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Abstract

The reasons why non-English speaking background (NESB) shopfloor employees participate in workplace language and literacy classes and the factors that affect their motivation to participate are relative unknowns. This study investigates NESB shopfloor employees' motivation to participate in a Communication Skills Development Program (CSDP) course and the factors that affected their motivation.

An inductive analysis of findings revealed that all of the employees participated in one of the CSDP courses for a variety of pre-determined life-specific reasons. These reasons are represented by three main categories of goals (i.e., 'Self-improvement through language and literacy development', 'Work', 'Outside work'). Of these goals, all of the employees reported 'Self-improvement through language and literacy development' as the underlying reason why they participated in one of the CSDP courses. Further, each employee reported a language/literacy practice that is peculiar to all of his/her goals and most sub-goals. An extended analysis of the employees' motivation to participate identified the employees as being 'transactional-', 'vocational-', 'fellowship-', 'social camaraderie-' and/or 'self-satisfaction-oriented' learners. Findings also revealed that a variety of 'personal', 'course-related' and 'context-related' factors either positively or adversely affected the employees' motivation to participate.

A qualitative case study design was implemented. Data was collected through interviews, observations, field notes and the review of artifacts. Data was inductively analysed by classifying patterns of relationships into categories that represent the employees' motivation to participate and factors that affected their motivation.
This study's findings have implications for theory and practice. At a theoretical level, these findings add to the existing theoretical understanding of why English as second language adults participate in workplace language and literacy classes and the factors that affect their motivation. At a practice level, these findings illustrate the need for Food Products management and program teachers to have an understanding of the reasons 'why' NESB shopfloor employees participate in workplace language and literacy classes and the factors that affect their motivation. For with such an understanding, first, Food Products management will be able to implement organisational practices that positively affect the employees' motivation to participate in future CSDP classes. Second, teachers will be able to assist the employees to set realistic goals, and design and implement course content that assists the employees to attain these goals. For it is when employees attain their goals that they will form and hold positive perceptions of the course in which they participate.
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A Note on Conventions and Tables Used in This Thesis

Three conventions have been adopted throughout this study. First, the company, the program's teachers and each of the employees involved in the study have been given a pseudonym. Second, direct quotes taken from interviews and informal conversations are presented in italics. Third, where a direct quote has needed qualification of meaning, words used to qualify the quote have been placed in brackets. Most of the conventions used in this study are based on conventions adopted by Breen, et al. (1994). Furthermore, the design of tables that outline the employees' goals and goal orientations have been based on a table presented in Volet and Lawrence (1988).
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Food Products—a Vignette

It is 3.30 p.m., at Food Products on a typically warm and fine Perth, mid­
week day in Spring. Refrigerated trucks pass with frequency through the
security gates and day shift workers are waved farewell by security personnel.
In line I wait for the guard to raise the security tollbar and, as he does, he calls
to me: I thought you'd be on staff by now. I smile, nod at him and think to
myself, yeah, seems that way. As I approach the car park on my right I
visualise within this slick, new and highly automated food processing factory
the people on the production line, the shopfloor workers I have interviewed
and the ones I will be speaking to today. Holding my basket (which contains
the tape recorder, microphone and questions I wish to ask) I walk towards the
factory and am met by the clean waft of food produce that emanates from the
factory's chimneys. As I approach the factory's entrance door, I remind
myself of an anecdote I once read about the famous American artists Newell
and Andrew Wyeth. Within this anecdote, Newell informed Andrew that the
person’s ear Andrew was painting had “pulled in all the information from the
world” and Newell suggested Andrew needed to capture that in his art
(Meryman, 1991, p. 100). I need to listen to the shopfloor employees and
capture each “story” they tell (Stake, 1994, p. 237).

The shopfloor employees at Food Products appear to be a happy and cheerful
group, who, as they walk past each other, often deliver a friendly gibe or tap
on the shoulder. The stories they told me are supportive of each other and the
company. Over half of them have each been employed by Food Products for
more than twenty-one years. Working with these people was an enjoyable
experience for me as they allowed me to observe and work with them on the production line, and they readily talked about their motivation to participate in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses and their perceptions of factors that affected their motivation. Often, I felt privileged to be given the opportunity to interview them and listen to the stories about their families and workplace experiences. I was grateful that they each allowed me a window into their lives.

Shopfloor Employees

The stories that comprise this study's descriptive data are drawn from observations, interviews, field notes and collation of workplace documents (Baynham, 1995; Patton, 1990). This data was obtained from ten Food Products non-English speaking background (NESB) shopfloor employees. All of these employees are employed as either production line packers or machine operators. Furthermore, all of them took part in one of Food Products' Communication Skills Development Program (CSDP) courses for NESB shopfloor employees. From here on the CSDP courses will be referred to as the Introductory course, Intermediate course, or, collectively, as the CSDP courses or program's courses.

Background

Workplace Education

Workplace education is the umbrella term given to adult education programs and courses that deal with the design and delivery of sequenced on or off-the-job learning and/or training. Workplace education is considered part of formal education (Foley, 1995). The implementation of workplace education programs stem from an international realisation and concern that not all employees have the necessary language, literacy and/or numeracy skills to actively participate in workplace reform initiatives (House of Representatives Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training, 1991). These initiatives are in response
to the opening up of a global market economy and implementation of Total Quality Management (TQM) practices. That is, ones where all employees are asked to actively participate in an organisation’s decision making processes (Schmidt & Finnigan, 1992). At the 1994 “G-7” meeting in Detroit—a meeting of political leaders from Britain, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the United States of America—members noted that “those without [literacy, numeracy and/or trade] skills face a more precarious future than anyone else as we enter the next century” (“Inventing tomorrow’s worker”, 1994, p. 26). Employment prospects were the main elements of the ‘precarious future’ referred to by G-7 members.

Like other industrialised nations, Australia has recently implemented award restructuring, multi-skilling, enterprise bargaining and TQM workplace reform practices. These practices require companies, governments and union organisations to “develop holistic and cooperative policies and processes for integrating formal education, on-the-job learning, off-the-job learning, and work group and organisational participation learning” (Ford, 1988, p. 214). The development of formal education policies and processes is a consequence of the economic growth of industrialised labour markets and has become the focus of many workplace education programs (Ford). Further, workplace education programs are perceived by some as being essential to a nation’s individual, local, and international economic performance and competitiveness (Crompton, 1990; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1992).

During the 1990s, the past Labor governments produced Standing Committee, Government, and Department of Employment, Education and Training policies and documents that focused on the concepts of workplace and adult education. In his Working Nation address to federal parliament, the former prime minister Mr Paul Keating (1994a) outlined the necessity for workplace education and training programs. He stated, “As the keys to a successful modern economy are skills, ideas and innovation, the keys to employment are education and training”
Further, his thoughts are echoed by those who perceive workplace education as being vital to total employee involvement in an organisation's decision making processes and to Australia's economic recovery and stability (Ferguson, 1990; Field, 1990; Macken, 1989). Some of the types of workplace education programs that have been implemented in Australia are communication, vocational training, Workplace English Language and Literacy, and Working Nation programs.

**Literacy**

It was not until 1990, the International Year of Literacy (IYL), that the need for the design and implementation of workplace language and literacy programs was publicly presented and given high priority by governments, corporate organisations and unions. Prior to and as a lead-up to the IYL, Australia's first survey of adult literacy was conducted (Wickert, 1989). This survey sought to measure its population’s proficiency in performing ‘document’, ‘prose’ and ‘quantitative’ literacy tasks (Wickert & Black, 1990). In general, the survey results revealed that that there is great variation within the adult population’s ability to perform relatively straightforward literacy tasks, but especially tasks involving prose and quantitative literacy (Wickert & Black; Wickert, 1990). Computation was the area of quantitative literacy that posed the most difficulty (Wickert & Black). The IYL and the results of this survey assisted adult educators to gain the attention of politicians, unionists and those involved in the policy formation and funding of workplace education. By the end of 1990 all states and territories had pledged a commitment to the adoption of "lifelong learning strategies" (Wickert, 1991b, p. 40) and, in so doing, implemented Workplace English Language and Literacy (WELL), Food Industry Language and Literacy Program (FILLP) and/or Working Nation programs.

**Literacy/Communication Programs**

'Adult literacy' and 'adult communication' programs form two umbrella programs under which most workplace education programs are located (Brown, et al., 1994). Both types of
programs include reading, writing, speaking and listening instruction. However, theoretical and practical distinctions exist between adult literacy and adult communication programs (Brown, et al.). The main differences between the two programs are related to the principles guiding each program and the setting of individual work as opposed to a whole group work. For example, generally, adult literacy programs are guided by the socially-oriented theories that view language as part of a "semiotic system" (Brown, et al., p. 43). That is, language is viewed as containing certain structures and patterns, and that the teaching of these structures and patterns deliver skills as a medium by which societies can have their needs met (Brown, et al.). Furthermore, instruction is guided by the principles of equity and access and involves setting individual-based learner work. In contrast, generally, adult communication programs are guided by personal- and psychologically-based principles and involve the provision of vocational and workplace training requirements. Communication programs usually involve whole group and class work (Brown, et al.). Also, the planning of communication program content occurs within a structured framework (e.g., competency-based framework) as opposed to content that is based on learner needs (Brown et al.). Broadly defined, language within literacy programs "is not seen as a neutral entity which carries meaning...but as centrally involved in making that meaning" (Brown, et al., p. 43). In contrast, communication programs perceive language "as a carrier of meaning" and involve the teaching of non-verbal communication and personal development and behaviour (p. 44). However, the terms 'adult communication' and 'adult literacy' are often used interchangeably by program planners and teachers. For example, when discussing the CSDP courses' titles and content, one of the program's teachers commented that if you put language and literacy in a course [title] that really turns people off or you make them feel more inadequate....so the names of courses do not communicate all what they [courses] are about.
Food Products’ Communication Skills Development Program

The Communication Skills Development Program that was implemented at Food Products was a workplace communication program that involved language and literacy instruction that was related to the employees’ culturally- and socially-based language and non-verbal communication needs. One of the main aims of the program was to give the employees the necessary English language and literacy skills so that they can participate in a communications-based Certificate in Food Processing course.

Food Products’ implemented the NESB Communication Skills Development Program for a variety of reasons. First, as explained to me in an interview with one of the company’s managers, Food Products is undertaking a organisational cultural shift. This is a move away from the continuous improvement strategies of the 1970s and 1980s to the more contemporary TQM practices of the 1990s (Schmidt & Finnigan, 1992). By introducing these practices the company is wanting to embark on negotiation and discussion with all groups of employees as well as offering them a chance to participate, in what management term, ‘learner centred’ rather than ‘training centred’ instruction. Management describes learner centred instruction as *skilling them up to where their needs are at*. Second, as part of TQM practices, the company is keen for all shopfloor employees to participate in a Certificate In Food Processing course. However, after conducting a language skills audit, the company realised that not the all shopfloor employees have the necessary understanding of English to participate in the Certificate course (Simpson & Beetson, n.d.). Third, from a Health and Safety perspective, the company perceived the need for all the shopfloor employees to be able to read and understand workplace safety signs and information.

The Communication Skills Development Program was a WELL funded program. WELL programs are designed to assist “those workers with the greatest need for workplace English language and literacy assistance in the context of occupational and workplace training requirements, whose English language and literacy proficiency is below the level where a
person is able to communicate in English with sufficient accuracy to meet basic vocational
needs” (Department of Employment, Education and Training, 1996, p. 4). A CSDP pre-
course report noted that: the NESB employees’ listening and speaking levels varied from
basic survival to total fluency, their reading skills varied from very weak to native-like
proficiency, and that spelling was a major problem for many of the employees (Simpson &
Beetson, n.d.). It was recommended that this group of shopfloor employees would benefit
from a WELL funded “basic literacy course which teaches strategies for learning how to
spell and write simple sentences [sic]” (Simpson & Beetson, objective 8.1.3). WELL
funding was granted to Food Products and was used to implement two on-site CSDP
courses. As explained in an interview with one of the program’s teachers, employees with a
basic survival level of listening/speaking and/or a very weak reading level were placed in the
Introductory course, and all of the other employees were placed in the Intermediate course.

Definition of Language/Literacy Used

Literacy has been defined by a wide number of educational practitioners and theorists, and all
have defined literacy as according to his/her respective ideological position (Baynham,
1995). An overview of recent understandings and beliefs about literacy (Brown, et al.,
1994) identified the following literacy-based statements. Literacy is “‘the ability to read and
use written information and to write appropriately in a range of contexts’” (Australian
Language and Literacy Policy cited in Brown, et al., p. 19); literacy is “‘historically and
culturally determined’” (Freebody & Luke cited in Brown, et al. p. 21); and, literacy
includes “‘literacies’ relevant to different contexts and to particular social purposes” (Brown,
et al. p. 22). Furthermore, literacy has been defined as “‘not simply a coding problem, but
intimately connected with forms of understanding not readily accessible through other
semiotic media’” (McCormack cited in Brown, et al. p. 23). All of these present day
statements reflect similar perspectives of literacy and, yet, at the same time, give emphasis to
specific aspect(s) of literacy.
One definition of literacy that is specifically related to adult learners is that written by The Australian Council for Adult Literacy (ACAL).

Literacy involves the integration of listening, speaking, reading, writing and critical thinking; it incorporates numeracy. It includes the cultural knowledge which enables a speaker, writer, or reader to recognise and use language appropriate to different social situations. For an advanced technological society such as Australia, the goal is an active literacy which allows people to use language to enhance their capacity to think, create and question, in order to participate effectively in society (Australian Council for Adult Literacy cited in Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training, 1991, p. 90).

The above definition not only considers the practices of reading and writing it also includes listening, speaking, critical thinking and numeracy (ACAL cited in the Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education & Training, 1991, p. 90). Furthermore, it recognises the importance of ‘cultural knowledge’ in relation to adult learners’ ability to use language that is “appropriate to different social situations” (p. 90) and to “think, create and question, in order to effectively participate in society” (p. 90). Food Product's Communication Skills Development Program (CSDP) was designed to assist NESB shopfloor employees to develop their listening, speaking, reading, writing and critical literacy skills. Also, this program took into consideration the employees’ expressed desire to be able to communicate effectively with those at work and in the general community. In consideration of these practices, it was decided that the definition of literacy that most closely resembles the instructional intent of the CSDP courses was the ACAL definition.

Even though the ACAL definition of literacy does incorporate many aspects of the CSDP courses, it does not, however, completely encompass the spoken and/or written language
aspects of the program as discussed by the employees and the teacher. That is, both the employees and the teacher made reference to spoken and/or written language in a similar way to that defined by Dawkins (1991). Therefore, it was considered prudent to include the Australian Language and Literacy Policy’s definition of ‘language’ alongside the ACAL definition of literacy, and, thereby, consider the CSDP courses as constituting a language/literacy program. Specifically, language is defined as:

the primary means of human communication, manifest generally in systematic ways through the communication skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing. Language [sic] in terms such as ‘language and literacy proficiency’ is an inclusive term, covering both English and other languages. (Dawkins, 1991, p. 8).

In consideration of the need to refer to both the ACAL definition of literacy and the Australian Language and Literacy Policy’s definition of language, throughout this study the CSDP courses will be referred to as ‘language/literacy course(s)’ or as a ‘language/literacy program’. Furthermore, within the analysis of the employees’ motivation to participate in one of the CSDP courses, the employees’ goals that refer to aspects of language and literacy will be classified as ‘language/literacy’ goals and/or practices.

Finally, this study was conducted at Food Products as the group of NESB shopfloor employees presented me with an opportunity to undertake a formative evaluation of the employees’ perceptions of the CSDP language/literacy course in which they participated. As this study progressed it became clear that the employees’ perceptions were strongly influenced by their motivation to participate in one of the CSDP courses and their perceptions of the factors that affected their motivation.
Problem Statement

As noted in a study of King Memorial Hospital employees’ participation in a workplace literacy program “very few of them [entry-level employees] have reached the goals that originally led them to the classes” (Gowen, 1990, p. 119). Gowen (1990, 1992) queries the agenda behind the Hospital’s workplace literacy program and poses the question of whether this and similar courses are meeting course participants’ goals.

Previous research has provided an understanding of how course providers and organisation managers perceive workplace education courses (Ford, 1988; Frank & Hamilton, 1993; Long & Donald, 1989; Pearson & Strickland, 1993), how health care workers assisted to shape their own adult basic education program (Perin, 1994), and adult literacy learners’ perceptions of how their lives have changed after participating in a literacy program (Malicky & Norman, 1996). However, little is understood of what motivates employees to participate in workplace education classes (Gowen, 1992), their perceptions of their learning (Baynham, 1990) and/or factors that affect their motivation to participate in learning (Berlin, 1986; Puchner, 1995).

The problem confronting course providers, management and union representatives is that they, as a tripartite consultative committee, fund, design and implement workplace education courses that are largely based on pre- and post-course summative assessments. Course design and implementation have rarely undertaken formative evaluations of the reasons why employees participate in workplace learning or the employees’ perceptions of factors that affect their motivation to participate (Berlin, 1986). Therefore, monies, time and effort are being expended on workplace education programs that may not meet the needs of the people these courses intend to assist (Gowen, 1992; Puchner, 1995; Stromquist, 1995). A formative evaluation of Food Products’ NESB shopfloor employees’ reasons why they participated in a CSDP workplace language and literacy course may be necessary if Food
Products administrators and program teachers are to design and implement future CSDP courses that will enable the NESB shopfloor employees’ to attain their learning goals.

**Purpose and Significance**

The primary aim of this study is to undertake a formative evaluation and descriptive account of the NESB shopfloor employees’ motivation to participate in the Introductory or Intermediate CSDP course and factors that affected their motivation to participate. A formative evaluation of the reasons ‘why’ adults participated in learning has implications for theory and practice (Beder, 1991; Merriam & Caffarella, 1991).

At a theoretical level, a formative evaluation of the NESB shopfloor employees’ motivation to participate in a CSDP workplace language and literacy course and factors that affected their motivation may assist to inform theories of adult education, L2 motivation, workplace language and literacy, and communication education (Berlin, 1986; Brown, et al., 1994; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Frank & Hamilton, 1993; Gowen, 1992; Mikulecky, 1995, Mikulecky, Lloyd, Seimantel, & Masker, 1996; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Puchner, 1995; Stromquist, 1995). Further, at present there is no Australian study that has formatively evaluated shopfloor employees’ motivation to participate in workplace education classes and/or the employees’ perceptions of factors that have affected their motivation to participate (Somerville, 1997). This gap within workplace education research has occurred even though, over the last ten years, workplace education has been at the forefront of adult education in Australia.

At a ‘practice level’, a formative evaluation will enable Food Products administration to tailor future CSDP programs to meet the employees’ NESB language learning goals (Beder & Valentine, 1987b; Gowen, 1992). It is necessary that L2 workplace education teachers have an understanding of the employees’ goals as current teaching theory emphasises the
importance for L2 program planners and teachers to be consciously aware that program content attends to the L2 community’s and individual student’s language learning needs (McKay, 1993; Prince, 1992). Furthermore, once Food Products administrators and Industry Education Services educators have an understanding of the employees’ perceptions of factors that affect the employees’ motivation, company administrators and future program teachers may be able to maximise employee participation (Puchner, 1995).

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

Primary Research Questions

1) What reasons did Food Products’ NESB shopfloor employees give for participating in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses?

2) What factors affected the employees’ motivation to participate in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses?

Subsidiary Research Question

2a) What are the employees’ perceptions of how these factors affected their motivation to participate in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses?
Chapter Outline

The present chapter has provided a background to the study and has described the problem behind this study. Also, it has explained the study's purpose and significance, outlined the research questions that are to be investigated and defined key terms used.

Chapter Two reviews all relevant literature. This includes a brief discussion of the history and development of adult education. A more detailed account of research that has examined adult literacy, workplace education, adult basic education (ABE) and/or English as a second language (ESL) students' motivation to participate in language classes is given. Also, a detailed account of research that has examined students' perceptions of language classes, factors that affect students' motivation to participate in learning, English as a second language studies, and achievement goal theory research is outlined.

Chapter Three gives an overview of the components of case study design and discusses research design issues specific to this inquiry. Also, this chapter justifies the selection and type of case study design employed. Further, it discusses and justifies the use of various data sources and the collection and analysis strategies used. Moreover, it outlines ethical considerations relevant to this inquiry.

Chapter Four presents and discusses this study's findings. First, the employees' motivation to participate in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses are described. Second, the factors that affected the employees' motivation to participate and, third, their perceptions of the ways these factors affected their motivation are discussed.
Definition of Terms

The terms defined below are specific to the understanding of this case study.

- 'Formative evaluation' "serves the purpose of improving a specific program, policy, group of staff (in a personal evaluation) or product. Formative evaluations aim at 'forming' the thing being studied" rather than generalising beyond a study's research focus (Patton, 1990, p. 156).

- 'Goals' refer to the employees' reasons 'why' they chose to participate in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses (Beder & Valentine, 1987a, 1987b; Carp, Peterson & Roelfs, 1974; Gowen, 1990, 1992; Houle, 1963; Johnstone & Rivera, 1965).

- 'Instrumental orientation' refers to a "pragmatic" (Gardner, 1985, p. 11) class of reasons that indicate an individual's "economic and practical advantages of learning" a second language (p. 52).

- 'Integrative orientation' refers to a "social-emotional" (Gardner, 1985, p. 11) class of reasons that "suggest that the individual is learning a second language in order to learn about, interact with, or become closer to the second language community" (p. 54).

- 'Motivation' refers to the employees' goals coupled with the employees' desire to attain their goals.
• 'Motivational orientation' refers to an employee's "class of reasons" for participating in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses (Gardner, 1985, p. 54; Houle, 1963). That is his/her type of motivation.

• 'Multiple goals' refer to an employee's desire to attain more than one achievement goal at a time. That is the attainment of either ability, social and/or task goals (Wentzel, 1989).

• 'Perception' refers to "an awareness of the truth of something. This sense is largely nontechnical and connotes a kind of implicit, intuitive insight" (Reber, 1985, p. 527).

• 'Prosocial goals' refer to a student's desire to develop "group cohesion and positive interpersonal interactions" with others (Wentzel, 1994, p. 174).

• 'Social goals' refer to an employee's "'virtuous intentions or personal commitment rather than ability'" (Maehr & associates cited in Urdan & Maehr, 1995, p. 242).

• 'Sub-goals' refer to the employees' specific reasons as to why they participated in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses. These sub-goals are linked to the employees' desire to attain their goals.

• 'Task goals' refer to an employee's desire to develop competence or attain mastery of a topic or concept (Urdan & Maehr, 1995).
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Introduction

The literature reviewed in this chapter has been divided into two main sections. These are Adult Education, and Students' Motivation and Perceptions. The first section contains a discussion of the history and development of adult education, adult literacy, and workplace education. The second section contains a discussion of:

- Descriptive studies that have examined adults' motivation to participate in learning and their perceptions of the courses in which they participated. Specifically, workplace learning studies will be examined in some detail.
- Factors that affect students' motivation to participate in learning.
- English as a second language studies.
- Achievement goal theory research.

Motivation to participate in learning has been referred to as the "power to attain the goal which is reflected in the motivational orientation. This power stems from the desire to attain the goal, positive attitude toward learning the language and effortful behavior [sic]" (Oxford & Shearin, 1994, p. 14). That is, an individual displays some goal directed activity and effort and, when questioned, will indicate a desire to attain the goal (Gardner, 1985).

As this study was conducted after the employees completed the program it was not possible to investigate the employees' motivation by collectively examining their goal-directed activity, effort and desire to attain their goals (Gardner, 1985; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). However, it was possible to question the employees and gain a retrospective understanding of their goals and their desire to attain their goals. The employees' goals were expressed by their reasons...
'why' they chose to participate in the program (Ames & Archer, 1988; Beder & Valentine, 1987a, 1987b; Carp, Peterson & Roelfs, 1974; Gowen, 1990, 1992; Houle, 1963; Johnstone & Rivera, 1965; Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, 1988; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989, 1994). Furthermore, the employees' desire to attain their goals is linked to their reasons why they chose to participate (i.e., their sub-goals). Therefore, the employees' motivation to participate in one of the program's courses will be examined by gaining an understanding of their goals and their desire to attain their goals.

Also, the employees' motivation to participate was further investigated by examining their motivational orientation(s); that is the employees' "class of reasons" for participating in one of the courses (Gardner, 1985, p. 54; Houle, 1963).

In examining the employees' motivation to participate in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses, I have combined descriptive research, second language (L2) motivational, and achievement goal theory's elements of goal(s), motivation, and motivational orientation(s). The decision to combine these elements is based on the writings of Crookes and Schmidt (1991) and Oxford and Shearin (1994).

There are four points that need to be explained about the literature that is to be reviewed in this chapter. First, the focus of this case study--NESB shopfloor employees' motivation to participate in a workplace language and literacy program and their perceptions of the program--are areas of investigation that have received limited research attention (Somerville, 1997). Therefore, research reviewed within this chapter may only relate to one or two aspects of this study's research focus.

Second, several of the studies that have examined students' motivation to participate in adult basic education classes refer to the "General Educational Development (GED)" test (Martin, 1994, p. 181). A GED is a post-secondary test that acknowledges that a person has
completed secondary education with the United States of America (USA) (Gowen, 1991; Martin). Also, the terms “high school equivalency [sic] diploma” (Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975, p. 40) and “high school diploma” (Gowen, 1992, p. 114) are used. These terms refer to a secondary school diploma for “adult school noncompleters” (Martin, p. 181). Both of these diplomas are equivalent to the secondary school diploma received by students when they have attained a given number of “credits” and completed four grades of secondary education (Martin & Fisher quoted in Martin, p. 181). An avenue for attaining a high school equivalency diploma is via a GED test (Martin).

Third, the definition of the term ‘adult basic education’ (ABE) is one that varies across all of this chapter’s reviewed literature. Some of these definitions refer to ABE students as person who are:

- “Over sixteen, out of school, and have less than eighth-grade literacy [of English]” (Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox 1975, p. 1).
- Deficient in the basic skills of reading, writing and mathematics (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984).
- “Adults of low academic ability” (Beder and Valentine, 1987a, p. 4).

The variety of definitions used to describe ABE is not an uncommon occurrence (Beder, 1991). The term ABE has been synonymously used by authors to refer to adult secondary education, GED preparation course and the entire USA federal adult education program (Beder). The provision of ABE classes has now extended to workplace education as it has become evident that certain groups of employees are in need of further education if they are to actively participate in award restructuring initiatives and future employment opportunities (Brown, et al., 1994; Chang, 1989). However, English as a Second Language (ESL) classes are often considered a separate entity from other components of adult education programs. This is largely due to the different student clientele and the teaching practices
used to instruct ESL students (Beder, 1991; Hammond, Wickert, Burns, Joyce & Miller, 1992).

Fourth, even though the Communication Skills Development Program (CSDP) undertaken by Food Products NESB shopfloor employees was a Workplace English Language and Literacy (WELL) program, and designed as a “basic literacy course which teaches strategies for learning how to spell and write simple sentences [sic]” (Simpson & Beets, n.d., objective 8.1.3), there is no attempt here to classify this case of NESB employees as ABE students. However, similar to ABE students, ESL students are “literacy students” who require an understanding of how to “tap into the discourses of our [Australian] society” (Jones, 1995, p. 13). Further, as WELL funded programs are designed to assist “those workers with the greatest need for workplace English language and literacy assistance in the context of occupational and workplace training requirements” (Department of Employment, Education & Training, 1996, p. 4), it would appear that the case of NESB Food Products shopfloor employees required basic English literacy skills training similar to some of the programs that were designed for ABE (Beder & Valentine, 1987a; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984), ESL (Beder & Valentine, 1987b; Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975) and/or workplace courses (Billet, 1994; Gowen, 1992; Mikulecky, et al., 1996). Moreover, some of the employees also required oral language skills which may not be needed by ABE students.

**Adult Education**

From post Second World War to the present day, the number, type and availability of adult education programs has expanded (Thomas, 1994a). Some of these programs are: ABE, communication skills programs, continuing education, ESL, further education and training, life-long learning, vocational education and training, workplace education, and workplace language and literacy. Factors that have influenced the expansion of adult education
programs include the perceived failure of the compulsory education system to enable adults to be economically and socially independent; an increased aging population; industrial and computer technology; and social, political and economic reforms (Ford, 1988; House of Representative Standing Committee on Employment, Education & Training, 1991; Merriam & Caffarella, 1991; Thomas, 1994b; Wickert, 1993). These factors are not peculiar to one or two countries, but rather they are common across most industrialised nations (Puchner, 1995).

Two international bodies that have greatly influenced adult education practices are the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) (Ford, 1988; Thomas, 1994a). UNESCO was the first of these bodies to recognise adult students’ diverse learning needs. To assist the World’s public to develop an awareness of adults’ basic learning rights and needs, UNESCO and the United Nations jointly proclaimed 1990 the International Year of Literacy (IYL) (Belanger & Mobarak, 1994). During the IYL interested adult educators, groups and organisations lobbied governments for funds to research and raise awareness of the educational needs of their nation's adult community.

Funded by the Adult Literacy Action Council (ALAC) Wickert (1989) conducted Australia’s first adult literacy survey. This survey involved 1,496 adults over the age of 18 (Wickert, 1989). This sample represented a cross-section of persons from differing socio-economic and geographical backgrounds. Excluded from the survey were residents of the Northern Territory, prisoners and hospitalised persons. Aboriginal people were not identified as their population in the survey was too few for reliable conclusions to be drawn (Wickert, 1989). Within this survey literacy is viewed as a social practice and one that involves “the application of specific skills, for specific purposes, in specific contexts, not as an isolated set of technical reading and writing skills” (Wickert & Black, 1990, p. 24; Baynham, 1995). Literacy is further perceived as encompassing prose literacy, document literacy and quantitative literacy.
The over-riding aim of this survey was to discover “what proportion of the adult Australian population is able to perform literacy tasks at various levels of difficulty” (Wickert & Black, p. 23).

An overview of the survey’s findings showed that:

- Most Australian adults are able to perform “straightforward literacy tasks” (Wickert & Black, 1990, p. 26). However, 1.0% did not continue with the assessment as they were found to have too “low levels of literacy” to continue in the study (p. 26).

- Ten per cent were unable to perform basic numerical calculations (Wickert & Black, p. 26).

- Variables related to “current literacy practice”, “level of education” and “age” affected an adult’s literacy proficiency (Wickert, 1989, p. 27; 1990). In relation to age, “older” persons were found to experience greater difficulty with “complex literacy tasks” (Wickert cited in Wickert & Black, 1990, p. 26).

- Four per cent more NESB adults than English speaking background (ESB) adults were unable to perform basic literacy tasks (Wickert, 1990, pp. 20-21).

- Approximately half of the study’s NESB population sought assistance with instances related to document literacy (Wickert & Black, p. 27).

- Unskilled workers were found to have “lower than average” levels of document, prose, and quantitative literacy (Wickert & Black, p. 26).

- The opportunity to practice literacy skills is the best predictor of literacy performance. Further, the practise of these skills occurs most frequently within a workplace setting (Wickert & Black, p. 27).

These findings revealed that there is no one type of literacy (i.e., document, prose, quantitative) that acts as the core to an adult’s language and literacy development or practices.
Rather there is a variety of literacies associated with a variety of purposes (Wickert, 1990). From the results of this survey, Dawkins concluded that "1 million, or up to 10% of the Australian population, do not possess effective literacy skills" (1991, p. iii).

A recent Australian Bureau of Statistics project funded two joint reports that examined adult Australians' work, home, and community literacy and numeracy skills (McLennan, 1997; Skinner, 1997). These reports were based on The Survey of Aspects of Literacy (SAL) that was conducted in 1996.

An overview of the SAL findings revealed that approximately 2.6 million adults could be expected "to experience considerable difficulties" when attempting to use printed materials that they may encounter in daily life (Level 1); 3.6 million adults are expected to experience some difficulties in using printed texts (Level 2); 4.8 million adults have skills that will enable them to cope with the literacy demands of everyday life (Level 3); 2.0 million adults are able to "display the ability to use higher order skills" (Level 4); and 300 000 adults (Level 5) "can make high level inferences, use complex displays of information, process conditional information and perform multiple operations sequentially" (McLennan, 1997, p. x). McLennan did not comment on these findings.

Contained within the SAL report are feature articles written by academics involved in the area of adult literacy. The SAL findings revealed that approximately half of the Australian population can be expected to experience difficulty in consistently using literacy tasks at Levels 3, 4 and 5 (Norton, 1997). Further to this, "Literacy difficulties amongst adults are serious and pervasive" and ones that are complex in origin (Lo Bianco, 1997, p. 86). Lo Bianco also commented that adult literacy programs that are designed to assist students to achieve some level of success need to consider addressing students' personal, community and family learning requirements rather than maintaining a vocational job-related focus.
Workplace literacy is an area of adult education that has received recent attention. This attention is widespread across the industrialised world and is related to economic development (Brown, 1995). Within the European Union vocational training is widely accepted as an area that requires continuous research and training funds. Unlike some European Union countries, Britain, during the life of the past Conservative government, rejected union participation in the planning and development of its education and training policies. Also the government released itself from funding the majority of vocational training programs and, thereby, placed responsibility for program organisation onto employer and/or corporate groups (Brown). These government actions assisted to reduce Britain's level of vocational training to that which is below some newly industrialised South-East Asian countries (Brown).

The topic of workplace literacy is receiving broad-based attention both within Canada and the USA (Chisman & Campbell, 1990; Taylor, 1995). Both countries have noted that there is a substantial number of adults who do not have the basic skills required to perform low-level job demands. Specifically, approximately one-third of Canadian workers experience difficulties when reading, writing or applying mathematical operations in the workplace (Taylor). Within the USA approximately 10 to 15 million workers have “seriously limited basic skills” and are classified as “low-level, marginal workers” (Chisman & Campbell, p. 146). In Canada and the USA workplace education programs have been introduced to assist to eliminate the mismatch between employees’ existing levels of reading, writing, mathematics and the skills required for these employees to function effectively within the workplace. Further to this, USA workplace programs have started to incorporate employment-related reading activities into ABE programs (Chang, 1989).

Within Australia, workplace literacy has received increasing attention from a wide variety groups and organisations. Specifically, employer groups have acknowledged the need for
many shopfloor employees to increase their levels of literacy: "Workplace communication is central to the changes that are being made in the workplace. Workplace communication is indeed at the heart of what we are all striving for, namely: improved quality and productivity" (Labor Council of NSW & Chamber of Manufactures of NSW, n.d., p. 2). Support for workplace training has also come from union groups and educators: "Unions must educate their membership into understanding that basic education is a legitimate, recognised industrial issue. It is the cornerstone of all vocational training" (Victorian Trades Hall Council, 1992, p. 1). Further, workplace English language programs are necessary if NESB migrants are able to actively participate in Australian society and workforce practices (Cleland, 1991; Joyce & Burns, 1992; Prince, 1992).

During the time of the Keating Labor government, approximately 2.5 billion dollars were earmarked for labour market programs (Keating, 1994b). Under the present Liberal government labour market programs have been restructured and now come under the umbrella of Vocational Education and Training (VET) programs (Department of Employment, Education and Training and Youth Affairs, 1997). The only labour market courses that are presently available are those associated with the WELL program (McKenna, 1997). The dismantling of Australia's past literacy initiatives has placed Australia out of step with many of the OECD countries (McKenna).

**Students' Motivation and Perceptions**

**Overview**

Most of the research which has been conducted in relation to workplace education has mainly focussed on issues related to company, employer, trainer and/or unions’ perceptions of workplace programs (Frank & Hamilton, 1993; Pearson & Strickland, 1993). Very little is understood about employees’ motivation to participate in workplace education programs or
the employees’ perceptions of factors that affect their motivation (Puchner, 1995; Somerville, 1997).

Motivation is a complex, multi-dimensional concept. It involves multiple interactions of variables such as attitude, effort, need, desire, reasons why, goal incentive, goal orientation, motivational orientation, motives, expectations, and factors that affect motivation (Cross, 1981; Gardner, 1985; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Puchner, 1995; Reber, 1985; Skehan, 1989). Motivation is an elusive term that lacks any continuity of definition across motivational literature (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Merriam & Caffarella, 1991; Reber). However, within this chapter, an attempt has been made to review motivational literature that will inform the examination of NESB shopfloor employees’ motivation to participate in workplace learning.

As the case of participants in this inquiry are from non-English speaking backgrounds, second language (L2) theories of motivation will be examined. The majority of L2 theories of motivation have been influenced by the pioneering work of Gardner and Lambert (Gardner, 1985). These researchers’ work is based on the social psychological model of language learning. This model is concerned with the attitudes of an individual learner in relation to how he/she wishes to access, interact and/or identify with the target culture. Gardner and Lambert’s early studies (cited in Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Ely, 1986; Gardner, 1985; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Skehan, 1989, 1991) have supplied a springboard for second language researchers who wish to examine L2 learners’ motivation to participate in L2 classes. Two studies that have examined and developed the earlier work of Gardner and Lambert are those of Ely (1986) and Clement and Kruidenier (1988).

When attempting to comprehend Gardner and Lambert’s early work and other researchers’ studies of L2 motivation, it is important to understand the distinction between the terms ‘motivation’ and ‘motivational orientation’. Gardner (1985) refers to a person’s motivation
to learn a second language as "the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity" (Gardner, p. 10). For a person to be motivated to learn a second language, desire and satisfaction must co-exist with effort (Gardner). Motivational orientation, however, refers to a person's type of motivation; that is, his/her "class of reasons for learning a second language" (Gardner, p. 54). The term 'motivational orientation', as defined by Gardner and Lambert, has been used to inform contemporary research that has examined L2 motivation. Within this study, motivational orientation refers to an employee's "class of reasons" for participating in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses (Gardner, 1985, p. 54; Houle, 1963). That is his/her type of motivation.

There is a present day need to eclectically examine and, thereby, expand the contemporary L2 motivational theory as proposed by Gardner and Lambert (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Oxford & Shearin, 1994, Skehan, 1991). That is an examination that draws from a range of fields of study and includes theory such as that proposed and examined by achievement goal theorists. The majority of past achievement goal theory research has focused inquiry on primary and/or secondary students' perceptions and beliefs about their reasons "why [sic] they are trying to achieve...rather than specifically what [sic] they are trying to achieve" (Wentzel cited in Urdan & Maehr, 1995, p. 215). Achievement goal theorists express these reasons as ability, task, social, and multiple goals (Ames & Archer, 1988; Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, 1988; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989, 1994). Studies that have examined adult students' goals and/or their perceptions of courses in which they have participated are, in the main, based on findings taken from studies conducted with university students (Aspenson, et al. 1993; Volet & Chalmers, 1992; Volet & Lawrence, 1988). University-based studies will not be reviewed here. The decision not to review university-based studies was made as there are vast and obvious learning and/or course content differences between university students and NESB shopfloor employees who have participated in a workplace language and literacy program. Furthermore, these studies did
not investigate aspects of literacy and/or second language learning. On the basis of these differences it did not seem appropriate to align university-based studies’ findings to this study’s findings.

As there are limited studies that have investigated English as a second language and/or adult achievement goals, research that has examined school students’ achievement goals will be used to inform this study’s findings. Within the discussion of these studies, reference will be made to specific achievement goal orientations (i.e., ability, multiple, prosocial, social, & task goal orientations). The terms ‘oriented’ and ‘orientation’ refer to a student’s class of reasons for wanting to academically achieve. The latter interpretation given to these terms is consistent with that used by achievement goal theorists (Ames & Archer, 1988; Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989, 1994).

Within this study several terms will be used to refer to aspects of motivation. Specifically, ‘goal(s)’ refers to the employees’ reasons ‘why’ they chose to participate in one of the CSDP courses. The terms goal(s) and reason(s) will be used interchangeably throughout this study. The term motivation refers to the employees’ goals coupled with their desire to attain their goals. Furthermore, the employees’ desire to attain their goals is linked to their sub-goals. Other terms used synonymously within this study are ‘motivational orientation’ and ‘goal orientation’. Both will be used to refer to the employees’ type of motivation.

1.0 Descriptive Studies
Past descriptive research that has examined continuing education (Carp, Peterson & Roelfs, 1974; Houle, 1963; Johnstone & Rivera, 1965), ABE (Beder & Valentine, 1987a; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984) and/or adult ESL students’ motivation to participate in learning (Beder & Valentine, 1987b; Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975) has examined the reasons ‘why’ adults participate. Further, some of these studies have also examined factors/barriers that have affected student participation in classes. This review of past
descriptive research will give a broad-based overview of why adults participate in education and the factors that affect their participation.

Adults are a diverse group of learners who participate in education for a variety of reasons (Blair, McPake & Munn, 1995; Houle, 1963). For example, adult students have reported that they participate in learning so as to: meet other people, “seek knowledge for its own sake” (Houle, p. 16); “prepare for a new job or occupation”, “become better informed” (Johnstone & Rivera, 1965, p. 142); “become a happier person”, “satisfy employer” (Carp, Peterson & Roelfs, 1974, p.42); participate in personal or social adult education courses (Hill, 1987), “learn new things” (Beder, 1987a, p. 59), “be independent” (Beder & Valentine, 1987b, p. 12), and “[help] family members” (Gowen, 1992, p. 109).

1.1) Houle’s study, The Inquiring Mind (1963), is noted as the work that pioneered examinations of adult students’ motivation to participate in learning (Beder, 1991; Cross, 1981; Merriam & Caffarella, 1991). It examined “who, what, when, where and why” adults participate in learning (Houle, p. 4). The study’s sample included 22 continuing education students. Individual in-depth interviews gathered information on the participants’ educational history, their reasons for participating in continuing education and perceptions of themselves as learners.

An inductive analysis of data themes identified three categories of learners: activity-, goal- and learning-oriented learners (Houle, 1963). Activity-oriented learners participate for reasons other than the understanding of course content. That is they participate because of the activity rather than to obtain any skill or knowledge (Houle cited in Cross, 1981). Reasons such as loneliness, finding/meeting a spouse, escape from personal problems and studying for studying’s sake are indicative of those who are activity-oriented (Houle). Goal-oriented learners are motivated by the attainment of a pre-determined and specific outcome, whereas, learning-oriented students participated because of a “desire to know” (Houle, p.
25) or to “seek knowledge for its own sake” (p. 16). In relation to these orientations, some of the sample were observed to have a specific orientation and others were observed to give emphasis to two or more orientations. That is, these goal orientations are not “pure types”, but rather a way of describing possible student orientations “which overlap at the edges” (Houle, p.16). Further to this, Houle observed that many adult students share common reasons for participating in learning, and that their differences are expressed by the emphasis each student gives to his/her motivation to participate.

1.2) Closely following on from Houle’s 1963 study, several national studies were conducted in the United States of America. These studies also examined adult’s motivation to participate in continuing education classes; namely, Johnstone and Rivera (1965), Carp, Peterson and Roelfs (1974) and the National Center for Educational Statistics (Hill, 1987). More recently, Blair McPake and Munn (1995) conducted one of the first United Kingdom studies that has qualitatively examined adults’ motivation to participate in continuing education. All of these past descriptive studies have influenced contemporary research. However, as each study’s population, design and methods used differ greatly from those used in this study, the above continuing education studies will not be reviewed in depth.

1.3) One of the first studies to examine urban ABE program practice was that conducted by Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox (1975). This comparative study was conducted in two stages. Stage one involved the attainment of data related to “program organisation and functioning ... processes of classroom interaction ... and the perspectives of those involved [sic]” (p. viii). Stage two involved the conducting of two national surveys that sought to “test the universality” of the study’s findings. These surveys involved contacting over 100 ABE public school directors (p. viii). As stage one’s findings are relevant to this study’s findings, stage one, alone, will be reviewed here.
The stage one study population of ABE and ESL students was drawn from a random sample of 59 classes that were being conducted in six major USA cites. ABE and ESL classes are collectively discussed as being part of an ABE program (Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975). ABE students are defined as “over sixteen, out of school, and have less than eighth-grade literacy [of English]” (Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, p. 1).

An analysis of data revealed that students participated in an ABE program for a variety of reasons. For example, they participated so as: “to qualify for better jobs, obtain a high school equivalency diploma, help their children with school work, get a driver’s license, learn to communicate in English, [and] meet new people” (Mezirow, Darkenwald, & Knox, 1975, p. 40). These reasons were placed into two distinct categories. That is, those related to a student’s work life, and those related to either family, community or personal development.

The students five main barriers to participating are: lack of information about program content, erratic attendance of some students, lack of clear assessment benchmarks, continuous acceptance of late enrolling students and the inappropriate placement of some students (Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975).

Factors that affected students’ participation in classes are age and sex (Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975). Older aged men and women were found to participate so as to improve themselves and socialise with other people. In contrast, younger to middle aged men, and women in their mid-teens to twenties, participated for job-related reasons. On the other hand, women in their twenties to forties participated so as to assist their children with homework and to be able to speak to them in English.

Those who participate in ABE programs were found, predominantly, to value and function within middle-class norms and behaviours (Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975).
However, these values, norms and behaviours unintentionally alienate and/or exclude the least literate of American society. For these latter people to be encouraged to participate in a program, radical change was seen as necessary at the program structure and content levels (Mezirow, Darkenwald, & Knox).

1.4) Nine years after Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox (1975) conducted their seminal examination of urban ABE program practice, Darkenwald and Valentine (1984) analysed the impact of an adult basic education program in the state of New Jersey, USA. Within their study, the authors sought to gain information related to students': reasons (goals) for participating in the program, attainment of these goals, participation outcomes, and problems associated with their participation. The population involved in the study was a randomly selected sample of two hundred and ninety-four enrolled ABE students. ABE students are defined as: those who are deficient in any of the basic English skills of reading, writing and mathematics (Darkenwald & Valentine). Excluded from the study were ESL students, prisoners and other atypical groups of learners. Study data were gathered by conducting in-depth telephone interviews. Data was inductively coded and statistically analysed for percentage distributions.

The analysis of data revealed that ABE students participated in the program for a variety of reasons. Some of these reasons are to: “get a job or better job”, “improve basic skills”, “enhance personal development/esteem/confidence”, “prepare for further education or training” and “get a [high school] diploma/finish schooling” (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984, p. 66). It was noted that these goals are similar to the goals of other adult learners (Darkenwald & Valentine). Most of the students mentioned more than one goal. It was observed that the mentioning of more than one goal is indicative of the students’ global perception of education (Darkenwald & Valentine).
In the final assessment of reasons for participating students were asked to indicate if they had attained their goal(s). Sixty-two per cent of the students had attained all or "a lot", whilst 35.3% had attained "some" or "a little", and 2.7% did not attain any of their goals (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984, p. 79). These findings and findings related to the above goals are important as they signal the need for program designers and educators to look beyond instructional/program goals and gain an understanding of what motivates students to participate in ABE classes (Darkenwald & Valentine).

The students' main problems/barriers to participating in the program are listed as: "Work-Related Scheduling Problems" (18.0%), "Difficulties with Learning" (17.5%) and "Family Problems" (16.1%) (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984, p. 70). These problems, however, are not statistically significant and are external to the program itself (Darkenwald & Valentine).

ABE students participated in the program for a variety of reasons that are directly and/or indirectly related to the program's instructional goals. It was concluded that if policy makers and educators fail to consider the full spectrum of learners' goals, program content will be incongruent to the students' needs and reasons for participating in ABE classes (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984).

From 1985 to 1987 Beder and Valentine (1987a; 1987b) conducted two phases of a three phase study. This study involved a descriptive analysis of the Iowa USA adult basic education and ESL student populations. Phase one's population included ABE students who had completed less than eleven grades of schooling and who were defined as "adults of low academic ability" (1987a, p. 4). Phase two's population included all enrolled ESL students within the state of Iowa. This latter population is referred to "the ABE/ESL target population" (1987b, p. 1). Phase three's population included "members of the target population who have never participated in literacy education" (1987b, p. 2). Throughout the discussion of these studies, the ABE study (1987a) will be referred to as phase one and the
ABE/ESL study (1987b) will be referred to as phase two. These phases will be collectively referred to as the "ABE studies" (1987b, p.2). As phase three’s population is related to those who have never participated in literacy education, this phase will not be reviewed here.

1.5) The phase one study was segmented into two stages (i.e., original stage and the follow-up stage). The original stage’s population was comprised of a random sample of 323 Iowa ABE students. The follow-up stage’s population was drawn from a random sample (n = 99) of the original stage’s population. Excluded from the study’s population were ESL students, institutionalised learners and those receiving literacy instruction through one-to-one volunteer programs.

Data was collected by conducting one and a half hour open-ended interviews and by asking survey questions. A descriptive analysis of why the students participated in classes revealed 62 item motivations. These motivations were then formatted into selected-response items and given a three-point Likert scale response rating (Beder, 1991). To gain an underlying structure of why students chose to attend ABE classes, a factor analysis of the sixty-two item motivations was conducted. This analysis yielded ten factors that showed the diversity of motivations reported by the students. These factors in order of stated importance are: ‘Educational Advancement’, ‘Self-Improvement’, ‘Literacy Development’, ‘Community/Church Involvement’, ‘Economic Need’, ‘Family Responsibility’, ‘Job Advancement’, ‘Diversion’, ‘Launching’, and ‘Urging of Others’ (Beder & Valentine, 1987a, pp. 70-71). This diversity of motivations illustrates the “multi-dimensional” nature of students’ motivation to participate in classes (Beder & Valentine, p. 12).

In relation to the five item motivations with the highest mean scores, three of these items are located within the factor of Self-improvement (i.e., I want to learn new things, I enjoy learning new things, Be more intelligent). The remaining two items are located within the factor of Educational Advancement (Beder & Valentine, 1987a).
Six months after the collation and analysis of the original stage’s data, Beder and Valentine conducted the follow-up stage of the study. Here, students were asked if they have made progress in attaining their goals. Fifty-one per cent reported that they had attained “‘a lot’” of their goals, 40 per cent reported that they had attained “‘some’” of their goals and 8 per cent reported that they had attained “‘none’” of their goals (Beder & Valentine, 1987a, p. 34).

Data related to ‘reasons for not attending’ the ABE program showed that two-thirds of the sample were no longer attending ABE classes. The main reasons given by these students were that they had “Completed the program” (41.9%) and “Work interference” (14.5%) (Beder and Valentine, 1987a, p. 35). Less than half of the students were classified as “dropouts” as termination of a class and completion of a program accounted for 50 percent of reported reasons (p. 35).

In relation to any life improvements the students have experienced since they attended the program, 77 percent of them indicated that their lives had improved. These improvements are: “Increased self-confidence or esteem” (35%); “Reads, writes or communicates better” (17.9%); and “Got or improved job” (9.0%) (Beder & Valentine, 1987a, p. 36). An important finding was the weighting students gave to improved self-confidence and self-esteem (Beder & Valentine).

Phase one’s findings showed that ABE students are not a homogeneous group who are motivated for reasons that are peculiar to ABE learners. Rather, they are motivated to participate in learning for reasons that are as multi-dimensional and as diverse as any other group of adult students. Further, like any other adult, ABE students are motivated by the desire to contribute to their self-improvement, families, communities and advance educationally, economically and occupationally (Beder and Valentine, 1987a).
1.6) The ‘phase two’ goal was: “to gain a better understanding of how ESL students might be served more effectively” (Beder and Valentine, 1987b, p. 37). Findings that will assist to inform this case study are related to data that examined ESL students’ motivation to participate in ESL classes.

Phase two of the ABE studies is similar in design and methods used in that of the phase one. However, unlike phase one, phase two’s population was taken from a non-random target population of 206 students; all of whom were enrolled in Iowa ESL classes. Data was gathered by conducting open-ended interviews and the implementation of an item-motivation survey. This survey included items that were reformatted from phase one as well as items suggested by Iowa’s ESL teachers. An analysis of the students’ motivation for having participated in the classes was, firstly, inductively identified and then given a three-point Likert scale response rating. The nine motivation items with the highest mean scores are (Beder & Valentine, 1987b, p.12):

1. “To read better English”.
2. “To write better in English”.
3. “To be more independent”.
4. “Because I enjoy learning new things”.
5. “To use the telephone better”.
6. “To read directions”.
7. “So I can make decisions about my own life”.
8. “To understand how to live in the United States”.
9. “To feel more sure about myself”.

A factor analysis of motivation items further identified the ESL students’ motivation to participate in classes. These factors are listed in order of stated importance: ‘Gain Reading and Writing Skills’, ‘Function Better/Reduce Isolation’, ‘Become Empowered’, ‘Self-
Improvement through Social Integration', 'Job/Economics', 'Helping Children', and 'Contribute to Native Land' (Beder & Valentine, 1987b, p. 27).

In relation to the previously discussed nine item motivations, four of these items are located within the factor Gain Reading and Writing Skills. Further to this, three items are located within the factor Function Better/Reduce Isolation (Beder & Valentine, 1987b). The attainment of reading and writing skills was perceived by the students as assisting them to integrate socially and economically into American society (Beder & Valentine). These skills were, also, perceived as ones that would enable the students to "move up the socioeconomic ladder" (p. 12), "to function better" (p. 10), to speak English to their children, and assist with their children's school work. The ESL students' motivation to participate in ESL classes was found to reflect a non-native born population's desire to be successful in the USA (Beder & Valentine).

Both ABE and ESL students are similarly motivated by factors related to: self-improvement, a desire to read and write, employment and economic concerns, and a desire to help family members (Beder & Valentine, 1987b). However, for phase two students, job advancement and economic need are perceived as part of the same factor; this was not the case for phase one students (Beder & Valentine). Another difference noted between phase one and phase two's findings is that of the ESL population's desire to successfully integrate into American society (Beder & Valentine). This desire is "woven throughout" most of the phase two's motivational factors (Beder & Valentine, p. 12).

Factors identified by the ABE and ESL students were representative of the reasons why adults participate in classes (Beder & Valentine, 1987b). An understanding of these factors can assist educators and administrators to "tailor both promotional messages and instruction" and, thereby, develop more effective recruitment strategies and deliver more effective instruction to students (p. 6).
1.7) Gowen (1990, 1992) conducted an ethnographic study that examined King Memorial Hospital administrators' and entry-level employees' beliefs about a Work Skills Development Program. The program involved the conducting of literacy classes for 60 African-American employees who worked in the hospital’s housekeeping department, food services department or laundry. All classes were held at the hospital and were run for a period of nine months. The program was implemented by hospital administration as they believed that many of the employees had deficient literacy skills and were, therefore: confused, inefficient workers who were unable to follow directions and who overly relied on oral communication to pass on or comprehend information (Gowen, 1992).

Study data was collected by conducting observations, interviews and discussions and, also, by the collating and reviewing of hospital and program artifacts. Data was then analysed into categories that identified, first, the administrators' beliefs about the employees' workplace literacy practices and the program, and, second, the employees' beliefs about their jobs, themselves, hospital administration, the program and what motivated them to participate in the program. The findings that were used to inform this case study are related to the employees' reasons for participating in the program and their beliefs about the program. These reasons are expressed as goals (Gowen 1990, 1992).

Study findings showed that the employees were motivated to participate in the program for a variety of reasons (Gowen, 1990, 1992). The goals most frequently referred to by the employees are: Getting a better job/more money, Getting more education, Self-improvement, and Helping family members. A further analysis of findings classified the seven goals into two distinct categories. These categories are “Getting out” and “Making myself whole” (Gowen, 1992, p. 109). The category of ‘Getting out’ represents the employees’ desire to improve their job-based skills and, thereby, get out of their present job situation. The
category of ‘Making myself whole’ refers to the employees’ desire for personal fulfilment and the pride they experienced in furthering their own education.

Each employee expressed a variety of beliefs about his/her job, family and the program (Gowen, 1992). These beliefs are rooted in past historical, political and social events of North America (Gowen). In relation to the employees’ beliefs about their jobs, some of them reported that they are satisfied with their jobs and believe that they could do no better. Others stated that they are competent workers and dream of promotion within the hospital workforce. A further group of employees want to change their jobs and, to do so, acknowledge the need to participate in some form of occupational training. None of the employees perceived him/herself as deficient in any way (Gowen).

In relation to the employees’ beliefs about the hospital administration, the majority of employees believed that the hospital administration had a hidden agenda that was designed to change their workplace behaviour and prevent them from advancing occupationally (Gowen, 1992). The employees justified this belief by commenting that very few entry-level employees have been promoted from this category of employment. It is the employees’ belief that: because the hospital administration implemented a literacy program that was disguised as a work skills program, the administration was attempting to manipulate how the employees communicate with and to each other (Gowen).

The employees’ categories of goals are vastly different to the administration’s goals (Gowen, 1992). This is illustrated by the observation that the administration’s goals are tied to improved productivity and employees’ advancement in job performance. Further to this, the administration’s goals are ones that are falsely based on the belief that the employees are illiterate persons who are confused, unorganised and incompetent within their jobs (Gowen). Also, there is a vast difference between both groups’ beliefs in relation to the literacy needs of the employees and the program content. For example, hospital and program administrators believed that employees required broad-based, metacognitive literacy skills.
In contrast, the employees believed that they required skills and information unique to their present job and, in some cases, the attainment of a GED (Gowen).

Gowen (1992) recommends that if future workplace literacy programs are to meet students' literacy requirements, future research needs to focus on: a) the "broader social and historical contexts of the community in which the workplace is located" (p. 131), b) the non-monetary benefits of a program, c) employees' perceptions of their learning needs and responses to a program, and d) what motivates students to participate in workplace literacy classes. This type of research focus will enable program planners and educators to have a comprehensive understanding of employees' literacy beliefs and goals (Gowen). Gowen's recommendation for the implementation of this type of research is supported by a wide variety of researchers and scholars (i.e., Keating, 1994; Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, 1988; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Volet & Lawrence, 1988) all of whom separately discuss the need for the implementation of eclectic, broad-based research practices.

1.8) A more recent examination of employees' workplace literacy goals is contained within a case study conducted by Mikulecky, et al. (1996). The study's focus was to examine which key elements of a workplace literacy program learners transfer to their life outside of the classroom. The study involved twelve blue-collar employees from three USA workplaces. Each of the employees represented an individual case (Mikulecky, et al.).

Data was collected by conducting classroom observations and interviews and by collating and analysing assignment material and learner weekly practice reports (Mikulecky, et al., 1996). During the data analysis key elements of program transfer were manually identified and then placed into categories and sub-categories. The four main categories identified are: 'Instructional Elements'; 'Learner Predispositions toward Literacy and Learning'; 'Perceived
Literacy Demands and Opportunities’; and ‘Changed Practices, Predispositions, and Perceptions’ (Mikulecky, et al.).

Within the case by case and cross-case analysis, “high”, “moderate” and “low” learner changes were identified by the allocation of change points (Mikulecky, et al., 1996, p. 8). That is, points were allocated to each learner’s practices in relation to the above four categories.

Findings from the data analyses revealed marked differences within and across the change groups. This was especially so between the high and low change groups. Findings showed that the high change group expressed at least one learning goal. In contrast, only one of the four learners in the low change group expressed any “clear learning goal” (Mikulecky, et al., 1996, p. 24). Furthermore:

• All members of the high change group perceived a need to use new and old literacy demands in and away from the workplace. Conversely, this need was considerably lower for the members of the low change group.

• All members of the high change group identified links between instruction and daily life. However, for members of the low change group these links were “less intense” (Mikulecky, et al., p. 25).

• Members of the low change group reported little perceived relationship between literacy tasks and everyday life. Also, this group was found to undertake jobs that required limited literacy demands.

• The majority of members in the high change group developed a positive rapport with the instructor and, conversely, no-one in the low change group reported much positive rapport with his/her instructor.
The authors concluded that the factors of clear learning goals and new home and work literacy demands influence a learner’s transfer of program content beyond the classroom (Mikulecky, et al., 1996).

This study’s findings have several implications for workplace literacy administrators and instructors (Mikulecky, et al., 1996). First, if transfer of literacy practices is to occur beyond the classroom there is a need to determine students’ literacy demands and, secondly, allocate instructor time to assist students to develop and refine workplace and learner-centred goals. Third, instructors need to develop a positive rapport with students and, at the same time, link literacy program content to each learner’s daily life (Mikulecky, et al.).

1.9) Another on-site study that examined employees’ perceptions of workplace learning is that conducted by Billet (1994). This study sought to examine the nature and outcomes of workplace learning arrangements. In doing so, it compared skilled workers’ perceptions of situated/unstructured learning elements (i.e., “elements of learning that are embedded in the workplace”, p. 114) to structured learning elements (i.e., “learning guides, mentors, videos and computer-based learning aids”, p. 115). Examples of unstructured learning elements are everyday activities, observing and listening, direct instruction, and learning from other workers (Billet). The participants involved in this study included 15 processing plant employees. All of these employees worked full-time for an Australian mining company.

Study data related to the participants’ perceptions of learning arrangements was gathered by conducting three individual interviews and, further to this, the implementation of survey items that investigated the participants’ perceptions of skilled worker attributes.

An analysis of the participants’ perceptions of structured and unstructured learning elements revealed that, the participants perceived that unstructured learning elements were more valuable than structured learning elements in assisting them to successfully perform tasks,
resolve workplace problems and secure workplace goals (Billet, 1994). The participants reported that the unstructured elements of direct instruction, everyday activities, other workers, and observing and listening were of greatest assistance to them; especially those that were integrated with everyday working activities (Billet). A structured element that was reported as assisting the participants was ‘mentors’.

For a situated learning program to assist participants to develop an understanding of workplace skills and knowledge, program content must be authentic in the context of the workplace environment (Billet, 1994). Further to this, it was indicated that authentic content needs to be embedded within the workplace’s social and cultural practices. Learning activities and programs that fail to consider and implement authentic content that is embedded in the workplace’s social and cultural practices will be less likely to generate effective learning outcomes (Billet).

The descriptive studies reviewed in this chapter have examined adult students’ motivation to participate in continuing education, ABE, ABE/ESL, and workplace education classes. Two of these studies have also examined students’ perceptions of a workplace language program; these studies will be reviewed in detail. In relation to students’ motivation to participate in a program, all of the authors note that students identified at least one goal. Several authors observed that they identified more than one goal (Houle, 1963; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984) and other authors noted that the students participate in learning for a variety of reasons (Beder & Valentine, 1987a, 1987b; Darkenwald & Valentine; Gowen, 1990, 1992; and Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975). Beder and Valentine (1987a) commented that ABE students’ motivation to participate in learning is as multi-dimensional as that of the wider adult population. This belief was supported by Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox.

At a program’s policy, design and content level, it was suggested that for learners to view programs positively, designers and educators need to understand students’ goals and assist
them to set clear learning goals (Berlin, 1986; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984; Gowen, 1990, 1992; Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975; Mikulecky, et al., 1996). Further to this, an understanding of students’ goals will assist planners and educators to promote and tailor programs that will meet the learners’ needs (Billet, 1994; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984; Gowen, 1992). Also, if program content is to assist students to understand workplace skills and knowledge, content must be authentic to the workplace. For when program policy, design and content are authentic to the workplace and have looked beyond instructional and administrative goals, workplace programs will have a greater chance of being viewed positively by the students (Billet; Gowen; Mikulecky, et al.; Puchner, 1995).

2.0 Factors that Affect Students’ Motivation

There is an abundance of research that has examined adults’ motivation to participate in learning. However, there is limited research related to adults’ non-participation and/or factors that affect learning (Berlin, 1986; Cross, 1981; McGivney, 1990). Research that examines factors that affect learning will enable educational policy makers, planners and teachers to gain a comprehensive understanding of barriers experienced by potential students or by students who withdraw from education (Cross; Puchner, 1995; Stromquist, 1995).

In an examination of adult and continuing education, the Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training (1991) identified six of the most frequently reported barriers for participants and would-be participants. These barriers are: insufficient financial resources to attend classes; lack of child care facilities; lack of transport, inappropriate location of courses and/or inconvenient class times; perceptual and attitudinal barriers that are related to adults’ lack of confidence in themselves as learners, and/or the insufficient course-based information; geographical isolation; credit for past learning or work experiences, and lack of coordination between training programs (pp. 119-127). Of these barriers, the two most often cited barriers are ‘insufficient financial resources’ and ‘lack of child care facilities’. Within its discussion of these six barriers, the Committee notes the importance of
gaining an understanding of why adults do not participate in learning and makes recommendations to governments as to how these barriers might be altered.

Two frameworks that classify why adults do not participate in learning are those outlined by Cross (1981) and Puchner (1995). Based on the work of Carp, Peterson and Roelfs (1974), Cross identified three categories of barriers to learning. These categories are "situational", "institutional" and "dispositional" (Cross, p. 98). Situational barriers refer to a potential student's life situation at a given time. Examples of situational barriers are lack of transport, limited finance, job responsibilities, family responsibilities, and not enough time to participate in courses. Institutional barriers are ones where the practices and procedures of learning institutions exclude or discourage potential students from participating in education. Examples of institutional barriers are: timetabling; transport to and from classes; location of classes; lack of interesting, pertinent, or practical courses; and lack of information regarding course content. Dispositional barriers refer to a potential student's attitudes and self-perceptions about his/her learning capabilities. Examples of dispositional barriers are "too old to learn", lack of confidence in one's ability, lack of energy, and low grades in previous schooling (Cross, p. 98). Situational, institutional and dispositional barriers do not fit into any one category, but rather they overlap with one another (Cross). The orientation attributed to a category is dependent upon the emphasis given by a potential student. (Cross).

In a workplace study, Puchner (1995) isolated factors that affect students' participation in workplace learning. These factors are "institutional", "situational" and "contextual" (Puchner, p. 164). These factors have been based on reviews of Third World students' motivation to participate in workplace education and learning categories identified by Cross (1981). If policy makers, planners and teachers wish to increase the number of students participating in adult education, they need to look beyond institutional and situational factors and be aware of the overall learning context (Puchner; Stromquist, 1995). Within this framework, institutional factors refer to features of the learning program. Situational factors
refer to personal issues that a potential student encounters when endeavouring to participate in learning. Contextual factors refer to "the opportunities available for an individual to benefit from the learning offered, the social or community support an individual receives, and the ability to perceive benefits that exist" (Puchner, pp. 164-165). Similar to Cross' categories, institutional, situational and contextual factors are not isolated factors, but rather are factors that interact with one another (Puchner).

For persons to be motivated to participate in learning they must be able to perceive tangible, applied and realistic benefits. That is benefits that are possible and appropriate to each individual (Puchner, 1995; Stromquist, 1995). Institutional and situational incentives alone are not sufficient to enhance participation in adult education programs (Mikulecky, 1995; Puchner). When implementing workplace learning, company management, policy makers, planners and teachers need to consider issues related to a favourable learning context. That is issues related to knowing the population, using appropriate instructional methods and having government/community support (Puchner). It is only when issues related to a favourable learning context are considered that potential students will be motivated to participate in workplace education (Mikulecky; Puchner; Stromquist).

Puchner's (1995) framework of factors that affect adults' participation in workplace learning will be used to inform this case study's findings.

3.0 English as a Second Language Studies

Research studies that have examined L2 learners' motivation to participate in second language classes have been influenced by Gardner and Lambert's social psychological theory of instrumental/integrative motivation (Gardner, 1985). Even though Gardner and Lambert's work has informed other L2 studies there is a need to further examine L2 students' motivation beyond that of instrumental and integrative orientations (Clement &

"The source of the motivating impetus is relatively unimportant, provided the motivation is aroused” (Gardner cited in Oxford & Shearin, 1994, p. 15). Gardner’s statement has been criticised by researchers who realise that importance of gaining an understanding of L2 motivation. The responding question: “Without knowing where the roots of motivation lie, how can teachers water those roots?” was posed by Oxford and Shearin (p. 15). Studies that have examined ‘the roots’ of L2 students’ motivation to participate in learning are Ely (1986) and Clement & Kruidenier (1988). Second language studies that will be reviewed in this chapter are those of Ely; Clement and Kruidenier; Gardner and Lambert (cited in Gardner, 1985); Tremblay and Gardner (1995); and Krashen (1981, 1989).

The instrumental/integrative theory of L2 motivation examined Canadian secondary school students’ types of motivation for studying a second language. Students who nominated “meeting and conversing with more and varied people”, or “as a means of better understanding French Canadian people and their way of life” were classified as “integratively oriented” (Gardner, 1985, p. 11). Integrative orientation refers to a “social-emotional” (p. 11) class of reasons that “suggest that the individual is learning a second language in order to learn about, interact with, or become closer to the second language community” (Gardner, p. 54). Students who nominated “learning French because it would be useful in obtaining a job”, or “it made them better educated” were classified as “instrumentally oriented” (p. 11). Instrumental orientation refers to a “pragmatic” (p. 11) class of reasons that indicate an individual’s “economic and practical advantages of learning” a second language (p. 52). The classification of instrumental and integrative orientations identify the type(s) of motivation reported by a learner. That is, either orientation “answers why the individual is studying the language” (p. 51).
Further to the instrumental/integrative theory of motivation, Gardner and his associates (cited in Tremblay & Gardner, 1995) developed the Socio-Educational Model of language acquisition. This model measures variables that influence motivation. These variables are "Integrativeness [sic]" and "Attitudes toward the Learning Situation" (Tremblay & Gardner, p. 506). Tremblay and Gardner expanded the Socio-Educational Model to include variables of motivation derived from the field of psychology. These variables are "expectancy and self-efficacy, valence [sic], causal attributions [sic], and goal setting" (p. 507). Through the implementation of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) his latter model investigated which of these variables would mediate the variables of 'Language Attitudes' and 'Motivational Behaviour'.

As this case study's data can be inductively matched to Gardner and Lambert's (Gardner, 1985) theory of instrumental/integrative motivation, the social psychological theory of L2 motivation will be used to inform this study's findings. However, as data related to factors that influence L2 students' motivation or mediate between their attitudes and motivational behaviour needs to be obtained through the implementation of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery, Tremblay and Gardner's Socio-Educational Model of language acquisition will not be used to inform this case study's findings. The decision not to use the AMTB was made as the application of this test does not fit in with this study's methodological framework.

There are two distinct problems associated with the instrumental/integrative theory of L2 motivation (Ely, 1986). These problems are the ambiguity that arises when a researcher attempts to distinguish between instrumental and integrative motivation, and whether the constructs of instrumental/integrative motivation cover all types of L2 students' motivation (Ely). This latter concern encouraged Ely to examine the different types of L2 motivation. In so doing, he conducted a descriptive survey that involved a collective sample of seventy-
five first and second year university students. All of these students were enrolled in Spanish classes at a northern Carolina university.

A factor analysis of data revealed three distinct clusters (i.e., patterns of L2 students' motivation). These clusters are (Ely, 1986):

"Cluster A" (i.e., students' interest in another culture, their desire to communicate to speakers of Spanish, or to participate in cultural groups).

"Cluster B" (i.e., students' desire to present as a "more attractive job candidate" or for the learning of Spanish to "be of use in one's career" (p. 31).

"Cluster C" (i.e., students' study requirements: "I need to fulfill [sic] the university foreign language requirement" or "I need to study a foreign language as a requirement for my major") (p. 31).

Cluster C was labelled: "requirement motivation" (p. 31).

A further analysis of findings revealed similarities between Cluster A to that of integrative motivation and Cluster B to that of instrumental motivation (Ely, 1986). Types of motivation that were outside of the instrumental and integrative orientations were those identified as belonging to Cluster C (Ely). Therefore, the constructs of instrumental/integrative motivation do not cover all types of L2 students' motivation (Ely). On the basis of these findings, more descriptive research is required if researchers and practitioners are to have an understanding of L2 students' motivational patterns (Ely).

Gardner and Lambert's instrumental/integrative theory of L2 motivation has been further cited as containing "ambiguities" within its definitions of instrumental and integrative orientations (Clement & Kruidenier, 1988, p. 274). Clement and Kruidenier examined the factors of: ethnicity, milieu and target second language in relation to the emergence of L2 students' learning orientations. A sample of 871 year eleven students was drawn from Canadian secondary schools found within the provinces of Ontario, Ottawa and Quebec.
A factor analysis of questionnaire items revealed four orientations that were common to all of the sample's eight groups. These orientations are: "pragmatic goals (i.e., the instrumental orientation) [sic]"; "to travel"; "seek new friendships"; and "to acquire knowledge" (Clement & Kruidenier, 1988, p. 286). All of these four orientations need to be considered as "independent orientations" (Clement & Kruidenier, p. 286) rather than an extension of integrative or instrumental orientation as classified by Gardner (1985).

Variations of motivational orientations were found to result from the interaction of the status of target group learners and their familiarity with the contact group (Clement & Kruidenier, 1988). For example, the orientation to "seek new friendships" is indicative of a "socio-cultural orientation" (p. 288). That is, one that refers to a person's "cultural and artistic presentation" and one that is often coupled with an intention to "seek knowledge" for travel purposes (p. 288). This socio-cultural orientation does not represent a person's social-emotional desire to bond with or be integrated into any one group (Clement & Kruidenier). Therefore, the reasons contained within 'seek new friendships' cannot be considered as part of integrative orientation. These variations of motivational orientations are expressed as being dependent on "'who learns what in what milieu'" (p. 288).

Krashen's Monitor Model of second language acquisition has also added to the debate surrounding L2 motivation (Krashen, 1989). This theory is located within the larger theoretical framework of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and has been influenced by the earlier work of Dulay and Burt (Krashen cited in Skehan, 1989). The thesis supporting the Monitor Model is: for a student to acquire a second language the student must have--comprehensible input (i.e., understand the messages), a low affective filter and an effective monitoring system (Krashen, 1981, 1989).
The Monitor Model of SLA contains five hypotheses: The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, The Natural Sequence Hypothesis, The Monitor Hypothesis, The Affective Filter Hypothesis, and The Comprehensible Input Hypothesis (Skehan, 1989). Of initial interest to this case study was the Affective Filter Hypothesis. Within this part of the Monitor Model of SLA, Krashen (1989) hypothesises that a high affective filter (i.e., one where students have a high level of anxiety, low motivation and low self-esteem) will prevent students from learning effectively. However, as the Monitor Model of SLA theory has been criticised by researchers and writers in the field of language learning (Gregg, 1986; Lightbown & Pienemann, 1993; Nagle & Sanders, 1986; Singleton, 1989; White, 1987) and as there is a paucity of research that supports the Affective Filter Hypothesis, Krashen’s work will not be used to inform this study’s findings.

There has been extensive and, sometimes, controversial discussion regarding age and its affect on L2 learning (Cook, 1991; Ellis, 1994; Singleton, 1989). The hypothesis that age is a determining factor that influences a learner’s efficiency and success in acquiring the phonetic or syntactic domains of a second language is questioned by Singleton. Further, there is a view that age itself is not a major factor in determining second language learning but, rather, “the different interactions that learners of different ages have with the [L2] situation and with other people” is backed by research findings (Cook, p. 84). However, in relation to adult L2 learners, it was found that the age does affect second language learning (Kaufmann, 1989; Rado & Foster, 1995). Specifically, Kaufmann observed that ‘educational background’ and ‘age’ are the most significant factors that affect the rate at which adult learners learn a second language. A conciliatory view surrounding the discussion of age and its affect on L2 learning is that, given the same naturalistic learning situations persons who are exposed to a second language in childhood will, in general, surpass those who are exposed to a second language in adulthood (Singleton cited in Cook).
In relation to middle-aged and senescent L2 learners, learners may experience problems associated with oral-aural aspects of the target language, phonetic coding and adjustments to aspects of classroom teaching (Brandle cited in Singleton, 1989). To counteract these problems educators need to consider: timetabling of courses, learners' needs and difficulties in relation to class organisation, the visibility and audibility of learning materials, and an active teaching approach that is based on learning and practise (Singleton). Further to the type of teaching approaches used with middle-aged and senescent learners, educators need to take account of adults' abilities to abstract and analyse information (Cook, 1991). Teachers also need to create a naturalistic L2 learning situation that includes "'here and now'" and abstract topics (Cook, p. 86).

In summary, past L2 motivational research studies have been influenced by Gardner and Lambert's social psychological theory of instrumental/integrative motivation (Gardner, 1985). More recently, writers and researcher in the area of L2 motivation have begun to question the sometimes ambiguous and, ironically, influential nature of Gardner and Lambert's earlier work (Clement & Kruidenier, 1988; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Ely, 1986; Dornyei, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Skehan, 1989, 1991). Further to Gardner and Lambert's earlier work, Gardner and associates (cited in Gardner, 1985) and Tremblay and Gardner (1995) have developed and expanded a Socio-Educational Model of language acquisition. However, these more recent studies have not considered or developed any other possible orientations of L2 motivation. Studies that have considered other L2 motivational orientations are that of Ely, and Clement and Kruidenier. Both of these studies found that there are L2 motivational orientations outside of the instrumental and integrative orientations as proposed by Gardner and Lambert.

Some writers and researchers who have questioned the social psychological theory of L2 motivation (Clement & Kruidenier, 1988; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Ely, 1986; Dornyei, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994) have suggested that future research needs to consider
implementing studies that draw on a variety of methods, techniques and theories of motivation. One theory that has been separately proposed by Crookes and Schmidt, Dornyei, and Oxford and Shearin is that of achievement goal theory.

4.0 Achievement Goal Theory Research

The framework of achievement motivation theory is closely associated with past and present theories of motivation that have investigated human needs. Examples of these theories are "need for achievement", "need for mastery" and "need for autonomy" (Urdan & Maehr, 1995, p. 214). A branch of achievement motivation theory, and one that incorporates social-cognitive theories, is that of achievement goal theory. The majority of achievement goal theorists have examined school students' achievement goals; namely, task, ability, social, and multiple goals (Ames & Archer, 1988; Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989, 1994). As there is a paucity of literature that has examined adult or ESL students' achievement goals, the achievement goal theory literature that will be reviewed in this case study discusses school students' achievement goals.

The achievement goal theory of motivation focuses on students' perceptions and beliefs about the reasons why they participate in "academic work" (Urdan & Maehr, 1995, p. 213). These reasons are theoretically expressed as goals; that is, ones that represent the "the purposes or meaning of academic work, achievement, and success" (p. 215). Achievement goals do not affect the amount of motivation a student brings to a learning situation; rather these goals affect the quality of a student's motivation (Ames cited in Urdan & Maehr). Quality of motivation is perceived by achievement goal theorists as having a direct effect on a student's behavioural, cognitive and affective outcomes (Urdan & Maehr).

Previous research studies have investigated adolescent students' task and ability achievement goals (Ames & Archer, 1988; Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988). Task goals refer to students' desire to develop competence or attain mastery of a topic or concept (Urdan &
Maehr). Examples of task goals are “to learn new things” and “to understand things” (Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, p. 517). Conversely, ability goals refer to students’ concerns to demonstrate ability that is relative to the performance of others (Urdan & Maehr). Examples of ability goals are “I wanted others to think I was smart” and “It was important to me to me to better than other students” (Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, p. 517).

Task and ability achievement goals are important indicators of students’ learning engagement patterns in a classroom environment (Ames & Archer, 1988; Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988; Wentzel, 1994). For example, students who are task oriented, as compared to ability oriented, place emphasis on developing and mastering new skills and are more inclined to value the learning process (Ames & Archer). Task oriented students believe that mastery of a skill or concept is dependent upon their personal effort. In contrast, ability oriented students believe that ability is based on being judged able by one’s peers and/or teachers, outperforming others and/or gaining success with limited effort (Urdan & Maehr, 1995). Task oriented students are more likely to enjoy participating in classroom activities than are ability oriented students (Ames & Archer).

Recently, research studies have begun to develop Wentzel’s earlier work that examined social goals. These studies have investigated the importance of social goals in relation to students’ academic learning outcomes (Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989, 1994). Social goals refer to a student’s “‘virtuous intentions or personal commitment rather than ability’” (Maehr & associates quoted in Urdan & Maehr, p. 242). More specifically, ‘prosocial goals’ refer to a student’s desire to develop “group cohesion and positive interpersonal interactions” with others (Wentzel, 1994, p. 174). Students who receive peer and teacher support are more likely to pursue “academically-relevant social goals” (Wentzel, 1994, p. 180). Also, peer and teacher support that develops a sense of “belongingness [sic] and relatedness” assists students to facilitate the adoption of goals that are valued by their
social group (Wentzel, p. 180). Teacher support is an important factor in motivating students to take responsibility for their academic work (Wentzel, 1994).

Multiple goals refer to a student’s attainment of two or more achievement goals (Wentzel, 1989). For students to attain academic success they need to be encouraged to pursue multiple goals that conform to the social mores of the classroom (Wentzel). Student’s classroom achievement is related to the pursuit of task as well as social goals; ones that are based on the student’s perceptions of his or her “socially-derived” and “self-referent standards of performance” (p. 136). The classroom environment is important in assisting students to meet their goals (Wentzel). Further to this, the relationship between a student’s motivational characteristics and academic success needs to “match the motivational characteristics of the classroom” (p. 140). This view supports the notion that a student’s goal orientation is dependent on how that student constructs the social reality of the classroom (Ames & Archer, 1988).

Of interest to this case study are the theoretical understandings of the achievement goal theory of motivation and the theory’s classification and description of achievement goals. Along with descriptive research studies, Crookes and Schmidt (1991), Oxford and Shearin (1994), Ely (1986), Clement and Kruidenier (1988), and Gardner and Lambert (Gardner, 1985), the achievement goal studies reviewed in this chapter will be used to inform the classification and description of shopfloor employees’ goals and goal orientations. These goals and goal orientations will be outlined and discussed in the following chapter.

5.0 Implications
Past research has examined a variety of issues that are related to adult students’ motivation to participate in learning. First, descriptive studies have examined adult continuing education and ABE students’ motivation to participate in learning (Blair, McPake & Munn, 1995; Beder & Valentine, 1987a, 1987b; Carp, Peterson & Roelfs, 1974; Darkenwald &
Valentine, 1984; Gowen, 1990, 1992; Hill, 1987; Houle, 1963; Johnstone & Rivera, 1965; Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975; Munn & MacDonald, 1988). Second, other descriptive studies have examined students’ barriers to participating (Cross, 1981; Puchner, 1995; Stromquist, 1995); employees’ perceptions of a workplace language program (Billet, 1994; Gowen, 1990, 1992); and workplace/home learning transfer (Mikulecky, et al., 1996). Third, research has also examined L2 students attitudes towards the community of speakers and motivational orientations to learn a second language (Gardner & Lambert cited in Gardner, 1985); language attitudes and motivational behaviours (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995); second language acquisition (Krashen, 1989); and motivational orientations that are outside of the instrumental/integrative theory of L2 learning (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Clement & Kruidenier, 1988; Dornyei, 1994; Ely, 1986; Oxford & Shearin, 1994).

Many of the above studies point to the necessity for educational research to examine and deliver an understanding of what motivates adult students to participate in learning and barriers to students’ participation. That is because an understanding of student motivation and possible barriers is necessary if teachers, policy planners and program designers are to meet the students’ educational, psychological and social needs (Beder & Valentine, 1987a; Gowen, 1992; McGroarty, 1993). Further, a comprehensive understanding of students’ motivation to participate in learning can be achieved through the implementation of controlled longitudinal studies; that is studies that examine motivation from the students’ perspective and review and discuss findings as expressed by the cohort (Beder, 1991; Merriam & Caffarella, 1991). To this end, methods such as participant observation, case histories and case studies may be best suited to assist researchers to formatively evaluate adult learning and the effects of students’ participation in a learning program (Alamprese, 1990; Keating, 1994; Patton, 1990). More specifically, a comprehensive understanding of L2 motivational research is needed; that is one that is based on theoretically eclectic methods and one that involves longitudinal studies (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Skehan, 1989). Further, L2 motivation needs to be examined as a conscious process rather than as an subconscious one
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that separates attitudes, effect and language learning outcomes from any intervening psychological process of learning (Crookes & Schmidt).

Based on the beliefs and recommendations of writers and researchers reviewed in this chapter, I will eclectically examine the case of NESB shopfloor employees' motivation to participate in a workplace language and literacy program and their perceptions of factors that affect their motivation to participate. The literature reviewed in this chapter will be used to inform the examination and discussion of this case study's findings.
CHAPTER THREE
Case Study Design and Methods

Introduction
This chapter is written in three sections. These sections are ‘Design’, ‘Methods’, and ‘Ethical Considerations’. The first section gives an overview of components of case study design and discusses research design issues specific to this inquiry. Also, this section justifies the selection and type of case study design employed. The second section discusses and justifies the use of various data sources and the collection and analysis strategies used. Third, ethical considerations relevant to this inquiry are briefly outlined.

Design
Overview
As the purpose of this study was to evaluate the CSDP courses from the employees’ perspective it was decided to conduct a formative rather than a summative evaluation. This decision was made on the basis that a formative evaluation would assist to inform and improve the design and content of future Food Products CSDP courses as well as adding to the existing summative information documented by the program’s teachers. Specifically, “formative evaluation serves the purpose of improving a specific program, policy, group of staff (in a personal evaluation) or product. Formative evaluations aim at ‘forming’ the thing being studied” rather than making controlled comparisons and generalisations beyond a study’s research focus (Patton, 1990, p. 156). One of the most effective ways of conducting a formative evaluation is by implementing case study research design (Patton).
Case Study Design

A case study is a research design that can be employed by researchers from varying disciplinary and philosophical backgrounds. It can be based on a qualitative or quantitative paradigm; have single or multiple population(s); study an event, an individual, a program, an institution or a group; and test or construct theory (Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1978). A case study represents "the process of learning about the case and the product of our learning" (Stake, 1994, p. 237). The case study approach is suited to research situations in which the case phenomenon is embedded in the context of the situation and where a researcher studies a phenomenon systematically (Merriam; Yin, 1994). The purpose of a case study is to understand the phenomenon from the perspective of its members and, in so doing, represent reality as defined and outlined by the case or individual cases studied (Stake, 1978, 1994).

Case study design was chosen to frame this inquiry as it is the most appropriate research design that would enable me to undertake a formative evaluation of the research phenomenon. This was evidenced by the realisation that it would be impossible to separate the phenomenon from the context of the workplace environment (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1994). It also became evident that a qualitative rather than a quantitative paradigm would be more suited to a formative evaluation and, at the same time, facilitate the attainment of thick descriptive data (Patton, 1990). Taking the above issues into consideration I decided to construct and implement a qualitative case study research design (Merriam; Patton; Stake, 1978, 1994).

The specific and identifying characteristics of a qualitative case study are its 'essential properties' and its 'purpose' (Merriam, 1988, Stake, 1978). First, here are four characteristics that constitute a case study's essential properties. These properties are "particularistic", "descriptive", "heuristic", and "inductive" (Merriam, pp. 9-10). A case study holds all these characteristics when it focuses on a particular event, program, or phenomenon and through inductive analysis and a descriptive account of findings informs the
reader’s understanding of the inquiry. Second, a case study is defined by its bounded system. A bounded system refers to the features that are case specific; that is, features that set parameters/boundaries around the case (Merriam; Stake, 1978, 1994). This study was designed with these essential properties and the concept of boundaries in mind.

The boundaries specific to this study are the ‘phenomenon,’ the ‘event,’ the ‘people’ involved in the event and the workplace ‘site’. These boundaries are outlined in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Summary of Case Boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>phenomenon:</strong> NESB shopfloor employees’ perceptions of the Communication Skills Development Program course in which they participated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>event:</strong> Introductory and Intermediate Communication Skills Development Program courses for NESB shopfloor employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>people:</strong> 10 NESB Food Products shopfloor employees who participated in one of the CSDP courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>site:</strong> a Food Products production site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methods**

**Data Collection**

**Overview.**

Data collection and analysis were conducted over a period of twelve months. This involved a four phase plan as outlined in Table 2.
### Table 2
#### Case Study Research Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Research process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>July to August 1995</td>
<td>• Outlined the research purpose and design to the Workplace Training Consultative Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conducted a pilot study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>September to December 1995</td>
<td>• Outlined the research purpose and design to prospective case employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Started data collection with the case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>January to April 1996</td>
<td>• Presented a mid-inquiry report to the Workplace Training Consultative Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Continued with and completed data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>April to June 1996</td>
<td>• Analysed, categorised and cross-checked data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Presented preliminary findings to case employees and the Workplace Training Consultative Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase One involved outlining the research process to Food Products' Workplace Training Consultative Committee. Permission was sought and gained from the committee to conduct a pilot study and the inquiry. In Phase Two I outlined the research process to the employees who had participated in one of the CSDP courses. Permission was gained from these employees to conduct the inquiry. This phase also saw the implementation of initial interviews, presentation of summary narratives, conducting of observations and the taking of field notes. Phase Three involved the presentation of a mid-inquiry report to the Workplace Training Consultative Committee; the collation and examination of workplace documents and artifacts; the continuation of interviews, observations and the taking of field notes. In Phase
Four a review and summarisation of findings was made. This involved examining, analysing, categorising and cross-checking data. A case record outline was presented to the employees for verification of findings (Patton, 1990). This involved showing each employee an overview of findings specific to him/herself. At a later stage a verbal summary of these findings was presented to the Workplace Training Consultative Committee.

Pilot study.

A pilot study was conducted in July of 1995 at one of Food Products’ other workplace sites. The purpose of the pilot study was to assist in the clarification of the format and wording of the case study demographic information sheet, consent form and interview questions. The persons involved in the pilot were three of Food Products’ NESB shopfloor employees. These employees have a similar demographic and educational background to the employees involved in the case study. Similar to the case, all of the pilot group participated in an on-site NESB Communication Skills Development Program course. This course was similar in design and implementation to the Introductory course conducted at the case study site.

The demographic information sheet consisted of questions related to an employee’s age-range, gender, nationality, number of years living in Australia, languages spoken at home and at work, years and levels of schooling and number of years that they have worked for the company. The pilot consent form contained detailed information about the study’s purpose and design and asked for each employee’s consent to participate in the study. As a result of this pilot study the consent form was simplified.

The pilot study also involved the trialing of “semistandardized” (Berg, 1989, p. 17) and open-ended interview questions (Patton, 1990). Specifically, a semistandardized interview:

involves the implementation of a number of predetermined questions and/or special topics. These questions are typically asked of each interviewee in a systematic and consistent order, but allow the interviewers sufficient freedom
to digress; that is, the interviewers are permitted (in fact expected) to probe far beyond the answers to their prepared and standardized questions (Berg, p. 17).

The asking of semistandardized and open-ended questions involved me designing a semi-structured interview guide that contained a set of thematically organised questions (Berg, 1989). These questions were worded so as not to elicit a specific response (Patton, 1990). All of these questions were framed around the initial primary research question and included topics related to the employees’ perceptions of: the course, reasons for participating in the course, changes that have or have not occurred from their participation in the course, an ideal course and general issues related to workplace education. Asking of these topic-based questions was guided by the work of Aspenson, et al. (1993) and Gowen (1992) and the writing of Dillman (cited in Donaghy, 1984).

During the pilot interview it became evident that the open-ended questions were too vaguely worded for persons with a basic understanding of English. Interviewees appeared confused and unsure of questions asked. For example, when I asked the employees: How would you best describe the sorts of things you did in the course?, one of the women responded, I don’t know, the other employees looked away and shrugged their shoulders. At the time of the interview this question was rephrased into a closed question: What sort of activities did you do in the course? When asked a closed question (Patton, 1990) interviewees appeared to understand the question and were keen to give a response. If an answer needed clarification or expansion, probes were used. These mainly consisted of “clarification”, “detailed-oriented” and/or “elaboration” probes (Patton, pp. 325-326). In addition to interview questions and probes a summarising transition statement was used to present a summary of an employee’s perceptions of a specific topic (Patton). Summarising transition statements enabled me to summarise what had been said in various sections of the interview. Further, these statements indicated to an employee that what he/she had said had been listened to in the interview situation. It also enabled an employee to clarify, correct or add to a topic area.
Five to seven days after the initial interview, a narrative summary that was based on information taken from the interview transcript and field notes was read to members of the pilot group. This enabled the group to clarify, correct and add to or verify my understanding of their perceptions of the CSDP course. The presentation of the narrative summary was used a member check to verify collated data (Guba, 1981).

Based on outcomes from the pilot interview: i) the wording of the consent form was changed from detailed paragraphs to point form presentation of information, ii) provision on the demographic information sheet was made for each employee to supply a pseudonym, and iii) interview questions were changed from open-ended wording to closed wording. However, the semi-structured design of thematically organised questions was retained. Changes to the wording of interview questions will be further discussed in the ‘data collection strategies’ section of this chapter. The final design of the demographic information sheet and the consent form used in the case study are included in appendices 1 and 2 respectively.

**Sample.**

The sample involved in this study was purposefully selected so as to be representative of a case of NESB shopfloor employees who had participated in a workplace language and literacy program (Patton, 1990). The number of employees included in the sample is 10 (i.e., 8 females and 2 males). A description of the employees’ demographic features is outlined below.

**Introductory course participants.** At the time of this inquiry all seven employees (6 females and 1 male) were aged forty to forty-nine years. Caterina, Francesco, Maria, Nicola and Sorina migrated to Australia from Europe (i.e., Italy and Macedonia), and Bow and May migrated from South-East Asia (i.e., Thailand and Vietnam). All of those who migrated from Europe have been in Australia for over two decades; whereas those from South-East
Asia have been here for one decade. When asked about languages they speak at home and work, all of the employees reported that they mainly speak their first language (L1) at home and English at work. Bow, Caterina and Francesco reported that they also communicate in English when speaking to their children. Francesco is the only one of the Introductory course employees to have completed secondary education; this he completed in Italy. All of the other employees have completed six to eight years of primary education in either Europe or South-East Asia. Other than Francesco, all of the employees are employed as production line packers. Francesco is employed as a machine operator, and he is presently assisting with in-house company training of other shopfloor employees. His supervisor informed me that he is one of the best in-house trainers the company has. The supervisor commented: *He knows when to assist and when to back off.*

**Intermediate course participants.** The shopfloor employees who participate in the Intermediate course are Christina, Marta and Pasquale (2 females and 1 male). At the time of this inquiry, all of them were aged between forty and forty-nine years. Further, all of them migrated to Australia from Europe (i.e., Hungary, Italy and Spain). Pasquale migrated to Australia in the 1960s and Christina and Marta arrived in the early 1980s. All of them speak their L1 at home and English at work. However, Pasquale sometimes speaks English at home. Pasquale completed eight years of primary schooling in Italy. He is presently employed as a senior machine operator. Christina and Marta both completed secondary education in Europe. After graduating from secondary school, Christina completed a laboratory technician's course and Marta completed a secretarial course and several computer courses. Each of these women has worked within her respective field of training in her home country. Further, Christina has worked as a laboratory technician at a Western Australian university. Both of these women are currently employed as production line packers.
Case study sources and strategies.

Within the bounds of this case study, the term 'source' refers to the points of reference from which data was obtained (Patton, 1990). Sources involved in this inquiry include i) Food Products staff and teachers, ii) documentation, iii) physical artifacts and iv) the physical and social environments. It was decided to use a variety of sources as this would assist to minimise the weaknesses of any single source and, at the same time, provide multiple perspectives on the phenomenon being researched (Patton; Yin, 1994).

i) 'Food Products staff and teachers' refers to people involved in the planning and the implementation and/or learning stages of the CSDP courses. The main people involved in the inquiry were the case of Food Products shopfloor employees who participated in one of the CSDP courses. Other people who assisted with the study were the pilot study group; a Food Products training manager, production supervisor and members of the Workplace Training Consultative Committee; and one of the program's teachers. At various times throughout the inquiry, I formally and informally held interviews and discussions with these people; observed patterns of their behaviour; and recorded field notes related to interviews, discussions and observations. I also attended four of the consultative committee's meetings. At these meetings I outlined each new phase of the research process as it arose within the study.

ii) 'Documentation' provided an unobtrusive means of collating data (Berg, 1989). That is, it enabled me to gain an understanding of various company and employee happenings without intruding on management's or the employees' time. Documents examined in this case study included pre- and post-course summative reports; company training brochures, booklets, meeting agendas and a Quality Assurance file. Examination of these documents occurred on and off-site and were supported by the taking of field notes and observations. Permission was given by management for me to view these documents and take field notes regarding information contained in them. Field notes were openly taken in front of the employees.
Collectively, documents provided me with a valuable source of information about the company and course background, activities, design and teaching processes used. These documents also assisted me to isolate research and interview topics and questions.

iii) A 'physical artifact' refers to "a technological device, a tool or instrument, a work of art, or some other physical evidence" (Yin, 1994, p. 90). The physical artifacts examined in this study were messages on the tea-room notice board, work-roster whiteboard and production site workplace signs. Examination of these artifacts was conducted on-site. Physical artifacts were examined by making observations of the language contained on the artifact, its purpose, and how and when it was utilised by a shopfloor employee. Physical artifacts provided me with a reliable guide to the shopfloor's documented language that physically surrounds and is accessed by the employees. It also provided me with a reference point when discussing, with a shopfloor employee, his or her workplace language/literacy practices.

iv) The 'physical environment' is the setting in which the embedded phenomenon is located (Patton, 1990). In relation to this study, the physical environment is Food Products' food processing factory. Direct observations related to the factory's architectural design, layout and automation of machines were recorded as field notes. Specific to this case study were observations related to the design and layout of the shopfloor and shopfloor employees' access to other areas of the factory.

In observing and describing the 'social environment' direct observations related to the company and shopfloor culture were recorded. Here, 'culture' refers to the way management and members of the case use their "acquired knowledge ... to interpret experience and generate social behaviour" (Spradley, 1979, p. 5). Observations related to the company and shopfloor culture are based on observations made with one another, decision-making patterns
and processes, and oral language used (Patton, 1990). This data was used to inform, support, and/or clarify data related to the employees’ perceptions of the CSDP courses.

Data collection strategies.
The attainment of thick descriptive data was gained through the use of multiple research strategies. This data was used to substantiate the formative evaluation of the CSDP courses. These strategies are i) observation, ii) interview and iii) the collation of field notes. The use of multiple strategies has enabled triangulation of data to occur (Patton, 1990). Further, triangulation assisted to clarify and verify observations and findings as well as identifying multiple realities as defined by the case (Merriam, 1988; Patton; Stake, 1994).

i) The ‘observation’ strategies used in this study were direct and participant observation (Patton, 1990). Specifically, direct observation enabled me to observe the written and oral language of the workplace and how and when the employees used English language/literacy practices on the shopfloor. In addition, participant observation gave me the opportunity to actively participate on the production line and, thereby, experience and speak to the employees about the language/literacy practices they use on-the-job and their perceptions of the workplace environment (i.e., workplace culture and happenings). Shopfloor observations were carried out for one and a half to two hours at a time. These observations were conducted over a period of ten work days. Observations made in other sections of the factory were not timetabled and continued for the life of the inquiry. Observations were used to inform the content of interview questions and verify interview and other collated data (Spradley, 1979).

ii) ‘Formal’ and ‘informal interviews’ were used to gain a descriptive account of the research phenomenon as described by the case, other Food Products staff and one of the CSDP teachers. Specifically, formal interviews were conducted with the pilot group, the case, a
program teacher and a Food Products training manager. Formal interviews were timetabled to occur and contained pre-planned content.

Three separate formal interviews were conducted with each of the employees. These interviews included an initial individual or group interview, a narrative summary presentation of the initial interview and a focus group interview (Fontana & Frey, 1994; Patton, 1990). I had hoped to be able to conduct initial individual interviews with all of the ten employees. However, due to the demands of the workplace, it was not possible to timetable individual interviews with all of the employees. It was a matter of who was available at a given time. Three initial individual interviews were conducted with Christina, Francesco and May. Initial small group interviews were conducted with Maria, Nicola and Sorina; Angela and Bow; and Marta and Pasquale. Where group interviews were held all group members had participated in the same course. Prior to the start of each initial individual/group interview the employee(s) were given a copy of the interview format guide sheet; that is one that contained an ordered list of interview questions (Patton, 1990). Further, all shopfloor employees’ initial interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed.

The structure and wording of the initial individual/group interview questions was framed around a semistandardized interview format guide that involved the asking of a number of predetermined, thematically organised, topic-based and closed questions (Berg, 1989; Patton, 1990). Interview questions included topics related to the employees’ perceptions of the course, reasons for participating in the course, changes that have or have not occurred from their participation in the course, perceptions of an ideal course and general issues related to workplace education. To counteract any predetermined answers from the case when asking closed questions, I attempted to probe statements made and encouraged the employees to discuss issues they wished to raise. If an employee indicated that he/she wished to discuss a topic that was not listed on the interview format guide, I followed his/her direction and
asked unplanned questions related to his/her interest area. Throughout the interview field notes were recorded on the interview format guide.

Five to seven days after the initial interview a narrative summary was physically presented to the interviewed employee(s). This was then read by the employee or, in some instances, I read it to him/her. The main purpose of the narrative summary was for it to act as a member check (Guba, 1981). That is, it enabled each employee to clarify, correct, add to, or verify my understanding of his/her motivation and perceptions of the CSDP course in which he/she participated. When presenting the summary I took my Macintosh Power Book computer into the interview. This enabled me to make automatic changes to each summary and confirm, for the employee, that I had taken account of changes that he/she wished to make. Narrative summary interviews were all tape recorded on a dictaphone; however these interviews were not transcribed. The decision not to transcribe narrative summary interviews was made as most of the interview involved the silent or verbatim reading of the summary. If a check on interview information was required the tape was played. During the interview I openly recorded detailed accompanying field notes.

Focus group interviews were conducted four months after the completion of all initial and summary interviews and after the analysis of preliminary findings. One of the employees studied thought that it would be more appropriate to hold small focus group interviews (i.e., three or four employees) as she believed that not all employees would feel comfortable to speak up in a large group situation. This recommendation was implemented and three focus groups (i.e., two Introductory course groups and one Intermediate course group) were formed. The purpose of the focus group interviews was to present to the employees an overall summary of the course in which they had participated and, thereby, gain a group member check and confirmation of preliminary findings (Fontana & Frey, 1994).
Interviews were also conducted with the training manager and one of the program’s teachers. Within these interviews several pre-planned questions were used as a starting point for each interview. The interview conducted with the training manager also involved a general discussion related to company, historical, political and workplace education issues. This interview was held on-site in his office. The interview with the teacher involved a discussion of the rationale behind the Communication Skills Development Program and its planning, course content and materials used. This interview was conducted in her office. Both interviews were tape recorded and then transcribed. During each interview field notes were recorded on an interview guide format sheet. These field notes assisted to consolidate and verify interview data.

Informal discussions were held with various members of management, the shopfloor supervisor and the machine operators. These discussions occurred incidentally and were often related to the research process, employees’ attitudes to workplace education, and company planning and policy of future workplace education programs. Field notes were documented to record a narrative account of what had been discussed and observed. These notes were used to confirm, clarify and inform other study data.

iii) The purpose of taking study ‘field notes’ was multiple. First, observation field notes were continuously recorded in a written, point, note or sketched form over the life of this inquiry. Direct observation notes were taken openly on-site and recorded in an observation notebook. These notes were specifically related to the shopfloor employees’ job entailment, their use of English literacies whilst working on the shopfloor, and observations of artifacts and the physical and social environments. Participant observation field notes were recorded on-site and after I had participated with the employees on the production line. These notes were recorded in point form in an observation notebook and then, at a later stage, documented as a narrative account of what had been said and observed. Second, all interview field notes were recorded in point or note form on an interview guide format sheet.
These notes included interviewees' direct quotes and understanding of topics discussed and interviewer observations and insights. These field notes stand as a record of insights, reflections and observations of inquiry happenings. Further, these notes have also assisted to inform, support or clarify inquiry data.

**Data Analysis**

**Overview.**

The purpose of this analysis was to describe, explain and interpret descriptive data so that a formative evaluation of the research phenomenon could be obtained. At all times this data analysis focused on this inquiry's primary and subsidiary research questions (Patton, 1990).

This purpose was achieved by conducting two individual case analyses followed by a cross-case analysis (Patton). The reasons for conducting two individual case analyses rather than a case analysis alone was: the employees who participated in the Introductory course and the employees who participated in the Intermediate course presented two distinct individual cases. These cases are referred to respectively as Individual Case I and Individual Case II.

![Diagram of the individual cases within the case](image)

**Figure 1.** A diagram of the individual cases within the case
Throughout the implementation of each individual case's analysis and the cross-case analysis patterns of relationships (i.e., categories, sub-categories) were inductively generated (Berg, 1989; Merriam, 1988; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 1990). The generating of these patterns enabled me to identify similarities and differences, first, within each individual case and then, second, across the case itself. First, a complete analysis of Individual Case I was conducted and findings recorded. This was followed by a complete analysis of Individual Case II. As for Individual Case I all findings were analysed and then recorded. The processes involved in each of the individual case's analysis was ongoing and expansive. It was ongoing in that it continuously involved the processes of analysis--classification, analysis--classification. It was expansive in that the continual classification and re-classification of data expanded identified categories into sub-categories. However, in some instances the classification and re-classification of data reduced the number of categories and/or sub-categories. For example when categories were too similar to each other the categories in question were amalgamated to form one category.

At the completion of each individual case's analysis a cross-case analysis was conducted. Similar to each individual case's analysis, the cross-case analysis involved the inductive identification of similarities and differences within identified categories and sub-categories. No reduction of categories or sub-categories occurred within the cross-case analysis.

A description of the strategies used to analyse each of the individual case's and the case's data is outlined below.

**Data analysis strategies.**

Multiple data analysis strategies were used in each of the individual case's and the cross-case's analysis. The use of multiple strategies was two-fold. First, it assisted in reducing any intrinsic bias that comes from the use of a single strategy (Denzin, cited in Patton, 1990).
Second, it enabled the systematic description, explanation and interpretation of data. The alleviating of intrinsic bias and the systematic description, explanation and interpretation of data further enabled a formative evaluation of findings to be made. The strategies employed in this analysis are outlined and discussed below.

Strategies used to analyse each of the ‘individual’ case’s data were: reviews of initial interview transcripts, narrative summaries and observation field notes; the construction of research question matrices (Miles & Huberman, 1984); the card indexing of interview statements and the sorting of index cards into categories and sub-categories (Berg, 1989; Patton, 1990); the sketching of data displays (Miles & Huberman); and matching of data to primary and subsidiary research questions.

Each of the individual case’s data were described by, first, reviewing transcribed initial individual and group interviews and narrative summaries. Transcripts and summaries were then read and information from them was noted on paper and then matched to the initial primary and evaluation research questions. Matrices based on the employees’ responses to initial interview questions were then formed. These matrices were then grouped and filed according to the interview questions’ themes (i.e., goals; perceptions of the courses, ideal course, and workplace training). The heading and categories of each matrix were inductively created by identifying each of the employee’s responses to each of the initial individual/group interview questions. Each of the employee’s responses to all of the interview questions were then tallied under exactly matching categories and against the relevant employee’s name. If an exactly matching category did not already exist a new category was created. The use of matrices gave a preliminary individual case overview of the employees’ perceptions of the CSDP course in which they participated. These matrices were also used to identify any surfacing similarities or differences within each individual case. Further, the use of matrices also enabled responses to be tabulated and quickly identified. Data recorded in each of the matrices was checked and re-checked against the research questions, narrative summaries,
transcribed interviews and observation field notes. The checking and re-checking of data was used to validate findings.

Another strategy used to validate data was the use of a computer word search. For example, when I asked the question: *Would you like to tell me anything else about the good or bad points about the workplace training course?*, a number of the employees responded that they found it *interesting*. In conducting the computer word search I entered the word ‘interesting’ and requested that the computer ‘find’ that word within the initial interview transcript document. When the word was found the transcript was re-read to make sure that the response was exactly related to the question asked. If the response matched the question the response was used to verify the already recorded finding or, in some situations, initiate an employee’s response that had not been realised by other analysis strategies.

After the above initial description of data was formed, data was further described by handwriting on an index card every interview statement that each employee made. Index cards were then sorted and matched to a specific research question. At the completion of this initial sorting cards were then categorised according to categories inductively identified (Berg, 1989). This process was ongoing with cards being re-categorised according to emergent themes (i.e., sub-categories) within each category. As far as possible, categories and sub-categories were labelled and referred to by terms identified by the employees. Finally, categories and sub-categories were cross-checked against observation and interview field notes, matrices, data collation sources and research questions. Index carded statements that did not appear to match any of the identified categories or sub-categories were placed aside to be described and explained at a later stage of an individual case’s analysis. The majority of these carded statements were used to explain or confirm existing categories and sub-categories. However, in some instances ‘negative cases’ were identified (Patton, 1990); that is, “instances and cases that do not fit within the pattern” (Patton, p. 463). Where a negative case was observed this finding was noted in an analysis record book and was
reviewed at a later stage. If, at this later stage, this finding could not be confirmed by at least two pieces of data the negative case was discarded. An example of a negative case was Francesco’s observation that the employees in the Introductory course had difficulty understanding the teacher’s diction. He perceived the teacher had a foreign accent that made her speech difficult to comprehend. However, he only made reference to this instance at one point in the interview. Furthermore, no other employee reported this instance.

Data displays were used to visually explain and interpret data (Miles & Huberman, 1984). These displays included: conceptual frameworks; category, theme and case explosion charts; thematically-worded constructed grids, diagrams and tables. The use of these data displays enabled the exploration, discovery, development and summarisation of categories and sub-categories as they emerged from the data. Data displays also provided a valuable tool in assisting with the visual description, explanation and preliminary interpretation of the individual cases’ findings.

At this preliminary stage of this analysis patterns of relationships were matched to the initial and primary research questions (Patton, 1990; Yin, 1994). This occurred so as to determine whether the data would be able to be used to answer these questions.

The main purpose of the ‘cross-case’ analysis was to identify similarities and differences across the case. The cross-case analysis did not seek to identify new patterns of relationships, but rather match the already existing patterns (i.e., categories, sub-categories, orientations) for similarities and differences across the case. An understanding of these similarities and differences enabled me to examine which categories and sub-categories were “universal” across the case (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 435) and which categories and sub-categories were particular and unique to an individual case (Stake, 1994). Strategies used to analyse the case’s data were similar to those used to analyse each of the individual’s case’s data. The strategies used in the cross-case analysis were: reviews of initial interview
transcripts, narrative summaries, and observation field notes; the matching of data contained in research question matrices; the matching of card indexed categories, sub-categories, orientations and factors that affect motivation; the sketching of data displays; and the matching of data to primary and subsidiary research questions. At the completion of the cross-case analysis the study’s findings were located within existing theoretical frameworks. These frameworks are contained within descriptive research, L2 motivational research, achievement goal theory research and research related to factors that affect adult motivation to participate in learning. Specifically, categories and sub-categories reported by the case were matched to the above frameworks. The matching of the study’s categories and sub-categories to other frameworks was used as a point of reference rather than a chance to generalise outside of the case.

Ethical Considerations

The principles guiding the ethical considerations outlined in this study are taken from the Australian Association for Research in Education [AARE] (1993) and are based on four of the Association’s ‘specific principles’ (pp. 2-11). These four specific principles concern: i) the individual/group participants, ii) the institution, iii) publication/ownership, and iv) maintenance of ethical standards.

Specific Principles

i) Individual/group participants.

a) The individual and group participants involved in this study were a group of NESB shopfloor employees. Informed consent to participate in the study was gained from the employees prior to the start of the inquiry. The employees’ informed consent was obtained by one of the teachers and myself verbally outlining to them the nature, purpose, strategies and timetabling of the inquiry. Further, I discussed with them any perceived potential risks/harm that they may experience as a consequence for having participated in the inquiry;
for example, loss of their jobs if the employees were thought to be criticising the company. In relation to the latter, the employees were informed by myself and management of management’s wish to gain an understanding of the employees’ perceptions of the course. Also the employees were informed of their right to withdraw from the inquiry at any time.

b) Individual and case misrepresentation was addressed by the use of triangulated data collection and analysis strategies, and member checks. During member checks case employees had the right to change or delete any information that they perceived as misrepresentative of their course-based perceptions.

c) Financial hardship did not occur as case employees were given company paid leave to participate in the inquiry.

d) The issue of anonymity was addressed by each of the employees supplying a case study pseudonym (i.e., name). This name was nominated by the case employee when he/she completed the demographic information sheet.

e) Case employees’ confidentiality was maintained by conducting data member checks; the use of pseudonyms; the deletion of any specific information that may implicate, embarrass or harm them. Further, the employees’ permission was gained to outline inquiry findings to the Workplace Training Consultative Committee.

ii) Institution

a) The company involved in this case study has been given the pseudonym ‘Food Products’. This name was selected by myself and was agreed to by company management.

b) When gaining an historical understanding of the company and the CSDP courses I endeavoured to gain information from a variety of sources. This assisted in minimising any
harm that could occur to the company through the “distortion of beliefs”, “injustice” or “falsehood” (AARE, 1993, p. 6).

c) Data collation strategies used in this inquiry met University ethics regulations and were passed by the Ethics Committee. Prior to conducting the study I outlined to the employees how, where and when data collection strategies would be implemented.

d) Field notes were available to be read and discussed with individual employees.

iii) Publication/ownership.

a) In publishing case records and reports no harm such as “stereotyping”, “reinforcement of prejudice”, “loss of privacy and dignity”, or damage to company integrity or personal relations has occurred (AARE, 1993, 7). To guard against harm occurring data member checks were conducted and, with the employees’ permission, findings were presented to company management.

b) Intellectual ownership of this study was maintained by myself with no compromise to the integrity of the inquiry or the participants involved. This was able to occur as Food Products’ management did not attempt to influence or direct the inquiry.

iv) Maintenance of ethical standards.

The maintenance of ethical standards was carried out throughout the life of the inquiry as I abided by the ethical considerations outlined in my research proposal and in the University research handbook. I also noted and implemented ethical considerations outlined in qualitative research literature (Berg, 1989; Merriam, 1988; Patton, 1990; Stake, 1994).
CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Discussion

Introduction

The discussion of this study’s findings will be presented in two sections. First, the employees’ motivation to participate in one of the Communication Skills Development Program (CSDP) courses will be described. Second, the factors that affected the employees’ motivation to participate and their perceptions of the ways these factors affected their motivation will be jointly discussed. Within each section the findings will be discussed in relation to Individual Case I (employees who participated in the Introductory course), Individual Case II (employees who participated in the Intermediate course) and a cross-case analysis of individual cases I and II. Both Individual Case I and Individual Case II will be separately referred to as the ‘individual case’ or collectively as the ‘individual cases’. As the cross-case analysis will discuss findings that are related to all of the employees who participated in the program it will be referred to as the ‘case’.

Within the individual cases and the cross-case analysis direct quotes have been used to support and verify findings. However, in some instances, some quotes have needed additional words to explain these quotes intended meaning. Additional words have been taken from other parts of the employees’ interview transcripts and placed in brackets. For example, in one part of his interview, Francesco reported that he wanted to learn to more writing. I want to, so I can explain myself, you know when I do a form I want to put in more what I think, you know the proper way. In other parts of the interview Francesco frequently referred to the importance of workplace English. In relation to the latter he commented: Most important is the workplace because you got to learn more in this place and spelling too I suppose. Therefore, within the discussion of Francesco’s goals I refer to his desire to learn to fill in [workplace forms] the proper way. I checked that my interpretation of
findings was correct when I presented each employee with a narrative summary of his/her interview.

Motivation

Answers to the first primary research question, ‘What reasons did the employees give for participating in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses?’ have been identified through a process of inductive analysis. Reasons given by the employees for participating were classified into categories and sub-categories that represent the employees’ goals and sub-goals. Goals refer to the employees’ reasons ‘why’ they chose to participate in one of the CSDP courses. Further, sub-goals refer to the employees’ specific reasons for participating. These sub-goals are linked to the employees’ desire to attain their goals. Second, goals and sub-goals were then classified into classes of reasons (i.e., orientations) that identify the types of motivation reported by the case. These orientations were then matched to theoretical orientations that have been identified through descriptive research (Houle, 1963); achievement goal theory research (Meece, Blumenfeld and Hoyle, 1988; Urdan and Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989, 1994); and L2 motivation research (Gardner and Lambert cited in Gardner, 1985). The decision to match this study’s findings to other theoretical orientations was made as there is a research-based need to eclectically examine L2 students’ motivation to learn a second language (Clement & Kruidenier, 1988; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Ely, 1986; Oxford & Shearin, 1994); and, more specifically, adult L2 students’ motivation to participate in learning (Beder, 1991; Beder & Valentine, 1987b).

Outline of Goals and Orientations

Goals.

The case of NESB shopfloor employees’ reasons for participating in one of the CSDP courses were identified by asking the employees to respond individually to the question: Why did you choose to participate in the course? An analysis of their responses to this and follow-
up questions revealed three main categories of goals: ‘Self-improvement through language/literacy development’, ‘Outside of work’, and ‘Work’. Contained within these goals are 14 sub-goals. Specifically, the goal ‘Self-improvement through language/literacy development’ refers to case employees’ desire to improve certain aspects of their everyday lives and, thereby, function more effectively within their own communities (i.e., shire, social, work). This self-improvement is perceived, by them, as occurring through the acquisition, development and/or use of one or several of the English language/literacy practices of speaking, listening, reading and writing. ‘Outside of work’ refers to the case employees’ desire to be able to speak English with friends or peers and/or conduct everyday personal business transactions with English speaking members of their local community. ‘Work’ refers to the case employees’ vocationally-based reasons for participating in one of the courses (e.g., speak to office staff, write a workplace report). Where possible, terms used to identify and define goals and sub-goals have been taken from the employees’ interview transcripts. Tabulated information related to the employees’ goals and sub-goals is outlined in Table 3.
Goal orientations represent types of motivation; that is, classes of reasons that represent why the employees participated in one of the CSDP courses. In the analysis of the employees’ types of motivation, first, their reasons for having participated were inductively classified into classes of reasons that represent ‘transactional’, ‘vocational’, ‘fellowship’, ‘social camaraderie’, and ‘self-satisfaction’ orientations. The transactional, vocational, and fellowship orientations have been influenced by the work of Gardner and Lambert (Gardner,
1985), and social camaraderie orientation has been influenced by the work of Wentzel (1994). 'Self-satisfaction' was not influenced by any theoretical orientations. Where possible, terms used to define these orientations have been realised by the case. Specifically, 'transactional orientation' refers to the class of reasons that identify the employees' desire to carry out spoken and/or written transactions with English speaking members of the Australian community. 'Vocational orientation' refers to the class of reasons that identify the employees' desire to be able to learn or develop new/old English language/literacy practices that will assist in the performance of their jobs or in the attainment of new jobs. 'Fellowship orientation' refers to the class of reasons that identify the employees' desire to socially interact with English speaking members of the Australian community. 'Social camaraderie' refers to the class of reasons that identify the employees' desire to acquire a level of spoken English that will enable them to develop group cohesion and/or experience positive interpersonal interactions with other employees. Further, 'self-satisfaction orientation' refers to the class of reasons that identify the employees as having participated for reasons of personal fulfilment. Information related to the employees' goal orientations is outlined in Table 4.

After the initial classification of the employees' goal orientations, these orientations were matched to Houle's (1963) typology of activity-, goal-, and learning-orientation. 'Activity-orientation' refers to those employees who participated for some reason other than that related to course content and/or information. For example, an employee may express a desire to be with other employees or to escape from workplace routine. 'Goal-orientation' refers to those employees who came to the program with a pre-determined, specific outcome in mind. Further, 'learning-orientation' refers to those employees who participated for the attainment of knowledge per se.

The employees' types of motivation were also classified and matched to achievement goal theory orientations (i.e., task, prosocial, ability, multiple). The definition of each of the four
achievement goal orientations used within this study have been adapted from the work of Ames and Archer (1988); Meece, Blumenfeld and Hoyle (1988); Urdan and Maehr (1995); and Wentzel (1989, 1994). Specifically, ‘task orientation’ refers to the class of reasons that identify the employees as having chosen to participate so that they can develop competence and/or improve their mastery of certain language/literacy practices (Urdan & Maehr; Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle; Wentzel, 1989). These reasons are consistent with learners who pursue a mastery outcome (Wentzel, 1989). ‘Prosocial orientation’ refers to the class of reasons that identify the employees as having chosen to participate so as to develop group cohesion and/or positive interpersonal interactions with associates (i.e., doctor, neighbour, shop keeper); peers; and/or friends (Wentzel, 1994). These reasons are consistent with learners who pursue a social outcome (Urdan & Maehr; Wentzel, 1989, 1994). ‘Ability orientation’ refers to those employees who are concerned to demonstrate performance to one’s peers, teachers or supervisors that is relative to the performance of others (Ames & Archer). These reasons are consistent with learners who pursue a performance outcome. Further, ‘multiple orientation’ refers to the class of reasons that identify the employees as having participated for reasons related to the dual attainment of either mastery, social and/or ability outcomes (Wentzel, 1989).

Finally, the employees’ types of motivation were matched to instrumental and integrative orientations as described by Gardner and Lambert (cited in Gardner, 1985). Within this study, ‘instrumental orientation’ refers to a class of “pragmatic” reasons that indicate that an employee is learning English for economically and/or practically advantageous reasons (Gardner, 1985, p. 11). Whereas ‘integrative orientation’ refers to a “social-emotional” class of reasons that indicate that an employee is learning English so that he/she can gain an understanding of, interact with or develop a close association with members of the English speaking Australian community (Gardner, p. 11).
Table 4
Employees’ Goal Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal orientations</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal orientations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social camaraderie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner orientations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement goal orientations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second language goal orientations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes:
Employees: * 1 = Angela; 2 = Bow; 3 = Francesco; 4 = Maria; 5 = May; 6 = Nicola; 7 = Sorina; 8 = Christina; 9 = Marta; 10 = Pasquale.

Symbols: • = Individual Case I; = Individual Case II.

Individual Case I

Goals and transfer of reasons.

Individual Case I (n = 7) employees’ motivation to participate in the Introductory course are contained within the following three main categories of goals: Self-improvement through language/literacy development (7 people), Outside of work (6 people) and Work (4 people). All of the employees reported at least two goals (See Table 3). Further to the reporting of these goals the employees reported a diversity of reasons that represent their desire to attain their goals. For example, the employees reported four of the five ‘Self-improvement through
language/literacy development’ sub-goals and four of the six ‘Work’ sub-goals. ‘Self-
 improvement through language/literacy development’ and ‘Work’ are the most multi-
dimensional of Case I’s goals. That is, both contain a wider diversity of sub-goals that
‘Outside of work’.

The goal ‘Self-improvement through language/literacy development’ was reported by all
employees. This goal’s sub-goals are: Speaking (4 people), Writing/spelling (3 people),
Reading (2 people) and English on the job (1 person). The sub-goals ‘Writing’ and
‘Spelling’ have been amalgamated into the one sub-goal ‘Writing/spelling’. The decision to
amalgamate these two sub-goals was taken as the employees jointly discussed these two areas
of language and literacy development. First, in relation to the sub-goal ‘Speaking’, the
employees reported a desire to learn to speak more than anything, speak better English and
change more. When I questioned Sorina as to what she meant by ‘change more’, she
reported that if she was able to improve her existing command of spoken English she felt she
would be able to participate in a greater variety of everyday-life activities. She commented:
Better language, better way. Second, within the sub-goal ‘Writing/spelling’, May reported
that she chose to participate in the course to improve writing, to spell, and Angela
commented, one thing I always want is to write English. Angela and Maria reported
personally-based reasons for wanting to improve their writing and spelling, and Francesco
reported vocationally-based reasons. Third, all of the employees who reported the sub-goal
‘Reading’ expressed a desire to be able to comprehend the intended meaning of a text. For
example, Maria reported a desire to better read [classroom-based texts] so that she could read
similar texts outside of the workplace. Fourth, the sub-goal ‘English on the job’ refers to the
employees’ desire to learn everyday English that is related to the workplace and the
employees’ jobs. When reporting this sub-goal Francesco commented: Most important is the
workplace because you got to learn more in this place and...you got to prepare this machine
over here. Out of all of the seven employees, Francesco expressed the strongest desire to
improve his present language/literacy practices: *Write or talk’in, doesn’t matter...I want to learn if it’s possible.*

Within the goal ‘Outside of work’ the employees reported two sub-goals. These are Fill in forms (2 people) and Speak to others (4 people). In relation to ‘Fill in forms’, both Angela and May reported that one of the main reasons why they participated in the course was to assist them to improve their writing so that they can competently *fill in forms [Medicare, bank and insurance] outside of work*. May reported that this sub-goal was the most important reason for her participating in the course, and Angela reported that being able to complete documented information is part of her overall desire to learn to write English. The sub-goal ‘Speak to others’ was reported by employees who want to be able to interact with local community members on a needs-by-needs basis. For example, some of them want to be able to speak English when *we go the shop or we go to the doctor*. Further to this, Maria and Sorina each want to be able to verbally communicate with neighbours.

‘Work’ was another goal reported by Case I employees. Within this goal the employees identified four sub-goals: Need (3 people), Companionship (3 people), Make a comment (1 person) and Job satisfaction (1 person). In relation to ‘Need’, Bow and Nicola reported a desire to speak English *if and when we need it [on the shopfloor]*. Within the sub-goal ‘Companionship’ the employees reported a desire to make English the lingua franca of the staffroom. Sorina commented: *[We always] try to speak English [in the staffroom]... for everybody can understand.* Francesco further explained to me that Food Products is a happy workplace and is one where: *If they [shopfloor employees] don’t understand someone explains it to them. People have been here a long time....we help one another.* In relation to ‘Make a comment’ Francesco reported that, as part of his job, he is required to *make [write] a comment* about the daily functioning of various food processing machines. However, he further reported that he has difficulty doing this. Francesco remarked: *If I want to make a comment *[the machine] stop this reason because this and that* I can’t do that.* Closely
aligned to 'Make a comment' is the sub-goal 'Job satisfaction'. In relation to this latter sub-goal, Francesco reported that if he was able to document work related information the proper way this would assist him to improve his job satisfaction.

From an analysis of the employees motivation to participate in the course, I have observed that each of them has reported a language/literacy practice that is peculiar to all of his/her goals and most sub-goals. For example, Bow reported that she chose to participate because of a desire to want to learn to speak English. For Bow, the reason 'to learn to speak English' is located within the goal and sub-goal 'Self-improvement through language/literacy development--Speaking'. This reason is also associated with her desire to speak English when I go shopping something like that (i.e., goal of Outside of work--Speak to others) and when I use for at work (i.e., goal of Work--Need). Speaking is the language/literacy practice that is peculiar to Bow, Maria, Nicola and Sorina's goals, and writing is the language/literacy practice that is peculiar to Angela, Francesco and May's goals.

The goal of 'Self-improvement through language/literacy development' underlies the employees' motivation to participate in the course. This is illustrated by the observation that the attainment of 'Self-improvement through language/literacy development' sub-goals are the lever for the employees to attain either 'Work' or 'Outside of the work' sub-goals. For example, Nicola's goal is to learn to speak English (i.e., goal Self-improvement through language/literacy development--Speaking) so the she may speak to a doctor or shop keeper (i.e., goal Outside of work--Speak to others) and communicate with other employees (i.e., goal Work--Companionship). For Nicola to be able to communicate with these persons, she must attain the Self-improvement through language/literacy development sub-goal 'Speaking'. These findings show that language/literacy development per se underlies the employees' attainment of their goals. Furthermore, as each employee has reported a language/literacy practice that is peculiar to his/her goals, it appears that the employees, themselves, perceive the underlying importance of their self-improvement through
language/literacy development and are aware of the need for them to acquire and/or develop given language/literacy practices if they are to attain their goals. Also, these findings show that the categories of goals reported by the employees are not isolated categories that stand alone. Rather, these goals and sub-goals are ones that overlap with one other. The finding that the categories of goals are ones that are not isolated goals is similar to findings noted by Houle (1963). Further to this, the finding that ‘Self-improvement through language/literacy development’ underlies the employees’ attainment of their goals is similar to findings noted by Beder and Valentine (1987a, 1987b) and Gowen (1992).

Attainment of reported goals.

As well as asking Case I employees why they chose to participate in the Introductory course they were asked: Has the course helped you to [read, speak, write English?], and How has that helped in your daily life? In relation to the first question, Bow was the only employee to report that the course has assisted her to attain her goal to learn to speak English. However, six of them reported that the course has helped them a little bit to attain their goals. In relation to the second question, some of the employees further reported that the course assisted them to speak English when they: go shopping (4 people), go to a doctor (3 people), go to a neighbour’s house (3 people), fill in forms (2 people), are at work (2 people) or are at home with their family (1 people). Even though Bow reported that the course has assisted her to speak English with her family, she did not report this as a reason for participating in the course. Of those who attained ‘a little bit’ of their goals, all of them reported that this was, in part, due the course being too short in duration and that they did not practise what they learnt. Francesco further reported that he did not attain his goals because he withdrew from the course. His reason for withdrawing was because part of the course (the last hour) was held during the time of the day he worked overtime for the company. This did not affect the other employees as this last hour of the course was in their own (out of work) time.
Reasons for or against participating in another workplace course.

When the employees were asked if they would participate in another workplace language and literacy course, 3 said yes, 2 reported that they are not sure and 2 said no. Of those who said that they would like to participate in another course, all of them reported the same reason as they gave for participating in the CSDP course. Further to this, Francesco also reported that he would like to participate in an introductory computer course so that he can learn to operate his home-based computer. These findings illustrate that the employees came to the course with specific reasons in mind, and, for many of them, it is not until these reasons are attained that they will choose a different kind of reason. When asked if they would participate in another workplace course, Sorina reported that she would consider participating if her friends decided to participate as well. Maria and Nicola, when commenting on why they would not like to participate said that the course was very hard and Maria commented: I wouldn't like to go through that again. There was many times that I got a headache.

Goal orientations.

The employees' motivation to participate in the Introductory course was further identified by classifying their goals into classes of reasons (i.e., goal orientations) that identify their types of motivation. Goal orientations reported by the employees are: transactional (6 people), vocational (3 people), social camaraderie (3 people) and self-satisfaction (4 people) (See Table 4).

'Transactional orientation' was reported by employees who commented that they chose to participate in the course so that they can speak English to a shop keeper, doctor and other persons with whom they conduct personal transactions. Some of them also expressed a desire to be able to complete documents such as Medicare, bank and insurance forms. For example, May commented that [the course] better help outside [of work]....Sometimes we go bank or somewhere or need to go insurance, we need to take a form to fill. Francesco is the only employee not to report transactional reasons.
'Vocational' reasons were reported by Bow, Francesco and May when they individually expressed a desire to verbally communicate with other employees on a needs by needs basis. For example, to speak to other shopfloor employees when they are on the production line or to the supervisor when they go into the office. Further to this, Francesco also commented that he chose to participate in the course so that he could learn more English and improve his writing and spelling of workplace reports. This, he felt, would enable him to carry out effectively his role as a machine operator and add to his level of work satisfaction.

In relation to 'social camaraderie orientation' the employees expressed a desire to speak English so that we [can] help one another. This orientation is specifically related to the employees' desire to be able to verbally interact and develop group cohesion with one another at work. None of the employees reported this orientation in relation to social acquaintances outside of work.

'Self-satisfaction orientation' was reported by Francesco, Nicola, Sorina and Maria. All of them reported the self-satisfaction that they would experience by increasing their understanding of English. For Nicola, Sorina and Maria this orientation is related to developing reading and/or speaking language/literacy skills. For example, Maria reported the self-satisfaction she would experience if she was able to understand more you know, this a reading or speaking better, clear. For Francesco this orientation is related to the satisfaction he would experience if he was able to document competently work related information.

All of the employees' goal orientations have been sequentially matched to theoretical orientations (i.e., learner, achievement goal, and second language goal orientations). Table 5 outlines the employees' goal orientations that were able to be matched to these theoretical orientations.
All of the employees' orientations were matched to Houle's (1963) typology of learners. An analysis of the employees' types of motivation revealed that transactional, vocational, social-camaraderie, and self-satisfaction oriented reasons are similar to reasons reported by goal-oriented learners. That is, the employees came to the course with a pre-determined, specific outcome in mind. For example, some of them reported that they want to learn to fill in...
[Medicare, insurance] forms (transactional); so I can fill in [a workplace] form (vocational); understand more...reading or speaking better, clear (self-satisfaction); and to speak English [in the staffroom] (social-camaraderie). These classes of reasons identify the employees as being goal-oriented learners (Houle). Although some of the employees reported that they participated in the course because they want to learn or learn more I can these reasons are not consistent with learning-oriented reasons outlined by Houle. None of the employees reported activity-oriented reasons.

‘Transactional’, ‘vocational’, ‘social camaraderie’, and ‘self-satisfaction’ orientations were sequentially matched to achievement goal ‘task’, ‘prosocial’, ‘ability’, and ‘multiple’ orientations. Orientations that match ‘task orientation’ are transactional, vocational, and self-satisfaction. Specifically, transactionally-based reasons that are similar to task-based reasons are: ones that refer to the employees’ desire to develop competence and/or improve their mastery of language/literacy practices so that they may conduct spoken and/or written transactions with English speaking members of the Australian community. Some examples of transactional/task-based reasons are: Learn more writing...so I can explain myself and fill in forms. Transactional/task-based reasons were the most frequently reported task-oriented reason (5 people).

Vocationally-based reasons that are similar to task-based reasons are ones that refer to the employees’ desire to develop competence and/or improve their mastery of language/literacy practices so that they can improve in their present job performance or attain a new job. Examples of vocational/task-based reasons are: Want to...explain myself when I make a comment and [I want to] learn more [workplace] English. Vocationally/task-based reasons were reported by Francesco alone.

Self-satisfaction-based reasons that are similar to task-based reasons are ones that refer to the employees’ desire to develop competence and/or improve their mastery of language/literacy
practices so that they may attain a sense of personal fulfilment. Self-satisfaction/task-based reasons were reported by Maria and Francesco. Here, they reported a desire to: *read and speak better* and *wanted to improve myself too, you know*. All of the above transactional, vocational, social camaraderie, and self-satisfaction reasons are consistent with learners who pursue a mastery outcome (Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, 1988; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989).

Orientations that match ‘prosocial orientation’ are transactional, vocational, and social camaraderie. Specifically, transactionally-based reasons that are similar to prosocial-based reasons are ones that refer to the employees’ desire to develop positive interpersonal interactions with English speaking associates. All of the employees who reported transactional/prosocial-based reasons expressed a pragmatic desire to be able to verbally communicate with persons in their local community (i.e., doctor, shop keeper, neighbour). Transactional/prosocial-based reasons were the most frequently reported socially oriented reason (4 people).

Vocational/prosocial-based reasons were reported by Bow, Francesco and May when they expressed a desire to develop positive interpersonal interactions with Food Products staff on a needs by needs basis. For example, Bow reported a desire to be able to speak English on the shopfloor *if and when we need it*. Here she and the other employees are referring to the need to speak English so that they can speak to the machine operators, supervisor and/or other shopfloor employees when they need to discuss work-related matters. When the employees are working on a production line, it is very difficult for them to conduct an ongoing conversation with other employees. This is due to the physical distance that often separates the employees from each other and/or the fact that they need to concentrate on the task at hand. Therefore, when they are on a production line conversation mainly involves short work-related statements.
Social-camaraderie based reasons that are similar to prosocial based reasons are ones that refer to the employees' desire to develop group cohesion with other Food Products shopfloor employees. Here, Francesco, Nicola and Sorina reported a desire to be able to speak English in the staffroom and so that everybody can understand. The latter, they feel, would enable them to interact with one another on a social level. Social camaraderie/prosocial reasons differ from vocational/prosocial reasons in that social camaraderie/prosocial reasons refer to the employees' desire to develop group cohesion with one another. In contrast, vocational/prosocial reasons are not related to developing group cohesion, but, rather, to developing pragmatic interpersonal interactions with a variety of staff that may or may not be within Francesco, Nicola and Sorina's workplace social network. All of the above transactional, vocational, and social camaraderie reasons are consistent with learners who pursue a social outcome (Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989, 1994).

None of the employees' orientations could be matched to ability-oriented reasons. However, Bow, Francesco, Maria, Nicola and Sorina all reported reasons that are located within both task and prosocial orientations. The reporting of task and prosocial reasons is consistent with learners who are defined as multiple-oriented learners (Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, 1988; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989).

Task orientation was the most frequently reported achievement goal orientation. This finding illustrates that mastery outcomes as opposed to social outcomes are more important to this individual case. Further to this, demonstrating performance to one's peers, teachers or supervisors was not a motivating reason for any of the employees to participate in learning (Ames & Archer, 1988).

Six of the employees' orientations were matched to instrumental and integrative orientations. Transactional and vocational orientations were found to match instrumental orientation.
Specifically, transactionally oriented reasons that are similar to instrumentally oriented reasons are ones that refer to the employees’ desire to participate so that they can carry out spoken and/or written transactions with English speaking members of the Australian community. For example, Bow, Nicola, Sorina and Maria all reported a desire to be able to speak to those with whom they conduct personal transactions (i.e., bank clerk, doctor, shop keeper), and Angela and May reported a desire to learn to complete bank, insurance and Medicare forms. This class of reasons is similar to the pragmatic advantages reported by instrumentally oriented learners (Gardner, 1985).

A few of these transactional reasons (e.g., [to learn to] speak English when [I] go to the shop, doctors or neighbours) may be considered, by some, as belonging to an integrative orientation. However, within this study, the employees emphasised a pragmatic emphasis for their motivation. None of the employees reported a social-emotional desire to meet and converse with “more and varied people, or as a means of better understanding [Australian] people and their way of life” (Gardner, 1985, p. 11). The ambiguity experienced in classifying the above transactional reasons is similar to that noted by Oller, Hudson and Liu (cited in Gardner) and Clement and Kruidenier (1988) in their respective discussions of the ambiguous nature of the instrumental/integrative theory of L2 motivation.

Vocationally oriented reasons that are similar to instrumental reasons are ones that refer to the employees’ desire to be able to learn or develop new/old language/literacy practices that will economically and/or practically advantage the employees within the workplace environment. Examples of vocationally oriented reasons that are similar to instrumental reasons are: So I can explain myself, and [to be able to] talk English to understand each other. These and similar reasons were reported by Bow, Francesco and Nicola.

Two other orientations reported by this individual case are ‘social camaraderie’ and ‘self satisfaction’. Both of these orientations fall outside of Gardner and Lambert’s theory of L2
motivation. The explanation for not including social camaraderie and self-satisfaction orientations within instrumental or integrative orientations is that none of the social camaraderie or the self-satisfaction reasons can be matched to pragmatic or social-emotional reasons as defined by Gardner (1985). The finding of orientations not contained within the instrumental/integrative theory is not new. Ely (1986) and Clement and Kruidenier (1988) respectively found that L2 orientations related to “[study] requirement motivation” (p. 31); “travel, friendship, and knowledge” (p. 286) are ones that could not be located within Gardner and Lambert’s theory.

In summary, Individual Case I employees reported a variety and diversity of goals and orientations for participating in the Introductory course. Each of the seven employees reported a specific language/literacy practice that is peculiar to all of his/her goals. Furthermore, it was observed that the goal ‘Self-improvement through language/literacy development’ underlies the attainment of ‘Work’ and ‘Outside of work’ goals. When asked if the course had helped them to attain their goals only Bow said it had. However, all of the employees reported that the course had assisted them to attain part of their goals. Only three employees affirmatively reported that they would participate in a similar workplace course. Further to this, they reported that they would participate in another workplace course for the same reasons as they participated in the CSDP course.

Individual Case II

Goals and transfer of reasons.

Case II employees’ (n = 3) motivation to participate in the Intermediate course are contained within three main categories of goals: Self-improvement through language/literacy development (3 people), Work (3 people) and Outside of work (3 people) (See Table 3). Further to the reporting of all of these goals the employees also reported a diversity of reasons. This diversity of reasons is identified through the reporting of thirteen of the study’s fourteen sub-goals. For example, the employees reported five ‘Self-improvement
through language/literacy development’ sub-goals and five ‘Work’ sub-goals. ‘Self-improvement through language/literacy development’ and ‘Work’ are the most multidimensional of Case II’s goals. That is, both contain a wider diversity of sub-goals than ‘Outside of work’.

‘Self-improvement through language/literacy development’ sub-goals are: Writing/spelling (3 people), Speaking (2 people), Reading (1 person), English on the job (1 person) and Computer knowledge (1 person). Within the sub-goal ‘Writing/spelling’, Pasquale and Marta each reported personally- and vocationally-based reasons for wanting to develop his/her understanding of how to spell and write in English. For Marta the sub-goal Writing/spelling was her main reason for participating in the course. She commented: I need writing, writing, writing. Marta, in making reference to the secretarial training she did in Spain, commented in a frustrated voice: I’ve got two or three courses of computer...I can understand what they mean, but I can’t writing. For Christina, an improved understanding of how to spell and write English is related to her desire to be able to comprehend aurally and visually the structure of sounds and words. She commented: I don’t know how to it [spell] to write properly, so I cannot hear the difference. Further to this, she informed me that she resigned her position as a laboratory technician because of her fear of answering telephone calls and the possibility of having to write messages. In reporting the sub-goal Speaking, Christina commented that she would like to learn [to speak] more as her present vocabulary has been picked up in the shopping centre and this, she feels, does not allow her to effectively communicate with others. Further to this, Pasquale reported that he would like to be able to explain [himself] a bit better when speaking to friends, peers and associates. The sub-goals Reading, English on the job, and Computer knowledge were only reported by Pasquale. In relation to the sub-goal Reading, he reported a desire to be able to read words related to the functioning of various food processing machines; for example over run this and pack this way. Within the sub-goal English on the job, Pasquale reported a desire to learn basic/practical English...that is useable on the job. That is, workplace English that is
specifically related to his job as a machine operator. He commented: *It's a basic English, more or less be using the same words all the time.* In relation to the sub-goal ‘Computer knowledge’, Pasquale commented that he *wanted a little bit of [computer] knowledge* so that he could word process a workplace report.

For Pasquale, the sub-goals Reading, English on the job, and Computer knowledge are all related to his job as a machine operator. These sub-goals have not been placed with ‘Work’ sub-goals alone as Reading, English on the job and Computer knowledge all refer to Pasquale’s desire for self-improvement through the acquisition and development of reading, workplace English and computer literacy practices. However, his acquisition of these language/literacy practices is linked to Work sub-goals.

‘Work’ was another goal reported by the employees. Work sub-goals are: Need (1 person), Make a comment (1 person), Job satisfaction (1 person), Independence (1 person) and Job change (1 person). The sub-goal ‘Need’ was reported by Christina. Here, she reported a desire to be able to *talk properly* to Food Products’ office staff if and when the need arises. Within the sub-goal ‘Make a comment’, Pasquale reported that he participated in the course because of a desire *to be able to write a small [workplace] report or message or notes.* He further reported that, as the senior machine operator, his job requires him to attend meetings, write messages and fill in run sheets (i.e., a record of the amount of food processed in one operational run). He also reported the sub-goals ‘Job satisfaction’ and ‘Independence’. In relation to the sub-goal ‘Job satisfaction’, Pasquale commented that he would gain greater job satisfaction and not be so *bored* if he was able to document competently any machine-related malfunctions. In relation to the sub-goal ‘Independence’, Pasquale frequently referred to a desire to be *more independent* of his superiors. For example, he expressed a desire to be able to use the computer to print off run sheets rather than asking someone *can you do this for me?* In relation to the sub-goal ‘Job change’ Marta reported a desire to improve her writing so that she may gain an *opportunity to apply* for an office-based job similar to the
secretarial position she held in Spain. She commented: *I was interesting to change my job one day...and you really need a lot of level in English to do that, especially when you write it [job application].*

'Outside of work' was the third goal reported by the employees. The sub-goals contained within this goal are: Fill in forms (2 people), Speak to others (2 people) and Friendship (1 person). The sub-goal 'Fill in forms' was reported by Marta and Pasquale. Both of them reported a desire to learn how to complete medical, bank and other *everyday...personal business* forms. Marta reported that if she receives a form in the mail she is unable to complete it; she commented: *[I] look at it, that's it.* Pasquale reported that when he goes to a bank or Medicare office he no longer wants to rely on clerical staff to explain documented information to him. The sub-goal 'Speak to others' was reported by Christina and Pasquale. Both of them expressed a desire to be able to verbally communicate with members of their local English speaking community. Pasquale also reported the sub-goal 'Friendship'. Here, he reported a desire to be able to speak English so that he can interact with friends outside of the Italian community. He further reported that when he interacts with English speaking friends he does not want to have to rely on bilingual friends to translate for him. He commented: *I mean if you go to a friend's house....you don't always speak Italian, you know you ask for someone to speak your language....[if you speak English] you more independent in everyday life.*

From an analysis of Case II's motivation to participate in the Intermediate course, Christina and Marta both reported a language/literacy practice that is peculiar to each of their respective goals and most sub-goals. Marta reported the language/literacy practice of writing and Christina the practice of speaking. Even though Christina also reported a desire to learn to write English this language/literacy practice is not peculiar to all of her goals. Unlike Christina and Marta, Pasquale reported a combination of speaking, reading and writing/spelling language/literacy practices; these practices are peculiar to all of his goals.
The goal 'Self-improvement through language/literacy development' underlies the employees' motivation to participate in the course. This is evidenced by the observation that the attainment of 'Self-improvement through language/literacy development' sub-goals are the lever for the employees to be able to attain 'Work' and 'Outside of work' sub-goals. For example, Pasquale's desire to learn to read and write workplace reports (i.e., goal Work—Make a comment, Job satisfaction, Independence) are only attainable through the acquisition of the 'Self-improvement through language/literacy development' sub-goals Writing/spelling, Reading, and English on the job. This finding illustrates the underlying importance of language/literacy development per se to the employees' attainment of their goals. Further, as each employee has reported a language/literacy practice that is peculiar to his/her goals, it appears that the employees, themselves, perceive the underlying importance of their self-improvement through language/literacy development. Further, they are aware of the need for them to acquire and/or develop given language/literacy practices if they are to attain their goals. Also, these findings show that the categories of goals reported by the employees are not isolated categories that stand alone. Rather, these goals and sub-goals are ones that overlap with one other. The finding that 'Self-improvement through language/literacy development' underlies the employees' attainment of their goals is similar to findings noted by Beder and Valentine (1987a, 1987b) and Gowen (1992). Further, the finding that the goals overlap with one another is similar to findings noted by Houle (1963).

Attainment of reported goals.

When Case II employees were asked if the course had assisted them to attain their goals, all of them reported a little bit. Christina reported that the course had assisted her to improve her speaking of English when she goes to the shops or talks to a neighbour. However, she further reported that she has yet to learn to spell words and speak confidently to others. Marta reported that the course had assisted her to fill in forms even though it has not given her the opportunity to do a different kind of job. Marta further reported that she did not attain
any of her goals as the course was *not long enough*, and that there are *not many* other ways in which the course has assisted her. In relation to his goal to be more independent at work, in daily life and with his friends, Pasquale commented that the course has helped him *a little bit* in his daily life and to do *my job a little more easy*. However, Pasquale further commented that he did not attain any of his goals because he withdrew from the course. Pasquale withdrew from the course due to loss of overtime pay.

**Reasons for or against participating in another workplace course.**

When asked if they would participate in another workplace course Christina and Marta said they would and Pasquale was *not sure*. Pasquale further commented that he would consider participating in another course if the company financially subsidised him. When asked why they would participate in another course, all of them reported the same reasons for having participated in the CSDP course. The finding that the employees would participate in another workplace course for the same reasons as they participated in the CSDP course illustrates that the employees participate for specific reasons that are important to them as learners.

**Goal orientations.**

Case II employees' motivation to participate in the Intermediate course has been further identified by classifying their reasons for participating into classes of reasons that represent the employees' types of motivation. These orientations are: transactional (3 people), vocational (3 people), self-satisfaction (3 people) and fellowship (1 person) (See Table 4).

All of the employees who reported 'transactional orientation' commented that they chose to participate in the course so that they can carry out spoken and/or written transactions with English speaking members of the Australian community. For example, Pasquale commented that *[the course] help you can go to the bank or for personal business.* Second, 'vocational orientation' was reported by all of the employees. Here, Christina expressed a desire to verbally communicate with those in the office. Marta expressed a desire to change to an
office based job and Pasquale expressed a desire to learn to read, spell and write English so that he can independently document work-related information. Third, within ‘self-satisfaction orientation’, Christina reported that this orientation is associated with her desire to learn speak English. She commented: *I was very quiet and I feel very shy to talk.... I wanted to learn better.... to talk properly.* On the other hand Pasquale reported that this orientation is associated with his desire to complete documents independently of his peers, friends and superiors. For Marta, self-satisfaction orientation is associated with her desire to improve her writing so that she may apply for an office-based job. Fourth, ‘fellowship orientation’ was reported by Pasquale alone. Here, he expressed a desire to learn to speak English so that he can interact with his Australian friends.

All of the employees’ orientations were matched to Houle’s (1963) typology of learners. An analysis of the employees’ types of motivation revealed that some transactional, vocational, self-satisfaction, and fellowship orientations are similar to reasons reported by goal-oriented learners. That is, all of the employees reported reasons that had a predetermined, specific outcome. For example, Christina reported that she wants *to learn to speak* English so that she can communicate with those in her local community (transactional). Pasquale reported he wants to learn *everyday... basic English* (vocational). Marta reported she wants *writing, writing, writing* (self-satisfaction), and Pasquale wants to be able to *explain myself [to friends]* (fellowship). These classes of reasons identify the employees as being goal-oriented learners (Houle). Further, ‘self-satisfaction’ was matched to activity-oriented reasons. Here Pasquale reported that he participated in the course because he was *bored [of workplace routine]*. This reason identifies him as an activity-oriented learner (Houle). None of the other employees reported learning-oriented reasons.

A further analysis of the employees’ types of motivation was identified by matching transactional, vocational, self-satisfaction, and fellowship orientations to task, prosocial, ability, and multiple achievement goal orientations. Orientations that were matched to ‘task
orientation' are transactional, vocational, and self-satisfaction. Specifically, transactionally-based reasons that are similar to task-based reasons are ones that refer the employees' desire to develop competence and/or improve their mastery of language/literacy practices so that they may conduct spoken and/or written transactions with English speaking members of the Australian community. Transactional/task-based reasons were reported by all of the employees. Some examples of these reasons are: *[To learn English so that I can] explain myself and [to] make an application for something.*

Vocationally-based reasons that are similar to task-based reasons are ones that refer to the employees' desire to develop competence and/or improve their mastery of language/literacy practices so that they can improve in their present job performance or attain a new job. Vocational/task-based reasons were reported by all of the employees. Here, Christina reported a desire to speak to office staff. Marta reported a desire to be able to complete a job application form and, thereby, gain an opportunity to apply for a different kind of job. Further, Pasquale reported a desire to read and write a workplace report.

Self-satisfaction based reasons that are similar to task-based reasons are ones that refer to the employees' desire to develop competence and/or improve their mastery of language/literacy practices so that they may attain a sense of personal fulfilment. Self-satisfaction/task-based reasons were reported by all of the employees. For example, they reported the self-satisfaction they would experience if they were able to competently complete various tasks (e.g., *understand a message is somebody leave a message, [to be given] opportunity to apply for a different kind of job*). All of the above transactional, vocational, and self-satisfaction reasons are consistent with learners who pursue a mastery outcome (Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, 1988; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989).

Orientations that were matched to 'prosocial orientation' are transactional, vocational, and fellowship. Specifically, transactionally-based reasons that are similar to prosocial-based
reasons are ones that refer to the employees' desire to develop positive interpersonal interactions with English speaking members of the Australian community. Transactional/prosocial-based reasons were reported by Christina and Pasquale. Both of them reported a desire to speak to people with whom they conduct personal transactions (e.g., clerk, shop keeper).

Vocational/prosocial-based reasons were reported by Christina alone when she expressed a desire to be able to develop positive interpersonal interactions with Food Products' staff on a needs by needs basis. For example, she reported a desire to learn to explain myself when I go [into the] the office.

Fellowship-based reasons that are similar to prosocial-based reasons are ones that refer to the employees' desire to develop group cohesion and/or positive interpersonal interactions with English speaking members of the Australian community. Fellowship/prosocial-based reasons refer to Pasquale's desire to interact with his Australian friends. All of the above transactional, vocational, and fellowship reasons are consistent with learners who pursue a social outcome (Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989, 1994).

In relation to achievement goal orientations, none of the employees' orientations could be matched to ability-oriented reasons. That is none of the employees reported reasons that were concerned with being judged able by ones peers, teachers or supervisors, nor were they interested in out performing other employees (Ames & Archer, 1988). However, Christina and Pasquale both reported reasons that are located within task orientation and prosocial orientation. The reporting of these dual reasons is consistent with learners who are defined as multiple-oriented learners (Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, 1988; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989).
Task orientation was the most frequently reported achievement goal orientation. This finding illustrates that mastery/learning outcomes are more important to the employees than other social or ability related outcomes.

Transactional, vocational, and fellowship orientations were matched to instrumental and integrative orientations (Gardner, 1985). Of these orientations, transactional and vocational orientations were matched to instrumental orientation, and fellowship orientation was matched to integrative orientation. Specifically, transactionally oriented reasons that are similar to instrumentally oriented reasons are ones that refer to the employees’ desire to carry out spoken and/or written transactions with English speaking members of the Australian community. For example, Marta reported a desire to learn to fill out forms, and Pasquale and Christina each reported a desire to be able to communicate with a shop keeper, neighbour or clerk. These transactional interactions are different from interactions noted in integrative orientation as the employees did not report a social-emotional desire to meet, converse or interact with English speaking members of the Australian community. Rather, their reasons are related to a pragmatic desire to communicate with associate (e.g., doctor, shop keeper, neighbour).

Vocationally oriented reasons that are similar to instrumental reasons are ones that refer to the employees’ desire to be able to learn and develop new/old language/literacy practices that will economically and/or practically advantage the employees within the workplace environment. Examples of vocational/instrumental reasons are: *Fill out a form when you want to apply for a different kind of job, talk properly [to office staff], read and understand a [workplace] message.* As for transactionally-based reasons the employees have emphasised a pragmatic rather than a social-emotional emphasis for learning a L2. Vocational/instrumental reasons were reported by all of the employees.
Fellowship orientation was matched to integrative orientation. Specifically, fellowship orientation refers to Pasquale’s desire to be able to speak English to and, thereby, interact with English speaking friends who are outside of the Italian community. Here, Pasquale has emphasised social-emotional reasons for learning a L2. Therefore, this class of reasons is similar to integrative orientation (Gardner, 1985). Pasquale was the only employee to report ‘fellowship orientation’.

Another type of motivation reported by the employees is ‘self-satisfaction’. This orientation refers to the employees’ desire to participate for reasons of personal fulfilment. For example, the employees reported reasons related to the self-satisfaction that they would experience if they were able to increase their understanding of English. As the self-satisfaction orientation is not related to pragmatic and/or social-emotional reasons to participate, self-satisfaction reasons were not able to be matched to Gardner and Lambert’s theory of L2 motivation. The finding that ‘self-satisfaction orientation’ is outside of instrumental and integrative orientations is similar to other studies that have observed that the social psychological theory of L2 motivation does not encompass the gamut of reasons of why students participate in L2 learning (Clement & Kruidenier, 1988; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Ely, 1986; Oxford & Shearin, 1994).

In summary, Case II employees reported a variety and diversity of reasons and orientations to participate in the Intermediate course. The goals most frequently reported by them are ‘Self-improvement through language/literacy development’ and ‘Work’. Both of these goals were reported by all of the employees. Self-improvement through language/literacy development underlies the employees’ attainment of ‘Work’ and ‘Outside of work’ sub-goals. Further to this all of the employees reported a language/literacy practice that is peculiar to all of his/her goals and most sub-goals. The types of motivation reported by the employees are: transactional, vocational, fellowship, and self-satisfaction; activity and goal (Houle, 1963); task, prosocial, and multiple, (Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, 1988;
Wentzel, 1989); and instrumental and integrative (Gardner, 1985). When asked if they had attained their goals none of the employees responded affirmatively. However, all of them reported that they attained part of their goals. Christina and Marta commented that they would participate in another course and Pasquale was not sure. All of them reported the same reason for having participated in the CSDP course.

Cross-Case Analysis

This cross-case analysis examines the differences and similarities between Individual Case I and Individual Case II’s motivation to participate in one of the CSDP courses and the differences and similarities within the case’s goal orientations.

Differences within the individual cases’ reasons for having participated in one of the CSDP courses were observed within the diversity of reasons reported, ‘Work’ sub-goals, and the emphasis the employees gave to a specific language/literacy practice (e.g., speaking, writing/spelling). These differences are outlined in Table 6.
Motivation to participate.

Table 6
Differences within Goals/Sub-goals Reported by Individual Case I and Individual Case II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Case I alone</th>
<th>Individual Case II alone</th>
<th>Emphasised by Individual Case I</th>
<th>Emphasised by Individual Case II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Work)</td>
<td>(Work)</td>
<td>(Work)</td>
<td>(Work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companionship</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Outside of work)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speak to others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Self-improvement through language/literacy development)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Outside of work)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Case II employees reported a greater diversity of reasons than did Individual Case I employees. For example, Individual Case II employees reported one more Self-improvement through language/literacy development, Work, and Outside of work sub-goal than did Individual Case I employees.

In relation to ‘Work’, Individual Case I employees reported that they chose to participate in the Introductory course so that they could learn to speak to each other for work-related reasons of ‘Companionship’ (3 people) and if and when the ‘Need’ (3 people) arises. The sub-goal Companionship is specific to Individual Case I alone. The explanation of the latter finding may be contained within the pre-course skills audit report (Simpson & Beetson, n.d.). This report revealed that Individual Case I employees have a lower Australian Second Language Proficiency Rating (ASLPR) level of spoken English than do Individual Case II
employees. It is likely, therefore, the acquisition of spoken English is more important for Individual Case I employees. Furthermore, an improved facility with spoken English would enable Individual Case I employees to use English as the lingua franca of the workplace and, thereby, communicate and interact with one another. The latter is something that already exists for Individual Case II employees.

Individual Case II employees reported the 'Work' sub-goals Independence (1 person) and Job change (1 person) alone. Specifically, 'Independence' refers to Pasquale's desire to be able to independently write a workplace report and 'Job change' refers to Marta's desire to apply for a different kind of job. Further Pasquale, alone, reported the Self-improvement through language/literacy development sub-goal 'Computer knowledge' and the Outside of work sub-goal 'Friendship'. The above 'Work' and 'Self-improvement through language/literacy development' sub-goals refer to Pasquale and Marta's desire to improve their language/literacy practices of writing and spelling. These Individual Case II findings are consistent with information delivered in an interview with this individual case's teacher. Within this interview, the teacher made reference to the amount of time she spent assisting the employees to improve their writing skills. She commented: We spent a heck of a lot of time on the writing.

Sub-goals that are related to the language/literacy practice of speaking (i.e., 'Speak to others' and 'Need') were collectively emphasised by Individual Case I employees and the sub-goal related to the language/literacy practice of writing/spelling (i.e., 'Job satisfaction') was emphasised by Individual Case II employees. The difference within the emphasis associated with these sub-goals matches the speaking emphasis given to most of Individual Case I's sub-goals and the writing/spelling emphasis given to most of Individual Case II's sub-goals.
Similarities within the individual cases’ reasons for having participated in one of the CSDP courses were observed within the employees’ goals, the attainment of their goals, and their reasons for participating in another CSDP course.

The similarities within Individual Case I and Individual Case II’s reasons for participating in one of the CSDP courses revealed that both of the individual cases reported Self-improvement through language/literacy development (7 Individual Case I & 3 Individual Case II), Outside of work (6 Individual Case I & 3 Individual Case II) and Work (4 Individual Case I & 3 Individual Case II) goals and sub-goals. Even though there are differences within the individual cases’ listening, speaking, reading and writing language levels (Simpson & Beetson, n.d.), there are observed similarities within the employees’ reasons for participating in the program. Also, the employees’ reported categories of goals that are similar to self-improvement, vocational, and non-vocational categories of goals reported by continuing education (Carp, Peterson & Roelfs, 1974, Hill, 1987; Johnstone & Rivera, 1965), ABE (Beder & Valentine, 1987a; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984; Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975), ABE/ESL (Beder & Valentine, 1987b) and workplace literacy (Gowen, 1992) students. This latter finding illustrates that the employees’ categories of reasons for participating in one of the CSDP courses are similar to categories of reasons reported by other adult learners.

Reasons reported by all of the employees were specific to their life needs at the time they participated in the course. For example, Francesco (Individual Case I) and Pasquale (Individual Case II) both reported a variety of self-improvement and work based reasons that are related to their workplace position as machine operators. All of the other employees reported self-improvement, work, and outside of work reasons that are related to their life specific need(s) to be able to communicate orally and/or in a written manner with English speaking associates. All of the employees’ above reasons, if attained, are ones that would enable the employees to speak better and/or write more properly and thereby “function
better” within Australian society (Beder & Valentine, 1987b, p. 12). The above findings are consistent with findings that note that ABE students (Beder & Valentine, 1987a; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984; Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975) and ESL students (Beder & Valentine, 1987b) participate in learning for a variety of life specific reasons.

Within the above life specific reasons, the employees reported the sub-goals ‘Fill in forms’ (2 Individual Case I & 2 Individual Case II) and ‘Make a comment’ (1 Individual Case I & 1 Individual Case II). These reasons are similar to Wickert’s 1989 finding that approximately half of the NESB population surveyed within her study sought assistance with instances related to document literacy (Wickert, 1989; Wickert cited in Wickert & Black, 1990).

Each employee reported a desire to learn, develop and/or improve a specific language/literacy practice that is peculiar to his/her goals and most sub-goals. These findings illustrate that each employee recognises that there is a specific language/literacy practice that is central to the attainment of most of his/her goals and sub-goals. Furthermore, this finding illustrates that an individual employee’s goals are not isolated goals that stand alone, but, rather, his/her goals and sub-goals are linked by a common thread (i.e., a specific language/literacy practice). The latter finding is similar to findings that show that adults’ categories of reasons for participating in learning are categories that overlap with one another (Houle, 1963).

The key reason why the employees participated in one of the CSDP courses is that of ‘Self-improvement through language/literacy development’. Language/literacy development is perceived by the employees as the lever that will enable them to improve their everyday lives and, thereby, function more effectively within their work and outside of work communities. The employees indicated that without language/literacy development their desire for self-improvement would be diminished (as reported by Individual Case I, p. 86 and Individual Case II, pp. 98-99). One of the main reasons that learners participate in ABE, ESL or workplace language/literacy classes is for reasons of self-improvement and/or
language/literacy development (Beder & Valentine 1987a, 1987b; Gowen, 1992; Mezirow, Darkenwald & Knox, 1975).

It appears that—due to the courses not being long enough, the employees not having a chance to practise what they learnt, and/or the financial problems experienced by Francesco and Pasquale—the employees did not attain their goals (9 people). However, another consideration may be that the employees did not attain their goals because they each set unrealistic goals within the course-based time frame available to them. Many of the case’s goals appear to be unrealistic as they set themselves the task of attaining more than one sub-goal in a relatively short time frame. For example, some of Individual Case I employees set themselves the tasks of learning to ‘Speak to others’ outside of work and for ‘Companionship’ at work. Some Individual Case II employees set themselves the tasks of learning to ‘Fill in forms’ outside of work and write a workplace report or job application. Perhaps the employees may have attained their goals had they set a realistic number of sub-goals, taken account of the course-based time available to them, and nominated the priority of each goal and sub-goal. For the employees to attain their goals it is important for teachers to set aside course time that assists students to develop and refine realistic workplace and learner-centred goals (Berlin, 1986; Mikulecky, et al., 1996). Furthermore, workplace education policy makers, planners and teachers need to consider that the employees may bring to the learning situation personal-, community- and/or family-based goals that are outside of instructional or job related goals (Gowen, 1992; Lo Bianco, 1997; Mikulecky, et al.; Puchner, 1995). In considering the employees’ goals, perhaps policy makers, planners and teachers could create a situation whereby program design and content are flexible enough to be adapted to meet the employees’ goals as well as the employer’s and/or funding organisation’s instructional/job related goals.

Most of the employees believe that the company should continue to conduct workplace training courses as these courses are interesting and help a little bit. Of the employees (i.e.,
5 Individual Case and 3 Individual Case II employees) who reported that they would participate in another CSDP course, all of them reported that they would participate for the same reasons that they participated in the CSDP course. This latter finding illustrates that the employees came to one of the courses with pre-determined reasons that are personally important to them as adult learners.

b) Goal orientations.
Goal orientations reported by the case are: transactional (9 people), self-satisfaction (7 people), social camaraderie (3 people), vocational (6 people) and fellowship (1 person). A cross-case analysis of these goal orientations revealed differences and similarities within the case’s types of motivation. Also, the analysis revealed which of the employees’ goal orientations were able or unable to be matched to theoretical orientations (Ames & Archer, 1988; Gardner, 1985; Houle, 1963; Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, 1988; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1989).

Goal orientations that are different between the individual cases are social camaraderie (Individual Case I), vocational (Individual Case II) and fellowship (Individual Case II). First, social camaraderie was reported by Individual Case I alone (3 people). It appears that social camaraderie is an important type of motivation for some of this individual case. Here, Francesco, Nicola and Sorina reported a class of reasons that is related to their desire to be able to verbally interact with one another at work. The ability to verbally interact with other employees is something that already exists for Individual Case II employees. Second, ‘vocational orientation’ was reported equally by three employees within each individual case. However, the emphasis given to this orientation differs between the individual cases. This is illustrated by the observation that Individual Case II employees reported a more vocationally-applied class of reasons than did Individual Case I employees. For example, Individual Case I employees vocational orientation is associated with a class of reasons that is related to conducting verbal communication with other employees. In contrast, for Individual Case II
employees vocational orientation is associated with a class of reasons that is related to the conducting of verbal and written workplace practices. These findings are consistent with this study’s previous findings that show that Individual Case II reported more writing related sub-goals than did Individual Case I, and, conversely, Individual Case I reported more speaking related sub-goals than did Individual Case II. Third, ‘fellowship orientation’ was reported by Pasquale alone. This finding illustrates that Pasquale is the only employee who reported a class of reasons that is related to a desire to socially-emotionally interact with English speaking members of the Australian community. It may be that other employees are either satisfied with their outside of work social groups or they have yet to develop social-emotional relationships with English speaking members of the Australian community.

Goal orientations that are similar to both of the individual cases are transactional (9 people), vocational (2 people) and self-satisfaction (7 people). Specifically, of the 6 Individual Case I and 3 Individual Case II employees who reported transactionally-oriented reasons, all of them reported a class of reasons that is related to their desire to be able to conduct written and/or spoken transactions with colleagues and/or other associates. This finding illustrates that the employees are motivated to participate for pragmatic reasons that are related to their life specific need to be able to conduct transactions with others. Both Francesco (Individual Case I) and Pasquale (Individual Case II) reported vocationally-oriented reasons that are related to their workplace positions as machine operators. The like reporting of this orientation illustrates that both of them participated for pragmatic life specific reasons. Of the 4 Individual Case I and 3 Individual Case II employees who reported self-satisfaction orientation, all of them reported the self-satisfaction they would experience if they were able to learn and/or develop existing language/literacy practices. This finding illustrates that some of the employees are motivated for reasons of personal fulfilment as well pragmatic work- and/or home-related reasons.
Transactional, vocational, fellowship, social camaraderie, and self-satisfaction orientations were able to be matched to other theoretical orientations. Specifically, transactional orientation was matched to goal, task, prosocial, and instrumental orientations. Vocational orientation was matched to goal, task, prosocial, and instrumental (Gardner, 1985) orientations. Fellowship orientation was matched to goal, prosocial, and integrative orientations (Gardner). Social camaraderie orientation was matched to goal (Houle, 1963) and prosocial orientations (Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, 1988; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 1994). Further, self-satisfaction orientation was matched to activity, goal (Houle) and task orientations. Also, 5 Individual Case I and 2 Individual Case II employees reported orientations that were able to matched to task and prosocial orientations. The latter identified these employees as multiple-orientated learners (Wentzel, 1989).

The matching of the employees’ types of motivation to orientations identified by Houle (1963), achievement goal and second language theorists’ are important as these researchers orientations assist to explain and give diverse ways of looking at the employees’ reasons why they participated in learning (Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Specifically, the reporting of goal-oriented reasons (10 people) illustrates that the employees came to one of the program’s courses with pre-determined reasons in mind (Houle). Only Pasquale participated for activity-oriented reasons and none of the employees reported learning-oriented reasons. In contrast, the reporting of task-oriented reasons (10 people) illustrates that all of the employees participated in learning for reasons related to the gaining of mastery and/or competence of certain language/literacy practices (Ames & Archer, 1988; Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle, 1988; Oxford & Shearin). They did not perceive learning as a means to an end, nor were they concerned to demonstrate ability that is relative to the performance of other employees (Ames & Archer; Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle; Urdan & Maehr, 1995). Rather, task-oriented employees reported that they valued the learning process (Ames & Archer; Meece, Blumenfeld & Hoyle). Also, this study’s findings reveal that an awareness of the employees’ prosocial goals enable interested parties to understand the employees’ social
behaviour and needs as well as understanding that they (7 people) participated for reason that are not related to mastery/competence alone (Wentzel, 1994). The reporting of multiple reasons verifies the need for teachers to give future groups of NESB employees an opportunity to pursue social as well as mastery goals (Wentzel, 1989).

The matching of the employees' orientations to instrumental/integrative orientation revealed that instrumental orientation (7 Individual Case I & 3 Individual Case II) was more frequently reported than integrative orientation (1 Individual Case I). This finding illustrates that the employees chose to participate in one of the program's courses for pragmatic rather than social-emotional reasons. At face value, it may appear that social camaraderie contains social-emotional reasons; for example talk English for everybody can understand. However, this and similar reasons refer to Sorina's and others desire to speak English to a specific group of other Food Products shopfloor employees and not with "more and varied people, or as a means of better understanding [Australian] people and their way of life" (Gardner, p. 11).

By not reporting integratively-oriented reasons (9 people), the employees have inadvertently reported that they were not motivated to participate in one of the courses so that they may interact with or become part of the Australian English speaking community. It appears that, other than Pasquale, the employees are content within their own workplace and outside of the workplace social groups. However, they do perceive a need to learn to speak English so that they may develop group cohesion and/or positive interpersonal interactions with one another at work. The finding that the employees reported more instrumentally-oriented than integratively-oriented reasons is different to findings reported by Gardner and Lambert (Gardner & Lambert cited in Gardner, 1985). However, it must be remembered that differences exist between this study and Gardner and Lambert's samples of students.

This study's dual finding of orientations outside of the social psychological theory of L2 motivation and that not all of the employees reported orientations that could be matched to
other theoretical orientations does not attempt to challenge the importance of any existing theory. However, these findings do illustrate that the employees participated in one of the CSDP courses for a greater range of orientations than are discussed by Gardner and Lambert. The finding of orientations outside of instrumental/integrative orientation is similar to findings outlined by other L2 and English as a foreign language researchers; namely, Clement and Kruidenier (1988), Crookes and Schmidt (1991), Dornyei (1994), Ely (1986), Oxford and Shearin (1994) and Skehan (1991). Even though existing descriptive research and achievement goal theory orientations, respectively, represent continuing education and secondary high school students goal orientations, this study’s findings illustrate that some of these orientations (e.g., learning, ability) were observed to be non-representative of orientations reported by NESB shopfloor employees.

Perceptions of Factors that Affect Motivation

Overview

Answers to the second primary research question: ‘What factors affected the employees’ motivation to participate in one the Communication Skills Development Program courses?’ and the subsidiary research question: ‘What are the employees’ perceptions of how these factors affected their motivation to participate in one of the Communication Skills Development Program courses?’ have both been identified through a process of inductive analysis. Factors and perceptions were both classified into categories and sub-categories that represent, first, factors that affected the employees’ motivation to participate and, second, the employees’ perceptions of these factors. These categories and sub-categories were matched to factors discussed by Puchner (1995) and Stromquist (1995) and then to beliefs and perceptions identified by Gowen (1990, 1992). The employees also recommended ways to improve future Food Products CSDP workplace language and literacy courses. These recommendations will be outlined following the joint discussion of factors and perceptions.
The employees reported three main factors that affected their motivation to participate in one of the CSDP courses: personal (10 people), course-related (10 people) and context-related (10 people). Personal factors refer to factors that were specific to the employees’ life circumstances at the time they participated in the program. Course-related factors refer to factors associated with the content, structure and teaching of the CSDP courses. Context-related factors refer to factors that are associated with the employees’ perceptions of the usefulness of the program, problems they experienced, shopfloor community’s attitude towards the program, and company’s attitude towards the program. Personal, course-related, and context-related factors are similar to, respectively, the situational, institutional, and contextual factors that have been outlined by Puchner (1995) and Stromquist (1995).

Individual Case I

Factors and perceptions of factors.

Within this individual case (n = 7) the employees reported personal (7 people), course-related (7 people) and context-related (7 people) factors. Sub-categories of personal factors are: ‘learning’ (4 people), ‘age’ (3 people), ‘retention’ (4 people), ‘retirement’ (1 person) and ‘family commitments’ (6 people) (See Table 7). At first, ‘learning’ positively affected the employees’ motivation to participate in the Introductory course as it was their first opportunity to do schooling in Australia. Bow commented that she was so excited that [I] sing the first time when we start. Maria, Nicola and Sorina initially shared Bow’s enthusiasm. However learning [was] difficult for them and it, thereby, became an adverse factor that affected their motivation. Maria commented that she was very nervous that she would no understand what the teacher was talking about. Age is a factor that adversely affected Angela, Francesco and May’s motivation to participate. Age is perceived by them as affecting their ability to learn new information. Angela believes that, [If] you starta from a young age you can teach them anything...but as you get older it’s much, much harder to pick up a little...it’s very hard. Francesco’s believes that because of his age it take a while before
you can put it in your head ....have to find room in there. Further to age, six of the employees reported that they had difficulty remembering what they had learnt in the course. Angela, Francesco and May believe that their lack of 'retention' of information was due to age and not practising what they had learnt: Don't practise after two months--forget most things. 'Retirement' was reported by Bow. This factor adversely affected her motivation as she perceives that there is no practical reason why she should learn to write: Retire soon--don't worry me for writing.

Contained within the sub-category 'family commitments' are the factors 'pay' (1 person) and 'home duties' (6 people). Loss of overtime pay was a factor that adversely affected Francesco's motivation to participate. He believes that loss of pay would have caused financial hardship for his family and, because of this, he withdrew from the program: When you got a family, when you lose three hours a week...in pay; it's a bit hard you know. When further asked if he would have continued to participate in the course had the company paid him overtime wages he commented: oh yeah would have, sure. Furthermore, Francesco believes that as he has been with the company more than 28 years...they should be good to us.

Angela, Bow, Maria, Sorina and Nicola's family commitments were different to Francesco's. Their family commitments involved them cooking, washing and cleaning at home. For all of these women, 'home duties' adversely affected their motivation to participate. When discussing written homework, all of them believe family commitments should come before homework: When you've got family it's [written homework] a bit too much. Unlike written homework, reading-related homework did not adversely effect their motivation. Maria, Nicola and Sorina perceived reading homework as an enjoyable experience: We don't mind read a little bit at home.
Course-related factors are contained within the sub-categories: ‘structure’, ‘content’, and ‘teaching’. Contained within structure are ‘lesson long enough’ (3 people) and ‘course too short’ (6 people). ‘Lesson long enough’ positively affected the employees’ motivation to participate and, conversely, ‘course too short’ adversely affected their motivation. When discussing course structure the employees held similar perceptions to each other. All of the employees perceive the two hour lesson was enough. However, all of them consider that the duration of the course was not long enough time and, because of this, the course has not helped do anything new. It was too quick to learn all what they were being taught. However, the employees’ overall perception of the course is that it was a good idea, interesting and they enjoyed most activities.

Factors contained within the course-related sub-category ‘content’ are: ‘liked activity related to goal’ (7 people), ‘liked reading homework’ (3 people), ‘disliked activity not related to goal’ (3 people), ‘writing/spelling difficult’ (6 people) and ‘written homework difficult’ (4 people). Factors that positively affected the employees’ motivation to participate-- ‘liked activity related to goal’ and ‘liked reading homework’--are related to their goals. Subsequently, the employees’ perceptions of these factors are positive. Conversely, writing was the activity most disliked by Maria, Nicola and Sorina. This activity was not related to any of their goals. Further to the activity of writing, all of the seven employees reported some difficulty with writing and spelling. Many of the employees perceive these difficulties as being due to the non-phonetic nature of English: Writing very hard...you write and read different [in] English; Italian better, the way you see the way you say it....and the way you read it too.

In relation to the course-related factor ‘teacher tried to help us’ (3 people), the employees noted that even though they experienced difficulties with some of the course content, they appreciated the purpose of the activities that they were given and the effort the teacher made on their behalf: We enjoyed do it, she was really good....she help us a lot.
Context-related factors have been classified into four sub-categories: ‘Usefulness of the program’, ‘Problem(s)’ they experienced, ‘Company’s attitude’ towards the program, and ‘Shopfloor community’s attitude’ towards the program.

‘Usefulness of the program’ factors that positively affected the employees’ motivation are: ‘outside of work’ (6 people), ‘work’ (4 people), ‘help a lot’ (2 people) and ‘help a little bit’ (5 people). Factors that adversely affected the employees’ motivation are: ‘help—not much’ (5 people) and ‘don’t practise what we learnt’ (4 people). The employees’ perceptions of the usefulness of the program are that it help a little bit as they have had an opportunity to practise speaking with those outside of work and to one another at work. Outside of work they are now able to speak to a neighbour (3), doctor (3) and a shop keeper (4). Angela and Bow believe that the course has assisted them to fill in forms. Francesco, within his position as a machine operator, believes that he has noticed some [benefit] for the employees who took the course. However there has not been a work-based opportunity to practise the writing that they learnt in lessons: Don’t use what [we] learnt, that’s the problem. For Bow, Maria, Nicola and Sorina their perception of the usefulness of the program was diminished by their lack of opportunities to practise what they had been taught.

For many of the employees their overall perception of the usefulness of the course is mixed. At one moment they perceive the course as yes helped, we learn a lot, but at a later stage they perceive the course help a little bit not much. These mixed perceptions are related to the employees’ acknowledgment that they are now able to carry out some English language/literacy practices that they were not able to carry out before they did the course. However, for six of them, the course did not assist them to attain their goals—helped at first, then no.
The ‘problem’ adversely affecting all of the employees’ motivation is the organisation of other shopfloor employees to ‘change-over’ and thereby relieve those attending the course of their workplace duties (7 people). All of the employees commented that by no-one coming to change with them on the production line we can’t go to school. Maria believes that [we] get left behind because coming late—understand nothing. An outcome of the employees coming late to class was that some of them always go home more late. Bow, Maria, Nicola and Sorina perceive coming home late as a disruption to their families: Live far away [from work], tired when get home.

Contained within the sub-category ‘Company’s attitude’ is the factor ‘management not prepared’ (2 people). This factor adversely affected Angela and Bow’s motivation to participate. The company’s attitude was perceived by Angela as being one of indifference to the program: Management not prepared [for the change-over], it’s not good enough. Angela further believes that lack of change-over organisation was an indication of loss of company interest in the program. Even though Bow also perceived a lack of company interest she did acknowledge, however, that it would be helpful [to the company] if the people [shopfloor employees] can speak English.

The sub-category ‘Shopfloor community’s attitude’ contains factors that positively affected the employees’ motivation: ‘positive towards the course’ (7 people), ‘staff together’ (3 people) and ‘better language help the company’ (2 people). Francesco commented that all other Food Products shopfloor employees were supportive of those who attended the Introductory course. This, he feels, transferred to those attending the course. The employees who attended the course perceive their participation in it as one that helped them to develop a sense of collegiality amongst each other. Francesco believes that: It doesn’t matter if you make a mistake, we still all between us….they laugh at me, I laugh at them…that’s nothing wrong with that, it’s good. Angela believes that, people more confident to go to
workplace course rather than night school. Furthermore, May perceives lessons as a time the staff [can be] together.

The context-related factor 'change-over caused disquiet' adversely affected the employees' motivation to participate (7 people). Angela expressed disappointment that shopfloor supervisors were unable to organise other workers to change-over with those attending class: *If management decide to...send you to this classes...it's no point you put an effort in and they just say "sorry we didn't have any one, that's it"; it's not good enough....I was very disappointed.* Comments similar to those expressed by Angela represent the disquiet the employees felt at not being able to attend classes on a consistent basis.

Factors related to the issue of change-over procedures are contained within three of the four context-related sub-categories: 'Problem(s)', 'Company’s attitude', and 'Shopfloor community’s attitude'. Out of all of the factors that adversely affected the employees' motivation to participate, factors related to the change-over appear to have the most adverse and far reaching effect on the employees’ motivation to participate in the course. For example, difficulties with organising other employees to release those who were attending one of the courses adversely affected the employees’ motivation as they came late to lessons, missed instructions that had been given to other employees, sometimes missed a whole lesson or left the course late and therefore returned home late.

Factors that were reported by six or more of the employees are: 'retention', 'home duties', 'course too short', 'liked activity related to goal', 'writing/spelling difficult', 'outside of work', 'change-over', 'positive towards the course', and 'change-over caused disquiet'. Four of these factors are context-related, three are course-related and two are personal factors. Further to this, three of these factors positively affected the employees’ motivation and six adversely affected their motivation to participate. Specifically, this finding illustrates the importance of context- and course-related factors when identifying factors that may affect
future groups of NESB shopfloor employees who participate in a similar Introductory CSDP course.

**Recommendations.**

The following recommendations were made by the employees and have been matched to personal, course- and context-related factors. These recommendations are:

1. Food Products should continue running workplace training programs as it's a good idea (context-related).

2. Food Products needs to subsidise all the employees who participate in a course (context-related & personal).

3. Management need to have people [other shopfloor employees] ready to change over--need commitment from the company (context-related).

4. Course content needs to include, writing (3 people), workplace English (1 person) and basic computer knowledge (1 person) (course-related).

5. Course needs to happen in work time (course-related).

6. Course needs to run on time (course-related & personal).

7. More hours/time to do the course (course-related).

**Individual Case II**

**Factors and perceptions of factors.**

Within this individual case (n = 3) the employees reported three main factors that affected their motivation to participate in the Intermediate course: personal (3 people), course-related (3 people) and context-related (3 people) (See Table 7).

The ‘personal’ factor that adversely affected the employees’ motivation to participate is ‘family commitments’ (3 people). Contained within this factor are the factors ‘home duties’ (2 people) and ‘pay’ (1 person). In relation to ‘home duties’, Christina and Marta believe that family commitments made it difficult to complete [homework]. For Marta family
commitments entailed cooking and cleaning and for Christina these involved helping her husband build an extension to their home. Loss of pay was a factor that affected Pasquale’s motivation: *It's upset you know...you don't want to be there any more.* Further to the upset that Pasquale experienced, he believes that the loss of 4 to 5 hours pay per week make a lot of difference to him and his family. It was due to his financial commitment to his family that Pasquale withdrew from the course.

Course-related factors have been classified into three sub-categories: structure (2 people), content, (3 people) and teaching (1 person). Factors contained within ‘structure’ are: ‘lesson long enough’ (1 person), ‘lesson too long’ (1 person), ‘lesson not long enough’ (1 person) and ‘students of mismatched abilities’ (1 person). The two hour duration of each lesson positively affected Christina’s motivation to participate; however, it adversely affected Marta and Pasquale’s motivation. For example, Christina believes that the timetabling and duration of the course should not be changed. Marta believes that the course should run for one whole day as two hours is not long enough. In contrast, Pasquale believes that two hour lessons are too long after work and he found it difficult to concentrate. Pasquale also believes that having students of mismatched abilities made it difficult for the teacher to plan lesson content and for the employees to maintain their interest in a lesson. He commented: *Sometime person say--ah “thata waste of time for me” or “it’s too hard me, I can’t go”.*

Factors contained within the sub-category ‘content’ are ‘liked activity related to goal’ (3 people) and ‘writing/spelling difficult’ (3 people). ‘Liked activity related to goal’ positively affected the employees’ motivation to participate. In contrast, ‘writing/spelling difficult’ adversely affected their motivation. The content of the course was perceived by the employees as interesting and they were happy with everything that happened in the course. All of the employees held positive perceptions of activities that were related to their goals. For example, Christina said she liked spelling and talking. Marta said she liked writing
because really you don't talk much when you're working, and Pasquale said he liked reading--basic English, everyday [English].

There was no activity that the employees did not enjoy doing. However, all of them perceive spelling as the most difficult of all the activities. These difficulties are related to the non-phonetic nature of English. For example, Christina reflected on a work situation when she was shaking when the phone was ringing because I have to write the message down. She further commented: In Hungarian language we never spell....I was surprised when people asking me how to spell it. Marta appreciated the effort the teacher put into assisting her and she commented on how difficult it was for the teacher when only a few students came to class or were ten to fifteen minutes late. Overall, the employees enjoyed participating in the course. They believe that the course helped them a little bit; Christina believes it gave her a chance to learn.

Context-related factors have been classified into four sub-categories: the employees' perceptions of the 'Usefulness of the course', 'Problem(s)' they experienced, 'Company’s attitude' towards the program, and 'Shopfloor community’s attitude’ towards the program.

Factors contained within 'Usefulness of the program' are: ‘outside of work’ (2 people), ‘work’ (1 person), ‘help a lot’ (1 person), ‘help a little bit’ (2 people), ‘help--not much’ (1 person) and ‘don’t practise what we learnt’ (1 person). Factors that positively affected the employees' motivation to participate are: ‘outside of work’, ‘work’, ‘help a lot’, and ‘help a little bit’. When discussing the usefulness of the course all of them believe that the course helped them a little bit outside of work. For example they reported that it helped them to communicate with a neighbour (1), a shop keeper (2), Food Products office staff (1) and when conducting personal business (2). Further to this, Christina believes the course helped her to speak English at work. Conversely, Pasquale believes that the course did not help him at work as he did not practise a lot when [I] finish. Marta believes that she learnt how to
write a letter to explain anything that happen in the company--that was really good for me, but, further to this, she believes that there are not many ways she has benefited from the course. Christina was the most positive of the employees. She believes that the course encourage me to try and learn...[it helped me] how to explain myself with colleagues.

The mixed perceptions of the usefulness of the course are due to the employees’ perceptions that the course assisted them to further develop existing language/literacy practices of speaking and reading. However, none of them attained his/her individual goal ‘to learn to write English’.

The ‘problem’ that adversely Marta and Pasquale’s motivation to participate was the ‘change-over’. Both of them commented that, on occasions, they did not attend lessons because it’s difficult to replace you. They perceive not attending and being late for class as disruptive to their learning. The change over procedure was not an issue for Christina as she was on night duty and, therefore, this required her to come to work an hour earlier rather than leave work and hour earlier. However, both Christina and Marta noted the problems the change-over caused for their teacher.

Factors contained within ‘Shopfloor community’s attitude’ are: ‘positive attitude towards the course’ (1 person), ‘better language help the company’ (3 people), ‘change-over caused disquiet’ (2 people) and ‘drop in motivation’ (1 person). ‘Positive attitude towards the course’ and ‘better language help the company’ positively affected the employees’ motivation. In contrast, ‘change-over caused disquiet’ and ‘drop in motivation’ adversely affected their motivation. Both Marta and Pasquale believe the organisational difficulties associated with the change-over caused disappointment for the employees and the teacher. Marta and Pasquale jointly commented: Sometimes she have to wait for maybe 15 to 20 minutes because one or another come late. Pasquale further expressed his disappointment when he spent most of his lunchtime making sure everything got organised, make sure
everything got everything--I used to miss my lunch and then he realised no get paid for the overtime hours he missed by attending the course. Even though adverse factors were reported by Marta and Pasquale, both of them acknowledged the effort the company made on their behalf and the importance of workplace training for the employees: *Make a lot of difference if you know the language. If we [shopfloor employees] try more quicker....you can understand what the person is talking about.* Pasquale’s perception of workplace training was supported by Christina: *[Workplace training] is a chance for other people [migrants] to learn the language so I think that should help the company.*

Factors contained within the sub-category ‘Company’s attitude’ are ‘promotion’ (2 people) and ‘management not prepared’ (1 person). Marta’s main motivation to learn to write English so that she may gain an opportunity to apply for another job. Initially, promotion was a factor that positively affected Marta’s motivation to participate. However, when she realised promotion was not a possibility for her, this factor adversely affected her motivation. Pasquale commented: *[We] dropped in motivation when the teacher told us....company policy is not to promote the people on the shopfloor.* Both Marta and Pasquale believe that the company should *encourage promotion as young people will want to be promoted.* Pasquale further believes that by not promoting shopfloor workers *it’s not fair...we [machine operators] have to train those people [supervisors] to, to come from outside....if you train one outside, why don’t you train one inside.* In relation to ‘management not prepared’ Marta expressed her disappointment at not being able to attend lessons or, if she did attend, not attending on time. She perceives this as being due to management’s lack of change-over organisation. However, Marta is aware that to conduct a workplace language and literacy course is an expensive procedure for the company. She commented: *It is very hard for the company to fund us someone to change you exactly on the time.*
Factors that were reported by two or more of the employees are: ‘home duties’, ‘liked activity related to goal’, ‘writing/spelling difficult’, ‘outside of work’, ‘help a little bit’, ‘change-over’, ‘promotion’, ‘better language help the company’, and ‘change-over caused disquiet’. Six of these factors are context-related, two are course-related and one is a personal factor. Further to this, four of these factors positively affected the employees’ motivation and five adversely affected their motivation. These findings illustrate the importance of context-related factors in relation to their how these factors can positively or adversely affect NESB employees’ motivation to participate in an Intermediate CSDP course.

**Recommendations.**

Recommendations made by the employees have been matched to personal, course- and context-related factors. These recommendations are:

1. Food Products continue running workplace training courses (context-related).
2. Food Products needs to run courses in work time (personal & context-related).
3. Food Products needs to subsidise all employees who participate in a course (context-related & personal).
4. The organisation of the change over needs to be improved (context-related).
5. Course content to include writing (2 people), basic everyday English (1 person) and a computer course (1 person) (course-related).
6. Course hours need to be lengthened (course-related).
7. Course needs to cater for a specific level of student (course-related).

**Cross-Case Analysis**

This cross-case analysis will, firstly, discuss factors and perceptions that are different between the individual cases and, secondly, factors and perceptions that are similar to both of the individual cases. Factors that affected each of the employees’ motivation to participate in one the CSDP courses are outlined in Table 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors that affected motivation</th>
<th>* Employee code</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family commitments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- home duties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course-related factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ lesson long enough</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lesson too long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lesson not long enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- course too short</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- students of mismatched abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ liked activity related to goal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ liked reading homework</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- disliked activity not related to goal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- writing/spelling difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- written homework difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ teacher tried to help</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context-related factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usefulness of the program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ outside of work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ help a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ help a little bit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- help—not much</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- don’t practise what we learnt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- change-over</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company’s attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- management not prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shopfloor community’s attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ positive towards the course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ staff together</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ better language help the company</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- change-over caused disquiet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- drop in motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes:** Employees: * 1 = Angela; 2 = Bow; 3 = Francesco; 4 = Maria; 5 = May; 6 = Nicola; 7 = Sorina; 8 = Christina; 9 = Marta; 10 = Pasquale.

Factors: ☆ = positively affected; ̶ = adversely affected

Symbols: Φ = Individual Case I; ̶ = Individual Case II.
Factors that affect motivation.

Personal, course-related, and context-related factors were reported by the case as either positively or adversely affecting the employees’ motivation to participate in one of the CSDP courses. In all, the employees reported a total of 31 factors; that is: 6 personal, 11 course-related and 14 context-related factors.

Factors that are different between the individual cases are ‘age’, ‘learning’, ‘retention’, ‘retirement’, ‘course too short’, ‘liked reading homework’, ‘written homework difficult’, ‘disliked activity not related to goal’, and ‘staff together’ (Individual Case I); and ‘lesson too long’, ‘students of mismatched abilities’, and ‘promotion’ (Individual Case II).

In relation to Individual Case I, the personal factors age (3 people), learning (4 people), and retention (6 people) are linked together, and the course-related factors written homework difficult (4 people) and disliked activity not related to goal (3 people) are linked together. For example, the employees believe that ‘age’ and/or ‘learning’ adversely affected their ‘retention’ of course information. Maria commented: Learning is difficult. When arrived in Australia went straight to work--should have been at school. May commented that due to her age she can’t remember. Further to this, Individual Case I employees believe that the short duration of the course did not assist them to retain new information. Sorina commented that there was not enough time too--we probably forgot everything she showed us. Maria, Sorina and Nicola reported the factor ‘disliked activity not related to goal’. For them this activity was writing. Their dislike of writing adversely affected their motivation to complete written activities in class and at home. Maria commented: Writing...never like. Sorina added: We don’t mind read...[written] homework hard for us. The employees’ comments about their perceived inability to learn and/or retain new information are similar to ‘perceptual and attitudinal barriers’ identified by the Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training (1991).
Whilst some L2 research has shown that age is not a major determining factor that influences a learner’s efficiency and success in acquiring a second language (Cook, 1991; Singleton, 1989), research which has investigated older L2 learners has indicated that age is a factor that affects L2 learning (Kaufmann, 1989; Rado & Foster, 1995). Similarly, for Angela, Francesco and May age is a factor that they perceive has affected their ability to learn new information. This finding illustrates the need for future CSDP teachers to be aware of the factors/barriers that employees may perceive as affecting their learning, and, perhaps, for teachers to outline to the employees ‘how adults learn’ and ‘factors that affect adult learning’ (see Merriam & Caffarella, 1991).

Overall, Individual Case I employees reported four more personal factors than did Individual Case II employees. This may be related to differences within the employees’ pre-course levels of English (Simpson & Beetson, n.d.) and/or their educational backgrounds. That is, at one extreme, some of the Individual Case I employees were found to have “just above basic survival” of spoken English (Simpson & Beetson, objective 8.1.1) and “very weak” reading skills (objective 8.1.2). In contrast, at the other extreme, some of the Individual Case II employees have “total fluency” of spoken English (objective 8.1.1) and “native-like proficiency” of reading (objective 8.1.2). In relation to the employees’ educational backgrounds, Francesco was the only Individual Case I employee to complete secondary education; whereas Christina and Marta (Individual Case II) have both gained post secondary school qualifications. It may be that the employees’ pre-course levels of spoken and written English and/or their past educational backgrounds have influenced their ability and/or their perceptions of the ability to learn/retain new information. These findings are similar to findings noted by Kaufmann (1989).

This difficulty with learning is not confined to L2 learners. Wickert found that variables related to “current literacy practice”, “level of education”, and “age” affected an adult’s
literacy proficiency (Wickert, 1989, p. 27; 1990). Furthermore, “older” persons were found to experience greater difficulty with “complex literacy tasks” (Wickert cited in Wickert & Black, 1990, p. 26). Although Wickert’s findings that discuss the variables of current literacy practice, level of education and age are not related to NESB adults alone, her findings do alert L2 researchers and teachers to the possibility that these three variables may affect an adults proficiency in acquiring a second language.

Factors that are specific to Individual Case II are ‘lesson too long’ (1 person), ‘students of mismatched abilities’ (1 person) and ‘promotion’ (2 people). ‘Lesson too long’ and ‘students of mismatched abilities’ are both course-related factors that are perceived by Pasquale as having adversely affected his motivation to participate. This finding is similar to Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox’s (1975) finding that the inappropriate placement of ABE students is a barrier to other ABE students’ learning.

The context-related factor ‘promotion’ was a strong motivation for Marta to participate in the Intermediate course. Both she and Pasquale believe that her and others’ motivation to participate in the course was adversely affected when the employees were informed that it was company policy not to promote people from the shopfloor. Pasquale commented: That’s why they drop the morale of the people [shopfloor employees] you know. Marta and Pasquale’s perceptions of the ways in which the factor ‘promotion’ affected their and other employees’ motivation to participate are similar to the perceptions of entry-level workers at King Memorial Hospital (Gowen, 1990, 1992). Like the entry-level workers, Marta and Pasquale perceive that the company, when implementing company policy, did not consider shopfloor employees’ overall potential to carry out higher level jobs.

Personal, course-related, and context-related factors were similarly reported by both of the individual cases. Here the employees jointly reported 19 of the 31 factors. In all situations personal factors were similarly reported as adversely affecting the employees’ motivation to
participate. ‘Family commitments’ is the personal factor most frequently reported. In both individual cases, the women reported ‘home duties’ (6 Individual Case I & 2 Individual Case II) and the men reported ‘pay’ (1 Individual Case I & 1 Individual Case II) as affecting their motivation. ‘Home duties’ are perceived by these women as ones that needed to be attended to before they attempt to complete written homework. Sorina commented: Yeah but homework...I got a little one to look after. For Bow, Maria, Nicola, Sorina (Individual Case I) and Marta (Individual Case II) coming home late from the course was another factor that affected their ability to carry out home duties. Loss of pay was a factor that affected Francesco (Individual Case I) and Pasquale’s (Individual Case II) ability to financially support their families. Francesco perceived the loss of pay as the company [not being] good to us. In contrast, Pasquale was more philosophical: That was an agreement...half [work time] half [own time]...you can’t blame the company...they be fair to us. To alleviate the problem of loss of pay, Pasquale believes that the company should have held the courses in company time similar to the course held fifteen to sixteen years ago in the old factory.

The reporting of personal factors identifies the need for future Food Products administrators and educators to actively consider the employees’ “demographic features” (i.e., age, past learning, family) that may affect his/her participation in a workplace course (Stromquist, 1995, p. 187). One way of showing consideration for demographic features is for planners to change program policy so that policy acknowledges differences that may exist within the employees’ demographic features and caters for a variety of employees’ needs within a given situation (Beder, 1991; Stromquist). ‘Family commitments’, ‘learning’, and ‘pay’ are similar to, respectively, ‘family problems’, ‘difficulties with learning’ (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1984) and ‘work interference’ (Darkenwald & Valentine; Beder & Valentine, 1987a) factors that were identified as affecting or being a barrier to ABE students’ learning. Furthermore, ‘pay’ is also similar to the barrier ‘insufficient financial resources’ identified by the Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training (1991).
The employees similarly reported course-related factors that positively and adversely affected their participation in the program. ‘Liked activity related to goal’ (7 Individual Case I & 3 Individual Case II) and ‘writing/spelling difficult’ (6 Individual Case I & 3 Individual Case II) were the most frequently reported factors. All of the 8 employees who migrated from a European country (5 Individual Case I & 3 Individual Case II) had difficulty learning to spell English. They commented that, as each employee’s first language has a phonetic base and English does not, they perceive this as causing them to have difficulty with spelling. They commented: *I cannot hear the difference; I get confused with letters; Italian is a different story altogether—it’s better.* The difficulties employees experienced with spelling and writing are similar to difficulties L2 learners sometimes encounter with the oral-aural aspects of the target language and phonetic coding (Singleton, 1989). To counteract these difficulties, L2 program planners and teachers need to consider: future NESB employees’ abilities to abstract and analyse information, adaptation of program content and modes of instruction to meet learners’ needs, and the development of an active teaching approach that is based on learning and practise (Cook, 1991; Joyce & Burns, 1992; Singleton).

Context-related factors that were reported by both of the individual cases are: ‘help a lot’, ‘outside of work’, ‘work’, ‘help a little bit’, ‘help—not much’, ‘change-over’, ‘don’t practise what we learnt’, ‘management not prepared’, ‘positive towards the course’, ‘better language help the company’, ‘change-over caused disquiet’, and ‘drop in motivation’. A discussion of these factors is outlined below.

All of the employees hold mixed perceptions about the usefulness of the course in which they participated. The employees’ mixed perceptions of the usefulness of the course are related to, first, the employees’ perception that the course has assisted them to carry out language/literacy practices that they were unable to carry out before they did the course (7 Individual Case I & 2 Individual Case II) and, second, even though the course assisted them
to carry out new and existing language/literacy practices, it did not assist these nine employees to attain their goals. These findings illustrate that, for this group of employees, their perceptions of the usefulness of the course in which they participated are linked to the attainment of their goals. On the basis of these findings, future CSDP program planners and teachers need to be aware of NESB employees' goals and actively take account of their goals when planning and implementing course content (Berlin, 1986; Mikulecky, et al., 1996).

Problems associated with the 'change-over' adversely affected nine employees' (7 Individual Case I & 2 Individual Case II) motivation to participate in the program. The employees expressed a variety of perceptions as to ways in which the change-over affected their motivation and caused disquiet amongst the employees who attended one of the CSDP courses. Some of the employees commented that they miss 1 to 1 1/2 of lesson and sometimes start late, go home late. Similar to King Memorial Hospital entry-level workers, the employees' perceptions of the company's attitude towards program organisation are coloured by some of the employees' perceptions that management had lost interest in the program (Gowen, 1990, 1991, 1992).

'Positive towards the course' (7 Individual Case I & 1 Individual Case II) and 'better language help the company' (2 Individual Case I & 3 Individual Case II) are context-related factors that positively affected the employees' motivation to participate in one of the CSDP courses. All of the employees who reported 'better language help the company' noted that the company, as well as the employees themselves, would benefit from the employees participating in the program. For example, Pasquale commented on the job-based efficiencies that would occur from the employees participating in one of the courses.

The number of context-related factors reported and the number of employees who reported these factors (see Table 8) illustrate that: context-related factors are of major importance in understanding the factors that affected the employees' motivation to participate in the
workplace program. Further, if NESB employees are to be motivated to participate in future workplace learning they must be able to perceive tangible, applied and realistic benefits (e.g., context-related factors) (Mikulecky, 1995; Puchner, 1995). These findings also illustrate that for employees to perceive a CSDP course as useful within the workplace itself, program content must be authentic to the workplace environment (Billet, 1994). Personal and course-related factors alone are not sufficient to understand why the employees participated in the program, nor, on their own, will personal or course-related factors enable future Food Products policy makers, planners and educators to create a favourable learning environment (Mikulecky; Puchner; Stromquist, 1995).

Table 8
Most Frequently Reported Factors: Factors Reported by Five or More of the Case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Type of factor</th>
<th>Individual Case I employees</th>
<th>Individual Case II employees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) liked activity related to goal</td>
<td>course-related</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) positive towards the course</td>
<td>context-related</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) outside of work</td>
<td>context-related</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) help a little bit</td>
<td>context-related</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) work</td>
<td>context-related</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) better language help the company</td>
<td>context-related</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) writing/spelling difficult</td>
<td>course-related</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) change-over</td>
<td>context-related</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) change-over caused disquiet</td>
<td>context-related</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) home duties</td>
<td>personal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) retention</td>
<td>personal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) help--not much</td>
<td>context-related</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) course too short</td>
<td>course-related</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) don't practise what we learnt</td>
<td>context-related</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Thoughts

A formative evaluation of the employees’ reasons for participating in one of the CSDP courses revealed that the employees were motivated to participate for a variety of life-specific reasons. Of these reasons, ‘Self-improvement through language/literacy development’ is the goal most frequently reported by the employees (10 people). This goal is the key reasons why the employees participated in the program. Further, the employees perceive language/literacy development as underlying the attainment of their goals and sub-goals. More specifically, Speaking (4 Individual Case I, 2 Individual Case II) and Writing/spelling (3 Individual Case I, 3 Individual Case II) Self-Improvement through language/literacy development sub-goals as two of the three sub-goals most frequently reported by the case. This finding further illustrates the importance of Self-Improvement through language/literacy development goals and sub-goals in motivating the employees to participate in one of the CSDP courses.

The employees reported particular motivational orientations for having participated in one of the CSDP courses. These orientations revealed that the employees’ life-specific reasons were pre-determined prior to their participation. In the main, the employees participated in the program for pragmatic reasons that are related to the attainment of mastery or competence of one or more language/literacy practices. Prosocial orientation that was reported by the employees is not related to social-emotional/integrative reasons for learning a L2, but rather, as pragmatic/instrumentally based reasons that will enable them to develop group cohesion and/or positive interpersonal interactions with associates.

Personal, course- and context-related factors were reported by both of the individual cases as affecting their motivation to participate in one of the program’s courses. Moreover, for both of the individual cases, context-related factors were the most often reported factor. This finding assists to support Puchner’s (1995) and Stromquist’s (1995) view that, within a workplace learning situation, factors other than personal and course-related factors are of
major importance in understanding what factors affect an employee's motivation to participate in workplace language and literacy classes.

An overview of the most frequently reported personal, course-related and context-related factors (i.e., those that were reported by five or more of the case) illustrate that course-based activities that are related to the employees' goals and are activities that the employees perceive as being useful to themselves positively affected their motivation to participate (see Table 8). Conversely, program organisation and content that did not consider the employees' demographic features, L2 learning difficulties or opportunities for them to practise what they learnt adversely affected the employees' motivation. Furthermore, the difficulties Food Products management experienced by not being able to secure staff to change-over on the production line inadvertently signalled to the employees company indifference towards the program itself and the factors that affected the employees' everyday lives. As well as illustrating each factor's importance in relation to the employees' motivation to participate in the program, these findings also show the interaction that occurred between personal, course- and context-related factors (Cross, 1981; Puchner, 1995).

The thesis proposed in this study is: Food Products NESB shopfloor employees participated in one of the CSDP workplace language and literacy courses for a variety of pre-determined life specific reasons. In the main, this group of employees formed and hold mixed perceptions of the usefulness of the program's courses. These mixed perceptions are due to the employees' belief that the course, in which they participated, assisted them to further develop existing language/literacy practices of either speaking, reading and/or writing. However it did not assist all of the employees to acquire/develop new and/or old language/literacy practices that would have assisted them to attain their goals. Rather, the course only assisted them to attain part of their goals. For future groups of NESB shopfloor employees to attain their goals and to form and hold positive perceptions of the workplace language and literacy course in which they participate, Food Products policy makers,
major importance in understanding what factors affect an employee's motivation to participate in workplace language and literacy classes.

An overview of the most frequently reported personal, course-related and context-related factors (i.e., those that were reported by five or more of the case) illustrate that course-based activities that are related to the employees' goals and are activities that the employees perceive as being useful to themselves positively affected their motivation to participate (see Table 8). Conversely, program organisation and content that did not consider the employees' demographic features, L2 learning difficulties or opportunities for them to practise what they learnt adversely affected the employees' motivation. Furthermore, the difficulties Food Products management experienced by not being able to secure staff to change-over on the production line inadvertently signalled to the employees company indifference towards the program itself and the factors that affected the employees' everyday lives. As well as illustrating each factor's importance in relation to the employees' motivation to participate in the program, these findings also show the interaction that occurred between personal, course- and context-related factors (Cross, 1981; Puchner, 1995).

The thesis proposed in this study is: Food Products NESB shopfloor employees participated in one of the CSDP workplace language and literacy courses for a variety of pre-determined life specific reasons. In the main, this group of employees formed and hold mixed perceptions of the usefulness of the program's courses. These mixed perceptions are due to the employees' belief that the course, in which they participated, assisted them to further develop existing language/literacy practices of either speaking, reading and/or writing. However it did not assist all of the employees to acquire/develop new and/or old language/literacy practices that would have assisted them to attain their goals. Rather, the course only assisted them to attain part of their goals. For future groups of NESB shopfloor employees to attain their goals and to form and hold positive perceptions of the workplace language and literacy course in which they participate, Food Products policy makers,
planners and teachers need to be consciously aware of factors that may affect an employee’s motivation to participate in similar CSDP courses.

Based on this study’s findings, Food Products policy makers, planners and teachers need to:

1. Be aware that employees may come to a CSDP workplace language and literacy course with pre-determined life-specific reasons for participating.
2. Be aware that the employees’ reasons for participating in a CSDP course may be similar or different to the company’s and/or instructional reasons for conducting a course.
3. Be aware that future Introductory Course participants may choose to participate in a CSDP course for spoken language reasons alone.
4. Gain a pre-course understanding of the specific nature and purpose of the employees’ goals.
5. Recognise that the employees require course-based time and assistance to set realistic goals.
6. Structure program organisation, design, course content and materials to assist the employees to attain their goals.
7. Implement organisational procedures that enable the planning and teaching of future CSDP workplace language and literacy courses to address personal, course- and context-related factors that may positively or adversely affect an employees’ motivation to participate in workplace language and literacy classes.

Limitations

The case of NESB shopfloor employees presented me with an opportunity to formatively evaluate the employees’ motivation to participate in a CSDP workplace language and literacy course and the employees’ perceptions of factors that affected their motivation. However, several limitations were experienced. Because of this case study’s purpose and the small number of people involved, these findings are specific to this study alone. Also, as this study was conducted after the completion of the CSDP courses, I was unable to observe the
employees participating in the program’s course. Therefore, I needed to rely on the employees’ and one of the program’s teachers for course-related and employee participation-based information. Even though these limitations occurred, it is hoped that this formative evaluation will enable Food Products administrators and the program’s teachers to implement future CSDP courses that will: 1) assist the employees to set and attain realistic goals, and, at the same time, 2) inform Food Products administrators and the program’s teachers about the factors that may positively or adversely affect future groups of NESB shopfloor employees’ motivation to participate in a CSDP workplace language and literacy course.

Suggestions for Future Research

Although past research has assisted to inform this study’s findings of the reasons why the employees participated in one of the CSDP courses and their types of motivation, none of the descriptive research, achievement goal theory and/or L2 theories of motivation was able to be used to describe the range of reasons and/or orientations that were reported by the employees. On the basis of this observation, it appears that there is a need to develop a comprehensive and eclectic framework that encapsulates shopfloor employees’ motivation to participate in workplace language and literacy classes, and, more specifically, NESB shopfloor employees’ motivation to participate in workplace language and literacy classes. Furthermore, there is a continued need to formatively evaluate workplace language and literacy courses and the factors that affect employees’ participation in classes. It also became evident that further L2 research needs to examine variables that influence adult second language learning and/or acquisition. On a different research-based matter, there is a need to examine Food Products’ shopfloor culture and, in so doing, gain a detailed understanding of how the workplace culture affects the employees’ opportunities or lack of opportunities to gain promotion from the shopfloor.

For it is when company administrators, teachers, program planners and policy makers have an understanding of particular groups of employees’ motivation to participate in workplace
language and literacy courses and the factors that affect their motivation that monies, time and effort will be expended on workplace language and literacy programs that are specifically designed to meet the needs of the people these courses intend to assist. By the latter becoming a reality for the employees they will be able to attain, as Sorina suggested, better language and experience a better way [of life]; that is, one that enables them to effectively communicate with English speaking people at work or in the community.
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Appendix 1

Demographic Information Sheet

Name: ___________________________  Gender: ______________

Age grouping: 20-29__  30-39__  40-49__  50-...__

Nationality: ____________________________________________

Years in Australia (if not Australian) _______________________

Language(s) spoken at home: __________________________________

Where do you speak English? _________________________________

Years of schooling: _________

Other forms of education ______________________________________

Number of years you have worked for the company ___________________

Present area of work _________________________________________

Case Study Name ___________________________________________
Appendix 2

Consent Form

The purpose of this case study is to find out what Food Products' shopfloor employees think about the Communication Skills Development Program (literacy or numeracy) training courses they did last year.

To do this I will need to:

1. Ask you to help me to do this

2. Look at and take notes of what you do at work

3. Collect samples of memos, forms and other written material

4. Ask you questions about the training course

5. Write a case study report on what you think of workplace training
I am happy to help Margy to do her case study on what shopfloor employees think about workplace training.

I am happy for her to:

1. Look at and take notes of what I do at work

2. Ask me questions about the training course I did

3. Collect samples of memos, forms and other written material

4. Write a case study report on what I think of workplace training

I understand that she will not write my name in her report or talk about what I tell her.

X____________________ X____________________

employee's name employees' signature

Margy Cullity

researcher's name/signature
NICOLA: Yeah that's what we talk at home. Little bit English we talk here and, and when we go to shop

MARIA: Yeah, eh that's it to the shop

NICOLA: If and when we need it, you know

MARIA: [inaudible] from next door or somebody [inaudible]

LINDA: With English people we talk English and ...

SORINA: If I have to talk to Maria we no speak the same dialect, language we have

MARIA: [INTERJECTS] Same language

SORINA: [OVER SPEAKS] to talk English to understand each other

ALL: Yes, yes [SPEAK OVER EACH OTHER]

SORINA: But if I speak to Nicola or Linda I .... [inaudible] (speaking over each other agreeing with Sorina) but if on the table together we always try to speak English...

ALL: English, English

SORINA: for everybody can understand
NICOLA: Not for home

MARGY: Yes, yes

NICOLA: Or we go to shop, or we go to the doctor or, we try you know

MARGY: Has the course helped you to use the English? Say for example when you do go to the shop or ....

SORINA: Oh yeah, it has helped
ALL: Oh, yeah, yeah

SORINA: Yeah, understand that, we no say it has no help but ...

NICOLA: It has taken a long time for us to learn

SORINA: See [Italian]

MARGY: Mm

MARGY: What did you like doing in the course, in the language course? (pause, nobody speaks, they look at each other and shrug shoulders) Was there a favourite activity that you really enjoyed, or was there something um, or was there a day when you thought I really understood what she was talking about? Was there something specific?

SORINA: Everything to let us a want change more
NICOLA: Yeah

SORINA: Doesn't matter, but

MARGY: So there was nothing really that, that was major that you really enjoyed doing?

SORINA: Yeah we enjoyed do it, she was really good actually, you know. We no say she's no good, she really good, help us a lot you know. But like I say for us everything interesting because everything, err, err we want to learn, so but we are like.

MARGY: Is there anything you didn't like doing in the language course?

SORINA: Writing

MARGY: Writing?
ALL: (laugh)

MARIA: Never like, it was harder to do
SORINA: A lot of work (all laugh)

MARIA: Yeah very hard for homework too, you know homework....

ALL: Yeah, yeah

MARIA: I ask the kids, the kids have got to answer to you

SORINA: Oh it's a hard, oh
NICOLA: Oh, no homework, no homework

MARIA: Oh when I say [INAUDIBLE] my son say 'Mumma ....

NICOLA: No homework it's so

MARIA: Oh

MARGY: Maria they didn't help you?

MARIA: They help me a lot, but they say "Mum did school did for you when you was young, you know now" [LAUGHS]

NICOLA: I got no one to help me home [LAUGHS]

MARIA: You know how it is, sometimes I [INAUDIBLE] "Everyone help Mum, I can't help" [LAUGHS] Mum like me I got...

SORINA: Probably we don't mind read a little bit at home

MARIA: Read a little bit, it's all right, but
Appendix 4

Summary of Transcript Between Sorina, Maria, Nicola and Margy

From the information you have given me I understand that you found out about the workplace language course when you were interviewed by one of the course teachers. After the interview you were all put in the same language class which was designed to help you to understand, speak and write English. This course happened twice a week with each lesson lasting for two hours. The reasons why you chose to participate in the language course were mainly because you wanted to understand and speak more English.

The sort of activities that you did in the course were mainly writing sentences, reading of stories and some spelling. Of these activities most of you found the writing to be the most difficult to understand and do. You enjoyed the reading and speaking and found that your speaking improved a little bit over the time you did the lessons. Nicola did not notice any improvement in her speaking of English. Most of you found the written homework hard to do and you did not like doing it very much. You did not mind the reading homework but not the written. None of you had anyone at home who could help you with your homework.

Some of the problems that you had when doing the language course were getting people to change with you on the line, getting to the lesson on time and finishing on time. Because of these problems you found that you did not have enough time to learn and found that you forgot some of things that the teacher taught you.

At work you speak English when you are speaking to a group of people who do not speak your language. You also speak English when you go to the shop, the doctors or when you speak to your neighbour.
If you were designing a new language course with your teacher, you said you would not put in anything new into the course or take anything out of the course you did. Some of you would not like to do another course in work time, but Sorina you said you would like to do one if you had company to do it with, but you wouldn't like to do it on your own.

You seem to think that workplace training is a good idea, but if it is to happen you need it to be in work time not employees time, to have people to take over from you on the line, and to start and to finish on time.