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Abstract

The acquisition of slang is crucial for English language learners (ELLs) who aim to achieve a native-like fluency. Not only are such learners motivated by these ambitions, but some of them also wish to integrate socially into the English language cultural community. This paper set out to examine the acquisition of American English slang by Saudi female undergraduate English majors in a foreign language (FL) context. The study aimed specifically to examine the relationship between their receptive and productive knowledge of American English slang and their university level and integrative motivation. In order to achieve these objectives, a total of 93 Saudi female undergraduate English majors at Prince Sultan University (PSU) in Riyadh participated in the study. The students were given a test of American English slang and a questionnaire measuring their integrative motivation. The test results demonstrated that their knowledge of American English slang was moderately limited. The results also revealed that their receptive knowledge of American English slang was better than their productive knowledge. The results of the questionnaire showed that the students’ integrative motivation level was moderately high. Moreover, no effect of university level on the students' knowledge of American English slang was found. With regard to integrative motivation, no correlation was found between the students’ overall integrative motivation and their knowledge of American English slang. In light of these results, implications and recommendations for further research are presented.
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ندماجية في اكتساب الدافعية التعابير العامية الأمريكية لدى طالبات الجامعة السعودية للازديمة انجليزية في المجتمع الثقافي لمتحدثي اللغة الإنجليزية. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تقصي مدى اكتساب الطلبة الدارسين في اللغة الإنجليزية تعلمها كلغة أجنبية. وبالتحديد تهدف الدراسة إلى معرفة الالقاء بين دافعيتهن ونوعية، لذكاء، وهويتهن، بالإضافة إلى مستوى معرفتهن بالتعابير عامية، و، كذلك، إلى معرفة الالقاء بين تلك القدرة ومستوى دافعيتهن من جهة أخرى. لهؤلاء، فذراع دائمة مفترشة وردية للتعليم للدارس، صلب، طالب، لتعليم TEXAS بجامعة LAWRENCE. تمت إعطائهن اختبار في اللغة الإنجليزية، وتمت من توعية الجزء الأول من الطالبات، الذين تشارك في هذه الدراسة، بتلك الدراسة. وقد أظهرت النتائج أن مدى معرفة طالبات اللغة الإنجليزية، تمثل تعابير استبانة عامة للدلالة. كما أظهرت أنها درجة استيعابهن تعابير تصل إلى درجة مرتفعة إلى دافعية، كما لم توضح الدراسة وجود الالقاء دالة بين دافعيتهن من ذلك الدافعية لدى الطالبات.
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Chapter I: Introduction

“What’s up?” “What’s happening?” “That’s so awesome!” Any English language learner (ELL) may encounter such expressions in everyday life, whether conversing with a native speaker, watching TV, or even reading a newspaper or a magazine. Without knowing the meaning of such terms and expressions, a non-native speaker of English could not fully understand natural English discourse. English, like many other languages, is loaded with non-standard terms, i.e., slang.

It is always said that slang is something that everyone can recognize but no one can precisely define. Slang is described as the “spice of language” (Lederer, 2002, p. 24). It is “word magic,” revealing the power of language that characterizes social rituals in all kinds of cultures across time (Danesi, 2010). Mattiello (2005) defined slang as the state-of-the-art vocabulary used in familiar, relaxed conversations in which formal language would be inappropriate and unconventional language is instead privileged. Eble (1996) offered another definition of slang. According to him, slang is “an ever changing set of colloquial words and phrases that speakers use to establish or reinforce social identity or cohesiveness within a group or with a trend or fashion in society at large” (p. 11).

Slang has always been seen as the speech of young people, and is closely associated with modern life trends in thinking, clothing, and speaking (Burdová, 2009). This is what makes slang terms “innovative, fresh, and rapidly growing as a reflection of the user’s way of living” (Burdová, 2009, p. 29). Although it is young people who mostly use slang, it would be a mistake to think that it is unique to them. People of different ages and different social status use slang more often than they realize. People might not always use slang when speaking, yet being able to understand frequently used slang terms is essential.

Comprehending slang is not only crucial for native speakers; second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) learners should also gain some competence with slang. Learning how to
use slang properly, however, is not an easy thing to do. Language learners need sufficient exposure to the target language, especially informal speech, in order to acquire slang. Thus, acquiring slang is much easier for individuals who are living in the target language community and are exposed to varieties of the target language. This is not the case in Saudi Arabia (SA), where English has been considered an FL that is rarely used in communication within the country. Nowadays, however, the use of English is increasing, whether in education, media, or business. It is worth noting that now practically all young Saudis learn English at school at some point during their pre-university education and that some of them are exposed to English, especially American English, on a daily basis via many routes such as the Internet, music, movies, or TV programs.

In today’s fast-moving world, many Saudi English foreign language (EFL) learners are eager to learn English because they are driven by their curiosity to explore the world around them. These learners do not stop at the structural formal English language learned at universities, but are desirous of learning and willing to expose themselves to other varieties of English as well. English language learning is expected to be an ongoing source of pleasure for such learners, who are motivated by dreams of achieving a native-like English fluency, in both formal and informal settings, and becoming bilingual. Thus, acquiring English slang is beneficial for them, allowing them to be part of the global English language speech community.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) introduced the concept of “integrative motivation” to describe such kind of motivation. They believed that the relationship between the language learners’ own cultural backgrounds and the backgrounds presented in the target language cultures cannot be neglected. L2/FL acquisition involves “imposing elements of another culture into one’s own life space” (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 193). Thus, learners’ positive attitudes toward the target language and their desire to establish a closer bond with the target language community might play a vital role in L2/FL acquisition.
Nonetheless, not all Saudi EFL learners endorse such favorable attitudes toward native English speakers. Some learners do not will to accept native English speakers due to their cultural, religious, and political diversity. Such learners believe that accepting native English speakers means adopting their cultural and intellectual values, and this, in turn, would affect their Islamic Arab identity. Alabdan (1986) observed that “Learning any FL and the cultural aspects that may accompany this learning may be seen as acquiring foreign traits whose spread might endanger the native culture and language” (p.4-5). Consequently, some learners tend to focus on Standard formal English and avoid slang, believing that slang represents a culture to which they do not belong.

Avoiding slang is not only a tendency of EFL learners; many instructors tend to avoid slang in their teaching as well. Such instructors maintain negative attitudes toward the use of slang because, according to them, slang is a corrupted form of language that might hinder the maintenance of structurally formal language teaching (Lieb, 2009). Some language teachers even believe that using slang does not help them construct a good professional image (Ríos-Ramírez, 2006).

Minimal research attention has been directed toward the acquisition of slang by EFL learners. Research in this area has mainly focused on the use of slang by native English speakers or the acquisition of slang by English L2 learners. Thus, research on the acquisition of slang by Saudi female undergraduate English majors is overdue, especially regarding whether or not it could be affected by their university level or integrative motivation.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study intends to examine the acquisition of American English slang by Saudi female undergraduate English majors at Prince Sultan University (PSU) in Riyadh, SA. It aims specifically to examine the relationship between their receptive and productive knowledge of American English slang and their university level and integrative motivation.
All in all, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of PSU students’ knowledge of American English slang?
2. Are there any statistically significant differences between the students’ achievement mean scores on parts 1 and 2 of the productive knowledge slang test (PKST)?
3. What types of English slang terms do PSU students know?
4. Are there any statistically significant differences in the students’ achievement mean scores on the American English slang test attributable to their university level?
5. What is the level of PSU students’ integrative motivation?
6. Are there any statistically significant differences in the students’ achievement mean scores on the American English slang test attributable to their integrative motivation?

**Significance of the Study**

As stated above, the acquisition of English slang is beneficial for language learners who aim to achieve a native-like English fluency. Although English slang may not be taught in a classroom setting and EFL learners do not have to produce slang language themselves, having at least some basic knowledge of English slang is important for social interaction and media comprehension. It is anticipated that this study will shed some light on this area of language acquisition. The study is also expected to broaden the scope of research on motivation by providing empirical evidence of the connection between slang and integrative motivation in an EFL setting. It is also hoped to be advantageous to those who are associated with language teaching and learning in general and with EFL pedagogy in particular. It may encourage EFL instructors to incorporate some basic slang knowledge in their formal language instruction. The findings of this research may also help curriculum designers to perceive the importance of cultural awareness and integrative motivation in language learning and perhaps make some attempts to raise students’ integrative motivation. Moreover, the study may encourage other
researchers to conduct further studies on this topic, thus enriching both local and international literature.

**Limitations of the Study**

The data and results of this study should be interpreted with regard to the following limitations:

1. The study is confined to Saudi female undergraduate English majors at PSU in Riyadh in the academic year 1432-33/2011-12. Therefore, any generalizations are confined to the population from which the sample was taken, which is not a very large one.

2. The study is restricted to one aspect of language acquisition: slang.

3. The study is limited to American English slang. As English slang differs greatly from one English-speaking country to another and Saudi language learners are more exposed to American English, limiting the study to American English slang is intended to give more valid and precise results.

4. The study is restricted to one aspect of motivation: integrative motivation.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are operationally defined for the purposes of this study:

**Foreign Language (FL):** a language that is indigenous to another country, plays no major role in the community, and is primarily learned only in the classroom (Ellis, 1994).

**Instrumental Motivation:** the desire to learn language for pragmatic gains such as getting a better job (Gardner & Lambert, 1972).

**Integrative Motivation:** the desire to learn language in order to communicate and gain closer contact with the language-speaking community (Gardner & Lambert, 1972).

**Motivation:** “an attribute of the individual describing the psychological qualities underlying behavior with respect to a particular task” (MacIntyre, MacMaster, & Baker, 2001, p. 463).
**Second Language (L2):** a language that is learned after the first language and functions as a recognized means of communication among non-native speakers in a non-native environment (Ellis, 1994).

**Slang:** a variety of language that is usually short-lived, and often belongs to a specific age or social clique, used to define in-groups and out-groups (Coleman, 2004).
Chapter II: Literature Review

To obtain a holistic picture of the issues related to the role of integrative motivation in the acquisition of American English slang by EFL learners, this chapter reviews the literature on the topics of both slang and integrative motivation. The chapter begins with an overview of studies on English slang in first language (L1), L2, and FL research. Next, some studies pertaining to motivation in general, and integrative motivation in particular, and their role in language learning are presented. This, in turn, leads to the link between slang and integrative motivation in the FL context.

Slang

Slang has been a subject deemed worthy of attention by many scholars. Numerous studies have been performed on slang. Most have been conducted in the L1 context, and fewer in the L2 context. The FL context, however, has received minimal research attention.

Slang in L1

In L1 slang research, a number of sociolinguistic variables have been examined. Gender and age are two major variables among them. Regarding gender, many studies have detected minor differences between females and males’ L1 slang (Grossman & Tucker, 1997; Labov, 1992). In terms of age, however, significant differences have been detected (Barbieri, 2008).

Labov (1992) carried out a study on high school adolescent slang in the United States. Gender was one of the main variables of the study. Among a number of findings, the study showed minor differences between the two genders in terms of the semantic categories of slang terms which they knew.

Another study was conducted in the United States by Grossman and Tucker (1997). The study investigated gender differences in the knowledge and use of slang among female and male graduates. All participants reported all the slang terms they knew to describe both genders, how many terms they used, and how frequently they used them. Overall, the results showed that
males listed more terms than females; however, no gender differences were found in the use of slang.

In another study, Barbieri (2008) employed keyword analysis on a large corpus of casual conversation in American English in order to explore age-based linguistic variations in spontaneous conversation. Barbieri found significant differences in the discourse of youth and adults. Younger speakers’ conversations were characterized by an unusually frequent use of slang.

**Slang in L2**

A series of studies related to the acquisition of slang in the L2 context have been conducted (Bembe & Beukes, 2007; Bradford, 2010; Terna-Abah, 2010). Bembe and Beukes (2007) conducted a study on the use of English slang by black youth in Gauteng, a province of South Africa. The study examined the black youth’s social motivations for using this variety of English. Through using examples from a questionnaire and informal interviews, the study explored twofold functions of slang. On the one hand, slang served different linguistic and social functions, such as linguistic innovation, signaling group identity, and fostering solidarity. On the other hand, slang manifested the black youth’s multifaceted identities in an environment in which diverse language and culture groups were in contact.

More recently, Bradford (2010) explored the acquisition of colloquial speech and slang by Spanish English second language (ESL) learners at the University of Texas at El Paso. The researcher used a multiple-choice vocabulary comprehension test to examine the Spanish ESL learners’ acquisition of slang, and determine whether they were acquiring more lexical than phrasal items and if frequency affected L2 acquisition. The test results indicated that ESL learners do acquire slang and that acquiring phrasal colloquial items can be a challenge for them. Results also showed that frequency alone may not be enough for ESL learners to acquire this language variety.
Terna-Abah (2010) examined the prevalence of slang use among Nigerian ESL learners. The study was conducted at the School of Basic and Remedial Studies at Ahmadu Bello University in Funtua, Nigeria. The study results showed that students greatly employ the use of slang that they find it difficult to draw a line between slang and Standard English, thereby affecting their performance and mastery of Standard English. Results also showed that both female and male students use slang in their daily communication, however, males speak more slang than their female counterparts. Another finding was that students’ social background motivated them to use slang. Students from the middle class who were exposed to TV and radio and possessed mobile phones were motivated to use slang. Age was another variable that affected the students’ use of slang. Students between the ages of twenty and twenty-five were more motivated to use slang than those below and above that age. Popular culture also contributed to the prevalence of slang use among the students. Students who have access to all the sources of popular culture, namely films, internet, television, radio, music, fashion, magazines showed an increase use of slang.

**Slang in FL**

The literature cited above examined the acquisition of slang in L1 and L2 contexts. As far as slang in the FL context is concerned, few studies have been carried out (Charkova, 2007; Ríos-Ramírez, 2006).

In a study conducted in Puerto Rico, Ríos-Ramírez (2006) aimed at providing Puerto Rican English teachers with materials through which they could introduce the informal style of English with a special focus on slang. To achieve that, the author developed a teaching unit of informal style consisting of six lesson plans. While teaching the unit, she observed students’ reactions to it. She also analyzed the slang elicited in the teaching unit through a free-written exercise. What the author found interesting was that the students demonstrated positive reactions
to the unit. In the free-written exercise, they were able to produce a large number of slang terms in English, Spanglish, and Spanish.

In another study of FL slang acquisition, Charkova (2007) examined the acquisition of English slang by two age groups of Bulgarian EFL learners; high school and university students. The instrument employed included knowledge tests of English slang terms and questions about attitudes toward English slang, sources and reasons for learning English slang, methods employed in learning English slang, and context of use. These issues were examined in view of gender and age differences. Results showed minor gender differences. In terms of age, however, significant differences were found. In the knowledge tests, the high school students’ production of slang was better than the university students’. The university students, however, outperformed the high school students on the receptive knowledge test. The functional analysis of the elicited slang corpus revealed the high school students’ knowledge of a great number of vulgar/offensive slang terms. On the other hand, knowledge of non-vulgar slang was more markedly associated with the university students. In respect of attitudes toward English slang, the high school students had significantly higher means for the covert prestige and the image projection factors. For sources for learning English slang, both groups indicated the same main sources as providers of slang. Regarding reasons for learning English slang, the main motive of the younger students was to express themselves better in English. For the older students, knowledge of English slang was viewed as a code giving them access to certain aspects of the FL culture and less as a mark of membership to a particular speech community of peers. Results also showed that both age groups relied mainly on their intuition and guessing ability or used the Bulgarian subtitles in the movies they watched to learn English slang. Concerning the context of use, for the high school students using English slang seemed to have become a natural part of their in-group interactions. English slang, however, did not really enter the daily interactions of the university students.
Motivation

The level of success in acquiring an L2/FL is affected by many factors. Among these, motivation has been proven to play a vital role. Although the term “motivation” has frequently been used by many researchers, there is still little agreement on the exact definition of motivation, its components, and the different roles these components play (Dörnyei, 1998). With respect to language learning, Gardner (1985a) defined motivation as “the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes toward learning the language” (p. 10).

The seminal work of Gardner and Lambert laid the foundation for a large body of research on motivation and its relation to L2 acquisition. Gardner and Lambert (1972) proposed a socio-educational model of L2 acquisition highlighting the role of motivation in L2 acquisition. In this model, a number of components are measured, using what is called the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB). The original formulations of the major concepts of the AMTB were developed by Gardner (1958, 1960) and later extended by Gardner and Lambert (1972) (Gardner, 1985b). Figure 1 presents the socio-educational model showing the connection between its constructs and the AMTB measures.

*Figure 1. The socio-educational model with indicators by Gardner (2006)*
This version of the AMTB was developed by Gardner (2006). The first component is attitudes toward the learning situation, measured by two factors: attitudes toward the teacher and attitudes toward the class. The second component is integrativeness, measured by three factors: integrative orientation, interest in foreign languages, and attitudes toward the target language group. The third component is instrumentality, measured by one factor: instrumental orientation. These three basic components are said to have an indirect influence on language learners’ achievement mediated through motivation, which is also measured by three factors: motivational intensity, desire to learn the target language, and attitudes toward learning the target language. Language anxiety, measured by two factors (language class anxiety and language use anxiety), is also said to influence and be influenced by language achievement (Gardner, 2006).

The basic construct of Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) socio-educational model classifies motivation into two orientations: instrumental and integrative.

The orientation is said to be instrumental in form if the purposes of language study reflect the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievements, such as getting ahead in one’s occupation. In contrast, the orientation is integrative if the student wishes to learn more about the other cultural community because he is interested in it in an open-minded way, to the point of eventually being accepted as a member of that other group (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 3).

**Motivation in L2**

A vast number of studies have been conducted to determine how motivation affects L2 learning success. Many of these studies have shown a strong correlation between motivation and L2 achievement.

Some researchers have proclaimed integrative motivation to be a predictor of linguistic achievement (Csizer & Dörnyei, 2005; Gardner, 1985a; Gardner, Smythe, Clément, & Gliksman, 1976; Lambert, 1974; Noels, 2001; Noels, Clément, & Pelletier, 1999; Svanes, 1987). Studies
revealed that L2 learners with higher integrative motivation achieved better results in language proficiency tests than those with lower integrative motivation (Gardner, Lalonde, & Pierson, 1983; Spolsky, 1969). Integratively motivated learners have less language anxiety, hold a more self-directed view of English language learning, and thus become more successful language learners than instrumentally motivated learners (Richards, 1994).

Conversely, other studies have shown that L2 learners with an instrumental motivation scored higher despite their lack of desire to integrate with the L2 culture (Oller, Baca & Vigil, 1977, as cited in Khan 2007, 5). Consistently with this idea, some researchers believed motivation to be more classroom-based (Clemént, Dörnyie, & Noels, 1994).

**Motivation in FL**

Other researchers have directed their attention to motivation in the FL context. In some studies, such as Greer (1996), Khan (2007), and Yu & Watkins (2008), it was found that integratively motivated language learners were more successful language learners. Some researchers, such as Benson (1991), Yang (2008), and Degang (2010), even showed that the correlation between integrative motivation and achievement was uniformly higher than that between instrumental motivation and achievement.

A large number of researchers, however, argued that instrumental motivation may be more important for foreign language learners (FLLs). Such researchers challenged Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) socio-educational model claiming that their theory was not applicable in the FL context. The main reason behind their argument is that as FLLs have limited exposure to the FL culture and less direct contact with the native FL speakers, they are less likely to integrate with the FL community (Au, 1988; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 1990, 1994; Ehrman, Leaver, & Oxford, 2003; Liu, 2007; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Rahman, 2005; Vaezi, 2008). In further support of this finding, Shaw (1981) claimed that integrative motivation plays a minor role in EFL contexts because English is considered an international language rather than a
language inseparably connected to certain countries. In many places learners do not get the chance to interact with the target language speakers (Shaw, 1981).

**Arab ESL Learners’ Motivation**

A considerable amount of research has been undertaken to investigate Arab ESL learners’ motivation and attitudes toward English (Abbashar, 1977; Abu-Rabia, 1996; Suleiman, 1993). In the United States, Abbashar (1977) conducted an early study on Arab graduate and undergraduate students learning English at Indiana University. The results revealed that neither instrumental nor integrative motivation contributed significantly to English language achievement. Within the same context, Suleiman (1993) examined the motivation of Arab students learning English at Arizona State University. The study indicated that students had no integrative motivation. They demonstrated greater emphasis on instrumental reasons for learning English. In the contexts of Israel and Canada, Abu-Rabia (1996) investigated the motivation of minority Arab ESL students. Overall, the results revealed that males were more integratively motivated than females.

**Arab EFL Learners’ Motivation**

Arab learners’ motivation to learn English has also been investigated in the FL context (Abdel-Hafez, 1994; Dwaik & Shehadeh, 2010; Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy, 1996; Zughoul & Taminian, 1984). In Jordan, two studies were conducted to investigate the motivation of Yarmouk University students toward learning English. The first study, conducted by Zughoul and Taminian (1984), showed that motivation involved in learning and using English in Jordan was instrumental in nature. In the other study, Abdel-Hafez (1994) demonstrated that males were significantly more integratively motivated than females.

In Egypt, Schmidt et al. (1996) investigated the motivation of Egyptian university students learning English at the American University in Cairo. The researchers concluded that students’ attitudes toward the FL culture and its native speakers influenced their FL acquisition.
A more recent study was carried out by Dwaik and Shehadeh (2010) in Palestine. The researchers examined the motivation of Palestinian college students in the city of Hebron. Results showed that none of the participants displayed an integrative motivation to learn English. Instrumental motivation was more likely to correlate with language achievement.

With regard to the Arab States of the Gulf, many studies on motivation have taken place (Albassam, 1987; Alhuqbani, 2009; AlMaiman, 2005; Alnasari & Lori, 1999; Al-Quyadi, 2000; Al-Shalabi, 1982; Al-Tamimi & Shuib, 2009; Dhaif-Allah, 2005; Makrami, 2010; Mulla, 1979; Qashoa, 2006; Voget & Oliver, 1998). In Kuwait, Al-Shalabi (1982) investigated the motivation of Kuwaiti university students. Results showed that the majority displayed strong instrumental motivation. Within the same Kuwaiti context, Voget and Oliver (1998) conducted a study of Kuwaiti Medical School students and reached the same conclusion.

In Bahrain, Alnasari and Lori (1999) conducted a study on English and Arabic major students in the College of Arts at the University of Bahrain. Results revealed that English majors had more positive attitudes toward English than those majoring in Arabic. Arabic majors were more likely to be instrumentally motivated to learn English.

In Yemen, Al-Quyadi (2000) investigated the motivation of English majors at Sana University. The study findings showed that students tended to have positive attitudes toward English and the use of English in the Yemeni social and educational contexts. The students had a high level of both instrumental and integrative motivation toward English. Within the same context, Al-Tamimi and Shuib (2009) examined petroleum engineering students’ motivation and attitudes toward learning English at Hadhramout University of Sciences and Technology. Results revealed the students’ greater support of instrumental reasons for learning English. Although students showed positive attitudes toward the culture of the English world, learning English for integrative reasons seemed to have the least impact on their English language motivation.
In the United Arab Emirates, Qashoa (2006) conducted a study to examine the instrumental and integrative motivation of high school students in Dubai. The study results demonstrated that students seemed to have a higher degree of instrumentality than of integrativeness.

In the Saudi context, a number of studies have also been conducted. Mulla (1979) investigated Saudi male high school students’ instrumental and integrative motivation. Contrary to many studies on motivation, results showed no correlation between motivation and language achievement. The results also revealed that neither instrumental nor integrative motivation applied in the context of SA. Another study conducted by Albassam (1987) investigated the motivation of Saudi female high school students. The study results indicated a more integrative than instrumental motivation, but no correlation between the students’ integrative motivation scores and their achievement scores was found. Their achievement scores were more likely to correlate with their instrumental motivation. AlMaiman (2005) examined the motivation of Saudi male intermediate students. He found that students’ motivation level, including integrative motivation, increased after one year of learning English. Dhaif-Allah (2005) also examined the motivation of Saudi intermediate school students. The study revealed that students displayed both instrumental and integrative motivation and that neither was deemed more important than the other. Another study was carried out by Alhuqbani (2009) to investigate Saudi police officers’ motivation and attitudes toward learning English. Results provided evidence that Saudi police officers were both instrumentally and integratively motivated to learn English; however, they demonstrated a higher degree of instrumental motivation to learn English. Makrami (2010) also examined the motivation of Saudi University students learning English either for specific purposes or general purposes at Jazan University. Inter alia, the study showed no correlation between motivation and final language achievement in the two groups. The study also showed that females were more motivated to learn English than males.
Motivation and the Acquisition of American English Slang

Despite the fact that both instrumental and integrative motivation are essential in language acquisition, it is noticeable that much controversy has arisen among researchers about which kind of motivation plays a more important role in L2/FL acquisition. The contradictory results of the different studies do not, however, lessen the importance of either instrumental or integrative motivation. Instead, they show that both are important in L2/FL acquisition.

It is important to note that as motivation has a strong role in language acquisition, it is logical to assume that motivation also affects slang acquisition. To the researcher’s best knowledge, however, minimal research attention has been directed toward the role of motivation in general, and integrative motivation in particular, in FL slang acquisition.

It is also worth noting that slang was associated in this research with integrative motivation rather than instrumental motivation for many reasons. Slang is considered a lexical innovation within a particular cultural context (Lighter, 1994). It is undoubtedly used as a marker of group membership (de Klerk, 1995; Eble, 1996). In addition, it is rarely studied in a formal language classroom setting but rather acquired through frequent exposure to the target language and direct interaction with the native speakers. Furthermore, its acquisition could be useful to L2/FL language learners for social integration into a community and comprehension of organic media. The main focus of this paper, therefore, is on integrative motivation and whether it affects the acquisition of American English slang by Saudi EFL learners.
Chapter III: Methodology

The present study is an experimental cross-sectional study involving quantitative techniques of data collection and analyses to determine the role of integrative motivation in the receptive and productive knowledge of American English slang among Saudi female undergraduate English majors. To answer the research questions of the study, participants were administered a slang test and a questionnaire. Information about the participants and details of the data collection and analysis methods, designs, and procedures are given in this chapter.

Study Population

The target population of the study is the Saudi female undergraduate English majors at PSU in Riyadh. They have studied English for at least six years before enrolling in the translation program at PSU. Admission into this program is based on successful completion of required orientation courses in the Preparatory Year Program.

Study Sample

The selected sample involves a total of 93 Saudi female students, ranging in age from 18 to 25 years old ($M = 21.58$, $SD = 1.58$). The sample is stratified by two variables: academic major, and university level. They vary on four different levels; freshman level, sophomore level, junior level, and senior level. These levels correspond respectively to beginner, lower intermediate, upper intermediate, and advanced. Two sections were selected randomly from each level.

Instrument

After extensively surveying the literature, the researcher developed a research instrument (Appendix A). The research instrument is composed of a test of American English slang and a questionnaire measuring the participants’ integrative motivation. The instrument is divided into three sections.
Section I. Demographic Information

This section elicits demographic information about the participants, including age, university level, and nationality.

Section II. Slang Test

This section is developed to test participants’ receptive and productive knowledge of American English slang. The section is divided into two sections.

A. Receptive Knowledge Slang Test (RKST)

This section of the slang test consists of a multiple-choice test of twenty commonly used American English slang terms and was especially designed for the study. The test is adapted from a study by Charkova (2007) and developed by the researcher, with the help of two native American speaker consultants.

In selection of the twenty slang terms, three criteria are considered. First, the selected slang terms are American English slang terms. Second, the slang terms are present-day commonly used so participants could have heard them in any everyday American English conversation. Third, they are categorized as non-vulgar terms for cultural and academic reasons.

The slang terms were selected from the following online dictionaries with the help of two native American speaker consultants: (a) Cambridge Dictionaries Online; (b) the Free Dictionary by Farlex; (c) the Online Slang Dictionary; and (d) Wiktionary.

The selected slang terms belong to five categories: nouns, verbs, adjectives, phrasal verbs, and idioms (Appendix B). Four slang terms are given from each category. The terms are presented in short sentences so that their meaning cannot be guessed from the context. Participants were asked to determine their meaning by choosing one of four options. The first option allowed them to indicate that they did not know what the term means, so that the answer could not be guessed. A hint was given to familiarize the participants of the meaning of slang in case they do not know what slang means.
B. Productive Knowledge Slang Test (PKST)

The PKST consists of two parts.

Part 1

The first part of the PKST is adapted from a study by Burdová (2009) with some modifications. Participants were asked to complete a ten-item set providing suitable slang terms that they knew and that were different from those in section (A). In forming the ten-item set, two main criteria were taken into consideration. First, the slang terms are commonly used by native American speakers. Second, the brief entries to these terms are not too specific; thus, participants were given a chance to think of as many slang terms as possible. A hint was also given to remind participants that a slang term could be a single word or a group of words.

Part 2

The second part of the PKST is comprised of a free production task to measure the participants’ productive knowledge of American English slang and determine the semantic categories of the produced slang terms. The free production task is adapted from a study by Charkova (2007) with some modifications. In the original task, participants were asked to provide a maximum of 20 English slang terms, explain their meaning, or provide a translation in Bulgarian. At the end of the task, participants were asked the following question: *Do you know more than 20 English slang words? Yes or No.* In the adapted version of the task, participants were asked to provide a maximum of only five slang terms, explain their meaning, or provide a translation in Arabic. They were also given a hint of the semantic categories of slang terms they might think of.

Section III. Integrative Motivation Questionnaire

This section consists of a self-report questionnaire to elicit data on participants’ integrative motivation. The questionnaire is developed by adapting Gardner and his associates’ AMTB. Gardner (1985b) stated that the AMTB was developed to assess the major affective
components involved in the motivation of English-speaking students learning French as an L2. The test provided a reliable and valid index of the various attitudinal/motivational characteristics that researchers might wish to investigate in different contexts (Gardner, 1985b). The original form of the AMTB enlists 11 subtests, nine of which measure attitudinal and motivational variables associated with L2 learning. Eight of the subtests are designed to measure three primary concepts in the socio-educational model: motivation, integrativeness, and attitudes toward the learning situation (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003). In the AMTB, participants need to respond to a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from $1 = \text{strongly disagree}$ to $7 = \text{strongly agree}$.

Before adapting the AMTB, the researcher requested Gardner’s approval (Appendix C). After attaining Gardner’s approval (Appendix D), some modifications of items and wordings were made to the AMTB. As the study is intended to examine participants’ integrative motivation in particular, only the factors under integrativeness were included in the questionnaire. Two of the three factors measuring integrativeness were used: attitudes toward French Canadians (changed to native English speakers (Americans)), and integrative orientation. Because the main focus of the study is on the acquisition of American English slang, the third factor measuring integrativeness, interest in foreign languages, was narrowed to interest in English language. Under each of the three factors, four positively worded items were used to come up with a twelve-statement questionnaire. In addition, the seven-point Likert scale of Gardner’s original AMTB was adapted into a five-point Likert scale, ranging from $1 = \text{strongly disagree}$ to $5 = \text{strongly agree}$. The reason for altering the scale was that the various values indicated in the questionnaire were more obvious and easier to explain and distinguish in a five-point Likert scale than a seven-point scale. The word "neutral" was also changed to "undecided" to avoid any misunderstandings.
Pilot Study

Before the actual study was conducted, the instrument was piloted on a group of 25 participants. As it was only a pilot study, participants’ level was not a major concern. The purpose of it was to judge the validity and reliability of the instrument. Data were processed with the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) software, version 19 for Windows.

The slang test was face-validated by two native speaker consultants and a jury of English-language specialists at the College of Languages and Translation at both Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University and Princess Nora bint Abdul Rahman University. Validity of the test was further calculated with Pearson Correlation coefficient. Items with correlation coefficients of less than 0.31 were disregarded. As regard the questionnaire, the validity of Gardner’s questionnaire was supported (Gardner, 2006). The validity was also calculated with Pearson Correlation coefficient. No items were disregarded in the questionnaire because the correlation coefficient between each item and the total score as well as between each of the three factors and the total score was over 0.55, which is an acceptable level.

Participants' answers were also sorted for the sake of reliability. The reliability coefficient of the slang test was calculated with Kuder-Richardson and split-half reliability coefficients. Both methods indicated high satisfactory levels of reliability (Kuder-Richardson = 0.91, Split Half = 0.80). Concerning the questionnaire, the reliability was calculated with Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient. Values for the coefficient alpha also indicated a high satisfactory level (Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.85).

Data Collection

To implement the study successfully, many procedures were carried out. Initially, the researcher and the advisor obtained the approval of both the Dean of the College of Women and the Chairwoman of the English Department at PSU (Appendixes E & F).
The study was conducted in the first semester of the academic year 1432-33/2011-12. PSU lecturers cooperated with the researcher by providing assistance and time from their classes for the study.

Before taking the test and filling out the questionnaire, participants were briefed on the aims of the study. To encourage honest responses, participants were assured that their names would remain anonymous and would be treated with complete confidentiality. Instructions on how to answer the test and fill out the questionnaire were also given. Most participants were enthusiastic about participating, especially after learning that the study was about American English slang. Both the test and questionnaire took approximately 25 minutes to complete.

**Data Analysis**

After participants had completed the test and questionnaire, their answers were computed and then analyzed with SPSS. Data from non-Saudi participants and participants who did not follow directions were excluded.

Participants’ answers to the free production task were further analyzed to determine the semantic categories of the produced slang terms. All produced slang terms were collected. Then, the following online dictionaries were used to decide whether a term could be categorized as slang or not: (a) Cambridge Dictionaries Online; (b) the Free Dictionary by Farlex; (c) the Online Slang Dictionary; and (d) Wiktionary. The elicited terms were rated by two raters, the researcher and a native American speaker. After that, they were categorized into four semantic categories: (a) speech acts; (b) neutral or positive terms; (c) negative non-vulgar terms; and (d) negative vulgar terms.
Chapter IV: Data Analysis and Results

In this chapter, the findings of the study are presented and analyzed. The chapter begins with descriptive statistics for participants’ demographic information. Next, results of the slang test are analyzed followed by the semantic categorization of the produced slang terms. The effect of the participants’ university level on the slang test results is then examined. After that, results of the integrative motivation questionnaire are presented. Finally, correlations between integrative motivation and slang test results are identified. The chapter concludes with answers to the research questions and a discussion of the reported findings.

Statistical Analysis of Results

Demographic Information

The following descriptive statistics define the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 1

Sample Distribution According to University Level

| University Level | Freq. | %  |
|------------------|-------|----|
| Freshman         | 18    | 19.4|
| Sophomore        | 19    | 20.4|
| Junior           | 26    | 28.0|
| Senior           | 30    | 32.2|
| Total            | 93    | 100.0|

As shown in Table 1, the total number of participants is 93: 18 freshman-level students, 19 sophomores, 26 juniors, and 30 seniors.

Slang Test

This section presents participants’ results for the American English slang test. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the two sections constituting the slang test: the receptive knowledge slang test (RKST) and the productive knowledge slang test (PKST).
Table 2

*Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Percentages for the RKST and the PKST*

| Slang Test Section | Mean (M) | Std. Deviation (SD) | %   |
|--------------------|----------|---------------------|-----|
| RKST               | 13.06*   | 5.20                | 65.32 |
| PKST               | 4.42*    | 3.56                | 29.46 |
| Total              | 17.48**  | 7.83                | 49.95 |

*Note. * Maximum score = 20.
**Maximum score = 40.

As indicated in Table 2, results of the slang test demonstrated that the participants’ overall knowledge of American English slang was ($M = 17.48$, $SD = 7.83$). As the maximum score of the whole test was 40, this overall knowledge test score could be considered moderately low, as illustrated in Figure 2. The standard deviation ($SD = 7.83$) showed a reasonable spread of the participants’ scores around the mean. Based on the notion of the normal curve, 94% of the scores fell within two standard deviation above and below the mean; specifically, between the scores 1.82 and 33.14. This clearly shows that few students were able to gain a score as high as 33.14 and few others obtained a score as low as 1.82.

![Figure 2](image)

*Figure 2. Comparison between the maximum score of the slang test and the overall mean score of the RKST and PKST.*

Table 2 also shows that the participants performed better on the RKST ($M = 13.06$, $SD = 5.20$) in comparison with the PKST ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 3.56$). These results indicate that the
participants’ receptive knowledge of American English slang was better than their productive knowledge, as illustrated in Figure 3.

![Figure 3. Comparison between the mean scores of the RKST and PKST.](image)

A paired-sample t-test was conducted to examine if the difference between the RKST and PKST mean scores was statistically significant.

Table 3

| Slang Test Section | N  | M    | SD  | t-value | df  | Sig. |
|--------------------|----|------|-----|---------|-----|------|
| RKST               | 93 | 13.06| 5.20| 19.64   | 92  | 0.01*|
| PKST               | 93 | 4.42 | 3.56|         |     |      |

Note. *p < 0.05.

The paired-sample t-test confirmed that there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the RKST ($M = 13.06$, $SD = 5.20$) and the PKST ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 3.56$) in favor of the RKST; $t = 19.64$.

Moreover, the participants’ mean score on the RKST was 13.06 and the maximum score for this section was 20; therefore, their performance could be characterized as above average. Additionally, their mean score on the PKST was 4.42 out of 20, indicating that their performance was very poor. This latter result is worthy of scrutiny as the PKST consists of two parts. The participants’ poor performance in the PKST might be owed to the nature of the second part of the PKST, the free production task. Unlike the RKST and the first part of the PKST, the free
production task lacks definite stimuli. Tests that lack definite stimuli are seen to be more difficult to answer. In order to examine whether the low scores on the PKST were owed to the free production task, a comparison between the scores of the two parts of the PKST test was performed as shown in Table 4.

Table 4

*Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Percentages for the Two Parts of the PKST*

| PKST Part | M       | SD | %    |
|-----------|---------|----|------|
| Part 1    | 3.39*   | 2.47| 33.87|
| Part 2    | 1.03*   | 1.54| 20.65|
| Total     | 4.42**  | 3.56| 29.46|

*Note.* *Maximum score = 10.*

**Maximum score = 20.**

As indicated in Table 4, the mean score of part 1 of the PKST ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 2.47$) was higher than the mean score of part 2 ($M = 1.03$, $SD = 1.54$). Figure 4 illustrates this difference.

![Figure 4. Comparison between the mean scores of the two parts of the PKST.](image)

A paired-sample t-test was conducted to examine if the difference between the mean scores of the two parts of the PKST was statistically significant.

Table 5

*Paired-sample T-test Comparing the Results of the Two Parts of the PKST*

| PKST Part | N  | M    | SD    | t-value | df  | Sig.  |
|-----------|----|------|-------|---------|-----|-------|
| Part 1    | 93 | 3.39 | 2.47  | 10.93   | 92  | 0.01* |
| Part 2    | 93 | 1.03 | 1.54  |         |     |       |

*Note.* *$p < 0.05.$*
The paired-sample t-test proved that there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of part 1 ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 2.47$) and part 2 ($M = 1.03$, $SD = 1.54$) of the PKST in favor of the first part; $t = 10.93$. From the previous statistical information it is possible to conclude that the nature of the free production task could have been part of the reason behind the low scores on the PKST.

**The Semantic Categories of Freely Produced English Slang Terms**

It is worth noting that the reason for including the free production task was not only to measure the participants’ productive knowledge of American English slang, but also to determine the semantic categories of the freely produced slang terms. Thus, after the freely produced slang terms had been collected and confirmed as American English slang, a corpus of 92 slang terms was compiled. The elicited slang terms were then categorized into four semantic categories (the most frequent terms are cited in parentheses): (a) speech acts (*What’s up? Whatever!*); (b) neutral or positive terms (*cool, awesome*); (c) negative non-vulgar terms (*jerk, nerd*); and (d) negative vulgar terms (*f**k, sh*t*). Negative non-vulgar terms were the most frequent type of slang terms produced by participants ($M = 29.99$, $% = 32.6$), whereas negative vulgar terms were the least frequently produced slang terms ($M = 15.99$, $% = 17.39$). Figure 5 illustrates the mean scores of elicited slang terms per semantic category.

![Figure 5. Mean scores of elicited slang terms per semantic category.](image-url)
Effect of Participants’ University Level on Slang Test Results

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test the effect of the participants’ university level on their performance in the slang test.

Table 6

One-Way Analysis of Variance for the Slang Test Mean Scores According to University Level

| Slang Test  | Source          | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.  |
|-------------|-----------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------|
| RKST        | Between Groups  | 1213.09        | 3  | 404.36      | 0.59   | 0.622 |
|             | Within Groups   | 60877.23       | 89 | 684.01      |        |       |
| PKST        | Between Groups  | 841.99         | 3  | 280.66      | 0.49   | 0.690 |
| (Part 1 + Part 2) | Within Groups | 50920.02       | 89 | 572.14      |        |       |
| Total       | Between Groups  | 942.54         | 3  | 314.18      | 0.62   | 0.604 |
|             | Within Groups   | 50920.02       | 89 | 572.14      |        |       |

Note. p < 0.05

As presented in Table 6, there were no statistically significant differences between participants’ mean scores on the slang test in relation to their university level, $F (3, 89) = 0.62, p = 0.604$. In other words, the participants were not able to develop their knowledge of slang as they progressed through university levels.

Integrative Motivation Questionnaire

This section presents the questionnaire results related to the participants’ integrative motivation to learn English. Participants were asked to respond to twelve items on a five-point Likert scale; 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. The interval width of these values was calculated according to the following equation:

Interval width = \( \frac{\text{Highest value} - \text{Lowest value}}{\text{Number of intervals}} = \frac{5 - 1}{5} = 0.80 \)
Thus, the following ranges were calculated:

Table 7

Ranges for the intervals of the Five-Point Likert Scale

| Attribute                 | Mean Range |
|---------------------------|------------|
| Strongly Agree (SD)       | 4.21-5.00  |
| Agree (A)                 | 3.41-4.20  |
| Undecided (Un)            | 2.61-3.40  |
| Disagree (Dis)            | 1.81-2.60  |
| Strongly Disagree (SD)    | 1.00-1.80  |

Overall mean scores for the three factors of the integrative motivation questionnaire, namely attitudes toward native English speakers (Americans), integrative orientation, and interest English language, are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Three Factors of Integrative Motivation

| Factor                                      | M    | SD  |
|---------------------------------------------|------|-----|
| Attitudes toward Native English Speakers (Americans) | 3.64 | 0.91 |
| Integrative Orientation                      | 4.20 | 0.82 |
| Interest in English Language                 | 3.72 | 0.96 |
| Total                                       | 3.85 | 0.70 |

Table 8 indicates that integrative orientation received the highest mean score among the three factors of integrative motivation ($M = 4.20, SD = 0.82$). On the other hand, attitudes toward native English speakers (Americans) received the lowest mean score ($M = 3.64, SD = 0.91$). Based on the achieved ranges, the statistical analysis of the overall mean scores for the three factors of the integrative motivation shows that participants had a moderately high degree of integrative motivation ($M = 3.85, SD = 0.70$). Figure 6 illustrates the mean scores of the three factors.
Figure 6. Mean scores for the three factors of integrative motivation.

To provide a closer look at the questionnaire results related to the participants’ integrative motivation, Tables 9, 10, and 11 present detailed statistical analyses of each individual factor.

A. Attitudes toward Native English Speakers (Americans)

Table 9

Frequency Distributions, Mean Scores, and Standard Deviations for the Questionnaire Items for Attitudes toward Native English Speakers (Americans)

| Item No. | Statement                                                                 | Freq. | %    | Freq. | %    | Freq. | %    | Freq. | %    | M    | SD  | Rank |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|------|-----|------|
| 1       | Native English speakers (Americans) are a very sociable, warm-hearted    | 11    | 50   | 16    | 14   | 2     | 3.63 | 0.93  | 3    |      |     |      |
|         | and creative people                                                      | 12.2  | 55.6 | 17.8  | 12.2 | 2.2   |      |       |      |      |     |      |
| 2       | I would like to know more native English speakers (Americans)           | 24    | 43   | 10    | 5    | 8     | 3.78 | 1.17  | 1    |      |     |      |
|         |                                                                         | 26.7  | 47.8 | 11.1  | 5.6  | 8.9   |      |       |      |      |     |      |
| 3       | I have always admired the native English speakers (Americans)           | 14    | 32   | 18    | 15   | 8     | 3.33 | 1.21  | 4    |      |     |      |
|         |                                                                         | 16.1  | 36.8 | 20.7  | 17.2 | 9.2   |      |       |      |      |     |      |
| 4       | The more I get to know the native English speakers (Americans), the    | 30    | 37   | 5     | 8    | 10    | 3.77 | 1.31  | 2    |      |     |      |
|         | more I want to be fluent in their language                               | 33.3  | 41.1 | 5.6   | 8.9  | 11.1  |      |       |      |      |     |      |

Overall Mean 3.64
Table 9 displays the participants’ responses to the questionnaire items related to attitudes toward native English speakers (Americans). Item 2 (\(M = 3.78, SD = 1.17\)) and item 4 (\(M = 3.77, SD = 1.31\)) clearly reflect the highest level of agreement among participants, with a very slight difference between them. These results suggest that the participants were eager to know more native English speakers (Americans). They also believed that the more they get to know the native English speakers (the Americans), the more they want to be fluent in their language. In contrast, when asked if they have always admired the native English speakers (Americans), participants showed in item 3 the lowest level of agreement on this factor (\(M = 3.33, SD = 1.21\)).

B. Integrative Orientation

Table 10

Frequency Distributions, Mean Scores, and Standard Deviations for the Questionnaire

| Items for Integrative Orientation |
|----------------------------------|
| Item No. | Statement | SA | A | Un | Dis | SD | M | SD | Rank |
|---------|-----------|----|---|----|-----|----|----|----|------|
| 5       | Studying English is important because it will allow me to be more at ease with other people who speak English | Freq. | 43 | 42 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.34 | 0.85 | 1 |
|         |           | %  | 47.8 | 46.7 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 3.3 |       |      |      |
| 6       | Studying English is important because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people | Freq. | 41 | 35 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 4.20 | 1.00 | 3 |
|         |           | %  | 46.1 | 39.3 | 7.9 | 2.2 | 4.5 |       |      |      |
| 7       | Studying English is important because it will allow me to better understand and appreciate English books, movies, TV programs, and songs. | Freq. | 44 | 38 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.27 | 1.01 | 2 |
|         |           | %  | 48.9 | 42.2 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 5.6 |       |      |      |
| 8       | Studying English is important because it will enable me to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups | Freq. | 34 | 34 | 13 | 5 | 4 | 3.99 | 1.08 | 4 |
|         |           | %  | 37.8 | 37.8 | 14.4 | 5.6 | 4.4 |       |      |      |
| Overall Mean | | | | | | | | | 4.20 |
Table 10 illustrates participants’ responses to the questionnaire items related to integrative orientation. The participants admitted that studying English is important because it will allow them to be more at ease with other people who speak English. This item shows the highest level of agreement on this factor and among all twelve items of the questionnaire ($M = 4.34, SD = 0.85$).

On the other hand, the lowest mean score ($M = 3.99, SD = 1.08$) is shown in item 8, suggesting that the participants were less likely to support the idea that studying English is important because it will enable them to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups.

C. Interest in English Language

Table 11

*Frequency Distributions, Mean Scores, and Standard Deviations for the Questionnaire
*Items for Interest in English Language

| Item No. | Statement                                                                 | Freq. % | V | A | Un | Dis | SD | M   | SD   | Rank |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---|---|----|-----|----|-----|------|------|
|         | I prefer to read English literature in its original form rather than Arabic translations |         | 27 | 30 | 13 | 9   | 8   | 3.68 | 1.27  | 3     |
|         | I often like to listen to English songs more than Arabic songs            |         | 24 | 17 | 12 | 22  | 15  | 3.14 | 1.47  | 4     |
|         | I often like to watch English TV channels more than Arabic TV channels    |         | 32 | 31 | 11 | 11  | 5   | 3.82 | 1.20  | 2     |
|         | I prefer watching English movies to Arabic ones                            |         | 51 | 25 | 3  | 4   | 7   | 4.21 | 1.20  | 1     |
| Overall Mean |                                                                        |         |    |    |    |     |     | 3.72 |      |      |

Table 11 depicts the participants’ responses to the questionnaire items related to interest in English language. The participants’ highest level of agreement on this factor is shown in item
Participants admitted that they prefer watching English movies to Arabic ones. The most interesting item in this factor is item number 10, which shows the lowest mean score among all twelve questionnaire items ($M = 3.14, SD = 1.47$). Participants preferred to listen to English songs than Arabic songs.

**Correlations between Integrative Motivation and Slang Test Results**

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between the participants’ integrative motivation and their mean scores on the American English slang test. Results of these correlations are presented in Table 12.

| Factor                                      | RKST | PKST  | Total  |
|---------------------------------------------|------|-------|--------|
| 1. Attitudes toward Native English Speakers (Americans) | -0.12| -0.23*| -0.18  |
| 2. Integrative Orientation                  | -0.08| -0.01 | -0.05  |
| 3. Interest in English Language             | 0.39**| 0.3** | 0.39** |
| Total                                       | 0.1  | 0.04  | 0.08   |

Note. * $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$

As shown in Table 12, the first factor of integrative motivation, attitudes toward the native English speakers (Americans), correlated negatively with the results of both the RKST and the PKST. The negative correlation was significant between the participants’ attitudes toward the native English speakers (Americans) and the PKST, $r = -0.23$, $p < 0.05$, but the significance was weak. As regards the overall slang test result, the correlation was negative, but not significant, $r = -0.18$. 

Note that the table and calculation are based on the given data and the described methodology.
Negative correlations were also found between integrative orientation and both the RKST and the PKST. Both negative correlations were non-significant. As can be seen, no significant effect was found for integrative orientation in the overall slang test result, $r = -0.05$.

Regarding the third factor, significant positive correlations were shown between interest in English language and both sections of the test: RKST, $r = 0.39$, $p < 0.01$, and PKST, $r = 0.3$, $p < 0.01$. The highest and more positive correlation among the two sections was found in the RKST. To put it simply, interest in English language correlated significantly and positively with the overall slang test result, $r = 0.39$, $p < 0.01$. The correlation was very weak, however.

Taken together, the correlations between the three factors of integrative motivation and the two sections of the slang test were almost non-existent, $r = 0.1$, $r = 0.04$, respectively. Consequently, no significant correlation was found between the three factors and the overall slang test result, $r = 0.08$. In sum, the results in Table 12 reveal that there was no role of integrative motivation in the students’ overall comprehension and production of American English slang.
Answers to Research Questions and Discussion of Results

To reach the final conclusion of the study, the research questions are answered in this section.

**Research Question # 1**

What is the extent of PSU students’ knowledge of American English slang?

The findings of the slang test showed that PSU students’ overall knowledge of American English slang was moderately low ($M = 17.48$, $SD = 7.83$) as the maximum score of the whole test was 40. The results also indicated that PSU students’ receptive knowledge of American English slang was better than their productive knowledge. The paired-sample t-test confirmed that there was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores between the RKST and PKST. These latter results confirm those of Webb (2008), who investigated the relationship between L2 learners’ receptive and productive vocabulary size. The results of Webb’s study indicated that total receptive vocabulary size was larger than productive vocabulary.

A possible interpretation for the findings is that, like most Saudi EFL learners, PSU students are exposed to varieties of English; however, they find it difficult to practice the English they acquire. The classroom setting is almost the only opportunity for them to practice English. They also have no, or little, contact with native English speakers except in a few situations. This, in turn, affects their English language productive skills in general and their production of English slang in particular.

**Research Question # 2**

Are there any statistically significant differences between the students’ achievement mean scores on parts 1 and 2 of the PKST?

The paired-sample t-test confirmed that there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the two parts of the PKST in favor of the first part. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the nature of the second part of the PKST as a free production task
could have contributed more to the participants’ low scores on the PKST than their limited knowledge of the English slang variety as shown by the overall mean score of the two parts combined.

**Research Question # 3**

What types of English slang terms do PSU students know?

The reason for including the free production task was not only to measure the students’ productive knowledge of American English slang, but also to determine the semantic categories of the freely produced slang terms. The elicited 92 freely produced slang terms were categorized into four semantic categories: (a) speech acts; (b) neutral or positive terms; (c) negative non-vulgar terms; and (d) negative vulgar terms. Findings showed that negative non-vulgar terms were predominant in the elicited corpus, whereas negative vulgar terms were the least frequently produced slang terms. The reason why negative vulgar slang terms were at the end of the scale might lie within the Saudi context and its conservative culture. Despite the fact that students do use vulgar terms in Arabic and English, it was difficult for them to write such terms down in the slang test. This can be seen in the students’ reactions in and during the slang test. When providing vulgar terms, many students inserted random symbols such as an asterisk (*), a dollar ($), a hash (#), a percent (%), and an exclamation mark (!). Some students wrote “the F word” instead of writing the term itself. A student also wrote, “I’m sorry” near a vulgar term she provided. In addition, some students asked questions like “Are you sure we’re allowed to provide any terms, even bad ones?”

Some other observations emerged in the process of scoring the data from the free production task as follows:

- Some interjections (e.g., *Ouch*, *Wow*, *Oops*, and *Yuck*) were produced. Although there was a controversy whether or not to consider interjections part of language, some slang dictionaries considered them part of the language slang such as the Online Slang
Dictionary and the Free Dictionary by Farlex. According to Wharton (2003, p.16), interjections “seem to fit the speech-act framework, in that there appears to be an attitude, emotional or otherwise, being conveyed toward the proposition expressed.” Therefore, such terms were categorized as speech acts.

- Some terms have both positive and negative meanings. For example, the term (sly) could be used to describe either a cool or a deceptive person. Such terms were categorized according to the provided explanation/translation.

- Some terms have negative meanings (e.g., wicked, sick, ridiculous, and crazy), but when used as slang terms, their meanings are reserved. Therefore, they were categorized as positive terms.

- Some markers were used by the students for emphasis, such as a final exclamation mark (e.g., Bleh!), a final combination of a question mark and an exclamation mark (e.g., What the hell?!), capitalization (e.g., HOT), and letter multiplication (e.g., Whatevrrrr).

- Alterations were made to some terms to give them a more slang-like nuance. For example, substitution (What’s up? became Wuz up?), blending (chill and relax became chillax), and clipping (brother became bro and fabulous became fab).

- A considerable number of informal terms (e.g., hi and dad) as well as formal Standard English terms (e.g. hilarious, and amazing) were provided. Providing such terms showed that some students found it difficult to draw a line between formal English, informal English, and slang. This finding confirms Terna-Abah’s (2010) finding that Nigerian ESL learners faced the same problem.

- Some very novel slang terms were used (e.g., Bazinga!) taken from the American TV show The Bing Bang Theory which showed the students’ exposure to contemporary American media.
• When providing examples of English slang, a literal translation of Arabic slang terms was sometimes used. For example, terms like (turtle), (cold), and (Sudanese) were used to describe a lazy person. Equivalent Arabic translations of such terms are often used to describe a lazy person in the Saudi culture, but such terms are never used in English. Therefore, these terms were disregarded.

Research Question # 4

Are there any statistically significant differences in the students’ achievement mean scores on the American English slang test attributable to their university level?

Results of the ANOVA showed no statistically significant differences in the students’ mean scores on the slang test in relation to their university level. This confirms that the students’ knowledge of American English slang did not develop strongly enough as they progress through university levels. This could be attributed to the fact that the students were exposed to formal English rather than English slang in the language classroom setting and that the slang variety of English is not usually taught in a language classroom, but rather acquired from sources such as media and direct contact with native English speakers. All in all, university level has no effect on students’ proficiency in English slang.

Research Question # 5

What is the level of PSU students’ integrative motivation?

Results of the questionnaire showed that PSU students had a moderately high degree of integrative motivation. This finding confirms the findings of Al-Quyadi (2000) that proved that EFL Arab learners could have a high degree of integrative motivation. Such finding contradicts those of Mulla (1979), Al-Tamimi and Shuib (2009), and Dwaik and Shehadeh (2010), however, which indicated that EFL Arab learners had the lowest level of integrative motivation. Neither does the finding support the claim of Au (1988), Crookes and Schmidt, (1991), Dörnyei (1994), Oxford and Shearin (1994), Ehrman et al. (2003), Rahman (2005), Liu (2007), or Vaezi (2008),...
who challenged Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) socio-educational model and argued that FLLs are less likely to integrate with the FL community owing to their limited exposure to the FL culture and less direct contact with native FL speakers.

Taking each factor individually, integrative orientation received the highest mean score among the three factors of the integrative motivation whereas attitudes toward native English speakers (Americans) received the lowest mean score.

Concerning the students’ responses to the questionnaire items related to attitudes toward native English speakers (Americans), their scores reflected the highest level of agreement with the idea that they were eager to know more native English speakers (Americans) and that the more they get to know the native English speakers (the Americans), the more they want to be fluent in their language. It was not surprising that students, at this young age, are keen to know more native English speakers and become fluent in their language. It is also worth mentioning that the students are English majors, so being surrounded by the English language and exposed to the culture of native English speakers might be another reason for their willingness to know more native English speakers (Americans) and become fluent in their language. In contrast, when asked if they have always admired the native English speakers (Americans), students showed the lowest level of agreement on this factor, supporting the findings of Dwaik and Shehadeh (2010). A reason for such lower score regarding this item might be the cultural, religious, and political diversity of the American speech community. The status of the students’ mother tongue (Arabic), the language of their religion (Islam) and its holy book (the Quran), as stated by Alabdan (1986), could have affected their accepting tendencies of the American native speakers. In his analysis of the motivation of Saudi public school EFL learners, Alabdan indicated that the students’ mother tongue (Arabic), which is associated with the glorious Islamic civilization and the great Arabian heritage, could affect their motivation and accepting tendencies of the English culture. Qashoa also (2006) argued that political, religious, and socio-
cultural factors are “crucial” in influencing Arab students' motivation for learning English, and that seems to pertain to historical, political, and religious considerations.

When responding to the questionnaire items related to integrative orientation, the students admitted that studying English is important because it will allow them to be more at ease with other people who speak English, showing the highest level of agreement on this factor and among all twelve items of the questionnaire. The students’ high support of this item might be owed to the assumption that studying a non-native language is seen to help decrease the learners’ language anxiety level (Gardner, 2006), giving them more confidence, and allowing them to be more comfortable when communicating with other people who speak that language. On the other hand, the students were less likely to support the idea that studying English is important because it will enable them to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups. The low level of agreement might have to do with the Saudi constrained EFL context. Although there is a considerable number of native English speakers living in SA, students rarely have direct contact with them and other cultural groups; thus, they hardly have a chance to participate in such activities.

With regard to their responses to the questionnaire items on interest in English language, the students’ highest score was given to the idea that they prefer watching English movies to Arabic ones. This finding confirms the finding of Al-Tamimi and Shuib (2009) which showed Yemeni EFL students’ interest in the culture of the English-speaking world as represented in their movies. Given the advanced movie-making of the English world, it is not surprising that the students showed favorable attitudes towards English movies. In addition, many ESL and EFL learners find it beneficial for their English language proficiency to be exposed to English language media, especially movies. Consequently, they are more likely to broaden their cultural horizons and become familiar with varieties of English. The effect of globalization can also be seen in their favorable attitudes toward this item. Conversely, when students were asked if they
preferred *to listen to English songs more than Arabic songs*, they showed the lowest degree of agreement on this factor and among all twelve items. Interpretation of such lower mean score could be justified with regard to two barriers, linguistic and cultural. From a linguistic point of view, the students might find it difficult to understand the lyrics of the English songs and this could have affected their favorable attitudes towards this item. From a cultural perspective, the students might be so fond of their Arabic culture, art, and music that English songs do not appeal to them.

**Research Question # 6**

Are there any statistically significant differences in the students’ achievement mean scores on the American English slang test attributable to their integrative motivation?

Results of a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient revealed no significant correlation between integrative motivation and the overall slang test result. As mentioned earlier, minimal research attention has been directed toward the role of integrative motivation in EFL slang acquisition. However, as the acquisition of slang is part of language acquisition, it is possible to associate the study with the literature on language acquisition in general. Thus, it is possible to state that the overall result of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient confirms the findings of research on Arab ESL contexts (Abbashar, 1977) and the Saudi EFL context (Albassam, 1987; Makrami, 2010; Mulla, 1979), which found no correlation between integrative motivation and English language achievement. The finding is inconsistent, however, with Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) socio-educational model and Gardner’s (1988) claim that "the role of attitudes and motivation should be consistent in many different contexts” (p.112). The finding also contradicts several previous research findings in L2 contexts (Csizer & Dörnyei, 2005; Gardner, 1985a; Gardner et al., 1976, 1983; Lambert, 1974; Noels, 2001; Noels et al., 1999; Spolsky, 1969; Svanes, 1987), and FL contexts (Greer, 1996; Khan, 2007; Yu & Watkins, 2008) which proclaimed integrative motivation to be a predictor of linguistic achievement.
The absence of correlation between integrative motivation and the overall slang test result was not expected, but it might be a result of the EFL context. Gardner and Lambert based their socio-educational model on surveys conducted in L2 contexts where the target language is acquired through direct exposure and frequent interaction with its native speakers. This is not the case in SA. In SA, English is considered an FL and is taught in a classroom setting with few opportunities for direct contact with native English speakers and minimal authentic language use situations. Dörnyei (1990) confirmed this fact in his argument that many results obtained from L2 contexts may not be applicable in FL contexts. Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) postulated that the “effect of attitudes might be much stronger in such a context where there is much more of an opportunity for contact between learners and TL speakers than in a foreign language context where the opportunities are more limited” (p.177).

Contrary to expectation and to the results of previous studies, negative correlations were found between the first two factors of integrative motivation; attitudes toward native English speakers (Americans) and integrative orientation, and the slang test results. The negative correlation was even significant between the participants’ attitudes toward the native English speakers (the Americans) and the PKST, but the significance was weak. The students’ educational level and their major might justify these findings. Being undergraduate English majors, students seek to achieve better exam results. Therefore, once they start studying English as a college major, they become more interested in exposing themselves to formal English than acquiring slang. Thus, it is possible to conclude that instrumental motives, i.e., students’ need to function effectively in their academic domain, might have interfered with their desire to acquire English slang.

It is worth mentioning, however, that a weak significant correlation was found between the third factor, interest in English Language, and the students’ slang test results. This finding was the only reaffirmation of Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) socio-educational model on the role
that integrative motivation plays in language acquisition. A possible interpretation is that compared with the first two factors of integrative motivation, interest in English Language is more related to the English language itself and its value as an international lingua franca than its culture and native speakers. When language learners are interested in the target language itself, regardless of whether or not they are interested in its culture and native speakers, it is logical to assume that they will be more motivated to achieve better language outcomes.
Chapter V: Summary, Implications, and Recommendations

In this chapter, the study findings are summarized. The study limitations are also presented, followed by recommendations for future research. Finally, a conclusion is drawn from the study results.

Summary of the Findings

This study aims at measuring EFL learners’ knowledge of American English slang and providing empirical evidence of the relationship between EFL learners’ receptive and productive knowledge of American English slang and their university level and integrative motivation. In order to achieve these objectives, a total of 93 Saudi female undergraduate English majors at PSU participated in the study. The students were given a test on American English slang and a questionnaire measuring their integrative motivation. The test results demonstrated that the students’ knowledge of American English slang was moderately limited. The results also revealed that their receptive knowledge of American English slang was better than their productive knowledge. The results of the questionnaire showed that the students’ integrative motivation level was moderately high. No effect of university level on their knowledge of American English slang was found. The research proves fairly conclusively that integrative motivation has no role in PSU Saudi female undergraduate English majors’ acquisition of English slang.

Implications and Recommendations

The theoretical framework of the study, as well as its findings, is believed to be significant for theoretical, pedagogical, and socio-educational reasons. From a theoretical point of view, it is hoped that the study with its new setting will provide more relevant data on FL literature, filling the gap in slang research, and providing empirical evidence of the connection between slang and integrative motivation in an EFL setting.
From a pedagogical point of view, it is hoped that the research will attract EFL instructors and curriculum designers’ attention to the inclusion of slang in EFL classrooms. Many EFL learners find difficulties in following the slang used in the conversations of native English speakers; therefore, introducing EFL learners to some common appropriate slang will serve to enhance their media comprehension and informal communication. Introducing EFL learners to some common slang may also increase their interest in learning English and their involvement in the language classroom activities. Lieb (2009) stated that if students feel that what they study is relevant to their lives, and usable in their communication with native speakers, they will become more motivated to study. This can be achieved by developing some lesson plans whereby EFL learners can be exposed to more media sources such as movies, TV programs, newspapers, and magazines. When slang is included in EFL classrooms, learners’ attention should be drawn to the differences between formal English, informal English, and slang. EFL learners should be able to distinguish among these language varieties and know where and when to use each of them.

From a socio-educational viewpoint, it is hoped that the study will emphasize the importance of stimulating EFL learners’ integrative motivation and positive attitudes towards the EFL language, culture, and people. EFL learners should be educated on how to accept the EFL culture despite its religious, social, and political diversity. They should keep in mind that their openness and accepting tendencies towards any foreign culture does not have to mean adopting its values. They should know that it is possible to accept and integrate with a foreign community while maintaining their original identities. In order to stimulate EFL learners’ integrative motivation, attempts should be made to establish direct contact between EFL learners and native speakers. For example, promoting social networking, organizing multicultural activities, hosting native guest speakers, and arranging some visits to foreign countries, if possible, as Qashoa (2006) suggested.
Several directions for future research can be drawn from the previous conclusions and implications:

1. The study could be replicated on a larger number of participants to give a broader picture of the investigated phenomena.
2. The study could also be replicated on Saudi male students to investigate the effect of gender on the acquisition of slang among Saudi EFL learners.
3. As the study was conducted among English majors, the students’ instrumental motives might have interfered with their desire to acquire English slang. Therefore, replicating the study on students from other majors is recommended.
4. It is also recommended that the study be replicated in other Arab countries to see how well the results could be generalized to other Arab EFL contexts.
5. Because the study was conducted among Saudi EFL students, conducting similar studies on Saudi ESL students is suggested. This will create a more comprehensive idea of the role of language context on the study outcomes.
6. The slang test used in this study can be developed and reused in other similar studies. This will give the research an opportunity to contribute to the literature on FL acquisition.
7. Further research is needed to investigate instructors’ attitudes towards the use of slang in their FL teaching.

**Conclusion**

As mentioned earlier, the majority of research on slang has tapped onto the connection between slang and a number of variables, such as gender and age. Most of this research has been carried out in L1 or L2 language contexts. To the researcher’s best knowledge, this study is one of the first to be conducted in an EFL context to provide some valuable insights regarding EFL learners’ knowledge of American English slang and provide empirical evidence of the
relationship between students’ receptive and productive knowledge of American English slang and their university level and integrative motivation.

The uniqueness of the study lies in its FL context, its focus on the slang variety of language, and its non-supportive evidence of Gardner and Lambert’s socio-educational model of L2 acquisition. The study is hoped to make a contribution toward deepening our understanding of integrative motivation. However, it is important to keep in mind that many factors that could have affected the participants’ integrative motivation, other than the ones tested in the study, were neglected owing to the limit of the study’s theoretical framework and the intangible psychological nature of motivation in general and integrative motivation in particular. Thus, future research is needed to give a consistent picture of integrative motivation and its role in the acquisition of English slang as only the tip of the iceberg has been discovered.
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Appendix A

Research Instrument

Instructions

“Slang is very informal language that is usually spoken rather than written, used especially by particular groups of people, usually in informal situations.”

We would like to ask you to help us by answering the following questions concerning the acquisition of American English slang by Saudi female undergraduate English majors. Please read each question carefully, and answer all questions to the best of your knowledge. Remember that this is not a test. Your responses should provide truthful information.

I. Personal Information

1. How old are you?

2. What is your university level?
   - [ ] Freshman Level
   - [ ] Sophomore Level
   - [ ] Junior Level
   - [ ] Senior Level

3. Where are you from?

   …………………
II. Test
A) Identify the meaning of the following underlined English slang terms. Please do not guess their meaning. If you feel that you do not know the meaning of some terms, just circle option (a) I don’t know its meaning.

1. That boy is a real geek.
   a) I don’t know its meaning   b) a happy person
   c) a funny person            d) an awkward person

2. It takes a lot of guts to play this game.
   a) I don’t know its meaning   b) money
   c) effort                    d) courage

3. She needs a shrink.
   a) I don’t know its meaning   b) a holiday
   c) a diet                    d) a psychiatrist

4. The program I watched yesterday was a real riot.
   a) I don’t know its meaning   b) very sad
   c) very popular              d) very funny

5. You ditched me.
   a) I don’t know its meaning   b) helped
   c) left                      d) hit

6. He’s been bugging me all day.
   a) I don’t know its meaning   b) judging
   c) annoying                  d) cheering me up

7. The baby has been whining all day long.
   a) I don’t know its meaning   b) playing
   c) complaining              d) singing

8. This game really sucks.
   a) I don’t know its meaning   b) it’s really bad
   c) it’s really loud          d) it’s really great

9. The guy was so creepy.
   a) I don’t know its meaning   b) nice
   c) scary                    d) happy

10. I feel so blue today.
    a) I don’t know its meaning  b) cold
    c) sad                      d) sick
11. In this coffee shop, the coffee is totally **gross**.
   a) I don’t know its meaning
   b) strong
   c) disgusting
   d) delicious

12. The party was pretty **lame**.
   a) I don’t know its meaning
   b) exciting
   c) well-organized
   d) bad

13. My sister always **cracks** me **up**.
   a) I don’t know its meaning
   b) helps me
   c) makes me laugh uncontrollably
   d) cheers me up

14. These are some tips that may help you **chill out**.
   a) I don’t know its meaning
   b) get better
   c) relax
   d) stay fit

15. How could she **screw up** like that?
   a) I don’t know its meaning
   b) lie
   c) make a mistake
   d) fall

16. Don’t **mess with** me!
   a) I don’t know its meaning
   b) make me angry
   c) misunderstand
   d) help

17. The food was **off the hook**.
   a) I don’t know its meaning
   b) great
   c) bad
   d) free

18. I **have your back**.
   a) I don’t know its meaning
   b) support you
   c) deceive you
   d) control you

19. Let’s **get the ball rolling**. Shall we?
   a) I don’t know its meaning
   b) play a game
   c) start
   d) go

20. Are you **out of your mind**?
   a) I don’t know its meaning
   b) happy
   c) crazy
   d) bored
B) Complete the following tasks by providing suitable slang terms.

PART 1: Think of slang terms that you know and are different from those in section (A).

*Hint: A slang term could be a single word (e.g., geek) or a group of words (e.g., off the hook).*

What slang term do you use

1. To describe a stupid person
2. To describe a lazy person
3. To describe an attractive woman
4. To greet someone
5. To curse someone/something (swear term)
6. To describe something great
7. To describe something terrible
8. To describe a funny situation
9. To say ‘someone failed the exam’
10. To say ‘nonsense’

PART 2: Complete the following table by providing any slang terms that you know and are different from those in sections (A) and (B). *Feel free to produce any slang terms that come to your mind.* In the first column, write the term; in the second, provide an explanation or a translation of its meaning in Arabic. If you are not sure what it means, write “Not sure” or “I don’t know” in the second column.

*Hint: You might think of positive/negative slang terms describing women/men, slang terms describing good/bad situations, swear terms, verbs and so on.*

| Slang Term | Explanation/Translation |
|------------|-------------------------|
| 1          |                         |
| 2          |                         |
| 3          |                         |
| 4          |                         |
| 5          |                         |
III. Questionnaire

Please read the following statements carefully and indicate your opinion by placing a tick (V) in the appropriate block. People have different opinions, so please keep in mind that we are interested in your personal opinion. Remember that this is not a test and there are no “right” or “wrong” answers.

|   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|------------------|---------|-----------|-------|----------------|
| 1. Native English speakers (Americans) are a very sociable, warm-hearted and creative people. |         |           |         |                 |                 |
| 2. I would like to know more native English speakers (Americans). |         |           |         |                 |                 |
| 3. I have always admired the native English speakers (Americans). |         |           |         |                 |                 |
| 4. The more I get to know the native English speakers (Americans), the more I want to be fluent in their language. |         |           |         |                 |                 |
| 5. Studying English is important because it will allow me to be more at ease with other people who speak English. |         |           |         |                 |                 |
| 6. Studying English is important because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people. |         |           |         |                 |                 |
| 7. Studying English is important because it will allow me to better understand and appreciate English books, movies, TV programs, and songs. |         |           |         |                 |                 |
| 8. Studying English is important because it will enable me to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups. |         |           |         |                 |                 |
| 9. I prefer to read English literature in its original form rather than Arabic translations. |         |           |         |                 |                 |
| 10. I often like to listen to English songs more than Arabic songs. |         |           |         |                 |                 |
| 11. I often like to watch English TV channels more than Arabic TV channels. |         |           |         |                 |                 |
| 12. I prefer watching English movies to Arabic ones. |         |           |         |                 |                 |

Thank you for your participation 😊
## Appendix B

### Slang Terms Used in the Receptive Knowledge Slang Test

| Category     | Slang Term | Meaning                                                                 |
|--------------|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Noun**     | geek       | an awkward person, especially one who is perceived to be overly intellectual |
|              | guts       | – courage                                                                |
|              | shrink     | – a psychologist or psychiatrist                                         |
|              | riot       | – something extremely funny                                              |
| **Verb**     | ditch      | to leave behind                                                          |
|              | bug        | to pester or annoy                                                       |
|              | whine      | to complain or express disappointment or unhappiness repeatedly          |
|              | suck       | to be bad at a particular subject or action                              |
| **Adjective**| creepy     | scary                                                                    |
|              | blue       | sad                                                                      |
|              | gross      | disgusting                                                               |
|              | lame       | bad; inefficient; uninspiring                                             |
| **Phrasal Verb** | crack up   | to laugh hysterically and uncontrollably                                  |
|              | chill out  | to calm down; relax                                                      |
|              | screw up   | to err; make a mess                                                      |
|              | mess with  | to annoy                                                                 |
| **Idiom**    | off the hook | great; excellent                                                          |
|              | have your back | to support                                                              |
|              | get the ball rolling | to start a process                                                        |
|              | out of your mind | to be crazy; to do something insane/crazy                             |
Appendix C

Requesting Gardner’s Permission to Use the AMTB

-----Original Message-----
From: Najla Alshawi (najla.alshawi@hotmail.com)
Sent: Saturday, October 15, 2011 5:27:43 PM
To: gardner@uwo.ca

Dear Dr. Gardner,

My name is Najla Alshawi and I am a master’s student in linguistics at Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. I am in the process of writing my master’s research on the role of integrative motivation in the acquisition of American English slang by Saudi female undergraduate English majors.

While surveying the literature related to motivation, I came across your Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB). I do not think I will find a better instrument to measure the students’ integrative motivation than this one. Therefore, I am thinking of using the factors under integrativeness to measure the students’ integrative motivation.

I would really appreciate it if you accept my request and allow me to use your instrument in my research.

Sincerely,
Najla Abdulaziz Alshawi

Teaching Assistant
Department of English
College of Languages and Translation
Princess Nora Bint Abdul Rahman University
Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
Appendix D

Gardner’s Approval to Use the AMTB

-----Original Message-----
From: R.C. Gardner (gardner@uwo.ca)
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2011 9:24:15 PM
To: Najla Alshawi (najla.alshawi@hotmail.com)

Dear Najla Abdulaziz Alshawi

This will confirm that you have my permission to adapt the Attitude Motivation Test Battery for your research purposes. I recommend that you administer the test in the language of the participants, and consequently it may be necessary for you to translate the items. In doing so, you should make use of the back-translation procedure where you have someone translate the items into the language of the participants and then have someone else translate these items back into English to ensure that the items are comparable. If not, it may be necessary to adapt the "bad" items attempting to maintain the same meaning as the originals. Also, once you have administered the test, I recommend that you compute Cronbach internal consistency reliability coefficients for each of the scales to ensure that they have reliabilities comparable to those of the original AMTB.

Please note too that in the socio-educational model, there are four aggregate scores that can be computed. These are:

Motivation which is the sum of Motivational Intensity + Desire to learn the language + Attitudes toward learning the language,

Integrativeness which is the sum of Integrative Orientation + Attitudes toward the target language community + Interest in Foreign Languages,

Attitudes toward the Learning situation which is the sum of Evaluation of the Language teacher + Evaluation of the language course, and

Language Anxiety which is the sum of Language Class anxiety and Language Use anxiety.

Integrative Motivation is then defined as the aggregate of Motivation plus Integrativeness plus Attitudes toward the Learning Situation minus Language Anxiety.

Much of this is discussed in writings on my web page (see address for language related files in my signature file below). The underlying theory, research and measurement is also discussed in a recent book, the reference for which is:

Gardner, R. C. (2010). Motivation and Second Language Acquisition: The Socio-Educational Model. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,
R. C. Gardner

Professor Emeritus
Department of Psychology
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario N6A 5C2
Office Phone: (519) 661-3670; Fax: (519) 661-3961
E-mail: gardner@uwo.ca

Webpages For language related files: http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/
For data analysis files: http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/DataAnalysisDotCalm
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PSU Request by the Advisor

Professor Nourah Abalkhail, Dean
College for Women
Prince Sultan University
Riyadh
20-Sep-2011

Dear Prof. Nourah Abalkhail, Dean of the College for Women,

This letter is written on behalf of my MA linguistics student, Najla Abdulaziz Alshawi, as I am her thesis advisor. I strongly support your kind approval of granting her permission to collect her MA research data at your eminent institute. Ms. Alshawi is a hardworking student and I believe that she is well prepared to fulfill her proposed project.

Best regards

Sincerely,

Prof. Dr. Abdulrahman Alabdan
Professor of Applied Linguistics at Imam Muhammed bin Saud University
Dear Prof. Nourah Abalkhail, Dean of the College for Women,

My name is Najla Alshawi and I am a master’s student in linguistics at Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University. I am in the process of writing my master’s research on the role of integrative motivation in the acquisition of American English slang by Saudi female undergraduate English majors.

I would like to ask your permission to apply my study at your institute. The instrument I will use is composed of a five-page questionnaire that might take 20-30 minutes. The questionnaire will be distributed to female students from four levels corresponding respectively with beginner, lower intermediate, upper intermediate, and advanced.

I really hope you accept my request and help me with this matter.

Sincerely,

Najla Abdulaziz Alshawi
Teaching Assistant
Department of English
College of Languages and Translation
Princess Nora Bint Abdul Rahman University
Riyadh, Saudi Arabia