics and Law- Vietnam National University of Ho Chi Minh City, Quarter 3, Linh Xuan Ward, Thu Duc District, Ho Chi Minh city.

Should you kindly agree to participating in the research, Truong Cong Bang will contact you to decide the staff and students to be invited to participate in the project.

Further information

If you would like further information please contact Truong Cong Bang on +61 411 759 232 or email Bang.Truong@uon.edu.au or Dr Jennifer Archer on +61 2 4921 6723 or email Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au.

Thank you for considering this request.

Dr Jennifer Archer
Project Supervisor

Mr. Truong Cong Bang
Research student

Complaints about this research

This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H-2013-0296

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au, or Ms. Dao Thi Anh Thu, Lecturer of English, University of Economics and Law- Vietnam National University of Ho Chi Minh City, Quarter 3, Linh Xuan Ward, Thu Duc District, Ho Chi Minh city, telephone +84 937 059 238, email thudta@uel.edu.vn
ACULTY OF EDUCATION AND ARTS

Dr Jennifer Archer
School of Education
Faculty of Education and Arts
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Phone: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Consent Form: Head of Department

An investigation of the motivation of male and female Vietnamese university students to learn English in the light of the expectancy-value model of academic motivation

Dr Jennifer Archer
Project supervisor

Associate Professor Shen Chen
Project Co-supervisor

Truong Cong Bang
Research student

Document Version 2; dated 25 September 2013

I agree to allow staff and students to participate in the above research project and give my consent freely.
I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained.

I understand I can withdraw the School from the project until such time as the completed questionnaire has been submitted and the interview has been transcribed and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing.

A summary of the results will be provided to the university and the participants via email.

Participants will be provided the opportunity to review the recording of the interview to edit or erase their contribution.

I consent to

- Facilitating the conduct of the research project in my School
- Allowing the researchers to distribute questionnaires to students
- Allowing the researchers to access the final English marks of students who complete the questionnaire
- Allow lecturers and students to be interviewed in a suitable room within the School.

Name: ____________________________

Signature:_________________________ Date: _______________
Letter of Information and consent form to Head of Department of English
(Vietnamese version)

KHOA GIÁO DỤC VÀ NGHỆ THUẬT

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Trường Giáo Dục
Khoa Giáo Dục và Nghệ Thuật
Đại Học Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Điện thoại: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Thống Tin Về Dự Án Nghiên Cứu: Bán Gửi Trường Khoa

Nghiên Cứu Về Động Lực Học Tiếng Anh Của Sinh Viên Nam Và Nữ Bộc Đại Học Ở Việt Nam Dưới Sự Soi Dẩn Của Thuyết Động Lực Học Năng Lực - Giá Trị

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Phó Giáo Sư Shen Chen
Hướng Dẫn Chính
Hướng Dẫn Phụ

Trưởng Công Bang
Nghiên Cứu Sinh

Tài Liệu Phiền Bản 2; Ngày 25 Tháng 9 Năm 2013
Kính gửi ....,


Lý do tiến hành nghiên cứu?

Mục đích của nghiên cứu này là tìm hiểu về niêm tín vào năng lực và giá trị của việc học tiếng Anh của sinh viên năm nhất không chuyên Anh tại ba trường Đại Học ở Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh. Nghiên cứu đã chỉ ra rằng niêm tín vào năng lực và giá trị của việc thực hiện các hoạt động có thể tác động đến kết quả đạt được, sự nỗ lực, kiên trì, và sự chọn lựa học tập của sinh viên. Chúng tôi hy vọng rằng nghiên cứu này sẽ tìm ra giải pháp cho việc cải thiện chất lượng giảng dạy tiếng Anh tại các trường đại học ở Việt Nam.

Nghiên cứu này là công trình cho luận án Tiến Sĩ Giáo Dục của Trường Công Bang tại Đại Học Newcastle.

Ai có thể tham gia dự án nghiên cứu?

Chúng tôi mời gọi sự tham gia của các sinh viên đại học năm nhất không chuyên Anh, và các giảng viên tiếng Anh hiện đang giảng dạy tiếng Anh cho sinh viên năm nhất không chuyên Anh tại ba trường đại học ở Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh.

Quyền chọn lựa tham gia dự án của giảng viên và sinh viên?

Sự tham gia vào đề tài nghiên cứu hoàn toàn là sự chọn lựa của họ. Chỉ những ai đồng ý tham gia dự án mới được tham gia. Cho dù họ quyết định có tham gia hay không tham gia dự án thì quyết định của họ không gây bất cứ trở ngại nào cho họ và không ảnh hưởng đến việc đánh giá khóa học hay môi quan hệ của họ với cơ sở giáo dục và nhân viên. Việc trả lời bản câu hỏi khảo sát được xem như đồng ý tham gia vào đề tài nghiên cứu. Người tham gia có thể rút khỏi dự án vào bất cứ lúc nào trước khi bản câu hỏi khảo sát được nộp và nội dung phỏng vấn đã được trình bày ra giấy.

Giảng viên và sinh viên sẽ phải làm gì?

Sinh viên sẽ được yêu cầu trả lời một bản câu hỏi ngoài giờ học. Tất cả tài liệu được định kèm cùng thư này. Thêm vào đó, một số sinh viên sẽ được mời tham gia phỏng vấn

Sinh viên được yêu cầu cho phép Trương Công Bang truy cập kết quả tiếng Anh cuối kỳ của họ và liên kết kết quả đó với bản câu hỏi kháo sát đã được hoàn thành của họ.

Giảng viên sẽ được yêu cầu cho phép Trương Công Bang giới thiệu công trình nghiên cứu đến sinh viên vào đầu giờ học (khoảng năm phút) và được mời tham gia phỏng vấn có ghi âm với Trương Công Bang. Cuộc phỏng vấn sẽ được thực hiện bởi Trương Công Bang, trong một phòng ở đại học, vào thời gian thích hợp cho giảng viên. Cuộc phỏng vấn kéo dài khoảng 20 phút.

**Những rủi ro và quyền lợi khi tham gia dự án nghiên cứu là gì?**

Không có bất cứ rủi ro hay quyền lợi nào cho người tham gia dự án nghiên cứu. Chúng tôi hy vọng kết quả của công trình nghiên cứu sẽ đưa ra những đề xuất để cải thiện việc giảng dạy tiếng Anh tại các trường đại học ở Việt Nam.

**Sự riêng tư được bảo mật như thế nào?**


**Thông tin thư thập được sử dụng như thế nào?**

Nếu quý vị chấp nhận đề giảng viên và sinh viên tại trường của quý vị tham gia vào dự án nghiên cứu, xin quý vị gửi lời điện và đơn chấp thuận và gửi lại cho người nghiên cứu Trường Công Bang qua địa chỉ thư điện tử Bang.Truong@uon.edu.au hoặc gửi thư điện đến địa chỉ: Trường Công Bang, Bộ Môn Tiếng Anh, Trường Đại Học Kinh Tế - Luật – Đại Học Quốc Gia Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh, Khu phố 3, Phường Linh Xuân, Quận Thú Độc, Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh.

Nếu quý vị vui lòng đồng ý tham gia dự án nghiên cứu, Trường Công Bang sẽ liên hệ với quý vị để sắp xếp mời giảng viên và sinh viên tham gia dự án.

**Thông tin thêm**

Nếu quý vị cần thêm thông tin, xin vui lòng liên hệ Trường Công Bang qua số điện thoại +61 411 759 232 hoặc thư điện tử Bang.Truong@uon.edu.au hoặc Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer qua số điện thoại +61 2 4921 6723 hoặc thư điện tử Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au.

Chân thành cảm ơn quý vị đã xem xét thư mời này.

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer

Ông Trường Công Bang

Hướng dẫn chính

Nghiên cứu sinh

**Thông báo về dự án**

Dự án này được phê chuẩn bởi Hội đồng Đạo Đức Nghiên cứu Con Người của Trường Đại Học. Phê chuẩn số H-2013-0296

Nếu quý vị thích mặc về quyền tham gia dự án, hoặc quý vị phản nàn về cách thực hiện, quý vị có thể trình bày với người nghiên cứu, hoặc muốn trình bày với một bên độc lập, Văn phòng Đạo Đức Nghiên cứu Con Người, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, điện thoại (02) 49216333, thư điện tử Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au, hoặc Dao Thị Anh Thu, Giảng viên Tiếng Anh, Trường Đại Học Kinh Tế- Luật- Đại Học Quốc Gia Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh, Khu phố 3, Phường Linh Xuân, Quận Thú Độc, Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh, điện thoại +84 937 059 238, thư điện tử thudta@uel.edu.vn
KHOA GIÁO DỤC VÀ NGHỆ THUẬT

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Trường Giáo Dục
Khoa Giáo Dục và Nghệ Thuật
Đại Học Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Điện thoai: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Đơn Chấp Thuận: Bàn Gửi Trường Khoa

Nghiên Cứu Về Động Lực Học Tiếng Anh Của Sinh Viên Nam Và Nữ Bộc Đại Học Ở Việt Nam Dưới Sự Soi Dẫn Của Thuyết Động Lực Học Năng Lực - Giá Trị

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer Phô Giáo Sư Shen Chen
Hướng Dẫn Chính Hướng Dẫn Phụ

Trưởng Công Bang
Nghiên Cứu Sinh

Tai liệu Phiên Bản 2; Ngày 25 Tháng 9 Năm 2013

Tôi đồng ý để giảng viên và sinh viên tham gia vào dự án nghiên cứu trên và hoàn toàn được tự do chấp thuận.
Tôi hiểu rằng dự án này được thực hiện như đã được trình bày trong Thông Tin Về Dự Án Nghiên Cứu mà tôi đã được cung cấp.

Tôi hiểu rằng tôi có thể rút trường tôi khỏi dự án vào bất cứ lúc nào trước khi bản câu hỏi khảo sát được nộp và nội dung phòng vấn đã được trình bày ra giấy và không phải trình bày lý do rút khỏi.

Một bản tóm tắt kết quả nghiên cứu sẽ được cung cấp cho trường đại học và người tham gia dự án nghiên cứu qua thư điện tử.

Người tham gia dự án sẽ có cơ hội xem lại bản phòng vấn để chỉnh sửa nội dung đóng góp của họ.

Tôi đồng ý
• Tạo mọi thuận lợi cho dự án nghiên cứu được thực hiện tại trường tôi.
• Cho phép người nghiên cứu phát các bản câu hỏi khảo sát cho sinh viên
• Cho phép người nghiên cứu truy cập điểm tiếng Anh cuối kỳ của những sinh viên đã hoàn thành bản câu hỏi khảo sát.
• Cho phép giảng viên và sinh viên được phòng vấn trong một phòng thích hợp tại trường.

Tên: ____________________________

Chữ ký: ____________________________ Ngày: _______________
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Letter of Information and consent form to EFL lecturers
(English version)

FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND ARTS

Dr Jennifer Archer
School of Education
Faculty of Education and Arts
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Phone: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Information Statement: Lecturing staff

An investigation of the motivation of male and female Vietnamese university students to learn English in the light of the expectancy-value model of academic motivation

Dr Jennifer Archer
Associate Professor Shen Chen
Project supervisor
Project Co-supervisor

Truong Cong Bang
Research student
You are invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Dr Jennifer Archer from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle. The research is part of Truong Cong Bang’s studies for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education at the University of Newcastle, supervised by Dr Jennifer Archer and Associate Professor Shen Chen.

Why is the research being done?

The purpose of the research is to examine ability-related and task-value beliefs about learning English in first-year non-English major students at three universities in Ho Chi Minh City. Previous research has shown that students’ achievement, effort, persistence, and choice of achievement tasks can be explained by their expectancy-related beliefs as well as the value they attach to the tasks. It is hoped that the research will provide a model for improved teaching of English in universities in Vietnam.

The research is part of Truong Cong Bang’s studies for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education at the University of Newcastle

Who can participate in the research?

We are seeking the participation of Vietnamese first year non-English major students, and lecturers who are teaching English to first year non-English major students at three universities in Ho Chi Minh City. You have received this letter because we asked the Head of the Department of English at your university to pass this information letter to lecturers who are teaching English to first year non-English major students. We do not have your personal information or contact details.

What choice do you have?

Participation in this research is entirely your choice. Only those people who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to participate, your decision will not disadvantage in anyway and will not affect your course assessments or relationship with your educational institutions or its staff. Participants can withdraw from the project until such time as the interview has been transcribed.
If you do decide to participate, you may withdraw from the project at any time without giving a reason and have the option of withdrawing any data which identifies you.

**What would you be asked to do?**

We ask that you allow Truong Cong Bang to have five minutes at the start of a lecture to introduce the study and distribute the questionnaire with the information statement and consent form to your students. With the permission of your Head of Department, we ask that you allow Truong Cong Bang to access the final English scores of students who have given permission to the researchers to access their final English score.

In addition, you are invited to take part in an audio-recorded individual face-to-face interview with Truong Cong Bang. The interview will be conducted in a room at the university at a time that suits you, with some snacks provided. Truong Cong Bang will ask your opinions of students’ motivation to learn English. The interviewer will flexibly switch language use (English or Vietnamese) depending on your preference. The interview recording will be transcribed. You can request to review and edit the transcript should you wish to do so.

If more lecturers volunteer for an interview than can be accommodated by the researcher, he will select those who are first to volunteer.

**How much time will it take?**

The individual face-to-face interview should last approximately 20 minutes.

**What are the risks and benefits of participating?**

There are no obvious risks or benefits to participants in this research. It is hoped that the research will provide a model for improved teaching of English in universities in Vietnam.

**How will your privacy be protected?**

Initially, it will be possible to identify participants from the audio recording of the interviews but all information will be kept confidential and will not be disclosed to others except as requested by law. The data will be disposed right after all information is linked. All hard copies of the data will be disposed using a paper shredder, and soft copies will be removed from the researcher’s computer. When we transcribe the audio tapes, participants’ names will be replaced with a numerical code. References to people or organisations will be blanked out. The student researcher is the only one who will transcribe all interviews. You will have an opportunity to review, edit or erase your contribution. The audio tape will then be wiped and the list of codes securely destroyed.

Any information collected by the researchers which might identify you will be stored securely and only accessed by the Project Supervisor, Co-supervisor, and Truong Cong
Bang. Data will be retained for five years at the Callaghan Campus of the University of Newcastle.

**How will the information collected be used?**

Information will be used in a thesis to be submitted for Truong Cong Bang’s degree, in papers published in academic journals, and presentations at conferences. A report will also be provided to participating universities via email. If you wish to obtain this report via email, please provide the researcher your email address at Bang.Truong@uon.edu.au. A summary of the results of the research will be provided to your university. You may request a copy of the summary. Individual participants will not be identified in any reports arising from the project. Universities will not be identified.

**What do you need to do to participate?**

Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, please contact the researcher.

If you would like to participate in an individual face-to-face interview, please complete and return the attached consent form to the secure collection box located in the staff common room. The consent form collection box will be removed by the researchers on …. 2013. Truong Cong Bang will contact you to arrange a time convenient to you for the interview.

**Further information**

If you would like further information please contact Truong Cong Bang on +61 411 759 232 or email Bang.Truong@uon.edu.au or Dr Jennifer Archer on +61 2 4921 6723 or email Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au.

Thank you for considering this invitation.

Dr Jennifer Archer
Project Supervisor

Mr Truong Cong Bang
Research student
Complaints about this research

This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H-2013-0296.

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au, or Ms. Dao Thi Anh Thu, Lecturer of English, University of Economics and Law- Vietnam National University of Ho Chi Minh City, Quarter 3, Linh Xuan Ward, Thu Duc District, Ho Chi Minh city, telephone +84 937 059 238, email thudta@uel.edu.vn
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND ARTS

Dr Jennifer Archer
School of Education
Faculty of Education and Arts
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Phone: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Consent Form: Lecturing staff

An investigation of the motivation of male and female Vietnamese university students to learn English in the light of the expectancy-value model of academic motivation

Dr Jennifer Archer              Associate Professor Shen Chen
Project supervisor            Project Co-supervisor

Truong Cong Bang
Research student

Document Version 2; dated 25 September 2013

I agree to participate in the above research project and give my consent freely.
I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained.

I understand I can withdraw from the project until such time as the completed questionnaire has been submitted and the interview has been transcribed and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing.

A summary of the results will be provided to the university and the participants via email.

Participants will be provided the opportunity to review the recording of the interview to edit or erase their contribution.

I understand that my personal information will remain confidential to the researchers.

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

I consent to:

- allowing the researchers to introduce the study to students in my classes
- allowing the researcher to access the final English scores of students who give permission for this to happen.
- a face-to-face audio-recorded interview
  (Please tick in the box if you would like to participate in the interview)

Name: ______________________________________________________________

Phone number or email address: (if you agree to participate in the interview)
__________________________________________________________

Signature: __________________________  Date: ______________
Letter of Information and consent form to EFL lecturers

(Vietnamese version)

KHOA GIÁO DỤC VÀ NGHỆ THUẬT

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Trường Giáo Dục
Khoa Giáo Dục và Nghệ Thuật
Đại Học Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Điện thoại: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Thông Tin Về Dự Án Nghiên Cứu: Bản Gửi Giảng Viên

Nghiên Cứu Về Động Lực Học Tiếng Anh Của Sinh Viên Nam Và Nữ Bộc Đại Học Ở Việt Nam Dưới Sự Soi Dẫn Của Thuyết Động Lực Học Năng Lực - Giá Trị

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Phó Giáo Sư Shen Chen
Hướng Dẫn Chính
Hướng Dẫn Phủ

Trưởng Công Bang
Nghiên Cứu Sinh

Tài Liệu Phiên Bản 2; Ngày 25 Tháng 9 Năm 2013

Lý do tiến hành nghiên cứu?

Mục đích của nghiên cứu này là tìm hiểu về niêm tin vào năng lực và giá trị của việc học tiếng Anh của sinh viên năm nhất không chuyên Anh tại ba trường Đại Học ở Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh. Nghiên cứu đã chỉ ra rằng niêm tin vào năng lực và giá trị của việc thực hiện các hoạt động có thể tác động đến kết quả đạt được, sự nỗ lực, kiến tri, và sự chọn lựa học tập của sinh viên. Chúng tôi hy vọng rằng nghiên cứu này sẽ tìm ra giải pháp cho việc cải thiện chất lượng giảng dạy tiếng Anh tại các trường đại học ở Việt Nam.

Nghiên cứu này là công trình cho luận án Tiến Sĩ Giáo Dục của Trưởng Công Bang tại Đại Học Newcastle.

Ai có thể tham gia dự án nghiên cứu?

Chúng tôi mời gọi sự tham gia của các sinh viên đại học năm nhất không chuyên Anh, và các giảng viên tiếng Anh hiện đang giảng dạy tiếng Anh cho sinh viên năm nhất không chuyên Anh tại ba trường đại học ở Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh. Quý vị nhận được thư mời này bởi vì chúng tôi đã yêu cầu Trường Khoa Tiếng Anh tại trường Đại Học của quý vị giúp chúng tôi chuyên thư mời này đến các giảng viên tiếng Anh đang giảng dạy tiếng Anh cho sinh viên năm nhất không chuyên Anh. Chúng tôi không có thông tin cá nhân và thông tin liên lạc của quý vị.

Quyền chọn lựa tham gia dự án của quý vị?

Sự tham gia vào dự án nghiên cứu hoàn toàn là sự chọn lựa của quý vị. Chỉ những ai đồng ý tham gia dự án mới được tính vào. Cho dù quý vị quyết định có tham gia hay không tham gia dự án thì quyết định của quý vị không gây bất cứ rủi ro nào cho quý vị và không ảnh hưởng đến việc đánh giá khóa học hay môi quan hệ của quý vị với cơ sở giáo dục và nhân viên. Người tham gia có thể rút khỏi dự án vào bất cứ lúc nào trước khi nội dung phỏng vấn đã được trình bày ra giấy.

Nếu quý vị đồng ý tham gia, quý vị có thể rút khỏi dự án vào bất cứ lúc nào và không phải trình bày lý do và có quyền chọn lựa rút dự liệu xác định quý vị.
**Quy vị sẽ phải làm gì?**

Chúng tôi yêu cầu rằng quý vị đồng ý cho Trương CôngBang nắm bắt vào đầu giờ giảng để giới thiệu công trình nghiên cứu và phát băn bối khảo sát cùng với Thông Tin Về Dự Án Nghiên Cứu và đơn Chấp Nhận cho sinh viên. Với sự cho phép của Trường Khoa, chúng tôi yêu cầu rằng quý vị đồng ý cho Trương Công Bang truy cập điểm tiếng Anh cuối kỳ của những sinh viên đã đồng ý cho người nghiên cứu truy cập điểm tiếng Anh cuối kỳ của họ.


Nếu có nhiều giảng viên muốn tham gia phòng vấn hơn số lượng mà người nghiên cứu có thể sắp xếp phòng vấn thì người nghiên cứu sẽ chọn dựa trên giảng viên nào đáng ký tính nguyên trước tham gia phòng vấn.

**Thời gian kéo dài bao lâu?**

Cuộc phòng vấn kéo dài khoảng 20 phút.

**Những rủi ro và quyền lợi khi tham gia dự án nghiên cứu là gì?**

Không có bất cứ rủi ro hay quyền lợi nào cho người tham gia dự án nghiên cứu. Chúng tôi hy vọng công trình nghiên cứu sẽ đưa ra một mô hình để cải thiện việc giảng dạy tiếng Anh tại các trường đại học ở Việt Nam.

**Sự riêng tư của quý vị được bảo mật như thế nào?**


Tất cả thông tin thu thập được mà xác định danh tính của quý vị sẽ được bảo mật an toàn và chỉ người hướng dẫn nghiên cứu chính, người hướng dẫn nghiên cứu phụ, và Trương
Appendices

Cong Bang được quyền truy cập. Dữ liệu sẽ được lưu trữ năm năm tại cơ sở Callaghan của trường Đại Học Newcastle.

Thông tin thư pháp được sử dụng như thế nào?


Quy vị cần phải làm gì khi tham gia dự án?

Xin vui lòng đọc bản Thông Tin Về Dự Án Nghiên Cứu và chắc chắn rằng quý vị hiểu nội dung của nó trước khi quý vị chấp thuận tham gia. Nếu có bất cứ điều gì quý vị không rõ, hay quý vị có câu hỏi nào, vui lòng liên hệ với người nghiên cứu.

Nếu quý vị chấp nhận tham gia vào buổi phòng vấn, xin vui lòng đến vào thư chấp thuận định kèm và bỏ vào hộp thư thất lạc được bảo vệ an toàn đặt trong phòng họp chung. Họp thư nhận thư chấp thuận sẽ được người nghiên cứu hủy bỏ vào….. năm 2013. Trương Cong Bang sẽ liên hệ với quý vị để sắp xếp thời gian举行的 họp với quý vị cho buổi phòng vấn.

Thông tin thêm

Nếu quý vị cần thêm thông tin, xin vui lòng liên hệ Trương Cong Bang qua số điện thoại +61 411 759 232 hoặc thư điện tử Bang.Truong@uon.edu.au hoặc Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer qua số điện thoại +61 2 4921 6723 hoặc thư điện tử Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au.

Chân thành cảm ơn quý vị đã xem xét thư mời này.

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Hướng Dẫn Chính

Ông Trương Cong Bang
Nghiên Cứu Sinh
Thạc sĩ về dự án

Dự án này được phê chuẩn bởi Hội Đồng Đạo Đức Nghiên Cứu Con Người của Trường Đại Học. Phê Chuẩn số H-2013-0296

Nếu quý vị thích mắc về quyền tham gia dự án, hoặc quý vị phản nàn về cách thức dự án được thực hiện, quý vị có thể trình bày với người nghiên cứu, hoặc muốn trình bày với một bên độc lập, Văn phòng Đạo Đức Nghiên Cứu Con Người, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, điện thoại (02) 49216333, thư điện tử Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au, hoặc Dao Thị Anh Thu, Giảng viên Tiếng Anh, Trường Đại Học Kinh Tế- Luật- Đại Học Quốc Gia Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh, Khu Phố 3, Phường Linh Xuân, Quận Thủ Đức, Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh, điện thoại +84 937 059 238, thư điện tử thudta@uel.edu.vn.
KHOA GIÁO DỤC VÀ NGHỆ THUẬT

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Trường Giáo Dục
Khoa Giáo Dục và Nghệ Thuật
Đại Học Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Điện thoại: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Đơn Chấp Thuận: Bàn Gửi Giảng Viên

Nghiên Cứu Về Động Lực Học Tiếng Anh Của Sinh Viên Nam Và Nữ Bộc Đại Học Ở Việt Nam Dưới Sự Soi Dẫn Của Thuyết Động Lực Học Năng Lực - Giá Trị

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Hướng Đạo Chính
Phó Giáo Sư Shen Chen
Hướng Đạo Phụ

Trưởng Công Bang
Nghiên Cứu Sinh

Tài Liệu Phiên Bản 2; Ngày 25 Tháng 9 Năm 2013

Tôi đồng ý tham gia vào dự án nghiên cứu trên và hoàn toàn được tư do chấp thuận.
Tôi hiểu rằng dự án này được thực hiện như đã được trình bày trong Thông Tin Về Dự Án Nghiên Cứu mà tôi đã được cung cấp.

Tôi hiểu rằng tôi có thể rút khỏi dự án vào bất cứ lúc nào trước khi bạn câu hỏi khảo sát được nộp và nội dung phỏng vấn đã được trình bày ra giấy và không phải trình bày lý do rút khỏi.

Một bản tóm tắt kết quả nghiên cứu sẽ được cung cấp cho trường đại học và người tham gia dự án nghiên cứu qua thư điện tử.

Người tham gia dự án sẽ có cơ hội xem lại bản phỏng vấn để chỉnh sửa nội dung đóng góp của họ.

Tôi hiểu rằng thông tin cá nhân của tôi được bảo mật cho người nghiên cứu.

Tôi có cơ hội được hỏi câu hỏi để được giải đáp một cách hài lòng.

Tôi đồng ý:

- cho người nghiên cứu giới thiệu dự án nghiên cứu cho sinh viên lớp tôi.
- cho người nghiên cứu truy cập điểm tiếng Anh cuối kỳ của những sinh viên đã đóng ý cho việc này được thực hiện.
- tham gia buổi phỏng vấn có ghi án
  (Vui lòng đánh dấu chọn vào ô vuông nếu quý vị đồng ý tham gia buổi phỏng vấn)

Tên: 

Số điện thoại hoặc địa chỉ thư điện tử: (nếu quý vị đồng ý tham gia buổi phỏng vấn)

Ký tên: ____________________________ Ngày: ____________
Appendix 10

Letter of Information and consent form to Students
(English version)

FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND ARTS

Dr Jennifer Archer
School of Education
Faculty of Education and Arts
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Phone: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Information Statement for the Research Project: Students

An investigation of the motivation of male and female Vietnamese university students to learn English in the light of the expectancy-value model of academic motivation

Dr Jennifer Archer                  Associate Professor Shen Chen
Project supervisor                Project Co-supervisor

Truong Cong Bang                   
Research student
Dear Student,

You are invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Dr Jennifer Archer from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle. The research is part of Truong Cong Bang’s studies for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education at the University of Newcastle, supervised by Dr Jennifer Archer and Associate Professor Shen Chen.

Why is the research being done?

The purpose of the research is to examine ability-related and task-value beliefs about learning English in first-year non-English major students at some universities in Ho Chi Minh City. Previous research has shown that students’ achievement performance, effort, persistence, and choice of achievement tasks can be explained by their expectancy-related beliefs as well as the value they attach to the tasks. It is hoped that the research will provide a model for improved teaching of English in universities in Vietnam.

The research is part of Truong Cong Bang’s studies for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education at the University of Newcastle

Who can participate in the research?

We are seeking the participation of first year non-English major students, and lecturers who are teaching English to first year non-English major students at three universities in Ho Chi Minh City. Your class was selected from the list of first year classes provided by the Head of the Department of English at your university.

What choice do you have?

Participation in this research is entirely your choice. Your decision will not disadvantage in anyway and will not affect your course assessments or relationship with your educational institutions or its staff. Submission of the completed questionnaire constitutes implied consent. Participants can withdraw from the project until such time as the completed questionnaire has been submitted and the interview has been transcribed. Only
those people who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to participate, your decision will not disadvantage you.

If you do decide to participate, you may withdraw from the project at any time without giving a reason and have the option of withdrawing any data which identifies you. However, if you choose to participate in the anonymous questionnaire, please note that you will not be able to withdraw your data once the questionnaire has been returned.

**What would you be asked to do?**

If you agree, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire in your own time. In the questionnaire, you will be asked your gender, your age, your major, your experience of learning English, your beliefs about your competence in English and the value you attach to being competent in English. We also ask your permission to access your final mark in this English class. We will need to access your student number to get your final mark and link it to your questionnaire.

We would be grateful if you would complete the questionnaire and deposit it in the collection box located outside the English staffroom.

In addition, you are invited to participate in an audio-recorded focus group interview of approximately five students. Only students 18 years or older can participate in the interview. The interview will be conducted in a room at the university, and at a time that suits all the students, with some snacks provided by the researcher.

It is possible that not all students who volunteer for an interview will be interviewed. If there are more volunteers for interview than can be accommodated by the researcher, the researcher will select those whose availability matches that of other students.

The interview will be conducted by Truong Cong Bang. He will ask you about your perceptions of yourself as a language learner and your motivation for learning English. The language used will be in Vietnamese. However, you can use any English words or phrases to express your opinions during the interview. The interview recording will be transcribed by Truong Cong Bang. You can request to review and edit the transcript should you wish to do so.

**How much time will it take?**

The questionnaire should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. The focus group interview should last approximately 30 minutes in one session.

**What are the risks and benefits of participating?**

There are no obvious risks or benefits to participants in this research. It is hoped that the research will provide a model for improved teaching of English in universities in Vietnam.
How will your privacy be protected?

We ask that you provide your student number so that we can access for final English score. All information will be kept confidential and will not be disclosed except as requested by law. Your student number will be replaced with a numerical code. The data will be disposed right after all information is linked. All hard copies of the data will be disposed using a paper shredder, and soft copies will be removed from the researcher’s computer.

Initially, it will be possible to identify participants from the audio recording of the interviews but all information will be kept confidential and will not be disclosed to others. When we transcribe the audio tapes, participants’ names will be replaced with a numerical code. References to people or organisations will be blanked out. The student researcher is the only one who will transcribe all interviews. You will have an opportunity to review, edit or erase your contribution. The audio tape will then be wiped and the list of codes securely destroyed. Participants in the group interview are requested to maintain the confidentiality of the group discussion and not divulge the content to outside parties.

Any information collected by the researchers which might identify you will be stored securely and only accessed by the Project Supervisor, Co-supervisor, and Truong Cong Bang for research purposes. Data will be retained for five years at the Callaghan Campus of the University of Newcastle.

How will the information collected be used?

Information will be used in a thesis to be submitted for Truong Cong Bang’s degree, in papers published in academic journals, and presentations at conferences. A report will also be provided to participating universities via email. If you wish to obtain this report via email, please provide the researcher your email address at Bang.Truong@uon.edu.au. A summary of the results of the research will be provided to your university at the end of the project. You may request a copy of the summary. Individual participants will not be identified in any reports arising from the project. Universities will not be identified.

What do you need to do to participate?

Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, please contact the researcher.

If you would like to participate, please complete and return the questionnaire to the designated box near the staff room. If you also would like to participate in a group interview, please complete and return the consent form to the above-mentioned box. The
questionnaire and consent form collection box will be removed by the researchers on …. 2013. We will contact you to arrange a time convenient to you for the interview.

Further information

If you would like further information please contact Truong Cong Bang on +61 411 759 232 or email Bang.Truong@uon.edu.au or Dr Jennifer Archer on +61 2 4921 6723 or email Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au.

Thank you for considering this invitation.

Dr Jennifer Archer                        Mr Truong Cong Bang
Project Supervisor                    Research student

Complaints about this research

This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No H-2013-0296.

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au, or Ms. Dao Thi Anh Thu, Lecturer of English, University of Economics and Law- Vietnam National University of Ho Chi Minh City, Quarter 3, Linh Xuan Ward, Thu Duc District, Ho Chi Minh city, telephone +84 937 059 238, email thudta@uel.edu.vn
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND ARTS

Dr Jennifer Archer

School of Education

Faculty of Education and Arts

The University of Newcastle

University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Phone: (+61) 2 4921 6723

Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895

Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Consent Form: Students

An investigation of the motivation of male and female Vietnamese university students to learn English in the light of the expectancy-value model of academic motivation

Dr Jennifer Archer

Project supervisor

Associate Professor Shen Chen

Project Co-supervisor

Truong Cong Bang

Research student

Document Version 2; dated 25 September 2013

I agree to participate in the above research project and give my consent freely.
I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained.

I understand I can withdraw from the project until such time as the completed questionnaire has been submitted and the interview has been transcribed and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing.

**I consent to participating in a focus group interview and having it audio-recorded.**

I understand that my personal information will remain confidential to the researchers.

A summary of the results will be provided to the university and the participants via email.

Participants will be provided the opportunity to review the recording of the interview to edit or erase their contribution.

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

Name: ________________________________________________

Phone number or email address (to arrange a time for the interview):
_________________________  __________________________

Signature:______________________________  Date: ________
Letter of Information and consent form to Students
(Vietnamese version)

KHOA GIÁO DỤC VÀ NGHỆ THUẬT

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Trưởng Giáo Dục
Khoa Giáo Dục và Nghệ Thuật
Đại Học Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Điện thoại: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Thông Tin Về Dự Án Nghiên Cứu: Bản Gửi Sinh Viên

Nghiên Cứu Về Động Lực Học Tiếng Anh Của Sinh Viên Nam Và Nữ Bộc Đại Học Ở Việt Nam Dưới Sự Soi Dẫn Của Thuyết Động Lực Học Năng Lực - Giá Trị

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Phó Giáo Sư Shen Chen
Hướng Dẫn Chính
Hướng Dẫn Phụ

Trưởng Công Bang
Nghiên Cứu Sinh

Tài Liệu Phiên Bản 2; Ngày 25 Tháng 9 Năm 2013
Các bạn sinh viên thân mến,


**Lý do tiến hành nghiên cứu?**

Mục đích của nghiên cứu này là tìm hiểu về niềm tin vào năng lực và giá trị của việc học tiếng Anh của sinh viên nam nhất không chuyển Anh tại ba trường Đại Học ở Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh. Nghiên cứu đã chỉ ra rằng niềm tin vào năng lực và giá trị của việc thực hiện các hoạt động có thể tác động đến kết quả đạt được, sự nỗ lực, kiến tri, và sự chọn lựa học tập của sinh viên. Chúng tôi hy vọng rằng nghiên cứu này sẽ tìm ra giải pháp cho việc cải thiện chất lượng giảng dạy tiếng Anh tại các trường đại học ở Việt Nam.

Nghiên cứu này là công trình cho luận án Tiến Sĩ Giáo Dục của Trường Công Bang tại Đại Học Newcastle.

**Ai có thể tham gia dự án nghiên cứu?**

Chúng tôi mời gọi sự tham gia của các sinh viên đại học nam nhất không chuyển Anh, và các giảng viên tiếng Anh hiện đang giảng dạy tiếng Anh cho sinh viên nam nhất không chuyển Anh tại ba trường đại học ở Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh. Lớp của các bạn được chọn từ danh sách các lớp nam nhất cung cấp bởi Trường Khoa Tiếng Anh của trường các bạn.

**Quyền chọn lựa tham gia dự án của các bạn?**

Sự tham gia vào đề tài nghiên cứu hoàn toàn là sự chọn lựa của các bạn. Quyết định của bạn không gây bất cứ trở ngại nào cho bạn và không ảnh hưởng đến việc đánh giá khóa học hay mối quan hệ của bạn với cơ sở giáo dục và nhân viên. Việc trả lời bạn câu hỏi khảo sát được xem như động ý tham dự vào đề tài nghiên cứu. Người tham gia có thể rút khỏi dự án vào bất cứ lúc nào trước khi bạn câu hỏi khảo sát được nộp và nội dung phòng văn đã được trình bày ra giấy.

Chi những ai đồng ý tham gia dự án mới được tính vào. Cho dù các bạn quyết định có tham gia hay không tham gia dự án thì quyết định của các bạn không gây bất cứ trở ngại nào cho các bạn.
Nếu các bạn động ý tham gia, các bạn có thể rút khỏi dự án vào bất cứ lúc nào và không phải trình bày lý do và có quyền chọn lựa rút dự liệu xác định các bạn. Tuy nhiên, các bạn lưu ý rằng, khi tham gia trả lời bài câu hỏi khảo sát, dữ liệu sẽ không thể rút lại một khi bản câu hỏi khảo sát đã được gửi trả lại.

**Các bạn sẽ phải làm gì?**

Nếu động ý tham gia, các bạn sẽ được yêu cầu điền trả lời vào một bản câu hỏi khảo sát với giới riêng của các bạn. Trong bản câu hỏi khảo sát, các bạn sẽ được hỏi về giới tính, tuổi, chuyên ngành học, kinh nghiệm học tiếng Anh, niềm tin vào năng lực học tiếng Anh và niềm tin vào giá trị đề cúng với việc tham thạo tiếng Anh. Các bạn cũng được yêu cầu cho phép người nghiên cứu được biết điểm tiếng Anh cuối học kỳ của các bạn để liên hệ với bản câu hỏi khảo sát bằng cách cho chúng tôi biết mã số sinh viên của bạn.

Các bạn vui lòng hoàn tất trả lời các câu hỏi khảo sát và gửi lại cho chúng tôi vào thùng thư pháp đặt bên ngoài văn phòng Khoa Tiếng Anh.

Bên cạnh đó, chúng tôi thanh mỗi bạn tham gia vào một buổi phỏng vấn nhóm khoảng năm sinh viên có thể đồng. Chỉ những sinh viên 18 tuổi hoặc trên 18 tuổi mới được tham gia phỏng vấn. Buổi phỏng vấn sẽ được tiến hành trong một phòng ở đại học, vào thời gian thích hợp với các bạn, có cung cấp chế độ ăn nhẹ bởi người làm nghiên cứu.

Có khả năng là không phải tất cả sinh viên đều xung phong tham gia cuộc phỏng vấn để được phỏng vấn. Nếu có nhiều sinh viên muốn tham gia phỏng vấn hơn số lượng mà người nghiên cứu có thể sắp xếp phỏng vấn thì người nghiên cứu sẽ chọn dựa trên việc bạn nào có thời gian rảnh để phỏng vấn mà phù hợp với những bạn khác để hình thành một nhóm phỏng vấn.


**Thời gian kéo dài bao lâu?**

Việc hoàn thành trả lời bài câu hỏi khảo sát mất khoảng 20 phút. Cuộc phỏng vấn nhóm kéo dài khoảng 30 phút trong một buổi.

**Những rủi ro và quyền lợi khi tham gia dự án nghiên cứu là gì?**

Không có bất cứ rủi ro hay quyền lợi nào cho người tham gia dự án nghiên cứu. Chúng tôi hy vọng công trình nghiên cứu sẽ đưa ra một mô hình để cải thiện việc giảng dạy tiếng Anh tại các trường đại học ở Việt Nam.
Sự riêng tư của các bạn được bảo mật như thế nào?

Chúng tôi yêu cầu bạn cho chúng tôi mả số sinh viên để chúng tôi truy cập điểm tiếng Anh cuối kỳ của các bạn. Tất cả thông tin sẽ bảo mật và không được tiết lộ cho người khác trừ khi pháp luật yêu cầu. Mả số sinh viên của các bạn sẽ được mã hóa bằng một mã số khác. Đừng lưu thư pháp được sẽ được hủy ngay khi các thông tin đã được liên kết. Tất cả bạn cùng của dữ liệu sẽ được hủy bằng máy cắt giấy, và bạn mêm được giữ bô khối may vi tính của người nghiên cứu.


Tất cả thông tin thu thập được mà xác định danh tính của các bạn sẽ được bảo mật an toàn và chỉ người hướng dẫn nghiên cứu chính, người hướng dẫn nghiên cứu phụ, và Truong Cong Bang được quyền truy cập cho mục đích nghiên cứu. Điều liệu sẽ được lưu trữ năm năm tại cơ sở Callaghan của trường Đại Học Newcastle.

Thông tin thu thập được sử dụng như thế nào?


Các bạn cần phải làm gì khi tham gia dự án?

Xin vui lòng đọc bản Thông Tin Về Dự Án Nghiên Cú và chắc chắn rằng các bạn hiểu nội dung của nó trước khi các bạn chấp thuận tham gia. Nếu có bất cứ điều gì các bạn không rõ, hãy các bạn có câu hỏi nào, vui lòng liên hệ với người nghiên cứu.

Nếu các bạn chấp nhận tham gia, xin vui lòng điền trar lại bản câu hỏi khảo sát và bô trở lại hợp thư thập được đặt bên ngoài văn phòng khoa tiếng Anh. Nếu các bạn cũng muốn tham gia vào một cuộc phòng vấn nhóm, xin vui lòng điền vào thư chấp thuận định kèm và bô vào hợp thư thập để đề cập ở trên. Hợp thư nhận bản câu hỏi khảo sát và thư chấp
thuận tham gia phòng vấn sẽ được người nghiên cứu huy bỏ vào … năm 2013. Chúng tôi sẽ liên hệ với các bạn để sắp xếp thời gian thighs họp với các bạn cho buổi phòng vấn.

**Thông tin thêm**

Nếu các bạn cần thêm thông tin, xin vui lòng liên hệ Trương Công Bang qua số điện thoại +61 411 759 232 hoặc thư điện tử Bang.Truong@uon.edu.au hoặc Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer qua số điện thoại +61 2 4921 6723 hoặc thư điện tử Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au.

Chân thành cảm ơn các bạn đã xem xét thư này.

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer Ông Trương Công Bang
Hướng Dẫn Chính Nghiên Cứu Sinh

**Thách mắc về dự án**

Dự án này được phê chuẩn bởi Hội đồng Đạo Đức Nghiên Cứu Con Nguời của Trường Đại Học. Phê chuẩn số H-2013-0296.

Nếu các bạn thắc mắc về quyền tham gia dự án, hoặc các bạn phản nàn về cách thực hiện, các bạn có thể trình bày với người nghiên cứu, hoặc muốn trình bày với một bên độc lập, Văn Phòng Đạo Đức Nghiên Cứu Con Nguời, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, điện thoại (02) 49216333, thư điện tử Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au, hoặc Dao Thị Anh Thu, Giảng Viên Tiếng Anh, Trường Đại Học Kinh Tế- Luật- Đại Học Quốc Gia Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh, Khu Phố 3, Phường Linh Xuân, Quận Thủ Đức, Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh, điện thoại +84 937 059 238, thư điện tử thudta@uel.edu.vn.
KHOA GIÁO DỤC VÀ NGHỆ THUẬT

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Trưởng Giáo Dục
Khoa Giáo Dục và Nghệ Thuật
Đại Học Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Điện thoại: (+61) 2 4921 6723
Fax: (+61) 2 4921 6895
Jennifer.Archer@newcastle.edu.au

Đơn Chấp Thuận: Bàn Gửi Sinh Viên

Nghiên Cứu Về Động Lực Học Tiếng Anh Của Sinh Viên Nam Và Nữ Bộc Đại Học Ở Viêt Nam Dưới Sự Soi Dẫn Của Thuyết Động Lực Học Nâng Lực - Giá Trị

Tiến Sĩ Jennifer Archer
Phó Giáo Sư Shen Chen
Hướng Dẫn Chính
Hướng Dẫn Phụ

Trương Công Bang
Nghiên Cứu Sinh
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Tôi đồng ý tham gia vào dự án nghiên cứu trên và hoàn toàn được tự do chấp thuận.
Tôi hiểu rằng dự án này được thực hiện như đã được trình bày trong Thông Tin Về Dự Án Nghiên Cứu mà tôi đã được cung cấp.

Tôi hiểu rằng tôi có thể rút khỏi dự án vào bất cứ lúc nào trước khi bạn câu hỏi khảo sát được nộp và nội dung phỏng vấn đã được trình bày ra giấy và không phải trình bày lý do rút khỏi.

Tôi đồng ý tham gia buổi phỏng vấn nhóm có ghi âm.

Tôi hiểu rằng thông tin cá nhân của tôi được bảo mật cho người nghiên cứu.

Một bản tóm tắt kết quả nghiên cứu sẽ được cung cấp cho trường đại học và người tham gia dự án nghiên cứu qua thư điện tử.

Người tham gia dự án sẽ có cơ hội xem lại bản phỏng vấn để chỉnh sửa nội dung đóng góp của họ.

Tôi có cơ hội được hỏi câu hỏi để được giải đáp một cách hài lòng

Tên: __________________________________________________

Số điện thoại hoặc địa chỉ thư điện tử (để sắp xếp thời gian phỏng vấn):
__________________________________________  ____________________________

Ký tên: ___________________________________________ Ngày: __________