

Comparison of Vocational and Grammar School Learners' Motivation in English as a Foreign Language

Berka, Nives

Master's thesis / Diplomski 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:142:096025>

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

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-11-15**



Repository / Repozitorij:

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



Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku
Filozofski Fakultet

Diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti i filozofije
Nives Berka

**Comparison of Vocational and Grammar School Learners'
Motivation in English as a Foreign Language**

Diplomski rad

Prof. dr. sc. Višnja Pavičić Takač

Osijek, 2014

CONTENTS

Abstract	
1. Introduction	1
2. Motivation as an Important Affective factor	2
2.1. The Cognitive and Affective Domains	2
2.2. Motivation in SLL Defined	3
3. Motivational Theories in SLL/FLL	4
3.1. Gardner's Motivation Theory	5
3.2. Other Motivational Theories	9
4. Research on Motivation in SLL/FLL Worldwide	12
5. Research on Motivation in SLL/FLL in Croatia	14
6. Comparison of Vocational and Grammar School Learners' Motivation in English as a Foreign Language (EFL)	16
6.1. Aims	16
6.2. Sample	16
6.3. Instruments and Procedure	17
6.4. Results	18
6.4.1. Results on Pragmatic-communicative Motivation	19
6.4.2. Results on Affective Motivation	22
6.4.3. Results on Integrative Motivation	24
6.4.4. Results on the Teaching Setting Demotivator	27
6.4.5. Results on the Learning Difficulties Demotivator	28
6.5. Discussion	32
7. Conclusion	34
Bibliography	35
Appendices	38
Appendix 1: The Types and Intensity of Motivation for learning EFL Questionnaire	38
Sažetak	41

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to compare vocational and grammar school learners' motivation in learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The first part of the paper brings the theoretical overview of the affective domain, and motivation as one of the most important factor influencing language learning. Furthermore, some second language motivational theories and models are presented. In the second part, the research on motivation in EFL among vocational and grammar school learners is presented. The results showed that the most representative motivation among Croatian learners is pragmatic-communicative motivation, followed by affective motivation, while other components seemed less significant.

Key words: motivation, vocational school, non-vocational school, Croatia, EFL

1. Introduction

Numerous definitions, including the one from Oxford dictionary, define learning as a process of acquisition of knowledge or skills through study and experience. In broad terms, definition is entirely applicable to many aspects, but not to the language itself. Its complexity is well defined by Williams (1994, as cited in Dörnyei, 1998) who points out that language belongs to a person's whole social being. It all begins with the first language learning where native language is learned, and expands to second language acquisition/foreign language learning (SLA/FLL). According to Littlewood (1984), second language (L2) is any language that is learned after the first language system is in place. Stern (1983) also points out that L2 is learnt and used within one country, whereas foreign language (FL) is learnt and used with reference to a speech community outside national or territorial boundaries, and is generally taught in the classroom.

The aim of this paper is to provide an overview of motivation as a part of cognitive domain that was often neglected in the language learning research. Many researchers (Brown, 1987; Dörnyei, 2001; Gardner, 1985; Mihaljević Djigunović 1997; Reid 1999) agree that besides cognitive domain and its factors, individual differences in the affective domain influence language learning processes to a great extent. Furthermore, views on motivation as one of the most important factors in the affective domain will be explained in detail. The paper includes various definitions and observations of motivation and its role in language learning.

Moreover, an overview of different motivational theories related to SLL/FLL achievement, and research findings on these topics from different parts of the world will be presented. Among all of them, Gardner's motivation theory including integrative motive, the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB), and the Socio-educational model of SLA will be elaborated in detail, and other relevant motivational theories will be briefly mentioned.

For a better understanding of learners' types and intensity of motivation in EFL in vocational and non-vocational secondary schools in Croatian socio-educational context a quantitative research was conducted. The results and conclusions drawn will be presented in this paper.

2. Motivation as an Important Affective factor

Throughout the years, language learning research has mainly focused on observations of cognitive domain and its factors, whereas the affective domain was considered as irrelevant. Over the last 20 years, the interest in affective domain and its research has increased and new studies have emerged (Pintrich, 2003).

2.1. The Cognitive and Affective Domains

Many scholars (Brown, 1987; Dörnyei, 2001; Gardner, 1985; Mihaljević Djigunović 1997; Reid 1999) agree that the factors influencing success or failure in language learning should not only be assigned to the cognitive domain, but to the affective domain as well. Even though the cognitive domain plays an important role, Brown (1987) agrees that human beings are emotional creatures whose intellectual actions are governed by emotions – that are an essential part of human behaviour.

The Oxford Dictionary defines affect as emotion or desire as influencing behaviour. According to Arnold and Brown (1999:1), affect is related to "aspects of emotion, feeling, mood or attitude which condition behaviour". Bearing that in mind, a lot of researchers list all the factors they consider significant in creating an affective domain. For example, for Jelena Mihaljević Djigunović (1997) the affective domain is one of the two domains influencing language learning achievement. According to her, the well-researched cognitive domain involves intelligence, language aptitude, and learning strategies. On the other hand, the affective domain involves factors such as motivation, attitudes, personality traits, and anxiety. She mentions that any strategy with stress on the emotions should find its place on the affective domain.

Brown (1987) and Gass and Selinker (2001) also agree that the affective domain contains numerous factors influencing SLL achievement. For Brown (1987), empathy, inhibition, anxiety, attitudes and many other factors create an endless list of relevant factors. Gass and Selinker (2001), on the other hand, emphasise factors such as motivation, age and aptitude as those responsible for the level of achievement in SLL among individuals.

Moreover, there are researchers who observe affect as a factor of even higher importance. For instance, Stern (1983:386) wrote that "the affective component contributes at least as much and often more to language learning than the cognitive skills". Arnold (2011) agrees that the affective domain is a prerequisite for cognitive learning, but also points out that the affective domain is not

in opposition to the cognitive domain nor can one be separated from the other. All in all, it is important to have both domains in mind in order to create firm foundations for successful language learning.

2.2. Motivation in SLL Defined

In the global world we live in, the English language is present in almost every part of human life. Moreover, the knowledge of it became a necessity not a luxury. The great exposure to the English language affects people's lives and future in many segments (social media, job market, simple daily conversations, etc.). Learning English has become an important part of general education. In order to help learners become more efficient, it is also important to explore different factors influencing the process of language learning. Among them, the most important one is motivation - the drive that pushes us further and makes us interested in starting and persistent in continuing the process of language learning.

According to Pintrich (2002, as cited in Pintrich, 2003) motivation's role is to explain what gets, keeps and helps learner to finish a particular task. For Dörnyei and Skehan (2003:614) "motivation concerns the direction and magnitude of human behaviour, or, more specifically (i) the choice of particular action, (ii) the persistence with it, and (iii) the effort expended on it." For them motivation is responsible for why, how long and how hard people decide and sustain in certain activity.

Furthermore, Gardner (1985:10) defines motivation as "the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language". In other words, there are three components of motivation: effort or intensity, desire, and attitudes toward learning the language. For him, truly motivated individuals display all three components, whereas each component by itself is of little worth.

Brown (1987) also agrees on the complexity of defining motivation and provides an overview of definitions following three perspectives: behaviouristic, cognitive and constructivist. From the behaviouristic point of view, individuals act in certain way due to the previous experiences of reward as a stimuli for their behaviour. On the other hand, other two perspectives focus more on the individual itself. From the cognitive perspective, there is more emphasis on the individual's choices. Finally, the constructivist perspective, in addition to personal choices, emphasises social environment in which the learning takes place. Brown also emphasises two basic sources of motivation - the intrinsic and extrinsic motives. For him, learners who learn a language for their

own needs are intrinsically motivated and those who look for a reward (prize, money) as a confirmation for their language learning achievement and progress are extrinsically motivated.

Besides intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in SLL, motivation is also examined in terms of instrumental and integrative motivation identified by Gardner and his colleagues. The two types of motivation, which were later on referred to as orientations, served as starting points in numerous studies conducted on this topic. According to Gardner (1985), the focus of integrative orientation is to establish social-emotional contacts with the members of the community, whereas instrumental orientation focuses on pragmatic reasons for learning a new language.

It is commonly agreed that motivation is complex to define; as Dörnyei (2001:7) says it is 'a real mystery' for which numerous studies could not provide a universal definition.

3. Motivational Theories in SLL/FLL

There are different motivational theories related to achievement and language learning. For clearer understanding Dörnyei (2005) provides an overview of the field and divides it into three phases: the social psychological period (1959 -1990), the cognitive simulated period (during 1990s), and the process-oriented period (the past five years).

The first period is characterized by the work of Wallace Lambert, Robert Gardner and other social psychologists in Canada who viewed second languages as mediating factors between different communities. For them, language learning is socially rooted, and in order to master L2, individuals need to develop L2 identity. The key tenet of social psychological approach is that, along with linguistic phenomena, language learning involves social context and interest in particular culture which means that individuals' effort, desire and attitudes toward L2 community influence their success in language learning.

The second period is characterized by advances in motivational psychology. According to psychologists, crucial aspect of motivation is how one thinks about one's abilities, possibilities, limitations, past performances, and many other aspects of the task to achieve or goals to attain. All those advances are well incorporated in the self-determination theory and the attribution theory in the L2 motivation.

The last period focuses on the temporal dimension of motivation. The process model of L2 motivation (Dörnyei and Ottó, 1998) focuses on motivation as a dynamic construct changing over time and influencing learner's success in FLL.

Gardner's and Dörnyei's contributions are thought to be the most influential ones. They both offer their framework of motivation research, as well as their own observations that served as a basis for other various studies. In the following sections, Gardner's motivation theory as well as other relevant theories will be presented and briefly explained.

3.1. Gardner's Motivation Theory

When Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert published their book, *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning* in 1972, an extreme interest for motivation and other factors influencing language learning emerged. They observed language learning from social psychological perspective and offered observations of how success depends on learner's thoughts and feelings toward the language spoken by the other community. They agreed that "the learner's ethnocentric tendencies, his attitudes toward the other group, and his orientation toward language learning" (Lambert, 1972:291) have a significant mark on his motivation to learn and in the end, on the language learning achievement itself. In other words, for Gardner and Lambert (1972), learner's motivation is determined by two factors: his attitudes and readiness to identify and his orientation to the whole process of SLL. In addition to that, they conducted a research project in Canada, which is, according to Dörnyei (2001), a country with a perfect setting due to the presence of the Anglophone and the Francophone communities speaking two of the world's most vital languages. The project resulted in creating two major constructs - integrative and instrumental orientation. The first orientation concerns "a sincere and personal interest in the people and culture represented by the other group" (Gardner and Lambert 1972: 132) as well as becoming similar to the members of that other group. The latter orientation reflects "the practical value and advantages of learning a new language" (Gardner and Lambert 1972:132) and is often connected to a pragmatic use (better job, higher salary). In general, the term 'orientation' raised a lot of controversy and was often misused. As a response to a lot of criticism from many different researchers, Gardner (1985) elaborates on the difference between orientation and motivation. He sees orientation as goal or reason for learning a new language and motivation as a complex phenomenon related to success or failure. In his paper, *Integrative Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (2001), he suggests that researchers should focus more on the motivation itself which is the only one responsible for success or failure in SLL process.

Furthermore, Gardner's motivation theory can be divided in three areas: the integrative motive, the socio-educational model and the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB). As crucial components in SLL achievement, Gardner (2001) mentions the integrative motive and different

attitudes. He defines the first concept as a "motivation to learn a second language because of the positive feelings toward the community that speaks that language" (Gardner, 1985:82-3). According to him, motivation and language aptitude have influence on achievement in language learning, whereas motivation is influenced by integrativeness and attitudes towards the learning situation (see Figure 1.).




Figure 1: *Basic model of the role of aptitude and motivation in SLL (from Gardner 2001)*

As it was mentioned before and can be seen in Figure 1, the integrative motive consists of three variables: integrativeness, attitudes towards the learning situation and motivation. Integrativeness, "reflects genuine interest in learning the second language in order to come closer to the other language community" (Gardner 2001:5). He observes it as openness and respect for other community which can, in extreme cases, manifest as a complete identification with the group members. The second variable, attitudes towards the learning situation comprises attitudes "toward any aspect of the situation in which the language is learned" (Gardner 2001:5). As an example, he lists the school context and attitudes directed toward the teacher, the classmates and the course. He also argues that it is natural that some learning situations in some individuals evoke more

positive attitudes than in others. The last variable, motivation, already mentioned in the previous paragraphs is comprised of three elements: effort, desire and attitudes towards learning the language. As proposed by Gardner (2001), motivated individuals are those who are persistent, express strong desire and have a positive affect toward the SLL.




Figure 2: Socio-educational model of SLA (Gardner and MacIntyre, 1993:8)

Furthermore, in the field of motivation research, Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model (see Figure 2) is considered to be the only empirically based model. It has a rich history and the revised version used today was proposed by Gardner and Smythe (1975). In his model, Gardner (1985)

emphasises that language differs from any other subject due to the social context and its impact on the learner's success in SLL. In other words, his model is concerned with individual differences in language learning with the stress on the cultural context. The socio-educational model consists of four main aspects: antecedent factors, individual difference variables, language acquisition context and outcomes.

Gardner (Gardner and MacIntyre, 1993) considers biological and experiential factors as antecedents in the language learning process. According to him, learner's age and gender as well as his previous knowledge of the target language should be considered by researchers when conducting a research. Furthermore, more emphasis is placed on individual differences and their explanations. He lists six individual differences and groups them in two categories – cognitive and affective factors. Intelligence, language aptitude and language learning strategies are considered as cognitive and language attitudes, motivation and language anxiety as affective factors. Schematic representation (see Figure 2) clearly shows that there are relationships between the variables in both categories. According to him, cognitive factors are independent of one another; learners who learn languages easily are not necessarily more intelligent than those having difficulties concerning the same process. On the contrary, affective factors depend on one another. Moreover, Gardner (Gardner and MacIntyre, 1993) sees language attitudes as an affective basis influencing motivation while motivation influence and is influenced by language anxiety. In other words, high levels of motivation decrease language anxiety and vice versa. It is also noted that individual differences can be formal or informal. For Gardner (Gardner and MacIntyre, 1993; Gardner 1985), in formal context explained as instruction and drills, all of the elements beside language attitudes have a direct effect on language learning. On the other hand, in informal context such as listening to the radio or reading, motivation plays an important role and has a direct impact on language learning. Since informal context has a voluntary nature, it is expected that motivated learners will take part in it while those less motivated will not. He also argues that once the learner enters informal context, other individual factors should be taken in consideration.

Finally, Gardner (Gardner 1985; Gardner and MacIntyre, 1993) proposed the AMTB, an instrument developed to measure different variables influencing SLL all over the world. He divides it in five categories: motivation, integrativeness, attitudes toward learning situation, language anxiety and other factors. Three categories and their influence on SLL were elaborated in the theoretical overview of the socio-educational model presented above so they will not be repeated. Other two categories, language anxiety and other factors also play an important role. Gardner

(Gardner and MacIntyre, 1993) comments that language anxiety refers to learner's reactions in which they are asked to speak the target language. He agrees that there are many possible situations, but AMTB measures only two of them: L2 class anxiety and L2 anxiety in any situation where the target language needs to be used. In addition to language anxiety, other factors such as instrumental orientation and parental encouragement are mentioned. Even though AMTB gained a lot of criticism, as well as the integrative motive, many researchers (Dörnyei 2001; Mihaljević 1998) consider it as a useful instrument in research of motivation in SLL/FLL.

3.2. Other Motivational Theories

In addition to Gardner's motivation theory, there are many others that offered different solutions, models, and approaches in the study of motivation in SLL/FLL. Dörnyei (2001) lists some of the following as the most influential in the field of motivation research: Clément's social context model, attribution theory, self-determination theories, Schuman's neurobiological model, L2 motivation and the social context as well as Dörnyei and Ottó's process model of L2 motivation.

Clément's social context model (Clément et al., 2003) proposes that cultural context (contact with the L2 community) leads to variations in L2 confidence. The model is primarily focused on the linguistic self-confidence as 'a socially defined construct' (1977, as cited in Dörnyei, 2001) and the most important attitudinal factor. From Clément's point of view, frequent contact with L2 community members increases motivation for learning the other language, influence future decisions concerning intercultural communication, and identification with the L2 members.

In the literature, attribution theory is associated with Bernard Weiner (1985, as cited in Mihaljević Djigunović, 1988) who distinguishes the following dimensions of attributions: cause (external or internal), stability and personal control. He also mentions ability, task difficulty, effort and luck as possible causes of success and failure. According to Pintrich (2003), the attribution theory proposes that learner's attributions for success or failure influence or have consequences on future expectancies. In the classroom context it means that learner's beliefs about achievement or mastering the material will influence actual studying. For example, learners who believe that particular task is hard to complete will not put as much actual effort in achieving it as those who believe the opposite.

Deci and Ryan (1985), in the self-determination theory (SDT), distinguish two basic types of motivation: intrinsic, as doing something because it is interesting, and extrinsic, as having an instrumental value. They define self-determination as "a quality of human functioning that

involves the experience of choice" (Deci and Ryan, 1985:38) and fundamental to intrinsic motivation. They also point out that even though intrinsic motivation gained a lot of attention, the other one should not be ignored. According to them, extrinsic motivation has four regulations: external, introjected, identified and integrated. In general, the main focus in their research is on psychological needs for competence, autonomy and relatedness as basic human need that needs to be satisfied (Dörnyei, 2001).

John Schumann's neurobiological model examines the notion of motivation in SLL from a neurobiological perspective (Dörnyei, 2001). Schumann (1997) sees emotional memory as a filter that appraises stimuli according to five dimensions: novelty (degree of unexpectedness/familiarity), pleasantness (attractiveness), goal/need significance (whether the stimulus is instrumental in satisfying needs or achieving goals), coping potential (whether the individual expects to be able to cope with the event) and self and social image (whether the event is compatible with the social norms and the individual's self-concept). He argues that these appraisals guide our learning and help in achieving high levels of expertise. Moreover, stimuli-appraisal system is seen as a major factor underlying motivation.

Dörnyei (2001), as well as many other previously mentioned researchers, agrees that human motivation is socially shaped and that the target language community and the social context in general have a great impact on SLL/FLL. Dörnyei lists some of the most influential theories/models related to the social context from which the intergroup model, acculturation theory, and situated language identity will be mentioned.

Giles's intergroup model (Giles and Byrne, 1982, as cited in Dörnyei, 2001) proposes a framework for the members of minority ethnic groups and their SLL. The model focuses on the individual's integration with the other members of the community as well as community itself. Mihaljević Djigunović (1998) agrees that in some aspects Giles' model is similar to Gardner's socio-educational model.

Another theory with the social process focus and aspects similar to the intergroup model is Schumann's acculturation theory. In his theory, Schumann uses two concepts – social distance and psychological distance. Both of them are seen as crucial factors in the achievement of the target language and are subsumed in the process of acculturation (Dörnyei, 2001; Gardner, 1985). In other words, social and psychological distance, determined by various social and individual factors, is responsible for individual's SLL/FLL achievement.

Clément and Noels (1992, as cited in Dörnyei, 2001) situated language identity approach is seen as the most situated one. The model is focused on the individual's maintenance of positive image which results in the motivation of pursuing various linguistic practices. Eventually, positively situated individual assimilates the major group or integrates in the minority group.

Dörnyei (Dörnyei and Ottó, 1998) criticizes the social psychological model as well as other competing models by saying that they do not provide a detailed summary of motivational factors influencing learners in the classroom, ignore temporal dimension and phases in the motivational process, and ignore motivational sources for accomplishing goal-directed behaviour relevant for the classroom. He argues that language learning is a long-term process sometimes lasting for years. In order to clear the obviously ignored problems, he accepted the challenge of time in motivational processes and proposed the process model of L2 motivation. Dörnyei and Skehan (2003) define it as

"the dynamically changing cumulative arousal in a person that initiates, directs, coordinates, amplifies, terminates, and evaluates the cognitive and motor processes whereby initial wishes and desires are selected, prioritized, operationalized, and (successfully or unsuccessfully) acted out " (617-18).

The model is based on process-oriented principles and Heckhausen and Khul's Action Control Theory (Dörnyei, 2001). In their theory, Heckhausen and Khul (1985, as cited in Dörnyei, 2001) introduced temporal perspective of motivation through three phases: choice motivation, executive motivation and motivational retrospection. Later on, these phases served as a certain base for the process model of L2 motivation. The model itself, has two main dimensions: action sequence and motivational influences. According to Dörnyei (2001), following the Action Control Theory phases, the first dimension represents behavioural process and has three main phases: preactional (choice of action), actional (implementation of the action) and postactional (critical retrospection). On the other hand, energy sources and motivational forces are part of the second dimension that fuels the whole process.

The overview of motivational theories in SLL/FLL shows that motivation, as a construct itself cannot be easily explained by using only one theory. It appears that in order to understand it better a broader perspectives should be considered.

4. Research on Motivation in SLL/FLL Worldwide

The main research conducted by Gardner and Lambert (1972) started a revolution in research of motivation in SLL/FLL. At the beginning they were interested in how some individuals learn the target language easily and others have difficulties mastering it. Later on, what appeared as a simple question, under the influence of many different factors turned into an extensive long-term research on motivation. Even though their study was primarily focused on the individual's attitudes and motivation, they discovered many other individual factors influencing motivational process. They observed roots of motivation from educational context (skills of the teacher, the materials, the classroom atmosphere, etc.) and social context (individual's attitudes, beliefs and other socially relevant variables toward the other culture) (Gardner, 2007). According to them, SLA involves more than just elements of individuals' own culture. Moreover, both contexts have influence on individual's level of motivation and should not be considered separately. In their research, educational context is labelled as integrativeness and social context as attitudes toward the learning situation. In order to provide empirical evidence, Gardner and Lambert (1972) conducted their research in bilingual and bicultural setting in Canada with English speaking Canadians learning French and French speaking Canadians learning English, which was later on, expanded to the United States (Louisiana, Maine and Connecticut) as well. The Canadian research in Louisiana and Maine involved high school students from English and French descent learning French as an L2, whereas in Connecticut only those of English descent were involved. All three social contexts displayed the presence of intelligence and language aptitude as well as attitudes and motivation in language learning. According to the results, learners with strong motivation and desire to learn French had good grades in school, even though in each context there were different attitudes present. For example, in Louisiana, motivation was based on the parental encouragement; in Maine, on learner's identification with the French teacher and sensitivity to other people's feelings; and in Connecticut, on learner's integrative orientation toward language learning process as well as realization of the usefulness of knowing the language (Gardner and Lambert, 1972; Mihaljević Djigunović, 1998). Other results showed differences between learners and teachers view on the development of proficiency in the target language. Since it was often claimed that results of the study conducted in Canada are only applicable to the context where English is thought as L2, Gardner (2007) conducted and collected data in countries where English is taught as a FL (Spain, Croatia, Poland, Romania, Brazil, and Japan) and showed the opposite. All of the results resembled those in Canada. For example, in Spain, correlation of six variables with grades in English showed that highly motivated learners have higher grades than less motivated ones. Also, learners interested in culture of the English speaking community and integration with their members achieved higher grades in English than less interested ones. Furthermore, small, but significant

difference showed that learners who see instrumental value in learning English do better than those who see it as irrelevant.

Dörnyei's (1990) research, considered as one of the most influential European research on motivation in FLL context, implies that besides integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, sociocultural motives and other motivational factors have a special importance. He developed a motivational questionnaire and used it to investigate characteristics of integrativeness, instrumentality and other factors. The subjects of his research were 134 adult learners enrolled in British "International House" organization. According to the results, in FLL context, there are four components of general motives (instrumental motivation, integrative motivation, need for achievement and attributions about past failures) as well as other situation-specific motives (appraisal of the classroom environment, linguistic self-confidence, language anxiety). The results confirmed that instrumental motivation and need for achievement are crucial in attaining an intermediate level of proficiency in FLL, whereas higher levels seek out for integrative motivation.

Fehér (1999) conducted a research in order to investigate factors that motivate Hungarian learners of vocational and non-vocational schools to learn L2. Dörnyei's questionnaire was used on 373 high school students of Újpest. In general, regardless of the type of school, results showed that motivation is positive and has an important role in learning English. All variables, except for language anxiety and linguistic self-confidence, showed almost maximum values. Results indicated that the first year learners in both schools had more self-confidence than fourth year learners who realised that there are fewer opportunities to improve their proficiency since they are about to graduate. Even though their self-confidence was high, the first year learners had less positive attitudes toward the English course. Concerning various types of school, results indicated that grammar school learners had significantly higher instrumental motivation (pragmatic benefits of English language) and higher interest in English culture than learners from vocational schools. Despite lower instrumental motivation and interest in other culture, vocational learners put a lot of effort into attaining proficiency in English.

Sarani and Ahmadi (2013) conducted a study examining students' motivation toward learning English as a FL and their levels of English proficiency as well as differences in motivation among male and female vocational learners. They included 160 learners of second grade of high school (57 male and 50 female learners from vocational and 53 male learners from non-vocational high school). In their research, they used AMTB questionnaire and a beginner English Proficiency Test. Results showed that the learners of non-vocational high school have higher level of proficiency in

English than those in vocational high school. Secondly, male learners of non-vocational high school were more motivated than those of vocational high school. Thirdly, regarding language learning motivation of male and female vocational learners, results have shown that female learners were more motivated than the male ones. All in all, it is important to stress that the knowledge of English in Iran is seen an essential requirement for military service and different job opportunities for young people which can also serve as a certain explanation for the presented results.

5. Research on Motivation in SLL/FLL in Croatia

Mihaljević Djigunović (1996; 1997; 1998) carried out research on types and intensity of motivation in FLL in the Croatian socio-cultural context. Since in Croatia English is a FL and primarily used for international communication, Mihaljević Djigunović (1997) designed a questionnaire for measuring types and intensity of motivation in a FLL context consisting of 38 items reflecting the five subscales. The questionnaire was used with a sample of 340 learners (primary school, adolescents and adult learners) from metropolitan and small town settings. The results showed the existence of three types of motivation for learning English: pragmatic-communicative motivation (goals that can be accomplished in the present or in future as well as integration in the international community), affective motivation (aesthetic and emotional implications), and integrative motivation (integration in the socio-cultural group where English is spoken as a native language). Furthermore, results detected two demotivators: the teaching setting and the learning difficulties demotivator. The results showed that pragmatic-communicative motivation is the most popular among learners of EFL. It was also shown that the integrative motivation is closely associated with less successful learners which, according to Mihaljević Djigunović (1996) serves as a great starting point for future research.

Kabalin Borenić (2013, as cited in Mihaljević Djigunović, 2013) observed motivation for English language learning at the University of Economics in Zagreb. Her results indicated three types of motivation (integrative, instrumental-communicative and instrumental) and one demotivator. Students showed positive attitudes toward the English language as well as a significant level of instrumental motivation.

Vilke Pinter (1995, as cited in Balenović, 2011) focuses on attitudes in examining the types of orientation of students learning English as an elective course at one of the universities in Zagreb

(Faculty of Veterinary Medicine). The results showed that students find communicative, cultural, informative and professional orientations equally important.

Miškulin-Čubrić (2002, as cited in Balenović, 2011) examined attitudes and motivation for FLL (English, German, Italian and French) based on a sample of 173 students at the Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management in Opatija. According to the results, among four recognized orientations, specific instrumental orientation turned out to be the most significant. The main reason for FLL is connected with the future advancement in professional career where FL has an important instrumental value.

6. Comparison of Vocational and Grammar School Learners' Motivation in EFL

In Croatian socio-educational context, research on learners' motivation in English as a FL with particular focus on their types and intensity in comparison to the type of secondary school could not be found. The present quantitative study sets out to fill that void.

6.1. Aims

The aim of this study is to determine and compare types and intensity of motivation in FLL in Croatian Grammar (later on referred to as non-vocational) and vocational schools. The areas that were investigated in the present study were based on Mihaljević Djigunović's (1996; 1997; 1998) types of motivation identified in FLL in the Croatian socio-cultural context. The present study seeks to answer the following questions:

- a) What is the relationship among type of school, gender, and grade on pragmatic-communicative motivation between secondary school participants?
- b) What is the relationship among type of school, gender, and grade on affective motivation between secondary school participants?
- c) What is the relationship among type of school, gender, and grade on integrative motivation between secondary school participants?
- d) What is the relationship among type of school, gender, and grade on the teaching setting demotivator between secondary school participants?
- e) What is the relationship among type of school, gender, and grade on the learning difficulties demotivator between secondary school participants?

6.2. Sample

A total of 541 students from secondary schools in Osijek participated in this study. 207 participants attended the vocational (Agricultural and Veterinary School, Catering and Tourism School, and Building and Geodetic School) and 334 the non-vocational schools (three grammar schools and Art and Design School). Art and Design School follows the English as a foreign language curriculum of non-vocational schools, and was therefore categorized as a non-vocational school in the data analysis. All participants were Croatian, between 15 and 19 years old, and learned English as an obligatory course. Average English grade of all participants was 3.68. More specifically, average grade of non-vocational school learners was 3.77 and of vocational school learners 3.53 where a significant difference was found ($t_{(539)} = 2.558$; $p < .011$).

6.3. Instruments and Procedure

a) Types of motivation

The data on types and intensity of motivation of Croatian EFL learners were collected using Mihaljević Djigunović's Types and Intensity of Motivation for learning EFL Questionnaire (1998). With its 38 items, the Types and Intensity of Motivation for learning EFL Questionnaire covers five components of motivation: pragmatic-communicative motivation, affective motivation, integrative motivation, the teaching setting demotivator, and the learning difficulties demotivator. The questionnaire was distributed in its original language, that is Croatian. The purpose of the questionnaire is to determine and compare the types and intensity of motivation in EFL learning in the Croatian non-vocational and vocational schools. The example statements and their Croatian equivalents for each type of motivation are listed below. The complete questionnaire is available in the appendix section.

Pragmatic-communicative motivation: "English will be useful to me in my future profession." („Engleski će mi pomoći u budućem zanimanju.”)

Affective motivation: "English sounds very nice." („Engleski jezik vrlo lijepo zvuči.”)

Integrative motivation: "I would like to be like the English, Americans, Australians, etc." („Želim postati sličan Englezima, Amerikancima, Australcima itd.”)

The teaching setting demotivator: "I don't like the teaching methods our teacher employs." („Ne sviđaju mi se metode nastave našeg profesora.”)

The learning difficulties demotivator: "After getting a bad mark I have no more wish to learn." („Dobio sam lošu ocjenu pa nemam volje učiti.”)

The level of agreement to each statement was specified by a five-point Likert scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) slightly disagree, (3) neither agree nor disagree, (4) slightly agree, (5) strongly agree.

In this study the reliability of the Types and Intensity of Motivation for learning EFL Questionnaire was assessed using Cronbach alpha coefficient. Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .787$ which indicates good internal consistency.

The questionnaire was written in the participants' native language, and it was administered during regular English classes. Before collecting the data, participants were explained that the questionnaire was anonymous, and that they would be included in the study only if they granted their permission. For the purpose of statistical analysis the following items were recoded:

"Our teacher teaches English in a very interesting way." („Naša nastavnica engleskog vrlo zanimljivo predaje.”)

"My teacher of English motivates me to learn." („Nastavnica engleskog motivira me na učenje.”)

"English is a stupid language." („Engleski je glup jezik.”)

"The teaching materials we use are very motivating." („Nastavni materijali potiču me na učenje.”)

Afterwards, quantitative scores for participants' questionnaire data were calculated and analysed, and will be presented in the next section.

b) The relationship between types and intensity of motivation and participants' type of school, gender and achievement

To verify the hypothesis, we conducted a 2x2x2 three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), whereby factors were type of school (grammar/vocational), gender (male/female) and achievement (grade in English) [low-grade (1, 2, 3) and high-grade (4, 5)]. Significance was set at $p < 0.05$. In order to determine the relationship between factors on each component of motivation, a separate analysis of variances was calculated. The statistical analysis was performed using SPSS (Version 19).

6.4. Results

The following sections bring forward the results of the research on types and intensity of motivation of Croatian EFL learners.

Table 1: *Scores on the Types and Intensity of Motivation for learning EFL Questionnaire*

	Pragmatic-communicative motivation	Affective motivation	Integrative motivation	The teaching setting demotivator	The learning difficulties demotivator
Mean	49.91	24.38	11.71	22.93	13.83

Std.					
Deviation	8.578	5.830	4.492	9.366	5.764

Table 1 shows overall findings regarding the types of motivation for learning EFL of all participants included in this study (i.e. the mean values of each type of motivation obtained with the Types and Intensity of Motivation for learning EFL Questionnaire). As it can be seen, the most representative motivation type of Croatian EFL learners is pragmatic-communicative, which is followed by affective motivation and the teaching setting demotivator. Other types of motivation (integrative motivation and the learning difficulties demotivator) are identified as less significant. However, integrative motivation seems to be the least representative among participants. None of the motivation types were marked as unimportant.

6.4.1. Results on Pragmatic-communicative Motivation

Table 2: *Results of descriptive statistics of pragmatic-communicative motivation*

		n	Mean	Sd. Deviation
Type of school	Non-vocational	334	51.25	7.03
	Vocational	207	47.75	10.26
Gender	Male	217	49.12	8.85
	Female	324	50.44	8.35
Grade	Low-grade (1, 2, 3)	222	46.21	9.52
	High-grade (4, 5)	319	52.49	6.76

Mean values presented in Table 2 show significant differences in pragmatic-communicative motivation among participants of non-vocational ($M = 51.25$, $SD = 7.03$) and vocational schools ($M = 47.75$, $SD = 10.26$); with higher pragmatic-communicative motivation among participants of non-vocational schools. It can also be seen that participants with high grade have higher pragmatic-communicative motivation ($M = 52.49$, $SD = 6.76$) than participants with low grade ($M = 46.21$, $SD = 9.52$).

Table 3: *Three-way analysis of pragmatic-communicative motivation*

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Type of school	1352.294	1	1352.294	22.911	.000*

Pragmatic-communicative	Gender	29.687	1	29.687	.503	.479
	Grade	5165.043	1	5165.043	87.508	.000*
	Type of school*Gender	17.846	1	17.846	.302	.583
	Type of school*Grade	1637.641	1	1637.641	27.745	.000*
	Gender*Grade	237.302	1	237.302	4.020	.045*
	Type of school*Gender*Grade	42.805	1	42.805	.725	.395
	Total	1387518.692		541		

*p<.05

Three-way analysis of variance (see Table 3) shows that the main effect of gender is not statistically significant, while the main effect of types of school [$F_{(1, 540)} = 22.911$; $p < .05$] and grade [$F_{(1, 540)} = 87.508$; $p < .05$] appear statistically significant.

Analysis of variance also shows that interactions between types of school and gender, gender and grade as well as types of school, gender and grade are not statistically significant. On the other hand, interaction between types of school and grade appears statistically significant [$F_{(1, 540)} = 27.745$; $p < .05$].

Analysis of types of school (see Figure 3a) shows that there is a significant difference in intensity of pragmatic-communicative motivation among participants of vocational schools with high/low grade, whereas among participants of non-vocational schools that difference is insignificant.

Grade analysis (see Figure 3b) shows insignificantly minor differences in intensity of pragmatic-communicative motivation among participants from both types of school with high grade. However, that difference is statistically significant among participants of vocational schools with low grade compared to participants of non-vocational schools with the same grade. Interaction appears as a result of high motivation among participants of non-vocational schools with low grade.




Figure 3a: *Type of School and Grade Interaction*




Figure 3b: *Grade and Type of School Interaction*

6.4.2. Results on Affective Motivation

Table 4: *The descriptive statistics of affective motivation*

		n	Mean	Sd. Deviation
Type of school	Non-vocational	334	24.74	5.13
	Vocational	207	23.81	6.78
Gender	Male	217	23.42	6.28
	Female	324	25.03	5.42
Grade	Low-grade (1, 2, 3)	222	21.89	6.47
	High-grade (4, 5)	319	26.12	4.61

Mean values presented in Table 4 show significant difference between affective motivation among female (M = 25.03, SD = 5.42) and male participants (M = 23.42, SD = 6.28); with higher motivation among female participants. Also, male participants with higher grade have higher motivation (M = 26.12, SD = 4.61) than participants with low grade (M = 21.89, SD = 6.47).

Table 5: *Three-way analysis of affective motivation*

		Sum squares	of Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Affective	Type of school	53.420	1	53.420	1.927	.166
	Gender	202.768	1	202.768	7.313	.007*
	Grade	2628.196	1	2628.196	94.790	.000*
	Type of school*Gender	17.644	1	17.644	.636	.425
	Type of school*Grade	803.558	1	803.558	28.982	.000*
	Gender*Grade	16.122	1	16.122	.581	.446
	Type of school*Gender*Grade	2.946	1	2.946	.106	.745
	Total	339999.117		541		

*p<.05

Three-way analysis of variance (see Table 5) shows that the main effect of types of school is not statistically significant, while the main effect of gender [$F_{(1, 540)} = 7.313$; $p < .05$] and grade [$F_{(1, 540)} = 94.790$; $p < .05$] appear statistically significant.

Analysis of variance also shows that interactions between types of school and gender, gender and grade as well as types of school, gender and grade are not statistically significant. On the other

hand, interaction between types of school and grade appears statistically significant [$F_{(1, 540)} = 28.982$; $p < .05$].

Analysis of types of school (see Figure 4a) shows that there is a significant difference in intensity of affective motivation among participants of vocational schools with high/low grade, whereas among participants of non-vocational schools with the high/low grade that difference is insignificantly minor.

Grade analysis (see Figure 4b) shows that participants of vocational schools with high grade have higher intensity of affective motivation compared to participants of non-vocational schools with the same grade. There is also a significant difference in intensity among participants of vocational schools with low grade and those of non-vocational schools with the same grade; higher intensity of motivation among participants of non-vocational schools. Interaction appears as a result of high motivation among participants of non-vocational schools with low grade.




Figure 4a: *Type of School and Grade Interaction*




Figure 4b: *Grade and Type of School Interaction*

6.4.3. Results on Integrative Motivation

Table 6: *The descriptive statistics of integrative motivation*

		n	Mean	Sd. Deviation
Type of school	Non-vocational	334	12.21	4.29
	Vocational	207	10.91	4.69
Gender	Male	217	11.09	4.55
	Female	324	12.12	4.41
Grade	Low-grade (1, 2, 3)	222	10.77	4.51
	High-grade (4, 5)	319	12.36	4.37

Mean values presented in Table 6 show significant difference in integrative motivation among participants of non-vocational schools ($M = 12.21$, $SD = 4.29$) and participants of vocational schools ($M = 10.91$, $SD = 4.69$); with higher integrative motivation among participants of non-vocational schools. It also appears that participants with high grade have higher integrative motivation ($M = 12.36$, $SD = 4.37$) than participants with low grade ($M = 10.577$, $SD = 4.51$).

Table 7: Three-way analysis of integrative motivation

		Sum squares	of Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Integrative	Type of school	168.924	1	168.924	8.957	.003*
	Gender	47.091	1	47.091	2.497	.115
	Grade	326.454	1	326.454	17.310	.000*
	Type of school*Gender	20.138	1	20.138	1.068	.302
	Type of school*Grade	196.662	1	196.662	10.428	.001*
	Gender*Grade	22.800	1	22.800	1.209	.272
	Type of school*Gender*Grade	5.367	1	5.367	.285	.594
	Total	85076.602		541		


*p<.05

Three-way analysis of variance (see Table 7) shows that the main effect of gender is not statistically significant, while the main effect of types of school [$F_{(1, 540)} = 8.957$; $p < .05$] and grade [$F_{(1, 540)} = 17.310$; $p < .05$] appear statistically significant.

Analysis of variance also shows that interactions between types of school and gender, gender and grade as well as types of school, gender and grade are not statistically significant. On the other hand, interaction between types of school and grade appears statistically significant [$F_{(1, 540)} = 10.428$; $p < .05$].

Analysis of types of school (see Figure 5a) shows a significant difference in intensity of integrative motivation among participants of vocational schools with high/low grade, where among participants of non-vocational schools with the high/low grade that difference is not that significant. Intensity of motivation is higher among participants of vocational schools with high grade.

Grade analysis (see Figure 5b) shows insignificantly minor differences in intensity of integrative motivation among participants with high grade in both types of school. However, that difference is statistically significant among participants with low grade attending vocational schools when compared to participants with the same grade in non-vocational schools.



Figure

5a: Type of School and Grade Interaction




Figure 5b: Grade and Type of School Interaction

6.4.4. Results on the Teaching Setting Demotivator

Table 8: The descriptive statistics of the teaching setting demotivator

		n	Mean	Sd. Deviation
Type of school	Non-vocational	334	26.53	9.18
	Vocational	207	17.13	6.23
Gender	Male	217	22.57	8.98
	Female	324	23.18	9.62
Grade	Low-grade (1, 2, 3)	222	23.07	9.06
	High-grade (4, 5)	319	22.84	9.59

Mean values presented in Table 8 show significant difference in motivation among participants of non-vocational schools (M = 26.53, SD = 9.18) and participants of vocational schools (M = 17.13, SD = 6.23). Participants with low grades more often tend to find the teaching setting as a demotivator (M = 23.07, SD = 9.06) then participants with high grade (M = 22.84, SD = 9.59).

Table 9: Three-way analysis of the teaching setting demotivator

		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
The teaching setting demotivator	Type of school	10518.191	1	10518.191	158.043	.000*
	Gender	85.310	1	85.310	1.282	.258
	Grade	269.737	1	269.737	4.053	.045*
	Type of school*Gender	4.798	1	4.798	.072	.788
	Type of school*Grade	61.631	1	61.631	.926	.336
	Gender*Grade	.060	1	.060	.001	.976
	Type of school*Gender*Grade	237.500	1	237.500	3.569	.059
	Total	331886.638		541		

*p<.05

Three-way analysis of variance (see Table 9) shows that the main effect of gender is not statistically significant, while the main effect of types of school [$F_{(1, 540)} = 158.043$; $p < .05$] and grade [$F_{(1, 540)} = 4.053$; $p < .05$] appear statistically significant.

Analysis of variance also shows that interactions between types of school and gender, types of school and grade, gender and grade as well as types of school, gender and grade are not statistically significant.

6.4.5. Results on the Learning Difficulties Demotivator

Table 10: *The descriptive statistics of the learning difficulties demotivator*

		n	Mean	Sd. Deviation
Type of school	Non-vocational	334	13.80	5.32
	Vocational	207	13.88	6.43
Gender	Male	217	13.84	5.59
	Female	324	13.83	5.89
Grade	Low-grade (1, 2, 3)	222	16.89	6.23
	High-grade (4, 5)	319	11.70	4.29

It can be seen from the mean values presented in Table 7 that participants of both types of schools with high grade have fewer difficulties in learning EFL ($M = 11.70$, $SD = 4.29$) than participants with low grade ($M = 16.89$, $SD = 6.23$).

Table 11: *Three-way analysis of the learning difficulties demotivator*

		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
The learning difficulties demotivator	Type of school	4.451	1	4.451	.171	.679
	Gender	3.298	1	3.298	.127	.722
	Grade	3557.013	1	3557.013	136.720	.000*
	Type of school*Gender	26.093	1	26.093	1.003	.317
	Type of school*Grade	275.687	1	275.687	10.597	.001*
	Gender*Grade	153.900	1	153.900	5.915	.015*
	Type of school*Gender*Grade	95.497	1	95.497	3.671	.056
	Total	121439,278				541

* $p < .05$

Three-way Analysis of variance (see Table 11) shows that the main effects of types of school and gender are not statistically significant, while the main effect of grade [$F_{(1, 540)} = 136.720$; $p < .05$] appears statistically significant.

Analysis of variance also shows that interactions between types of school and gender, and types of school, gender and grade are not statistically significant. On the other hand, interactions between types of school and grade [$F_{(1, 540)} = 10.597$; $p < .05$] and gender and grade [$F_{(1, 540)} = 5.915$; $p < .05$] appear statistically significant.

Analysis of types of school (see Figure 6a) shows that participants with low grade of both types of school have more learning difficulties compared to participants with high grade of both schools. The only difference is in intensity which is higher among participant of vocational schools.




Figure 6a: *Type of School and Grade Interaction*

Grade analysis (see Figure 6b) shows that participants of vocational schools with low grade have more difficulties in learning the language than participants of non-vocational schools with the same grade. On the other hand, participants of non-vocational schools with high grade have more difficulties compared to their peers from vocational schools with the same grade. Interaction appears as a result of more learning difficulties among participants of non-vocational schools with high grade when compared to participants of vocational schools with high grade.




Figure 6b: *Grade and Type of School Interaction*

Gender analysis (see Figure 7a) shows that both female and male participants with low grade have more difficulties in learning English than their peers with high grade.

Grade analysis (see Figure 7b) shows that female participants with low grade have more difficulties in learning than male participants with the same grade. On the other hand, male participants with high grade have more difficulties than female participants with the same grade. Interaction appears as a result of more learning difficulties among male participants with high grade.




Figure 7a: Gender and Grade Interaction



Figure 7b: *Grade and Gender Interaction*

6.5. Discussion

In this study we investigated the relationship among type of school, gender, and grade on three components of motivation (pragmatic-communicative, affective, integrative) and two demotivators (the teaching setting and learning difficulties) between secondary school learners in the Croatian socio-educational context.

Regarding the first research question on the pragmatic-communicative motivation, difference was found between vocational and non-vocational secondary school learners. The mean value demonstrate that learners of non-vocational schools are more motivated than those of vocational schools. High motivation is particularly evident among learners of both types of school with high grade. These findings are compatible with Mihaljević Djigunović's study (1998) where learners with high grade in English are more motivated than those with low grade. Since pragmatic-communicative motivation is similar to instrumental motivation, we can say that the results of this study are also compatible with Fehér's (1999) study where learners of grammar school have higher instrumental motivation than learners of vocational schools. The reasons of high motivation in Croatian socio-educational context among non-vocational learners might be rooted in the EFL teaching curriculum. Non-vocational school learners are exposed to a wide range of information about cultural issues and customs of English speaking communities which than increases their desire to learn the language, and maybe even integrate into the international community. They perceive English as a language of international communication from which they can benefit (foreign university, job). On the other hand, vocational school learners are exposed to English for specific purpose often connected to their future professions which may narrow their view of English as a great communicative tool in the globalized world.

The findings concerning the second research question on the affective motivation show that female learners have higher motivation than male learners. The results are compatible with Mihaljević Djigunović's (1998) study which showed that female learners are more emotionally connected to FL than male learners. A possible explanation might lie in conventional beliefs that females are more emotionally expressive than males (Parkins, 2012).

Regarding the third research question on integrative motivation the mean values show that learners of non-vocational schools are more motivated than those of vocational schools. The results seem to corroborate to Gardner's (1985) findings that the need for integration in the other community is

present to a great extent. The only difference is that in the Croatian social-educational context learners do not have many opportunities to communicate with native speakers of English. The level of their integrative motivation may depend mainly on the teacher, materials and the classroom setting. Furthermore, the reason for vocational school learners' low integrative motivation can lie in the fact that they are not exposed to the teaching materials featuring native speakers of English to the same extent as their peers of non-vocational schools.

The results concerning the fourth research question show that non-vocational learners more often tend to consider the teaching setting as a demotivator compared to their peers from vocational schools. It appears that non-vocational learners find the teachers' choice of materials, its implementation in the classroom context as well as the classroom atmosphere insufficient for their progress in EFL learning. According to Mihaljević Djigunović (1998), those learners will look for other ways to improve their English language (language schools, private lessons, etc.), and finally form a negative attitude toward the teaching setting itself. On the contrary, vocational learners seem satisfied with the information provided in the classroom and find it beneficial for their future professions. It also appears that less successful learners often tend to find the teaching setting demotivating. The results of this study can be compared to Sakai and Kikuchi's (2009) study where two main demotivators (learning contents and teaching material, and test scores) for less motivated students were identified.

The results concerning the fifth research question on the learning difficulties demotivator show that learners of both types of school with high grade have fewer learning difficulties compared to those with low grade. The findings are compatible with Mihaljević Djigunović's (1998) study where less successful learners experience more learning difficulties because of the lack of basic knowledge.

7. Conclusion

Language learning is a complex processes influenced by a number of cognitive and affective factors. This paper explored motivation as one of the most important affective factors in language learning. The primary focus of this paper was to compare vocational and non-vocational school learners' motivation in EFL in Croatian socio-educational context. The results obtained from this study showed that the most representative learners' type of motivation is pragmatic-communicative, which is followed by affective motivation. According to the results, the most representative demotivator is the teaching setting. Furthermore, integrative motivation and the learning difficulties demotivator appeared less important. Also, component analysis showed that the main effects of types of school and grade are significant in EFL learning.

There are more than a few limitations of this study, the primary one being the subjectivity of the grading system. The grading system and methods differ from teacher to teacher which can influence the results to a great extent. In this study, the reliability of grading system was not checked. Furthermore, a small, but important difference in the number of non-vocational and vocational school learners in the sample could have had a minor effect on the overall results.

Since the study revealed the integrative motivation as the least popular type of motivation among learners of both types of school, there are implications for teachers and material developers. Firstly, teaching curriculum and materials should be modified. Vocational learners should be exposed to topics of cultural issues, customs and community of the language they are learning. Secondly, teachers should devote more time to observing their students and understanding their needs and aspirations. Nowadays, especially with the Internet revolution, it is expected from teachers to incorporate more materials with the native English speakers in their lessons.

In the future research it might be beneficial to study learner's opinions on the textbooks used in the class, as well as on the teachers, as crucial figures in the FLL. It might also be good to explore grading systems and compare them with the types of learners' motivation.

Bibliography

- Arnold, J. (2011) Attention to Affect in Language Learning. *Anglistik: International Journal of English Studies*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 11-22.
- Arnold, J. and Brown, H. D. (1999). A map of the terrain. In: Arnold, J. (Ed.) (1999) *Affect in Language Learning*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 1- 24.
- Balenović, K. (2011) Motivacija odraslih učenika za učenje engleskog jezika u kontekstu globalizacije. *Napredak : časopis za pedagoški teoriju i praksu*, 152 (2), 189-209.
- Brown, H.D. (1987) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Clément, R., Baker, S. C., and MacIntyre, P. D. (2003) Willingness to communicate in a second language: The effects of context, norms and vitality, *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, vol. 22, pp. 190-209.
- Deci, E.L., and Ryan, R.M. (1985) *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990) Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 45-78.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in Second and Foreign Language Learning. *Language Teaching*, vol.31, pp. 117-135.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001) *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Longman.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005) *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998) Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, vol. 4, pp. 43-69.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003) Individual differences in second language learning. In: Doughty, C.J. and Long, M.H. (Eds.) (2003) *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 589-630.
- Fehér, E. (1999) Motivation in learning English at three secondary schools Újpest. Szombathely/Budapest: Berzsenyi Dániel Teacher Training College [unpublished M.A. dissertation].
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Language Learning: the Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

- Gardner, R.C. (2001) Integrative Motivation and Second Language Acquisition. In: Dörnyei, Z. and Schmidt, R. (Eds.) (2001) *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, pp. 1-19.
- Gardner, R.C. (2007) Motivation and Second Language Acquisition, *Porta Linguarium*, vol. 8, pp. 9-20.
- Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W.E., (1972) *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Newbury House: Rowley.
- Gardner, R.C. and MacIntyre, P.D. (1993) A student's contribution to second language learning. Part II: Affective Variables, *Language Teaching*, vol. 26, pp. 1-11.
- Gardner, R.C. and Smythe, P.C. (1975) Motivation and Second Language Acquisition. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, vol.31, 218-30
- Gass, S.M. and Selinker, L. (2001) *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Language, Psychology, and Culture: Essays by Wallace E. Lambert*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Littlewood, W.T. (1984) *Foreign and Second Language Learning*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (1996) Learner Motivation as a Source of Variance in Attitudes, Effort and Achievement, *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia*, vol. 41, pp. 211-223.
- Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (1997) Research on the Affective Domain in EFL Learning: a Study of Motivation, *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia*, vol. 42, pp. 257-268.
- Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (1998) Uloga afektivnih faktora u učenju drugoga jezika [Role of affective factors in FLL]. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (2013) Interdisciplinarna istraživanja u području obrazovanja na primjeru glotodidaktike, *Sociologija i Prostor*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 471-491.
- Oxford Online Dictionary. Available at: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/> (Visited on 5th August 2014)
- Parkins, R. (2012) Gender and Emotional Expressiveness: An Analysis of Prosodic Features in Emotional Expression, *Griffith Working Papers in Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 46-54.

- Pintrich, P.R. (2003) Motivation and Classroom Learning. In: Reynolds, W.M. and Miller, G.E. (Eds.) (2003) *Handbook of Psychology*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., vol. 7, pp. 103-122.
- Reid, J. (1999) Affect in the classroom: problems, politics and pragmatics. In: Arnold, J. (Eds.) (1999) *Affect in Language Learning*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 297-306.
- Sarani, A. and Ahmadi, M. (2013) A study of Vocational and Non-vocational High School Learners' Language Proficiency and Motivation, *Advances in Asian Social Science*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 892 – 898.
- Sakai, H. and Kikuchi, K. (2009) An analysis of demotivators in the EFL classroom. *System*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 57-69.
- Schumann, J.H. (1997) *The Neurobiology of Affect in Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stern, H.H. (1983) *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix

Appendix 1

Types and Intensity of Motivation for learning EFL Questionnaire

Draga učenice/dragi učenice,

ovim upitnikom želimo istražiti tvoj stav i motivaciju za učenje ENGLESKOG JEZIKA. Upitnik je u potpunosti anoniman, a tvojim ćemo se podacima isključivo koristiti u svrhu izrade diplomskog rada. Molimo te da pažljivo pročitaš sve stavke u ovom upitniku i ocijeniš (od 1 do 5) KOLIKO se sa svakom pojedinom tvrdnjom ti osobno slažeš. Molim te da nijednu stavku ne preskočiš. Sve tvrdnje odnose se na ENGLESKI JEZIK.

Dob: _____

Spol: M / Ž

Ocjena iz engleskog jezika prošle godine: _____

Što misliš koju ćeš ocjenu imati ove godine? _____

1 – uopće se ne slažem, **2** – djelomično se slažem, **3** – niti se slažem niti se ne slažem,
4 – prilično se slažem, **5** – potpuno se slažem

1. Engleski mi omogućava da komuniciram s mnogo stranaca.	1 2 3 4 5
2. Naša nastavnica engleskoga vrlo zanimljivo predaje.	1 2 3 4 5
3. Engleski je vrlo zanimljiv jezik.	1 2 3 4 5
4. Na satu engleskoga stalno sam u panici jer znam da ništa neću razumjeti kad me nastavnica pita.	1 2 3 4 5
5. Nastavnica engleskoga motivira me na učenje.	1 2 3 4 5
6. Želim postati sličan/slična Englezima, Amerikancima itd.	1 2 3 4 5
7. Engleski mi omogućava da čitam strane časopise.	1 2 3 4 5
8. Engleski je vrlo lijep jezik.	1 2 3 4 5

9. Ne sviđaju mi se metode predavanja naše nastavnice.	1 2 3 4 5
10. Engleski će mi pomoći u daljnjem školovanju.	1 2 3 4 5
11. Moje je predznanje tako malo da bih nešto mogao/mogla naučiti jedino da počnem od početka (a to, dakako, ne mogu).	1 2 3 4 5
12. Volim izgovarati engleske riječi.	1 2 3 4 5
13. Želim se oženiti osobom iz SAD, Velike Britanije itd.	1 2 3 4 5
14. Dobio/dobila sam lošu ocjenu pa nemam volje učiti.	1 2 3 4 5
15. Engleski često koristim za razgovor sa strancima.	1 2 3 4 5
16. Sviđaju mi se engleske riječi.	1 2 3 4 5
17. Naša nastavnica nepravedno ocjenjuje.	1 2 3 4 5
18. Radije učim nešto korisnije od engleskog jezika.	1 2 3 4 5
19. Engleski će mi pomoći u budućem zanimanju.	1 2 3 4 5
20. Da je nastava zanimljivija, imao/imala bih volju učiti.	1 2 3 4 5
21. Engleski jezik vrlo lijepo zvuči.	1 2 3 4 5
22. Radije bih učio/učila neki drugi strani jezik.	1 2 3 4 5
23. Engleski nam pomaže da postanemo dio svijeta.	1 2 3 4 5
24. Engleski je pretežak za mene.	1 2 3 4 5
25. Želim znati engleski da bih mogao/mogla živjeti u SAD, Velikoj Britaniji itd.	1 2 3 4 5
26. Engleski mi koristi u svakidašnjem životu za razumijevanje pop glazbe, filmova i sl.	1 2 3 4 5
27. Engleski je glup jezik.	1 2 3 4 5
28. Naša nastavnica nije motivirana za rad s nama.	1 2 3 4 5
29. S engleskim mogu proširiti svoju opću kulturu.	1 2 3 4 5
30. Želim jednog dana posjetiti rođake/prijatelje u SAD-u, Australiji itd. pa će mi engleski dobro doći.	1 2 3 4 5
31. Nastavni materijali potiču me na učenje.	1 2 3 4 5
32. Roditelji me tjeraju da učim engleski.	1 2 3 4 5

33. S engleskim mogu putovati po cijelom svijetu.	1 2 3 4 5
34. Ne učim engleski jer imam lošu nastavnicu.	1 2 3 4 5
35. Sa znanjem engleskoga mogao/mogla bih čitati književna djela u originalu.	1 2 3 4 5
36. Naša nastavnica previše pozornosti pridaje dobrim učenicima.	1 2 3 4 5
37. Engleski mi katkad koristi da prevedem upute na stranim aparatima (npr. kućanskim).	1 2 3 4 5
38. Želim znati engleski da bih više saznao/saznala o životu Engleza, Amerikanaca, Australaca itd.	1 2 3 4 5

Hvala na sudjelovanju!

Sažetak

Cilj ovog rada je usporediti motivaciju učenika strukovnih srednjih škola i gimnazija pri učenju engleskog jezika kao stranog jezika. Prvi dio rada donosi teorijski pregled afektivnog područja i motivacije kao jednog od presudnih faktora koji utječu na usvajanje jezika. Štoviše, predstavljene su i neke teorije o motivaciji, kao i modeli učenja. U drugom dijelu rada predstavljeno je istraživanje o motivaciji pri učenju engleskog kao stranog jezika među učenicima strukovnih srednjih škola i gimnazija. Rezultati su pokazali kako je među hrvatskim učenicima najreprezentativnija uporabno-komunikacijska motivacija, nakon koje slijedi afektivna motivacija, dok se ostale komponente čine manje značajnima.

Ključne riječi: motivacija, strukovna škola, gimnazija, Hrvatska, engleski kao strani jezik