

# Exploring the Ideal and Ought to Second Language Self in English as a Foreign Language

---

**Matušin, Ines**

**Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad**

**2014**

*Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj:* **Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:142:449391>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2024-12-18**



*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[FFOS-repository - Repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Osijek](#)



Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku  
Filozofski fakultet

Diplomski studij Engleskog jezika i književnosti (nastavnički smjer) i Filozofije

Ines Matušin

**Exploring the Ideal and Ought to Second Language Self in  
English as a Foreign Language**

Diplomski rad

Mentor: prof.dr.sc. Višnja Pavičić Takač

Osijek, 2014.

## Summary

The present study deals with Dörnyei's motivational system in learning English as a second language (L2). The paper consists of two parts. The first part concerns the L2 motivation and the motivational theories that have addressed it. Then, Gardner's theory of motivation and integrative motive are described, which are followed by a review of its criticism. The more prominent part of this paper presents Dörnyei's work, and the L2 system he proposed. Next, major motivational research in L2 in the world and Croatia is reviewed. The second part of the paper describes the empirical research conducted on the sample of secondary school students in Donji Miholjac. In the present study, the concept of integrativeness was replaced with the Ideal L2 Self as a more appropriate concept for learners' L2 learning motivation. In general, learners' motivation correlates with their Ideal L2 and Ought-to L2 Self, which leads to the conclusion that Dörnyei's motivational system is more suitable to understand learners' L2 motivation because it gives a deeper and more detailed description of the causes and consequences of their motivation. At the end, the conclusion is given based on the underlying theory and research results.

**Key Words:** L2 learning motivation, L2 Motivational Self System, Dörnyei, the Ideal L2 Self, the Ought-to L2 Self, Gardner

## Sažetak

Ovaj se rad bavi motivacijskim sustavom u učenju engleskog kao drugog jezika koji je predložio Dörnyei. Rad se sastoji od dva dijela. Prvi dio opisuje što je to uopće motivacija u učenju inog jezika te se obrađuju teorije koje su se njome bavile. Zatim se daje prikaz Gardnerove teorije motivacije i njegovog integrativnoga motiva te kritika same teorije. Važan dio rada posvećen je Dörnyeiovoj teoriji i razmatranju bitnih temelja inojezičnog motivacijskog sustava koji je predložio. Zatim se daje pregled glavnih istraživanja u području inojezične motivacije, kako u svijetu, tako i u Hrvatskoj. Drugi dio rada donosi opis empirijskog istraživanja provedenog na uzorku donjomiholjačkih srednjoškolskih učenika, u kojemu je koncept integrativne motivacije zamijenjen konceptom idealne slike o sebi u učenju stranog jezika kao prikladniji pojam za opis njihove motivacije u učenju stranog jezika. Općenito, motivacija za učenje engleskog jezika povezana je s idealnom i očekivanom slikom o sebi, što na kraju dovodi do zaključka da je Dörnyeiev motivacijski sustav prikladniji za razumijevanje motivacije u učenju engleskog kao stranog jezika jer daje dublji i detaljniji opis uzroka i posljedica njihove motivacije. Na kraju je donesen zaključak temeljen na navedenim teorijskim postavkama i istraživanjima.

Ključne riječi: motivacija u učenju engleskog kao drugog jezika, motivacijski sustav u učenju drugog jezika, Dörnyei, idealna slika o sebi, očekivana slika o sebi, Gardner

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
1.1. What is L2 Learning Motivation? .....	2
1.2. L2 Motivation Theories.....	4
1.3 Three L2 Motivational Research Phases .....	6
2. Gardner’s View of L2 Motivation.....	8
2.1. Integrative Motive .....	11
2.2. Criticism of Gardner.....	13
3. Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System.....	14
3.1. Possible Selves/Future Selves: Ideal and Ought Self – Foundations of L2 System .....	15
3.2. L2 Motivational System- Ideal L2 Self and Ought-to L2 Self.....	17
4. Review of Motivational and L2 Motivational Self System Research .....	20
4.1. Research on L2 Motivational Self System .....	20
4.2. Research on Motivation in Croatia.....	23
5. Exploring the Ideal and Ought to Second Language Self in EFL.....	25
5.1 Aims and Research Questions.....	26
5.2. Participants .....	26
5.3. Instrument.....	27
5.4. Procedure.....	28
5.5. Results and Discussion.....	28
5.6. Conclusion.....	34
Bibliography	
Appendices	

## 1. Introduction

The present study deals with Dörnyei's motivational system in learning English as a second language (L2). Motivation in second language acquisition (SLA) is a very complex area in SLA research field and is one of the most important variables of language learning which is responsible for the intensity of the learning itself. How to understand learners' motivation for learning L2 has been a long-term problem for many linguistic and psychology researchers. However, they all agree that without enough motivation, learners are more likely to fail in achieving their goals in language learning than the learners who are more motivated. Dörnyei's L2 motivational system made a substantial reform in understanding learner's SLA motivation because it unites the psychological theories of the learner's selves/identity.

The study has two parts. The first part deals with the L2 motivation and the motivational theories that have been dealing with it. Then, Gardner's theory of motivation and integrative motive are described, which are followed by a review of its criticism. The more prominent part of this paper talks about Dörnyei's work, and the L2 system he proposed. Next, major motivational research in L2 in the world and Croatia are reviewed. The second part of the paper describes the empirical research conducted on the sample of 58 secondary school students. In order to explore the validity of Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self-System, the present study investigated learners' L2 learning motivation and explored their motivational profiles.

The reason why I chose this research area for the study is the fact that the comprehension of L2 motivation is one the most important factors in the language learning and teaching and it can be very helpful for all language teachers in giving the right motivational impetus while teaching L2. The purpose of this paper is to give an overview of important studies and research in the area and conduct a new study to explore Dörnyei's Ideal and Ought-to L2 Self in context of Croatian highschool L2 learners.

I think it is an interesting venture to explore learners' motivational profiles because it enables us, as future teachers, to see which aspects of their identity/possible selves have the most influence on L2 motivation so we could understand and improve it. Indeed, learners' internal wishes, hopes and aspirations, which are unified in learners' Ideal L2 Self and the Ought-to L2 Self, can be a great motivational stimulus to achieve better proficiency in L2.

## 1.1. What is L2 Learning Motivation?

The word motivation comes from the Latin verb *movere* meaning “to move”. The answers to questions like what moves an individual to make certain choices and decisions, to pursue dreams, goals, and persist in certain actions, lie in the heart of the motivation theory and research. However, these simple questions have gathered plenty of theory and research over the decades and created numerous theoretical models unifying different understandings of the L2 motivational construct. Dörnyei and Ottó (1998:65) define L2 motivation as “the dynamically changing cumulative arousal in a person that initiates, directs, amplifies, terminates, and evaluates the cognitive and motor processes whereby initial wishes and desires are selected, prioritized, operationalized and (successfully or unsuccessfully) acted out”.

Ellis (as cited in Root, 1999) simply asserted that motivation affects the extent to which language learners persevere in learning, what kinds of behavior they perform, and their actual achievement. The strength of learners’ desire to learn can make a difference in how willing and successful L2 learners can be.

Traditionally, researchers focused on language learning motivation in isolation. In nowadays theories, L2 motivation cannot be separated from complex socio-linguistic factors. Ushioda (as cited in Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011) claims that learners’ motivation should always be considered from different learning angles because learners’ L2 motivation is not independent of the motivation for other areas of learning because it depends on the motivation for learning other subjects as students weigh the pros and cons of making choices during their education. Weiner (as cited in Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011) also mentions the complexity of student motivation saying that when studying student motivation, researchers will have to include many other concepts of learner’s personality, such as self-worth, self-confidence, affection or effort in order to deal with it in a proper way.

L2 motivation theory was once dominated by goal-directed learning orientations in Gardner’s theory. Language learners would be either integratively or instrumentally-oriented to achieve proficiency in L2 use. Gardner and Lambert (1972:12) define integrative orientation as “a willingness to become a member of another ethno-linguistic group”, while the instrumental orientation is “characterized by a desire to gain social recognition or economic advantage through knowledge of a foreign language”. Later on, Deci and Ryan (2000) developed “the self-determination theory” and introduced two other aspects of motivation: intrinsic

motivation, which refers to doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable (the feeling of joy because of the completion of the activity itself), and extrinsic motivation, which refers to doing something because it leads to a beneficial outcome. Later on, these theoretical notions have been shifted to a new concept to include the aspects of identification within learners' self-system to induce motivation for better L2 proficiency (Dörnyei's L2 Motivational System as its highlight). Motivation to learn a particular language started to be interpreted through certain aspects of possible future selves.

Motivation itself was widely accepted by the teachers and researchers as one of the fundamental factors which influence the level of success in L2 learning. Dörnyei and Csizér (2002) say that human motivation to learn is a complex phenomenon influenced by many sources and situations coming from learners' social learning environment, inner aspirations, and the students' past experiences in the society. Paiva (2011) said that motivation is an important complex subsystem in SLA systems, which represents crucial force in any learning process. This seems to be consistent with Deci and Ryan's (2000) position that motivation is not a unitary phenomenon, as well as with Dörnyei's who sees it as a complex, multi-dimensional construct within person's identity. Motivation is not just a matter of having intrinsic or extrinsic orientations as stated in the earlier theories. It provides the main impetus to initiate L2 learning and enables learners to sustain the long learning process. Without sufficient motivation, even individuals with the excellent abilities cannot accomplish their goals, dreams, and desires. On the other hand, high motivation can make up for considerable disadvantages in one's learning conditions, bad learning strategies or style, and language aptitude.

L2 motivation can also be defined as a construct which unifies factors from different psychological field such as intrinsic/extrinsic motivation, past successes/failures in learning L2, self-confidence, the impacts from the social environment as well as classroom-situation factors such as classroom environment, tasks, group cohesion, teachers, and grades.

Motivation in SLA has been interpreted and defined by many researchers. However, they all agree that L2 motivation is a multi-construct that comprises characteristics that mostly depend on the individual differences of the L2 learners and their social environment.



## 1.2. L2 Motivation Theories

Due to the great number of L2 motivation theories, including the most popular Gardner's theory of L2 motivation, L2 motivation fields began to re-examine the existing motivation theories to incorporate psychological theories of the self. L2 motivation research has begun to examine how different people theorize the motivation to learn another language.

At the very beginning of L2 research, L2 motivational area was dominated by the work of Gardner and Lambert, who considered the motivation to learn L2 to be very important for inducing learners' desire to integrate into other L2 community. Gardner and his Canadian associates formulated a model of L2 motivation and developed a standardized motivation battery, the AMTB (Attitude/Motivation Test Battery). Two components of this model are: integrative and instrumental orientation. The former is associated with the positive attitudes towards the L2 society and the desire to integrate into L2 community. The latter is related to the beneficial gains of L2 proficiency, such as having a successful career or good salary and social reputation. After Gardner's theory had been introduced, many researchers started to expose their own findings and thoughts about L2 motivation which resulted in L2 motivation reform. One of the main drives of the reform was to adopt an education-centered approach to motivation research. The reform shared three underlying themes (Dörnyei, 1998: 124):

- (a) There was an effort to expand the social psychological approach with a number of psychological concepts that were seen as primary in the area which did not receive significant attention in L2 research.
- (b) More attention was given to L2 motivation with regard to specific language tasks and how this motivation can be improved
- (c) Main focus was shifted from wider social aspects to classroom-specific situations.

Clément and Kruidenier (as cited in Root, 1999) in their research specified a few factors that influence motivation. They identified four motivational orientations: instrumental orientation, travel, seeking new friendships, and acquiring knowledge. They concluded that social status of the learner and their connection or identification with their social environment are important determinates for the actualization of the four orientations. For this reason, they tried to focus more on learners' milieu than on learners' integrative or instrumental orientation which are, after all, often influenced by the milieu itself.

Ely (as cited in Root, 1999) conducted a study wanting to prove the possibility that the integrative/instrumental dichotomy did not represent the only spectrum of students' motivation. However, mixtures of motivation emerged that resembled instrumental and integrative orientations, which tell that instrumental and integrative motivation, unquestionably, form at least two aspects of learners' motivation.

Crookes and Schmidt (1991) also tried to ignore instrumental and integrative orientations, and only looked at how motivation includes both internal and external factors. Indeed, they identified some internal factors: interest in the language based on existing attitudes, experience and background knowledge, expectation of success or failure, outcomes, and the language learner persistence in language learning.

After Deci and Ryan's self-determination theory was introduced into motivational field, L2 researchers started to incorporate some of the elements of that theory in order to understand L2 motivation better. Brown (1987) is one the main researchers who emphasized the importance of intrinsic motivation in the L2 classroom-specific situations. He claims that traditional schools promote extrinsic motivation which makes students more focused on the material possessions/rewards, pleasing their teachers and parents rather than being satisfied with internal rewards which make them more eager to learn, improve their self-actualization and acquire knowledge. On the other hand, an intrinsically oriented school can provide more positive, affirming environment which insists on the respect for the gained knowledge in language learning. Brown also talks about the differences between integrative and instrumental orientation and extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. Two orientations are in dichotomy and refer only to the context of learning. Two motivations represent the intensity of learners' emotions ranging from deep internal reward, such as the completion of activity itself, to strong external rewards, such as money, prize, grades or positive feedback: "The product of this system is a student who has been taught to fear failure above all and therefore to refrain from potentially rewarding risk-taking or innovative behavior" (Brown, 1987:78).

The greatest shift in L2 motivation field was made by Dörnyei and his L2 motivational system dealing with the inner selves of L2 learners. Based on Dörnyei's (2005) theory of the motivational self-system, recent studies have been conducted to highlight the important role of self-concept in motivation and to explore motivation according to learners' cognitive and affective characteristics. Therefore, a learner should be seen as reasonable and emotional being whose L2 motivation depends on his/her entire self. As part of this general move

towards understanding the relationships between social context (family, classroom, and society) and the individual, there has been a significant shift towards considering the learner as a “person” rather than as an “abstract, depersonalized learner”. According to Ryan and Dörnyei (2013) learners’ L2 motivation can be fully understood if those learners are seen as whole persons together with their cognitive and affective aspects.

### **1.3 Three L2 Motivational Research Phases**

At the present time, L2 motivation is in the process of being retheorized in the context of learners’ self and identity which represent the mainstream notions in psychology (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2009). Taking into account different contextualization of L2 motivation theories, Dörnyei (2005) has identified the following three distinct phases: the social psychological period (1959–1990), the cognitive-situated period (during the 1990s) and the process-oriented period (the turn of the century).

The social psychological period was marked by the works of Gardner and Clément. According to Gardner (as cited in Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011:41), L2 motivation includes three components: motivational intensity or effort, desire to learn the language, and attitudes towards learning the language. Gardner argues that these three components are not independent because the truly motivated individual displays all three. Clément (1986) talks about his concept of linguistic self-confidence which affects the quality and quantity of learner’s motivation to learn and use the language of the other language community. Clément and his associates proved that the good communication between the members of different languages will be a major motivational factor in learning the other community’s language, inducing desire for intercultural communication and identification with the L2 group.

The cognitive-situated includes more cognitive approaches to L2 motivation, and there was a need to move from a macro (social context) to a micro (learner as a person) perspective on learner’s motivation, and how this motivation works in the classroom-oriented situations. The focus switched to the learning/teaching practice: the quality of the course, the tasks, the teacher, and the learners’ autonomy. Some important theories in the cognitive-situated period were self-determination theory, attribution theory, and task motivation. Self-determination theory includes two general types of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic (Noels et al., 2000). The first one is based on intrinsic interest in the activity itself and the other is based on extrinsic rewards because of the completion of that activity. Attribution theory emphasizes the importance of the factors that language learners attribute to the causes of the success or failure

they experience during their language. Finally, researching task motivation theory is focused on the studying L2 motivation while performing specific tasks and it is also marked by the shift from a macro perspective in a language community to a micro perspective in the classroom.

The process-oriented period began in 2000 and it is still present. It emphasizes the dynamic nature of motivation. Dörnyei (2005:83) argues that “there is a need to adopt a process-oriented approach/paradigm that can account for the daily ups and downs of motivation to learn, that is, the ongoing changes of motivation over time”. Within a process-oriented approach, motivation is viewed as dynamic system which is marked by the constant changes over certain period, depending on learners’ behavior (Dörnyei 2009). During this period, Dörnyei proposed the L2 Motivational Self System which interpreted L2 motivation in relation to a theory of self and identity. Studying the nature of L2 motivation, the system explores student’s motivation in language learning and possible success in SLA.

The most elaborate model of the process dimension of L2 motivation was developed by Dörnyei and Ottó (1998). Their model organizes the motivational factors which influence motivated behavior. This model includes three stages of L2 motivation process. The first stage is called pre-actional phase which corresponds to “choice motivation” leading to the selection of the goal or task to be conducted. The action plan is induced by individual’s desires and hopes. The second phase is called actional phase which corresponds to “executive motivation” that refers to the action itself while it is being carried out. The individual is committed to action, makes a decision and implements it, and waits for the possible outcomes. The third phase is called post-actional phase which involves “critical retrospection” after action has been completed. The main processes during this phase are the evaluation of the completed action, further planning and thinking or discussing about the possible ways how to improve future actions (see Figure 1).




Figure 1. Schematic representation of the Process Model of L2 Motivation (Dörnyei and Ottó, 1998:48)

All these theories contributed to the understanding of the construct of L2 motivation. Dörnyei (2003:18) said that all these theories do not necessarily exclude one another but simply complement each other since they are related to different phases of the motivational process.

## 2. Gardner's View of L2 Motivation

The “pioneers” of the L2 motivational area in Canada, Robert Gardner, Richard Clément, and Wallace Lambert, have looked at the study of L2 motivation as a sub-area within social psychology. As Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) mentioned, those three L2 researchers and social psychologists had set the ground for L2 motivation field which remained firm through

generations. Two chapters (2., 2.1.) are dedicated to Gardner's work on L2 motivation theory and the well-known integrative motive due to his big role in laying down the foundations for L2 motivation research. Instrumental motive is not directly described in his theory but it is mentioned as "instrumental orientation" as part of his socio-motivational model which will be discussed later. Crookes and Schmidt (1991) mentioned that Gardner and Lambert were the first to make the distinction between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation that has influenced all other second language research.

In Gardner's (2006:3) opinion, L2 motivation "is a general characteristic of the individual that applies to any opportunity to learn the language. It is relatively stable, because of its presumed antecedents, but it is amenable to change under certain conditions". In his view, motivation refers to a kind of central mental "engine" that consists of notions of effort, will and task enjoyment which are "united" in each motivated learner (Gardner, 1985:50). The interesting problem in Gardner's motivation theory is the relationship between motivation and orientation. The role of orientations (goals) is to induce motivation and direct it towards a certain decision or goal and it is not a measurable component of motivation. Orientations function only as motivational antecedents and there are two types: integrative and instrumental orientations, which are the most widely known concept in the L2 field.

Integrative orientation assumes a positive disposition toward the L2 group and the desire to interact with it. It suggests that the learner is learning L2 in order to learn about, interact with or become closer to L2 community members (Gardner, 1985). Integrative orientation has become a crucial part and basis for Gardner's motivation theory and it has also been used by many other researchers. Later, Gardner identifies this orientation with the notion of integrativeness and defines it as positive look on the L2 and learners' wish to integrate into L2 culture and become similar to the L2 speakers (as cited in Dörnyei, et al., 2006). Although it is among the most often researched concept in the field, this orientation is not fully understood because it is difficult to define and observe (Dörnyei, 2003). Gardner (2001) emphasized that integrativeness did not mean that one wanted to become a member of the other cultural community, but rather an individual's openness to take on characteristics of another cultural-linguistic group. Individuals for whom their ethnicity is not a major characteristic of their identity and who are interested in other cultural-linguistic communities would possess high levels of integrativeness: "thus the individual's openness to other cultures will influence his/her motivation to learn the language (Gardner, 2001:7). So, this positive attitude and openness towards other L2 group plays a big role in developing a strong L2

motivation. However, Suzuki (2011) mentions a re-examination of his theory, especially of integrative notion, due to the changing status of the English language. Dörnyei (2009:23) for example, points out that “because of the increasing use of English as a tool for communication in a multicultural context, the learners’ target of integration is ambiguous”. So, the interpretation of integrative motivation as a desire to learn L2 only to integrate into or communicate with L2 community is now questionable, because learners can possess integrative motivation for other reasons too.

On the other hand, instrumental orientation represents the opposite side of integrative orientation in Gardner’s theory, referring to the potential pragmatic gains of L2 proficiency, such as achieving a good career or good academic results, and reflects the great force to learn L2 because of its usefulness. So, instrumental orientation assumes only utilitarian goals. Gardner (as cited in Dörnyei et al., 2006) also talked about instrumentality as a type of orientation rather than motivation, or as a reason/goal for L2 learning. Gardner and his associates have largely ignored instrumentality saying only that instrumental L2 motivation is aroused by offering some material reward to participants for achieving good results in specific language learning tasks.

Gardner's theory emphasizes that students' attitudes towards L2 group mostly influence how successful they will be in learning their language (Dörnyei, 1998). This means that, learning specific foreign language is affected by many other social factors in learners’ environment. According to Williams (as cited in Dörnyei, 1998) this is mainly because language is a part of one's identity, and is used to convey this identity to other people. One’s identity is a complex construct unique for each individual, and for having L2 motivation as its part, nobody can predict the quantity or quality of that same L2 motivation with certainty. However, L2 motivation can be measured with the highest accuracy focusing on the very act of learning the language. The motivation “engine”, made up of effort, will and attitude, can be changed by a number of motivational stimuli such as a given test, additional tasks, interest in the task’s content etc., but Gardner (as cited in Dörnyei, 1998:122) states that “the source of the motivating impetus is relatively unimportant provided that motivation is aroused”.

Gardner’s theory as only consisting of a dichotomy of integrative and instrumental motivation is the common misinterpretation of his work. “Motivation” in Gardner's theory does not consist of any integrative or instrumental elements, only orientations that induce and direct it either in a strong interpersonal (integrative) or a strong practical/utilitarian way

(instrumental), which is already mentioned above. So, in his model, an integrative/instrumental dichotomy only exists at the orientation level. However, he says that the distinction between two orientations is not so useful in explaining the role of the motivation in SLA, but “it is the intensity of the motivation in its broadest sense, incorporating the behavioral, cognitive, and affective components, that is important” (Gardner, 2006:12). That is why he mostly relies on his integrative motive because it includes integrativeness as a component which provides the better opportunity for success in L2 proficiency than other motivational types that lack this component (Gardner, 2001).

Gardner (2006) also made a distinction between language learning motivation and classroom learning motivation. Language learning motivation refers to the motivation to learn a second language. It is a relatively stable characteristic of the individual that refers to any opportunity to learn the language. However, it can be changed under certain conditions, depending on the learner and the learning environment.

The second class of motivation is classroom learning motivation, specifically the language classroom. It is considered to be the integral part of motivation in general. It refers to individual’s motivation while producing certain language task. There are many components that affect individuals’ classroom learning motivation such as the teacher, the class atmosphere, materials, as well as personal characteristics of the learner. However, one cannot distinguish between the two types of motivation. They operate on the individual at any given time in any given situations.

## **2.1. Integrative Motive**

The most researched aspect of Gardner’s integrative motivation theory has been the concept of the ‘integrative motive’, which is defined as a “motivation to learn a second language because of positive feelings towards the community that speaks the language” (as cited in Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011:42). According to Gardner (2001:2) the concept of the integrative motive includes not only the orientation but also the motivation (for example attitudes toward learning the language, plus desire and motivational intensity) and other variables involving the L2 community and the language learning context. It has some common characteristic with Dörnyei’s Ideal L2 Self which will be discussed later. The integrative motive is a construct made up of three main components (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011: 42) (see Figure 2).



1. Integrativeness, which is identified with integrative orientation (referring to the interest in foreign languages, openness and positive attitudes towards the L2 community)
2. Attitudes towards the learning situation including attitudes towards the language teacher and the L2 course.
3. Motivation, which includes effort, desire (will), and attitude towards learning.




Figure 2: Gardner's Construct of Integrative Motive (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011:42)

Beside the construct of integrative motive and the Attitude /Motivation Test Battery (AMTB), Gardner's L2 theory includes the socio-educational model, which is a learning model that sets motivation as its base. According to Crookes and Schmidt (1991) Gardner's socio-educational model differentiates among cultural beliefs, motivation as a source of individual differences in language learning, formal and informal learning situations, and linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes. There are some factors of the learner which affect motivation, besides integrativeness, instrumentality and attitudes, such as effectiveness, effort, persistence, attention, desires, self-confidence (Gardner, 2006). Other factors that influenced motivation belong to educational context (immediate classroom situation) and cultural context (attitudes, beliefs, personality characteristics, ideals, expectations, etc.), then some pedagogical factors (the classroom environment, teaching techniques and attitudes towards the language teacher and course), language anxiety and parental influence. All these motivational factors determine language achievement (see Figure 3).




Figure 3: Gardner's Socio-Educational Model of Motivation (Gardner, 2001:6)

## 2.2. Criticism of Gardner

According to Root (1999) Gardner received criticism for focusing so much on the integrative motive. Motivation should be seen as a complex totality related to the specific characteristics of the individual. In Gardner's defense, Root stated that he did not intend to limit the orientations to two classes (integrative and instrumental), but simply asserted that an individual who selects integrative reasons over instrumental ones shows higher levels of motivational intensity (Root, 1999).

Dörnyei (1998), Crookes and Schmidt (1991), and Oxford and Shearin (1994) also discussed some problems concerning Gardner's L2 motivation theory. They did not write against Gardner, they just wanted to complement it. However, they all agree that "existing social psychological construct is not applicable in some areas of the L2 learning process as in some others; in certain educational context-in the real world domain of the SL classroom" (Dörnyei, 1998:124) and that traditional motivational categories do not explain, precisely enough, the actual students' learning behavior.

There are two main shortcomings of Gardner's L2 motivation (Dörnyei, 1994b:521): the lack of sufficient elaboration and the lack of supporting empirical evidence. The lack of sufficient elaboration means that every L2 motivation research, as well as Gardner's, should construct and explain every motivational aspect or factor in concrete terms, by specifying their interrelationships, and then try to connect them to the previous knowledge. The lack of

supporting empirical evidence means that every L2 motivation research should have firm empirical ground which will integrate old research variables so that new variables could be developed (Gardner, as cited in Dörnyei, 1994b:521).

What Dörnyei finds difficult to understand is Gardner's concept of integrative motive. The fact that motivation is just a part of "integrative motive" is difficult to apprehend because "motivation" is the broader term so, in his view, "integrative motive" is the sub-system of "motivation" (Dörnyei, 1994b, 517). The next concept Dörnyei criticized is the separation between "orientation" and "motivation". Gardner said that the individual orientation (or "goal"), is separate from "motivation" which rises and directs motivation, and refers the reasons to learn L2. But, Dörnyei (1994b:518) claims that orientations and motivation are often intermingled in the L2 area. He said that, although those two notions are separated in Gardner's sense, they are not independent from integrative motivation because integrative motivation includes integrative orientation. Orientations are also often considered to be the central element of motivation and therefore closely related to it. Dörnyei also noted that attitudes and motivation should not be separated either for being a unique construct (1994b:519).

However, Dörnyei agrees with Gardner and Lambert's theory that the instrumental/integrative dichotomy is something that needs to be prevailed because they do not exclude each other but relate and complement each other. However, Dörnyei (1994a) mentioned that, in the L2 area, Grader focused too much on integrativeness and thus ignored the instrumental disposition. Dörnyei asserted that instrumental orientation would have a greater influence on language learners because its aspects also make one part of learner's L2 self. Moreover, Dörnyei, in his L2 Motivational System, gave instrumental motivation the greater role including it in Ought-to L2 Self.

### **3. Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System**

Before talking about Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System, it is important to mention the foundations of the system itself. The self-theory provides two aspects which L2 Motivational System was based on: possible selves and self-discrepancy theory. Those two theories gave the basic theoretical background that Dörnyei accepted and adjusted for measuring and defining learners' L2 motivation.

### **3.1. Possible Selves/Future Selves: Ideal and Ought Self – Foundations of L2 System**

The L2 self-system focuses on two aspects of self-theory from psychology (Ryan and Dörnyei, 2013): possible selves (Markus and Nurius, as cited in Ryan and Dörnyei, 2013) and self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, as cited in Ryan and Dörnyei, 2013). Possible selves represent visions of one's self in the future that may direct current behavior. Those visions or "future self-images" mostly direct behavior due to the psychological need to reduce discrepancies between the present self and ideal self. The possible and future selves have been defined as the major and stable dimensions of personality. At the beginning of the new millennium, the dynamic nature of the self-system was getting more attention from the self-theorists who gradually replaced the traditionally static concept of self with a self-system that controls and changes future behavior (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2009).

One of the best known psychological approach linked with the human self is the notion of "possible selves". Markus and Nurius (as cited in Dörnyei, 2009:12) distinguished between three main types of possible selves: (1) ideal self that one would like to become, (2) self that one could become, and (3) self one is afraid of becoming. The ideal or hoped-for selves might include "the successful self", "the creative self", "the self-confident self" while the feared selves might include "the alone self", "the depressed self", "the disappointed self" etc. They also mention "ought selves" defining it as "an image of self held by another" (Markus and Nurius, as cited in Dörnyei, 2009:12). So, possible selves represent a person's specific image of oneself in the future, referring to one's visions about oneself. Markus and Nurius's notion of possible selves is concerned with how people conceptualize their potential selves and how they direct them from the present toward the future (Dörnyei, 2009).

Ideal and ought-to selves are two constructs used in psychology research of person's identity. They represent two parts of possible selves. They were used for the first time by Higgins in his self-discrepancy theory which claims that people are motivated to gain the matching pictures of our present self and our future-self guides. The two key components of Higgins's (as cited in Ryan and Dörnyei, 2013:91) self-theory are the ideal self and the ought self. As seen above, Markus and Nurius also mention these concepts, but Higgins used them as more defined terms in his theory of motivation. The ideal self refers to the representation of the characteristics that one would ideally like to possess (pictures of hopes, dreams, or wishes), while the ought self refers to the representation of characteristic that one believes one ought to possess (pictures of someone else's obligations, responsibilities or expectations). Dörnyei

(2009) mentions that an important difference between Higgins's and Markus and Nurius's concepts of the future selves is that while the latter authors talk about multiple possible selves, including more than one ideal or ought self, Higgins talks about a single ideal and ought self for each person. Dörnyei said that both the ideal and ought self should be united in each possible self in order to gain harmonious identity.

Each learner has a desired future self-image, but they differ in how easily they can achieve successful possible selves and how their ideal and ought self guides will be developed. There are several characteristic of the future self listed by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011: 83-84):

- (a) The first case includes the future self which is sufficiently different from the current self. (On the other hand, if there is no observable discrepancy between current and future selves, no effort to be proficient in L2 is necessary.)
- (b) The second case includes the future self-image which is perceived as plausible. (Possible selves are only effective if the individual perceive them as possible or realistic within the person's abilities.)
- (c) The third case includes the future self-image which is not perceived as certain, because it takes too much time and effort to be realized. (The learner must believe that the possible self will not happen automatically and must take effort to make this image real.)
- (d) The fourth case includes the future self-image which is perceived as in harmony so it does not clash with the expectations of the learner' social environment. (Social norms that are incompatible with the learner's self-image are counterproductive.)

A desired future self-image is also complemented by feared possible self meaning that better motivation is achieved if the learner also has a vivid image about the negative consequences of failing to achieve the desired self-image.

Dörnyei used those possible/future selves, as being part of our identity, and included them into his L2 Motivational System that will be become the Ideal L2 and the Ought-to L2 Self. Interpreting the self-theory and Gardner's integrativeness, Dörnyei (2005) developed his two self-concept of L2 motivation. The first, the language-specific aspect of the ideal self, is the Ideal L2 self. The second aspect, the Ought-to L2 self, contains the less internalized forms of instrumental motivation such as the avoidance of possible negative learning outcomes and acceptance of other people's expectations through L2 learning. The third aspect deals with L2

learning experience. If a person starts learning L2 without any internal or external self-guides, his/her L2 motivation is shaped by the learning environment and experience (for example the teachers, peers, classroom, and learning success or failure). Chen (2012:2) also mentions the importance of learning experience saying that “L2 identities need to be understood within the particular learning context under investigation”.

### **3.2. L2 Motivational System- Ideal L2 Self and Ought-to L2 Self**

Dörnyei made a substantial reform introducing the L2 Motivational Self System that puts L2 motivation into a new theory of self and identity. The L2 Motivational Self System represents a major transformation from previous motivational theories unifying psychological theories of the self-system. The L2 Motivational Self System suggests (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011:86) that there are three primary sources of the motivation to learn a L2: (a) learner’s vision of oneself as an effective L2 speaker, (b) the social pressure coming from the learner’s environment, and (c) positive learning experiences. Dörnyei moved beyond Gardner’s integrativeness and possible selves’ theory and seemed to offer the most elaborate way forward through self-theory. Dörnyei sees his system as a progression from Gardner’s theory, referring to his advantages and disadvantages. Ryan and Dörnyei (2013:91) state that L2 Motivational System is “a motivational framework that seeks to incorporate affective and emotional factors with cognition”.

As Dörnyei (2009) said, his new model was developed according to the results of the large motivation study in Hungary that involved over 13,000 students over a period of 12 years and which focused on attitudes towards five target languages-English, German, French, Italian and Russian. In this study, a variable that was originally identified as integrativeness, which determined the extent of a learners’ motivation, was put into a broader aspect, learners’ “ideal L2 self“, and so the connection was created with L2 motivation and future selves.

The system itself has grown out of the two motivational concepts of “integrativeness” and “instrumentality” which were first introduced by Gardner and Lambert, as already stated. The basic of this new system is the equation of the traditional motivational aspects that have been interpreted as “integrative motivation” with the Ideal L2 Self and as “instrumental motivation” with the Ought-to L2 Self. For example, if the person that one would like to become is proficient in L2, he/she can be described as having an “integrative disposition”. On the other hand, if the person that one would like to become knows English only to be successful, he/she can be described as having an “instrumental disposition”.

In general, the L2 Motivational Self System includes the internal desires of the learner, the social pressures coming from learner's environment and the learning experience. According to these aspects, Dörnyei's system is composed of three elements (Dörnyei 2009:18): the Ideal L2 Self, the Ought-to L2 Self, and the L2 Learning Experience.

The Ideal L2 Self is based on learners' aspirations and goals he/she would like to achieve and it is closely related to the integrative motivation, as already stated. It is a useful motivator to learn L2 because of the learner's desire to reduce discrepancy between his/her actual and ideal self (Dörnyei 2009:29). If a learner has a bright self-image of how successful he/she will be in learning L2 it can serve as a powerful motivator to achieve that reality. This is one of the fundamental concepts of L2 learning motivation, as suggested by Dörnyei. It has a "promotion" focus, concerned with hopes and accomplishments. The fully realized Ideal L2 Self is a vivid and real image one can see, hear and feel. A learner can possess a vision as a member of an imagined L2 community partly based on real-life experiences of L2 members, and partly on imagination. So, learners' Ideal L2 Self can be a great motivational set-up even if there is no actual contact with the L2 group (Dörnyei et al., 2006). The Ideal L2 Self gives a L2 learner the chance for a successful future. In other words, learners are eager to study English in order to achieve their desired "self-image". Therefore, Dörnyei's Ideal L2 Self reflects what Markus and Nurius refer to as possible self which involves notions of what individuals would like, might, and are afraid of becoming (Dörnyei, 2009). Suzuki (2011) in her study explains that even if the learner is motivated by external reasons, as long as the L2 learner imagines him or herself as a successful person who uses English in the future, that image functions as the effective source of motivation.

The Ought-to L2 self is a product of learners' obligations, expectations from the social environment, and responsibilities which are expected from her/him in the future as a language learner. This self shares similarities with the instrumental motivation. The Ought-to L2 Self has a "prevention" focus, controlling the negative outcomes, obligations and responsibilities, and it keeps learners away from negative consequences of L2 learning (failing exams, disappointing one's parents, getting lower grades etc.). This dimension corresponds to Higgins's ought self. It refers to the more extrinsic types of instrumental orientation. The Ought-to L2 Self also reflects the social pressure to accept other people's views about language learning. Those learners obey expectations from their social and learning environment to study the L2 hard. However, those social pressures can be sometimes useful because, in case they are removed, learners might quit doing those enforced learning tasks.

The L2 Learning Experience, although irrelevant for this study because it is not sufficiently developed and researched, is derived from the learning environment (teachers, peers, and classroom environment) and learners' perceptions of their previous language learning successes and failures.

One of the most important aspects of L2 motivational system is Gardner's integrativeness which plays a key role in L2 motivation, including two criterion measures: language choice and intended effort to study the L2. The immediate antecedents of integrativeness are attitudes toward L2 speakers/community and instrumentality, which indicates that this central component in the motivation structure is defined by beneficial outcomes or rewards and personal attitudes toward members of the L2 community. Other relevant components are: cultural interest, milieu, vitality of L2 community and self-confidence (see Figure 4).




Figure 4: Schematic representation of the structural equation model (Dörnyei et al., 2006:83)

There are some other similarities which Dörnyei's model shares with Gardner's L2 model, expect integrativeness. For example, a model put forward by Tremblay and Gardner (1995) includes language attitudes factor at its base, which is similar to Dörnyei's concept of the Ideal L2 Self which unites some aspects of integrative orientation, instrumental orientation, and L2 attitudes. Gardner's socio-educational model is also similar to Dörnyei's motivational



self system if we consider “that the motivation subcomponent in Gardner’s construct is, in effect, a measure of motivated behavior, and that Gardner attached a possible instrumental motivational link to the motivation subcomponent in his construct” (Dörnyei, 2006:31). Therefore, Gardner’s motivation construct suggests that motivated behavior is determined by three major motivational dimensions - integrativeness, instrumentality, and attitudes toward the learning situation - which corresponds closely with the L2 Motivational Self System.

#### **4. Review of Motivational and L2 Motivational Self System Research**

Over the last ten years several quantitative and qualitative studies have been conducted to prove and validate ‘the Motivational L2 Self System’. L2 motivation research is aimed at understanding the operation of motivational factors/aspects in the learning of L2 as well as exploring ways to improve and understand students’ motivation. As Dörnyei and Ushioda mention in their work (2011:197), motivation is not something that is easy to research because of its multidimensional construct (meaning it is a complex construct that is not easily measured), it is dynamic, abstract and not directly observable (meaning that there is no objective measures of motivation). Still, Dörnyei and other researchers, who used his L2 System in order to confirm or validate it, conducted many studies and research in order to explore learners’ motivation using L2 Motivational System.

##### **4.1. Research on L2 Motivational Self System**

In this chapter, the most relevant research conducted in the world and its main conclusions will be represented. In all of these studies Dörnyei’s L2 System is used either to explore learners’ motivational profiles or to validate his System.

The aim of Csizér and Dörnyei's study (2005) was to define and describe L2 learners’ motivational profiles. This research is very important because it represents the very beginnings of Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational System. Five dimensions of students’ motivational and attitudinal aspects toward five different second languages were measured and analyzed, using survey data collected from 8,953 13- and 14-year-old Hungarian pupils on two occasions. There were four distinct motivational groups that emerged from the analysis, and they interpret this classification within Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System. In the second part of the study, three groups of different motivational profiles learners were examined concerning English and German. The first group consisted of the least motivated learners, who were mostly not interested in foreign languages, cultures, and language learning. The

second group showed more positive attitudes toward the L2 culture and community; the third group was focused more on instrumental aspects. This pattern was also interpreted within Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System. (Csizér and Dörnyei, 2005:656) argued that the reasons why the learners in the second and third group had not developed a strong Ideal L2 self were: (a) in the case of the second group, learners did not see L2 as something that would bring them success in the future and (b) in the case of the third group, learners' motivation was determined by the Ought-to L2self. However, another conclusion is that most of the Hungarian schoolchildren who participated in the study had developed the Ideal L2 self with regard to at least one L2. Although it is beneficial for a student to have interest in foreign languages in general, being motivated to learn more than one L2 at the same time can cause the lack of effort to learn another. So, there is a "competition" among second languages and in this study English was the "winner" and German "the loser".

Dörnyei et al., (2006) conducted another similar research with similar results but it considered to be as one of the biggest L2 motivation surveys, involving over 13,000 language learners during 1993, 1999 and 2004. The survey also took place in Hungary. The study measured Hungarian L2 learners' motivation to learn five different target languages: English, German, French, Italian and Russian. The special questionnaire was developed by Dörnyei with the help of Clement. One of the main conclusions is that the motivational model, which was proposed by Dörnyei, turned out to be suitable for the measured data across five languages. In this model, language choice and intended effort were affected by integrativeness which should be reinterpreted as the Ideal L2 Self. The two primary antecedents of integrativeness, attitudes towards L2 speakers/community and instrumentality, show that the learners' ideal image was affected by their own beliefs and visions as much as by the expectations of the others, which would eventually lead them to professional success and better future. The study confirmed the validity of the L2 Motivational Self System. They also named four learner's profiles according to their L2 motivation. The first group consisted of basically non-motivated students, while the fourth group developed a strong Ideal L2 Self. Group 2 had more positive attitudes toward the L2 community and Group 3 showed more instrumental aspects. This distinction also corresponds to the construct of the L2 Motivational Self System.

The main purpose of Taguchi et al.'s (2009) research was to validate Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System in three Asian contexts. Participants were from Japan, China, and Iran. For the instrument, they used questionnaires. The main conclusion was that the results from Dörnyei's large Hungarian research project were truly valid because similar patterns

were also observed in those three countries. The findings supported the L2 Motivational Self System proving that integrativeness can be interpreted as the Ideal L2 Self. The results confirmed that instrumentality can be classified into promotion and prevention focuses depending if the learner wants to learn language in order to prevent negative outcomes or want to promote his/her L2 knowledge to have a successful carrier.

Slightly different research was made by Kubanyiova (2009). The purpose of her research was to apply Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System to explain teachers' motivation in a language teacher training course. Her findings suggest that the extent to which teachers actively engage in the training tasks and develop their good teaching strategies may depend on (Kubanyiova 2009: 240): (a) how far this tasks are consistent with their Ideal L2 Teacher Selves; (b) how far they recognize a discrepancy between their current and desired selves; and (c) how much they are motivated to reduce this discrepancy. Teachers who have a strong Ideal L2 Teacher Self are more confident in the teaching strategies they use and are assured they can pass the course without bigger problems. Teachers who experience such gap between their current and ideal selves are more likely to employ self-regulatory strategies to minimize the negative results of the course. The teachers whose Ought-to L2 Teacher Selves or Feared L2 Teacher Selves is more prominent are likely to introduce new approaches to teaching such as giving students more autonomy. So, teachers' motivation may be affected in different learning/teaching situations and it depends on their possible selves within their working self-concept.

Papi (2010) examined a model that contains the main components of Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System in relation to L2 anxiety. 1011 Iranian high school students filled in a questionnaire. The results showed that all elements of the L2 Motivational Self System motivated language learners to put more effort into learning English. However, their impact on L2 anxiety showed a different picture. While the learners who had bigger Ideal L2 Self and better L2 learning experience show little or no L2 anxiety; learners with higher levels of the Ought-to L2 Self were significantly more anxious. So, students can be motivated through an ideal view of their future L2 self or through less internalized picture, visualized to fulfill others people' expectations, which makes learners more anxious.

Suzuki (2011) explored learners' Ideal L2 selves. The questionnaires were distributed to 187 Japanese university students who enrolled in World Language Courses (WLC) classes. Four main conclusions were drawn. First, the Ideal L2 Self was found important for the high- and

mid-motivated learners, but not so for the low-motivated learners. However, learners' L2 learning experience was an effective motivational impetus for all groups, which is unusual because learning experience is not considered to be so influential. Compared to the high-motivated learners' Ideal L2 Self, the low-motivated learners' Ideal L2 Self was vague and not defined. The study identified two Ideal L2 selves from high-motivated learners: a) Ideal L2 Self which is closer to their actual self and b) Ideal L2 Self which is distant from their actual self. The difference between high- and low-motivated learners' Ideal L2 Self mostly comes from the learners' linguistic self-confidence because low-motivated learners lost their confidence through their English classes in high schools and the high-motivated learners developed their self-confidence by communicating in English with the others.

In Chen's study (2012) the Ideal L2 Self and the Ought-to L2 Self were helpful in the analysis of Taiwanese students' motivation. The questionnaire was based on students' reasons for studying English, and future plans. Then, an interview guide was formulated for 26 senior high school students in Chinese. The illustrated Ideal L2 Self corresponds to its theoretical construct proposed by Dörnyei (2005). However, Ought-to L2 Self seems inconsistent with the original theoretical concept because it contains a mixture of both prevention- and promotion-focused instrumentality in studying English. This only proves that the results of measuring learners' self usually depend on learners' contextualization of the given concept.

In the study by Kormos et al., (2011) the English learning motivations of Santiago's 518 secondary school students, university students and young adult learners are surveyed. They analyzed how their future goals, L2 attitudes, beliefs and parental encouragement shaped their motivated behavior. This study showed that the most important learning goal of the surveyed students was related to learners' wish to use English as a means of international communication and that desire shaped students' future self-guides. Additionally, external influences, coming from the students' immediate social environment, also had a significant effect on language learning future-self-guides.

## **4.2. Research on Motivation in Croatia**

Most of the research on motivation in Croatia has been conducted by Mihaljević Djigunović.

In her 1995 research (which was conducted long before Dörnyei introduced his system so the results are still interpreted according to Gardner's' motivational theory), Djigunović Mihaljević starts from the assumption that the type of motivation for learning L2 is likely to

be determined by learner's milieu (social environment) and the content of the learning materials. The aim of the study is to measure the types and intensity of L2 motivation in the Croatian socio-cultural context. There were 578 learners of three age groups, 470 learners of different ages and proficiency levels, and 340 learners of primary school, adolescent and adult English as foreign language (EFL) learners. The subjects were asked to write open-ended essays and to fill in two questionnaires. The findings of the study indicate three types of motivation for EFL learning among Croatian learners: a) instrumental type of motivation that includes the pragmatic-communicative component (learners see English as a mean of international communication and as mean to achieve future goals), b) affective motivation (learners like English and they enjoy learning and using it), and c) integrative motivation (learners wish to integrate into a English socio-cultural group and identify themselves with it).

Her 1996 research discusses Croatian learners' differences in attitudes toward the English teacher and the course, as well as differences in effort they expend in learning and in achievement of their goals. A total of 340 subjects belonged to three age groups (primary and secondary school and adults) and they showed different proficiency levels. The participants filled in the battery of questionnaires. The results show pragmatic-communicative motivation (instrumental motivation) to be the most desirable type of motivation in learning English. In general, learners are shown to be "discriminating observers and participants of language-teaching process" (Mihaljević Djigunović, 1996: 222) meaning that they are aware of everything that is happening in their immediate learning environment (the quality teachers' strategies, the quality of the course, materials, etc.). However, learners do not automatically attribute their own failure in learning English to a lack of teacher competence. Integrative motivation is found among less successful learners which was very unusual.

Mihaljević Djigunović and Bagarić (2007) conducted a study in which they compared attitudes and motivation of Croatian learners of English and German. Comparisons are made not only according to the two FL but also to the two different age groups: end of primary school (age 14) and end of secondary school (age 18). The aim of this study was to see how learners feel about the two FL, language learning and themselves as language learners. Data was gathered by means of a questionnaire. A total of 220 learners participated in the study. The results of this study suggest that learners of English, compared to learners of German, have more positive attitudes toward language learning so their motivation is higher too. It is probably so because it is easier to learn, less effort needs to be put in to achieve good results, and learners are more exposed to English nowadays so they use it almost every day, even

unconsciously. Motivation for learning German as a FL decreases with years of study because learners are less exposed to it which results in lower linguistic self-confidence.

Jelovčić's (2008) study presents the results of the tests conducted during the course "English language in profession" on the first year of study at the Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb. The aim of the study was to determine the attitudes of students toward the course, their motivation for learning English for their profession and towards teaching strategies that they considered to be more desirable and effective. Testing was conducted on a sample of 141 participants (average age 19 years). The data was collected by means of a poll containing 20 questions. Results showed that students had a positive attitude towards learning English and the most desirable way of learning are oral communication, reading and writing. Students were mostly interested in reading texts which refer to their profession, expanding their vocabulary and discussions on specialized topics. The combination of general and professional English, with the emphasis on the selection of interesting topics, strongly motivated students to work harder.

In Kolić-Vehovec et al.'s (2009) study the aim was to determine possible gender differences between the eighth grade pupils of the primary school in Croatia and ninth grades pupils in Slovenia in (meta)cognitive (dictionary, metacognitive knowledge and comprehension) and motivational factors (interest, participation in reading tasks, perceived competence, external motivation) at reading comprehension. The results show that girls have a better metacognitive knowledge of reading strategies, greater motivation to read and better understanding of narrative text. What is relevant in this study is that students from Slovenia scored higher not just on (meta)cognitive factors of comprehension and on the understanding expository text, but also on the intrinsic motivation. On the other hand, students from Croatia express higher extrinsic motivation and perceived competence. They are motivated by better grades and by desire to be better than others.

## **5. Exploring the Ideal and Ought to Second Language Self in English as a Foreign Language**

## 5.1 Aims and Research Questions

The aim of the present study is to explore Dörnyei's Ideal and Ought-to L2 Self in Croatian context. The focus in this study has been on profiling the motivational dispositions of grammar school EFL learners. The study emphasized five research questions:

1. What is the relationship between motivational variables - the Ideal L2 Self, the Ought-to L2 Self, Integrativeness, Instrumentality and Family Influence - and learners' motivational profile?
2. What is the relationship between five motivational variables: the Ideal L2 Self, the Ought-to L2 Self, Integrativeness, Instrumentality and Family Influence?
3. What is the relationship between students' perception of EL knowledge and the motivational aspects?
4. What is the relationship between motivational variables and learners' total L2 motivation?
5. Is there any difference between age and gender groups considering learners' L2 motivation?

## 5.2. Participants

The participants in this study were 28 first-year (all aged 14 and 15) and 30 fourth-year (all aged 17 and 18) English language learners who attend grammar school in Donji Miholjac, Croatia. There were 32 female and 26 male learners (see Table 1). As for their self-perception of L2 knowledge it ranges from 3.00 (min) to 5.00 (max). Learners' perception of English language knowledge (EL) differs between two classes. The first-year class has a bigger number (17) of pupils who gave themselves the highest grade for EL knowledge, while in the fourth-year class only six pupils gave themselves the highest grade. Concerning gender differences and the perception of EL knowledge, slightly more male learners gave themselves higher grades than the female participants (see Table 2).

*Table 1: Learners' gender and class*

---

Frequency	Percent
-----------	---------

Male	26	44.8
Female	32	55.2
First class	28	48.3
Fourth class	30	51.7
Total	58	100.00

*Table 2: Perception of English language (EL) knowledge according to learners' gender and class*

		perception of knowledge			Total
		3	4	5	
Class	first year	3	8	17	28
	fourth year	6	18	6	30
Gender	male	3	11	12	26
	female	6	15	11	32

### 5.3. Instrument

The questionnaire used in this survey was adopted from Taguchi et al.'s study (2009) of L2 Motivational Self System among Japanese, Chinese, and Iranian Learners of English, which followed Dörnyei's guidelines to ensure appropriate psychometric properties. It was also translated into Croatian and re-organized by removing irrelevant items for the current study which refer to the third part of Dörnyei's L2 System - L2 Learning Experience. This third part of Dörnyei's system is not measured because it has not been sufficiently explored and explained. The questionnaire consists of 14 items with six-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6), which assess learners Ideal L2 self, Ought-to L2 self, Family influence, Instrumentality, and Integrativeness. These are also the main variables of the questionnaire selected on the basis of Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System. The items were arranged in a way that the first three items represent learner's Ideal L2 Self; the next three items represent learner Ought-to L2 Self, then the following two items represent learners' Family influence; the following three items learner's Integrative motivation and the last three items represent learner's Instrumental motivation. The modified questionnaire is attached as Appendix A. The variables and the items are attached as Appendix B. Table 3



presents the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient based on the data collected from the questionnaire.

*Table 3: Reliability Statistics of the Questionnaire Items*

Cronbach Alpha	Number of Items
.894	14

## 5.4. Procedure

All the questionnaires were filled in during regular English classes and it took learners approximately 10 minutes on average. The collected data were first entered into IBM SPSS Software 20. The following statistical measures and tests were used: descriptive statistics, Pearson product moment correlation test, and independent samples t-test.

## 5.5. Results and Discussion

### *Questionnaire Items*

Table 1 in Appendix C represents basic descriptive statistics for all questionnaire items lined up from the lowest to the highest mean. Table 4 represents the descriptive statistics for the two questionnaire items which represent the items with the highest and the lowest mean; (*I have to study English, because, if do not study it, I think my parents will be disappointed with me*,  $M=1.9665$ ,  $SD=1.35032$ ; *Studying English is important to me because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak English*,  $M=5.4138$ ,  $SD=1.00933$ ). That means that the majority of the first and fourth-year L2 learners believe not to be under strong family, peer or teacher influence or pressure to study and use English as their second language. On the other hand, all L2 learners believe that studying English is important because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak English and it is important for them in finding a good job. For this reason, their Ought-to L2 self is pretty strong, because although not very pressured by the social environment, they are eager to become successful in the future in which they see English as a very useful tool.

*Table 4: Descriptive statistics for the questionnaire items with the lowest and the highest mean (N=58)*

<b>Questionnaire Item</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
I have to study English, because, if I do not study it, I think my parents will be disappointed with me.	1	6	1.9655	1.35032
Studying English is important to me because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak English.	3	6	5.4138	1.00933

### *Learners' Motivational Profile*

The first research question probes the relationship between motivational variables and learner's motivational profile. Table 5 shows that Family influence, as one part of the Ought-to L2 Self, has the lowest place in learners' English language learning while the Integrativeness, as a major component of the Ideal L2 Self (M=4.7989) plays a great part in studying English which is important information because it proves Dörnyei's belief that the learners' Ideal L2 Self improves their motivation in SLA. They have a vivid ideal picture of themselves as L2 learners, although still not clearly defined, who see English as something that is very important for their future in general. The Ideal L2 Self is a useful motivator for learning L2 because of the desire to reduce discrepancy between learners' actual and ideal self. Their Ideal L2 Self is encouraging them to become better and more proficient at using English as their L2. They want to study English because as educated persons they are supposed to know it. That also tells that their Ideal L2 Self includes some aspects of instrumentality. Moreover, it will help them in future communication with EL community. The Ought-to L2 Self does not seem to have such a big influence on the learners. Still, it is present as a product of the individual's perceived obligations, expectations from the society, and responsibilities expected in the future as a language learner. The Ought-to L2 Self encourages learners to obey possible social expectations to study L2 hard (in order to have good carrier, money, good job, or brighter future in general) and keep learners away from negative outcomes (failing exams, disappointing one's parents, having bad grades). L2 learners in this sample believe it is their duty to study L2 hard, although majority of them feel no pressure by their family, so they want to learn English because it will help them to get better jobs and position in the society.

*Table 5: Statistics for the motivational variables (N=58)*

Questionnaire variables	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
FAMILYINFLUENCE	1.50	6.00	3.1923	.97585
OUGHT-TO L2 SELF	1.67	6.00	4.2874	1.00960
INSTRUMENTALITY	1.67	6.00	4.5287	.96737
INTEGRATIVENESS	1.33	6.00	4.6724	1.14876
IDEAL L2 SELF	2.00	6.00	4.7989	.90900

### *Questionnaire variables*

In order to answer the second research question, Pearson product-moment correlations coefficient was conducted. The second question probes the relationship between questionnaire variables - the Ideal L2 Self, Ought-to L2 Self, Integrativeness, Instrumentality and Family Influence. Table 6 shows the significant correlations among questionnaire motivational variables. The first variable, the Ideal L2 self has the greatest significant correlation with Integrativeness,  $r=.731^{**}$ ,  $p<.000$ . The Ought-to L2 Self has the greatest significant correlation with Instrumentality,  $r=.722^{**}$ ,  $p<.000$ . Family influence has the greatest significant correlation with the Ought-to L2 Self,  $r=.609^{**}$ ,  $p<.000$ . These results mean that the aspects of integrative motivation, such as openness and positive attitudes toward English language and L2 community, can be identified with aspects of the Ideal L2 Self, such as a need for English language in future careers, readiness to put a great effort in learning English language, learning English due to internal desire, and using English as a primary means of communication. In the same way, aspects of instrumental motivation, such as learning English in order to travel the world, finding a good job and avoiding bad grades in English language class, can be identified with aspects of the Ought-to L2 Self, such as learning English in order to be successful in the future career and the belief that every educated person should know how to speak English. Aspects of Family influence are also identified with aspects of the Ought-to L2 Self because family, peers, teachers make or do not make a great impact on learner's motivation and attitudes towards second language. These results show that aspects of instrumental and integrative L2 motivation can be correlated and replaced by Dörnyei's Ideal and Ought-to L2 Self, which means that Dörnyei's L2 Motivational System is valid and can

replace Gardner's model of motivation as more appropriate system for exploring motivational profiles.

*Table 6: Correlation between the questionnaire variables*

		IDEAL L2 SELF	OUGHT-TO L2 SELF	FAMILY INFLUENCE	INTEGRATIVE NESS	INSTRUMENT ALITY
IDEALSELF	Pearson Correlation	1	.491**	.294*	.731**	.538**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.025	.000	.000
	N	58	58	58	58	58
OUGHTOTSELF	Pearson Correlation	.491**	1	.609**	.631**	.722**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	58	58	58	58	58
FAMILYINFLUEN CE	Pearson Correlation	.294*	.609**	1	.385**	.499**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.025	.000		.003	.000
	N	58	58	58	58	58
INTEGRATIVENES S	Pearson Correlation	.731**	.631**	.385**	1	.594**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.003		.000
	N	58	58	58	58	58
INSTRUMENTALI TY	Pearson Correlation	.538**	.722**	.499**	.594**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	58	58	58	58	58

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

### *Students' perception of EL knowledge*

The third question investigates the relationship between students' perception of EL knowledge and the motivational aspects. There was a significant correlation between learners' perception of EL knowledge and their Ideal L2 Self,  $r=.712^{**}$ ,  $p<.000$  (see Table 7). This means that the higher perception of EL knowledge the higher the learners' Ideal L2 Self. Those who gave themselves high grades have high Ideal L2 Self, which suggests that the discrepancy between their actual and the Ideal L2 self is getting smaller. Their Ideal L2 Self is prevailing in L2 motivation which helps them to achieve greater proficiency in learning English. Those students who gave themselves higher grades are more linguistically self-confident and believe that English is truly something that is very useful for their education. Integrativeness also shows a significant correlation with learners' perception which means that Ideal L2 Self includes learners' openness to L2 community and willingness to integrate

into it too. Family Influence shows the smallest correlation with their perception meaning that their social environment has the lowest impact on their ideal L2 image.

*Table 7: Correlation between the learners' perception of EL knowledge and their Ideal l2self, Ought-to L2 self, Family influence, Integrativeness and Instrumentality*

		<u>Ideal l2</u>	<u>Ought-to l2</u>	<u>Family Inf.</u>	<u>Integrativeness</u>	<u>Instrumental.</u>
perception of EFL knowledge	Pearson Correlation	.712**	.253	.081	.508**	.374**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.056	.546	.000	.004
	N	58	58	58	58	58

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

#### *Learners' total L2 motivation*

The fourth question - what is the relationship between motivational variables and learners' total L2 motivation - was also investigated using Pearson product-moment correlations coefficients. As it can be seen in Table 8, there is a significant correlation between learners' total L2 motivation and the Ought-to Self,  $r=.862^{**}$ ,  $p<.000$ , Integrativeness,  $r=.862^{**}$ ,  $p<.00$ , and Instrumentality,  $r=.840^{**}$ ,  $p<.00$ . This means that learners' total motivation mostly depends on their Ought-to L2 Self together with the aspects of Integrativeness, which is interesting because it is stated that learners' Ideal L2 is pretty strong. So, although they share openness and positive attitudes towards L2 community, the social environment, external rewards, the prevention of negative outcomes, and desire for positive outcomes of learning English in the future still have the greater impact on their total L2 motivation.

*Table 8: Correlation between learners' total motivation and other motivational variables*

		<u>Ideal L2 Self</u>	<u>Ought-to L2 Self</u>	<u>Family Inf.</u>	<u>Instrumentality</u>	<u>Integrativeness</u>
Total motivation	Pearson Correlation	.778**	.862**	.647**	.862**	.840**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	58	58	58	58	58

#### *Gender and Class differences*

The first independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the Ideal L2 self, the Ought-to L2 self, Family influence, Instrumentality, and Integrativeness variables for males and females. There was no significant difference in scores for males ( $M=4.2418$ ,  $SD=.74726$ ) and females ( $M=4.4665$ ,  $SD=.86345$ );  $t(56)= -1.046$ ,  $p= .300$  (two-tailed). Although an independent samples t-test shows no significant difference between male and female learners in any aspects of L2 motivation for English learning, Figure 1 shows that females' L2 motivation in English language learning is slightly more affected by all aspects of L2 motivation than male learners.

The second independent samples t-test compared first-year and fourth-year learners on the same variables. There was a statistically significant difference in scores for first-year learners ( $M=4.8520$ ,  $SD= .66152$ ) and fourth-year learners ( $M=3.9119$ ,  $SD= .67416$ );  $t(56)= 5.355$ ,  $p= .000$  (two-tailed). It means that first-year learners have higher motivation in all aspects of L2 motivation than fourth-year learners, especially in the Ideal L2 Self and Integrativeness, meaning that the younger the learner the higher the level of Ideal L2 Self, Ought-to L2 Self, Family influence, Integrativeness and Instrumentality he or she has (see Figure 2). In general, their total L2 motivation is higher than that of the fourth year learners. This can be so due to first-year learner's young age. They are still very young and ambitious and, although they still do not have a clear picture of themselves as L2 learners, they have great expectations from English and they are aware that it can be very helpful for their future and see it as something important.




Figure 1: Gender differences according to Ideal L2, Ought-to L2 self, Family influence, Integrativeness, and Instrumentality




Figure 2: Class differences according to Ideal L2, Ought-to L2 self, Family influence, Integrativeness, and Instrumentality

## 5.6. Conclusion

Several main conclusions can be drawn based on the underlying theory and research results. First of all, the results support Dörnyei's Ideal and Ought-to L2 Self because there is a statistical support for the correlation between learners' aspects of integrative and instrumental motivation and those two selves. The concept of Integrativeness was replaced with the Ideal L2 Self as a more appropriate concept for understanding learners' L2 learning motivation in this sample. As for instrumentality, promotional aspects demonstrated a significant correlation with both the Ideal and Ought-to L2 selves. It is suggested that Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System can be a better psychological model than Gardner's socio-educational model for understanding Croatian secondary school students' L2 learning motivation. The Ideal L2 Self includes more than just integrative motive, but also some aspects of instrumentality too, such as learning English for internal reasons which include future benefits and higher social status. That is why the Ideal L2 Self is more complex and provides a wider picture of learners' L2 Self. This is an important result because Dörnyei's Motivational Self System allows for a deeper, more profound, and psychological analysis of the learner's L2 motivation. It takes

into account all possible influences on L2 motivation, from inner desires, wishes, aspirations, to the social expectations, obligations, needs, pressures etc.

Another conclusion is that all learners possess high levels of the Ideal L2 Self as well as Instrumentality and Integrativeness, as parts of the Ideal L2 Self. First-year students have the highest level of this L2 Self whose English language expectations, at the beginning of their high-school EL learning, are still quite high. First-year students, still pressured by their family and peers, created an imaginary, ideal picture of themselves as learners of L2 who have great aspirations for themselves as L2 learners and feel that the outside world expects them to know English. Fourth-year students also think that English is something that will be useful for them in the future and they, as educated persons, should and must know English, but they feel less pressured by their peers, family and teachers. This is surprising because their state school-leaving exam is getting closer and it is expected of them to be pressured by both teachers and parents. Probably this is due to their age, as teenagers they are, in a phase when they are trying to be independent from everybody else.

What is interesting is that learners' total motivation mostly depends on their Ought-to L2 Self together with the aspects of Integrativeness, although they possess high levels of Ideal L2 Self. So, although they share openness and positive attitudes towards L2 community, the social environment, external rewards, the prevention of negative outcomes, and desire for positive outcomes of learning English in the future still have a greater impact on the L2 motivation. In today's world, knowing English is very important for almost every aspect of human life due to its international status. Therefore, learners are aware that the outside world expects them to know English well as educated young people who are constantly surrounded by it.

In general, they all possess higher levels of the Ideal L2 Self, meaning that they share vivid, ideal image of themselves as L2 learners who possess dreams, wishes and big expectations from English, and desire to integrate into L2 community (integrativeness) to achieve some economic and social gain (instrumentality).

There was no significant difference between male and female learners in any aspects of L2 motivation for English learning, although females' L2 motivation in English language learning is slightly more affected by all aspects of L2 motivation than that of male learners. Concerning class differences, first-year learners have higher motivation in all aspects of L2 motivation than fourth-year learners. In general, their total L2 motivation is higher than that



of fourth year learners. They are still very young and ambitious and, although they still do not have a clear picture of themselves as L2 learners, they have great expectations from English and they are aware that it can be very helpful for their future and see it as something important and useful.

Dörnyei's Ideal and Ought-to L2 Self have been explored as being influential for understanding L2 learners' motivation, particularly in EL contexts around the world. However, it remains necessary to survey the Ideal L2 self and the Ought-to L2 Self of a wider range of students in order to confirm the usefulness of this model. With regard to possible future research directions, investigation of a more detailed view of the Ideal L2 Self could be pursued. Nevertheless, the L2 motivational Self System was explored and seen as a better framework for L2 motivation because it highlights a focus on learners' own wishes and desires, together with the importance of paying attention to the nature of their ideal self-images.

## Bibliography

- Brown, H.D. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Chen, S. (2012). Motivation and Possible Selves: An Interview Study of Taiwanese EFL Learners. *Language Education in Asia*, 3(1): 50-59.
- Clément, R. (1986). Second language proficiency and acculturation: An investigation of the effects of language status and individual characteristics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 5(4): 271-290
- Crookes, G. and Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning* 41 (4): 469-512.
- Csizér, K. and Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Language Learners' Motivational Profiles and Their Motivated Learning Behavior. *Language Learning* 55(4): 613-659
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994a). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 273-284.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994b). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge! *Modern Language Journal*, 78. 515-523.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31 (3):117 135
- Dörnyei, Z. (Ed). (2003). *Attitudes, orientations and motivations in language learning*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dörnyei, Z., (2005). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2006). Individual differences in second language acquisition. *AILA Review*, 19, 42-68.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System. In Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (eds), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 9–42.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Csizér, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics* 23, 421–462.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 43–69.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (eds) (2009). *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., and Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Longman.
- Dörnyei, Z., Csizér K., and Németh N. (2006) *Motivation, Language Attitudes and Globalization: A Hungarian Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London. Edward Arnold Ltd
- Gardner, R.C. (2001). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition.  
<http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/caaltalk5final.pdf>
- Gardner, R. (2006). Motivation and Second Language Acquisition.  
[http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/SPAIN\\_TALK.pdf](http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/SPAIN_TALK.pdf)
- Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley: Newbury House Publication,
- Jelovčić, I. (2010). Strani jezik struke-analiza stavova studenata. *Metodika*, 20 (11): 44-55.
- Kolić-Vehovec S., Pečjak S., and Zubković-Rončević B. (2009). Spolne razlike u (meta) kognitivnim i motivacijskim čimbenicima razumijevanja teksta adolescenata u Hrvatskoj i Sloveniji. *Suvremena psihologija*, 12 (2): 229-242
- Kormos J., Kiddle T., and Csizér K. (2011). Systems of Goals, Attitudes, and Self-related Beliefs in Second-Language-Learning Motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, 32 (5): 495-516.

- Kubanyiova, M. (2009). Possible selves in language teacher development. In Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (eds) *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters: 314–332.
- Paiva, V.L.M. de O. e (2011). Identity, Motivation and Autonomy in Second Language Acquisition from the Perspective of Complex Adaptive Systems. In: Murray, G. et al. *Identity, Motivation and Autonomy in Language Learning*. Bristol: St Nicholas House, 2011. 57-69
- Mihaljević, Djigunović, J. (1995). Research on the affective domain of EFL learning: a study of motivation. *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabensis*, 42, 257-267.
- Mihaljević, Djigunović, J. (1996). Learner motivation as a source of variance in attitudes, effort and achievement. *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabensis*, 41,211-223.
- Mihaljević, Djigunović, J. and Bagarić, V. (2007).A Comparative Study of Attitudes and Motivation of Croatian Learners of English and German. *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabensis*, 52, 259-281.
- Murray, G., Gao X., and Lamb T. (2011). *Identity, Motivation and Autonomy in Language Learning*. Bristol: St Nicholas House, 57-69
- Noels, K.A., Pelletier, L.G., Clément, R., and Vallerand, R.J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning*, 50:1, 57-85
- Oxford, R. and Shearin, J. (1994). Language Learning Motivation: Expanding the Theoretical Framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78 (1):12–28
- Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System*, 38, 467-479.
- Root, E. (1999). Motivation and Learning Strategies in a Foreign Language Setting: A Look at a Learner of Korean. *CARLA*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1-74
- Ryan, S. and Dörnyei, Z. (2013). The long-term evolution of language motivation and the L2 self. In A. Berndt (Ed.), *Fremdsprachen in der Perspektive lebenslangen Lernens*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 89-100

- Suzuki, M. (2011). Ideal L2 Selves of Japanese English Learners at Different Motivational Level. The bulletin of the Graduate School, Soka University, 329-351  
<http://libir.soka.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/10911/3540/1/dk33-329.pdf>
- Taguchi T., Magid M., and Papi M. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (eds) *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Multilingual Matters, Bristol, 66–97.
- Tremblay, P. and Gardner, R.C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79 (4): 505-518.

## Appendices

### Appendix A

#### English Learner Questionnaire

*This is a questionnaire concerning your motivation in SLA. The results of this survey will be used only for research purpose so please give your answers sincerely. Thank you very much for your help! We would like you to tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following statements by simply circling a number from 1 to 6. Please do not leave out any of items.*

**1 Strongly disagree   2 Disagree      3 Slightly disagree      4 Slightly agree      5 Agree      6 Strongly agree**

1.	I can imagine myself living abroad and having a discussion in English.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
2.	Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using English.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
3.	The things I want to do in the future require me to use English.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
4.	Studying English is important to me because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak English.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
5.	I have to study English; otherwise, I think I cannot be successful in my future career.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
6.	Studying English is important to me in order to gain the approval of my peers/family/professor.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
7.	My parents encourage me to take every opportunity to use my English.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
8.	I have to study English, because, if I do not study it, I think my parents will be disappointed with me.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
9.	If an English course was offered at university or somewhere else in the future, I would like to take it.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
10.	I am prepared to expend a lot of effort in learning English.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
11.	I would like to study English even if I were not required.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
12.	Learning English is important to me because I would like to travel internationally.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
13.	Studying English can be important to me because I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>
14.	I have to study English because I don't want to get bad marks at school.	<b>1 2 3 4 5 6</b>

*Please provide the following information by circling your age and gender or writing your response in the space.*

**Age:**  18  19  20  \_\_\_\_\_

**Gender:** \*Female \*Male

**Year of study:** \_\_\_\_\_

**English ability:** *Please evaluate your English language knowledge by circling one grade.*

*F (failing)      D      C      B      A (excellent)*

\*Your grade in English language class at the end of the school year 2012/2013: \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank you for your cooperation!**

## **Appendix B**

### **VARIABLES:**

#### **IDEAL L2 SELF:**

- 1.I can imagine myself living abroad and having a discussion in English. **1 2 3 4 5 6**
- 2.Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using English. **1 2 3 4 5 6**
3. The things I want to do in the future require me to use English. **1 2 3 4 5 6**

#### **OUGHT-TO L2 SELF:**

1. Studying English is important to me because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak English.  
**1 2 3 4 5 6**
- 2.I have to study English; otherwise, I think I cannot be successful in my future career. **1 2 3 4 5 6**
- 3.Studying English is important to me in order to gain the approval of my peers/teachers/family **1 2 3 4 5 6**

#### **FAMILY INFLUENCE**

- 1.My parents encourage me to take every opportunity to use my English **1 2 3 4 5 6**
2. I have to study English, because, if I do not study it, I think my parents will be disappointed with me  
**1 2 3 4 5 6**

#### **INTEGRATIVENESS**

1. If an English course was offered at university or somewhere else in the future, I would like to take it.  
**1 2 3 4 5 6**
2. I am prepared to expend a lot of effort in learning English. **1 2 3 4 5 6**
3. I would like to study English even if I were not required. **1 2 3 4 5 6**

#### **INSTRUMENTALITY**

- 1.Learning English is important to me because I would like to travel internationally. **1 2 3 4 5 6**
2. Studying English can be important to me because I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job.  
**1 2 3 4 5 6**
3. I have to study English because I don't want to get bad marks at school **1 2 3 4 5 6**



## Appendix C

Table 4: Descriptive statistics for the 14 questionnaire items with their Mean, Min and Max and St.D.

---

Questionnaire Items	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
I have to study English, because, if I do not study it, I think my parents will be disappointed with me	1	6	1.9655	1.35032
Studying English is important to me in order to gain the approval of my peers/teachers/family.	1	6	2.8793	1.64453
I have to study English because I don't want to get bad marks at school	1	6	3.6207	1.53128
My parents encourage me to take every opportunity to use my English	2	6	4.2931	1.09328
The things I want to do in the future require me to use English	2	6	4.3966	1.12296
I am prepared to expend a lot of effort in learning English.	1	6	4.4310	1.35222
I have to study English; otherwise, I think I cannot be successful in my future career.	1	6	4.5960	1.2292
If an English course was offered at university or somewhere else in the future, I would like to take it.	1	6	4.7069	1.32465
Learning English is important to me because I would like to travel internationally.	1	6	4.8621	1.34358

---

---

I would like to study English even if I were not required.	2	6	4.8793	1.21507
Whenever I think about my future career, I imagine myself using English.	2	6	4.8966	1.13462
I can imagine living abroad and having a discussion in English.	2	6	5.1034	.94942
Studying English can be important to me because I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job	2	6	5.1034	1.08724
Studying English is important to me because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak English.	3	6	5.4138	1.00933

---