

JIHOČESKÁ UNIVERZITA V ČESKÝCH BUDĚJOVICÍCH
FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
ÚSTAV ANGLISTIKY

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

UNCOVERING THE L2 MOTIVATIONAL SYSTEM: A PILOT STUDY OF CZECH AND
POLISH STUDENTS

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Helena Lohrová, Ph. D.

Autor práce: Elena Dacheva

Studijní obor: Anglický jazyk a literatura – Španělský jazyk a literatura

Ročník: 2.

2016

Prohlašuji, že svojí bakalářskou práci jsem vypracovala samostatně pouze s použitím pramenů a literatury uvedených v seznamu citované literatury.

Prohlašuji, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. V platném znění souhlasím se zveřejněním své bakalářské práce, a to v nezkrácené podobě elektronickou cestou ve veřejně přístupné části databáze STAG provozované Jihočeskou univerzitou v Českých Budějovicích na jejích internetových stránkách, a to se zachováním mého autorského práva k odevzdanému textu této kvalifikační práce. Souhlasím dále s tím, aby toutéž elektronickou cestou byly v souladu s uvedeným ustanovením zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. Zveřejněny posudky školitele a oponentů práce i záznam o průběhu a výsledky obhajoby kvalifikační práce. Rovněž souhlasím s porovnáním textu mé kvalifikační práce s databází kvalifikačních prací a systémem na odhalování plagiátů.

České Budějovice, 28.7.2016

.....

Elena Dacheva

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Mgr. Helena Lohrová, Ph. D. for her patience and thorough guidance through my work. Secondly, I would like to thank the students of the University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice and the students from the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, for their kind participation in my research. Last but not least, I would like to thank Peter F. for helping me with the statistical analysis of my data.

Anotace

Cílem této bakalářské práce je prozkoumat motivační systém osvojování druhého jazyka u českých a polských studentů studujících anglický jazyk a literaturu na Jihočeské univerzitě v Českých Budějovicích a na Jagellonské univerzitě v Krakově. Výzkum byl inspirován dvěma předchozími studiemi. Zaprvé to je Dörnyeiho maďarská studie, která se zaměřuje na přístup k jazyku a motivaci ke studiu jazyka a jejíž výsledky vedly autora k vytvoření teorie „L2 Motivational Self System“. Dále komparativní studie realizovaná v Japonsku, Číně a Iránu vedená Taguchi a kol., kteří zjišťovali, zda je Dörnyeiho teorie aplikovatelná i v jiných zemích. Cílem této práce je poskytnout čtenáři přehled problematiky motivace z hlediska psychologie a především z hlediska psychologvistiky, kde motivace hraje významnou roli při osvojování druhého jazyka. Můj výzkum má za cíl ověřit Dörnyeiho teorii „L2 Motivational Self System“ v České Republice a Polsku, kde podobný výzkum zatím nebyl proveden. V první kapitole seznamuji čtenáře s obecným významem motivace, se základními teoriemi motivace a jejich vývojem. Druhá kapitola se zabývá významem a funkcí motivace při osvojování druhého jazyka. Ve třetí kapitole představuji výsledky dvou zahraničních studií z Maďarska a Asie. Čtvrtá, závěrečná, kapitola je věnována mému vlastnímu dotazníkovému výzkumu v České republice a Polsku.

Klíčová slova: motivace, druhý jazyk, motivační dimenze, L2 Motivational Self System, čeští a polští studenti angličtiny, korelační analýza, dotazník.

Annotation

The bachelor thesis seeks to discover the L2 motivational system among Czech and Polish students, more precisely among students studying English language and literature at the University of South Bohemia in the Czech Republic and at the Jagiellonian University in Poland. The research undertaken was inspired by two studies. Firstly, Dörnyei's study conducted in Hungary, where the main focus of the research were language attitudes and language learning motivation. Its results led Dörnyei to outline a new approach which conceptualized second language (L2) learning motivation, called the 'L2 Motivational Self System'. Secondly, Taguchi *et al.*'s 'Comparative study in Japan, China and Iran', who undertook their study to examine if Dörnyei's new System was country-specific. The aim of the thesis is to provide the reader with a meaningful insight into the topic of 'motivation' both as part of psychology and its transition to psycholinguistics, where motivation is represented as an important influencer of the learner's language acquisition. My research was undertaken in order to examine Dörnyei's 'L2 Motivational Self System' in the Czech Republic and Poland. To my knowledge, such a focus has never been adopted in these countries before. In Chapter One, I inform the reader about the general meaning of 'motivation' and evolution of motivation theories through time. Chapter Two discusses the meaning of motivation and its functions in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Chapter Three addresses the findings of two foreign studies carried out in Asia and Hungary. Finally, Chapter Four is dedicated to my own comparative research between the two universities in the Czech Republic and Poland.

Key words: motivation, Second Language (L2), motivational dimensions, L2 Motivational Self System, Czech and Polish university learners of English, correlational analysis, survey.

Contents

Introduction.....	6
I. Exploring motivation from the psychological perspective.....	9
1.1 What is motivation?.....	9
1.1.1 Introduction to motivation theories in psychology.....	12
1.1.2 Creation of reductionist models.....	13
1.1.3 Creation of motivation theories through time.....	14
II. Motivation to learn English as an L2.....	18
2.1. In history.....	18
2.1.1 The social psychological period.....	18
2.1.2 The cognitive-situated period.....	21
2.1.3 The process-oriented period.....	22
2.1.4 The L2 Motivational Self System (the socio-dynamic period).....	25
III. The Hungarian and Asian study.....	28
3.1 The Hungarian study.....	29
3.2 The comparative study among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian students.....	30
IV. Uncovering the L2 Motivational System among Czech and Polish students.....	32
4.1 Purpose of the study.....	32
4.2 Participants.....	32
4.3 University of South Bohemia and the Jagiellonian University – a cultural backdrop.....	33
4.4 Survey design.....	35
4.5 Data analysis.....	36
4.6.1 The procedure for Cronbach Alpha analysis.....	38
4.6.2 Correlational analysis.....	40
4.7 Results discussion.....	45
4.8 Conclusion.....	47
Works cited.....	51
Appendix 1: English Learner Survey.....	53

Introduction

Motivation plays an important role in learners' studying process. It might come from within the learner him/herself or from an outside influence. Psychology has taken the term under its wings and characterised it as a challenging phenomenon to define but at the same time declared it as an individual concept which leads one into action. Motivation drives person's internal wishes to become true. When we decide to achieve something we automatically turn our desire into motivation. One finds him/herself under a constant pressure from the society, therefore, the need to be successful forces us into feeling motivated all the time. In the first chapter of my bachelor thesis the meaning of the term motivation is reviewed from a psychological point of view, and how it was evolving through the years.

Scholars have created many theories which tried to conceptualize this term but the content of each one was not consistent enough to engulf it whole. Theories were rewritten, modified and re-analysed, which led to constant confusion and never ending opinions on a concept which was very personal and difficult to define with one simple definition. The number of living creatures which exist on our planet equals to the number of possible motivation theories. Psychologists have tried to gather similar motivational drives into several groups which seems like the only reasonable solution to categorizing motivation and its types. Once the general grounds for motivation are set in the first chapter, Chapter Two specializes on a topic which concerns second language acquisition specifically, i.e., motivation in psycholinguistics and its prominent role in one's learning process. How were second language (L2) theories created and changed through time? What were the most important theories and researches which shaped the motivational theories in the field of second language acquisition? The reader will come across names such as: Gardner and Clément, Dörnyei, Ushioda, and Taguchi *et al.* multiple times, since these are the pioneers who influenced my work and research. In the third chapter I introduce the two studies which inspired my research at the University of South Bohemia in the Czech Republic and at the Jagiellonian University in Poland. The studies in Hungary and Asia are pioneering works which started new eras in motivational L2 theories. Dörnyei's 'L2 Motivational Self System' has explained many issues connected with 'instrumental' and 'integrative' motivational

dimensions, which in general were thought to be applicable in monolingual countries, but the truth is not quite so. The fourth chapter of my bachelor thesis is dedicated to my own research, which I undertook in the Czech Republic and Poland.

One of the purposes of my research is to examine if Dörnyei's 'L2 Motivational Self System' is applicable in the countries where I administered my survey. Through correlation and Cronbach Alpha analyses in the SPSS program, I provide answers about the relationships between motivational dimensions such as: 'criterion measure', 'ideal L2 self', 'ought-to L2 self', 'instrumentality', 'integrativeness', 'family influence', 'cultural interest', 'attitudes to learning English' and 'attitudes to the L2 community'; which brings the reader closer to understanding learners' motivation to learn English as a second language at University.

I. Exploring motivation from the psychological perspective

This chapter represents a brief introduction to the topic of motivation from the psychological point of view. Why is motivational psychology important? How did motivational psychology evolve and what is it about? Motivation is one of the explanations used when excusing or complementing individual's behaviour. Under the same external and social influences, people still tend to behave differently whilst attempting to achieve the same goals. This individual behaviour happens due to the differences of motivation each one of us possesses. Why do some students perform well in school when equally talented ones underachieve? Why do some people work harder at their job and their colleagues do not? Individual behaviour requires consideration of personal motivation, which triggers in motivational psychology many new possibilities for research, exploration and creation of new motivation fields such as the field of 'L2 motivation'. This field deals with Foreign Language Learners' motivation to study a second language, and it has brought many new insights into psycholinguistic as introduced in the next chapter.

1.1 What is motivation?

According to *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* the word *motivation* is derived from "motive, origin ME: from OFr. *motif*, from late L. *motivus*, from *movere* 'to move'" (929). What moves a person to strive for an action, to take a particular course, and not others and to persist in achieving it. Nevertheless, *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology* terms motivation as "an intervening process or an internal state of an organism that impels or drives it into action" (454). This is comparative to the Oxford definition. Motivation is a process which individuals create when they find themselves in a certain position. Such position may occur when one requires impetus to do or say something, a drive to do more than one thinks is capable of. However, this fact, which labels motivation as an energizer of behaviour, is not considered or defined by authors in a single way. As Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda say, some theorists view the state when we feel motivated as a general state, something that we feel always, a generalized drive, we do not have particularly some specific goal or directionality (113). In the early approaches, Robert S. Woodworth relied on the fact that behaviour is caused by 'stimuli', ignoring the motivational aspect completely. It

might be compared to that of a car; it has a drive mechanism and a steering mechanism, but might be going nowhere (28). For example, our behaviour may be explained by an internal need, such as hunger, which drives us to an activity – to eat, after which our organism is put into ‘quiescence’ or a peaceful position until the need strikes again (29). Considering people, an example of such behaviour occurs when someone is angry, the feeling of being angry is what is dominant in that situation, one is not led by a rational behaviour which would provoke a different and much more calm reaction in him or her. The thought of proving our point is the motivator, it is a quick lift to our anger, a ‘stimuli’, but once we are angry we forget about our purpose which drove us, in the first point, to such state. Nevertheless, it needs to be realized that these early concepts have based their conclusion mostly on observing animals, observations and analyses on human mind have still been at their first beginnings.

On the other hand, one may argue that motivational states are specific to particular drives and needs, and they must always be analysed according to specific goals and aims. In the study of human psychosocial motivation, this state is taken as axiomatic, meaning, it is self-evident, it does not need to be explained or proven in any way because one’s motivation is characterized by observing why a particular behaviour happens. However, motivation is not the single factor determining a certain behaviour. There are other factors, such as: the availability of the goal, the possible presence of conflicts, and unconscious factors (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 29).

Turning to *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology*, it divides researches on motivation in three categories: (a) physiological, which focuses on the primary drives: hunger, thirst, temperature maintenance, pain avoidance, sex; (b) the behavioural, elaborates and refines drive theory and learning theory, what could be better in our behaviour when we are striving for our aim, what is our incentive that drives us to do something and (c) the psychosocial, which studies complex human behaviours: such as the need for achievement, need for hierarchy (455).

A different way of characterizing motivation has professor Jiří Mareš, who states that in specialized English, concerning with definitions and theories on scientific topics, we come across a diversity of theories concerning motivation (252). Jiří Mareš argues that we

understand motivation as a collection of internal and external factors which influence human behaviour. According to him, there are three sides of motivation: a structural one that tries to capture different complex structural models and contains particular variables from which motivation is composed; then a continuing side or a process side, and a product side (253). Jiří Mareš's characterization is reasonable, since when we strive to do something, we do it for different reasons, which cover the structural pattern. An example of particular variables in the structural pattern, which compose our motivation, can be either internal (what we would like to become; what we are expected to be) or external (family influence, peer pressure, etc.); the realization or acting upon our motivation is the process pattern and the product is what has motivation made us do.

According to Robert C. Beck, one further aspect connected with motivation, which should not be overlooked, is the role of emotions (31). Emotions are very closely related to motivation. Hence, emotional states have motivational properties, we feel a certain way because of something, moreover, as mentioned before, motivation is characterized as an energizer, it is important to say that *that* energizer has a certain emotional tone behind it.

Robert C. Beck writes that the study of emotion connected with motivation has been a very problematic issue to define and characterize accurately, due to the different approaches and contradictory data, as it usually happens when many different opinions meet and discuss topics which are very individualistic (33). Such topic is the topic of 'emotion', but in order to discuss emotion one needs to define it. How do we define 'emotion' in the first place? Do we ask ourselves how many emotions there are? The answer lies in who we ask and how they define emotion. When talking about feelings in theories, we are talking about *affect*, a term which has replaced the word 'feeling' due to the broader scope of the word 'affect' which in contrary to 'feeling' bares in its meaning something that has affected us, there's an initiation for our 'feeling'(35). The important role of affect in motivation theories will be discussed further below.

So far, it may be concluded there are many theories, opinions, and definitions concerning human motivation. They have a different level of generality and they highlight different variables (internal or external). Therefore, as a part of the branches of Psychology, 'motivation' has caused many problems only by its complicated and almost non-definable

meaning. Non definable due to myriads of definitions given by scholars. A super theory of motivation will always remain an impossible desire. After all, motivation theories explain why entities behave and act as they do, and every person is a single entity, every person has a different reason, so should there be millions of different theories defining motivation as well?

Consequently, one single theory cannot capture the broad scope of the meaning of 'motivation'. However, when considering the meaning of 'motivation' most researchers agree that: "motivation is the choice of a particular action, the persistence of it, the effort expended on it. In other words, motivation is responsible for: *why* people decide to do something, *how long* they are willing to sustain the activity, *how hard* they are going to pursue it" (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 4).

1.1.1 Introduction to motivation theories in psychology

According to Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, very early theories of motivation have been influenced by the work of Freud, *The Complete Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (4). In his work, Freud states that "not all motivated behaviour can be seen as the result of the rational, the conscious or the wilful. Much of behaviour is motivated by unconscious factors working through a network of defence mechanisms, symbolic disguises and psychosexual cloaks" (qtd. in *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology* 455). Freud writes about unconscious drives, intuition, emotions and instincts shaping the behaviour of the entity (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 5). In conclusion, motivation has been seen as an emotional characteristic of the human. These theories are reformed in the 1st decade of the 21th century as well, due to the development of parallel branches in psychology. Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda list Evolutionary Psychology as a branch of this type. Evolutionary Psychology is a very modern scientific branch which tries to observe how evolution has shaped not the physical parts of the human organism but human behaviour and the mind (6). Evolutionary psychology has its origins in Evolutionary Biology, which roots were settled when Darwin published "On the Origin of Species" in 1859. Robert C. Beck calls this the 'Regulatory Approach'(25). This approach has a biological tradition which connects with Darwin's research and to the so called experimental medicine. Scholars have focused on the cognitive perspective of animals. They observed how mental activity, as a starting point, can help organisms adapt in

a new environment, apart from the physiological changes of the body (25). According to the Johan J. Bolhuis *et al.* in their article in the ‘Public Library of Science’, for the past 30 years, the evolutionary interpretation of human cognition has been dominated by the field of evolutionary psychology, as mentioned above. Anyway, Johan J. Bolhuis *et al.* say that this field is based on assumptions which are now questioned by new findings and approaches from genetics, neuroscience and evolutionary biology. In connection to motivation, evolutionary psychology is uncovering the importance of emotions and motives, which lead us to seeing motivation even nowadays as an unconscious process (Johan J Bolhuis *et al.*). Nevertheless, in the second half of the 20th century, scholars have directed their concepts of motivation as a part of cognitive, conscious processes, such as: goals and expectations, self-value and observation of our own actions. With this, in that time, a division was formed between two meanings considering motivation, i.e., a conscious and unconscious process; cognition versus affection (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 5). Cognitive perspectives on motivation today are equally active and engaged in the concepts of motivation as the resurgence of beliefs pointing out motivation as a product of emotions. Nowadays there is a challenge of developing a theoretical connection between these two dimensions in an understandable and coherent way (Ryan, qtd. in Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 5). There has been an attempt to conceive a theory which tries to integrate both motivational conscious and unconscious processes/cognition and affect, in a unified framework, i.e., Weiner and his *attribution theory*, about which I will talk further below.

1.1.2 Creation of reductionist models

As Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda argue, over the years, researchers have developed different constructs of motivation concerning the cognitive/affect perspective. However, these constructs have lacked comprehensiveness since they have based their theories only around several motivational aspects (8), considering students for example, in account may be taken aspects such as: family and school environment. Anyway, this tendency to create such theories is not surprising at all, since human behaviour is a complex issue and the number of potential triggers to a certain action is very extensive. According to this issue, researchers have striven towards creating reductionist models (8). These models reduce the potential triggers of human behaviour by identifying key variables which could explain a significantly

bigger number of triggers of people's different types of behaviour, but which key factors to choose as representatives of the others 'sub-factors'? (9). Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, compare this to a loosely knitted net, which represents human behaviour. A difficult task for motivational psychology is knowing which knots to pull, i.e., which key factors to choose and to be given the key roles in the theories. Another challenge is how to cast the net in and maintain its meaningful shape, meaning, what kind of relationship is to be highlighted between the key factors (9).

However, these theories explain motivational behaviour which is to a certain degree isolated and specific. Other factors which may interfere in the person's life are not included. They do not cover all the factors a person is surrounded by. For example, a motivational theory may cover only concepts when one has decided to enrol in a language course, but does not cover the fact that a learner is always multitasking during the day and there are myriad of factors which could take off one's attention or focus from what one wants. There is competition, pressure, other duties at school or at home.

1.1.3 Creation of motivation theories through time

As introduced in Chapter One, in the second half of the 20th century theories of motivation were influenced by the cognitive perspective which was influenced by the rise of Behaviourism. In behaviourist theories there is great of a focus given to the social context where one is living, and how this context influences one's thinking. External environment influenced motivation in terms of rewards and punishment of one's behaviour (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 6).

Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda claim that one of the first influential theories in the second half of the 20th century was the *Expectancy-value theory*. This theory states that individuals take part into a certain action depending on their expectation of how well they will do on the task and how much the achievement will be valued, depending on their preferences. The pioneer who created a comprehensive model of achievement motivation was J. W. Atkinson (13). Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda also state that the 'expectancy-value' theory is made from four components: expectancy of success, incentive values, need for achievement and fear of failure. The *expectancy of success* includes cognitive processes such as: analysis or rethinking one's past experiences, judging one's own abilities and

competence and attempting to maintain one's self esteem. *Incentive values* are the values which encourage us to do certain actions depending on the incentive, or the reward (e.g. if we are offered money to perform a certain behaviour, then the money are the incentive to our behaviour). Each one of us has different incentive values which could pull us to do something (14). Concerning the *need for achievement*, Atkinson says that individuals with high need for achievement are interested in excellence and succeeding just for the sake of succeeding. They initiate work with higher intensity by themselves, and continue to persist in their failure. These individuals' need for achievement is part of their personality and affects every aspect of their life, even education. *The fear of failure* is opposite from *the need for achievement*. They differ in the prevailing behaviour, the one on which the individual spends most of her or his energy on, i.e., to avoid a negative outcome rather than to focus on approaching a positive outcome (Atkinson and Raynor 1974, qtd in Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 14).

Bernard Weiner's attribution theory connects with Atkinson's component of the achievement theory, i.e., the expectancy of success. It represents the cognitive process of processing one's past experience, as mentioned above. In the 1980s this theory was dominant in the research of student motivation. Attribution theory states that the student gives the importance of the attributes he or she gains due to past achievements or failures, which influence her or his present drive (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 15). As mentioned briefly in paragraph 1.1, this theory was also one of the first cognitive motivation theory which included emotions to its meaning. Emotions are integrated as a consequence to someone's gained attributions. For example, attributing to one's character a factor such as 'lack of aptitude to learn a second language' causes feelings of shame or humiliation, or disgust towards learning the language, since from previous experience, an individual has concluded that he or she does not have the gift to learn a foreign language (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 15).

The next set of theories which one needs to pay attention to are the 'goal theories'. The cognitive concept of having a 'goal' has replaced the concepts 'need' or 'drive', which are very often mentioned in the earlier motivation theories. The 'goal theory' represents a complex of three features: *goal setting, goal-orientation, goal content and multiplicity*. The

goal setting theory is comparable to the *expectancy of success theory*, meaning, the commitment to reach a certain goal is enhanced when one believes that the goal is possible and important to reach (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 20). According to Locke, these are the settings and conclusions he reached while observing the behaviour of a human reaching a goal: the more difficult the goal, the bigger the achievement; if the goal is more specific then the performance would be more accurate; when a goal is easy to reach the commitment is not that high, since it does not require a big effort; high commitment is reached when one knows that the goal is very important and reachable (Locke, qtd. in Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 20). Unlike the *goal setting theory* which was originally dedicated to motivation in the workplace, the *goal-orientation theory* is based on students and their performances in academic institutions. According to Ames, students can be divided into two groups: those who adopt *mastery orientation*, and those who adopt *performance orientation*. Students with mastery orientation believe that their effort will lead to success, and those with performance orientation view learning as an ‘ego-involvement goal’, they perform only to reach a goal which will give them a recognition in the public (Ames, qtd. in Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 20). While these two theories are concerned mainly with the achievement of the individual, student’s goal orientation may not always be directed towards academic success. Wentzel has led a research on students’ content of their goal, i.e., what was the real matter of their goal, whether they strove to make friends, please the teachers, avoid punishment etc. (Wentzel, qtd. in Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 22). Wentzel’s work dwells on proving how academic accomplishment has benefited from multiple social goals as well, and how the development of social competence influences positively on one’s academic competence (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 22).

As one can notice there is a division between the theories concerning the concept of individualism and social context. Can we treat individuals as autonomous agents or is their motivation shaped by social norms, values, meanings, which represent the social context? As de Bot *et al.* say:

A language learner is regarded as a dynamic subsystem within a social system with a great number of interacting internal dynamic sub-sub systems, which function within a multitude of their external dynamic systems. The learner has his/her own

cognitive Eco system consisting of intentionality, cognition, intelligence, motivation, aptitude, L1, L2, and so on. The cognitive Eco system in turn is related to the degree of exposure to language, maturity, level of education and so on, which in turn is related to the SOCIAL ECOSYSTEM, consisting of the environment with which the individual interacts.[..]. (qtd. in Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 38)

A reasonable answer, to the question mentioned before, could stand behind the thought that human behaviour is a complex dynamic system where a great number of mutually connected components affect the system simultaneously. Because of the mutual reactions between the components we could never ascribe a change in the behaviour to one component only, since they do not function in isolation (Z Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 37).

II. Motivation to learn English as an L2

In the first chapter motivation is addressed from the psychological point of view. The discussions led on the topic dealt with motivation and the types of motivation in general which can characterize human behaviour, they were mostly applicable, the early ones on animals, and the later ones on the work force, with exception to the ‘attribution’ and ‘goal-setting’ theory, which can be applied on learning as well.

This chapter focuses on the motivation one possess when learning a second language. The study of L2 motivation has evolved into an independent research and study field. It has originated due to the issues the learning of an L2 provokes, such as: social integration, psychological, behavioural and cultural enquiries which one needs to have in order to become a fluent speaker.

2.1. In history

According to Dörnyei (2005) there are three distinct periods concerning the development L2 motivation theories: (a) *the social psychological period* (1959-1990); (b) *the cognitive-situated period* (during the 1990s); (c) *the process-oriented period* (the shift of the century) and (d) *socio-dynamic period* of L2 motivation theory (current times) (66). This chapter is focused mainly on the *social psychological period* and Dörnyei’s new theory of ‘L2 Motivational Self System’ in the *socio-dynamic period*, the core principles of which were introduced by Dörnyei in 2005. These two periods are closely connected because the social psychological period presented a counter view to Dörnyei’s new concept of the ‘self framework’, which broadened the scope of ‘L2 Motivation’ research since then. The *cognitive -situated* and *process-oriented period* represent an inevitable shift which brought ‘L2 Motivation’ research to a much more elaborated, highly-developed science field.

2.1.1 The social psychological period

Dörnyei (2005) lists as pioneers of the first period, Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert with their work on the bilingual grounds in Canada (67). They thought that the existence of two communities with a different first language and mother tongue in one place motivates the speakers to learn the other (second) language in order to better

communication, cultural understanding and political affiliation with the other community. Nevertheless, a key issue in this concept is that learner's attitudes towards the L2 and the L2 community influence the desire to learn the language. When learning a new language one has to devote his/her time acquiring the culture of the people who speak that language, which is similar to the learning motivation theories mentioned in the first chapter. Anyway, learning motivation when acquiring a new language is different from those mentioned before. The new speakers are willing "to identify with members of another ethnolinguistic group and to take on very subtle aspects of their behaviour, including their distinctive style of speech and their language"(Gardner and Lambert, qtd. in Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 40).

The *social psychological perspective* deduced the name from its scope of effect. It concerns attitudes and relations between different linguistic communities (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 40). In the field of SLA, Gardner and Lambert's work has been pioneering for highlighting non-cognitive, or affective factors, specifically motivation as significant cause for the variability in language learning success. This means that researches before have put focus on cognitive factors, such as the students' ability to learn a second language and their aptitude. But Gardner and Lambert thought that these cognitive factors are insufficient in order to determine individually someone's achievement, therefore, motivation plays a very prominent role (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 41). Gardner and Lambert's concepts of motivation have triggered the rise and shaping of L2 motivation, consecutively, their theory of L2 motivation is analysed more deeply.

According to Gardner, L2 motivation comprises three components: (a) *motivational intensity or effort*, (b) *desire to learn the language* and (c) *attitudes towards learning the language*' and the three components which every truly motivated learner possesses are: effort, will or want (cognition) and task enjoyment (affect) (qtd. in Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 2011, 41). In Gardner's theory there is a closely knitted relationship between motivation and orientation, where orientation represents the 'goal'. The role of orientations is to motivate learners, in other words, to push them towards a set of goals. However, Gardner's theory orientations are not strictly part of motivation, they just function as antecedents of the motivation. Before a learner is truly motivated, he or she needs a goal and

that would arouse his/her motivation. Accordingly, two orientations are created, labelled as *instrumental* and *integrative*, which are the most known concepts associated with Gardner's work in the L2 motivation field. (Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 41). Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda define these orientations as follows:

Integrative orientation concerns a positive disposition towards the L2 group and the desire to interact with and even become similar to valued members of that community; it was defined in Gardner Lambert's pioneering study as the 'willingness to be like valued members of the language community'. *Instrumental orientation* is the utilitarian counterpart of integrative orientation in Gardner's theory, pertaining to the potential pragmatic gains of L2 proficiency, such as getting a better job or a higher salary. (41; Gardner and Lambert's qtd. in Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda 41)

The study which initiated such discoveries was Gardner and Lambert's research in Canada in 1985. The colourful social situation in Canada has led these two linguists to undertake a research concerning the multicultural communication between the Francophone and Anglophone communities. Dörnyei (2005) says:

Gardner and Lambert viewed second languages as mediating factors between ethnolinguistic communities and thus regarded the motivation to learn the language of the other community as primary force responsible for enhancing or hindering intercultural communication and affiliation. These researchers adopted a social psychological approach that was based on the main tenet that "students' attitudes towards specific language group are bound to influence how successful they will be incorporating aspects of that language". (67; Gardner, qtd. in Dörnyei 67)

In conclusion, it was not until the 1990s that motivational psychologists started to show an active interest in the social context of the motivation. Therefore, the view on foreign languages was changing. Dörnyei (2005) argues that:

Gardner and Lambert's claim indicated that unlike several other school subjects, a foreign language is not a socioculturally neutral field but it is affected by a range of sociocultural factors such as language attitude, cultural stereotypes, and even

geopolitical considerations. This social argument has been accepted by researchers all over the world, regardless of the actual learning situation they were working in; (68).

Gardner introduced a new motivational variable in his work and that is ‘Attitudes towards the learning situation’, which includes attitudes of the learner towards the language teacher and the L2 course (Dörnyei 2005, 68). This variable is logical, since previous models of motivation research focused mainly on the cognitive factors of the student, as said before. An important role in student’s natural acquisition of a foreign language plays the affectionate side as well. Gardner’s model turned tables in the L2 motivation research, it became very dominant, so his research was copied among scholars, until the theory remained unmodified over time and it could not be applied to various environments. If one analyses more deeply the environment where Gardner did his research, would reach these conclusions: it is an environment where integration is happening naturally, there are real existing groups where an L2 learner can integrate into. But what if one undertakes this research in a country with one official language, and that would not be English, countries such as the Czech Republic or Poland, to which lawfully declared English community a learner of English would integrate in? In Canada, Francophone communities can integrate into an Anglophone community, since English is an official language in Canada as well, and vice versa. As a consequence, “after the 1990s, there was a growing conceptual gap in educational psychology (...) and the time was ripe for a new phase in L2 motivation research” (Dörnyei 2005, 71).

2.1.2 The cognitive-situated period

The grounds of this period are thought to be settled by two researchers, Graham Crooked and Richards Schmidt, in the 1991. But the need for change was in the air since the turn of the 1980s and 1990s. The cognitive-situated period is classified by the desire to bring the cognitive into the research, which undermined motivation psychologists to set up a new theory and undertake new researches based on previous motivation – cognitive theories in the past (Dörnyei 2005, 74). This period might also be called as the ‘Renaissance Period’ in motivational psychology. The main tenets of this period were to prove that:

(a) how one thinks about one's abilities, possibilities, potentials, limitations, and past performances, as well as various aspects of the tasks to achieve or goals to attain (e. g., values, benefits, difficulties) is a crucial aspect of motivation. (b) to narrow down the macroperspective of the L2 motivation from whole communities to more fine-tuned and situated analysis of motivation as it operates in actual learning situations (such as language classrooms), characterized by microperspective. (74)

The declared tenets did not imply that Gardner's and his 'macroperspective' was denied, but quite the contrary, its results were compared to that of the 'microperspective' researches. After all, Gardner's work was useful for characterizing and comparing motivational patterns between different cultural communities and it dealt with issues such as multiculturalism, language globalization, intercultural communication, etc. In comparison to Gardner's theory, researches found out that classroom L2 learning is more important, dynamic, and resourceful than they thought it was (74). Dörnyei (2005) sums up many researches in this field, therefore, several conclusions are listed which adduce what the research in a classroom has provided to the field. Researchers, in general, have found out that: students shared positive attitudes towards knowing foreign languages; main reasons for lack of success were teaching and assessment methods such as rote-learning, which dwells on memorizing the material by continuous repetition; a big role in students' decision whether to take a certain foreign language at school played the quality of the teaching program (76-77). With the close approach towards classroom motivation, the cognitive-situated period set the grounds for the next period, which even in greater depth analyses the dynamics of the classroom.

2.1.3 The process-oriented period

As Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda suggest in their work, motivational theories have been trying to characterize learners' motivation over a certain span of time in order to analyse their dynamics and processes that happen while the learners acquire a particular language (60). As a learner of foreign languages, from personal experience, my L2 motivation ebbs and flows continuously. This is a natural process for every foreign language learner. One never feels motivated or demotivated continuously. Learners' motivation goes through many

periods over a span of time, as Dörnyei & Ottó (1998) suggest in their ‘Model of L2 Motivation’, where they try to describe the aspects of motivational evolution while a learner acquires a new second language (qtd. in. Dörnyei 2005, 84). In their model they break down the motivational process on temporal segments such as: initial wishes and desires; transformation of the wishes into goals; learner’s intentions on how to reach the goal and the enacting of the planned tactics or accomplishing of the goal; and evaluation of the process (Dörnyei 2005, 84). For a better overview, Dörnyei & Ottó (1998) separate the motivational process into three stages: (1) *preactional stage*, (2) *actional stage* and (3) *postactional stage*.

In the first, *preactional stage*, learners choose their motivation, by which they automatically choose the goal or task that they will pursue. In other words, the learners in this stage set the goals, form intentions and launch the action. During this stage the learners are influenced by the goal properties, meaning, if the goal is relevant, reachable; the learners’ attitudes towards the L2 and the community, how much they expect to succeed; types of strategies they are going to apply and the support they are getting from their surroundings. In the second stage, the motivational process is also called *executive motivation*, where the learners carry out the tasks and they control the actions directed towards the goal. The learners’ motivation in this stage can be influenced by the learning experience and its qualities, pleasantness, significance, learner’s self and social image. In the last, *postactional stage*, also called *motivational retrospection*, students deal with the evaluation of their success. Students process their experiences and evaluate their activities. In the classroom environment, they are mostly influenced by the received feedback, praise and grades, which paves the way for their further goals and motivation to pursue more in the future (Dörnyei 2005, 84-85).

The ‘Model of L2 Motivation’ is obviously a well starting point to understanding motivational evolution in students, but it has several shortcomings. According to the model, it seems that there is a clear cut boundaries where one’s motivation begins task management, starts and ends with self-evaluation. But can one be certain where exactly does the action start in one’s education of an L2? Dörnyei (2005) argues that during one’s action process, there are myriads of parallel actions that a learner does and they indirectly influence her or

his learning, especially in classrooms (86). Dörnyei's argument continues with reasoning that although there are internal and external forces influencing learners' acquisition, many researches have left out in their empirical data the products of the negative influences, such as 'demotivation' (90). Ushioda (2003) analysed this dark side of student motivation as follows:

The inevitable problems in classroom motivation arise when there is not a happy fusion between internal and external forces but a negative tension, where the latter dominate at the expense of the former. In other words, individual motivation becomes controlled, suppressed or distorted by external forces. (...), this may happen through negative influences in the classroom social dynamic, or through regulating forces in the educational system. (...) Collective motivation can all too easily become collective dissatisfaction or rebellion, often in the form of classroom counter-cultures defined by rejection of educational aims and values. (qtd. in Dörnyei 2005, 90)

In conclusion, the student is not the only one responsible for his or her motivational process in classroom. The student can be responsible for self-regulating her/himself but the external influence cannot be eliminated. Self-regulation can be one way of superficially eliminating external influences, after all, the learner him/herself is the most responsible for the employment of positive filtering and controlling the situation. For example, if someone turns off negative influence and focuses on forward – pointing aspects, then by putting things into positive light, the learner will succeed. On the contrary, if the learner dwells on negative feedback and does not make an effort to move on, then learner's results and progress would stagnate as well.

The *process-oriented* period has set the roots for the *current* views, from 2005 onwards, of L2 Motivation researches. There are many paths one researcher could choose to follow in his/her research, I have chosen my path towards Dörnyei's new format of 'possible -selves', which has opened new doors in the *socio-dynamic period*, and has set the grounds for my study.

2.1.4 The L2 Motivational Self System (the socio-dynamic period)

In 2005, Dörnyei (2009) outlined a new approach to L2 learning motivation, called the ‘L2 Motivational Self System’ theory. The roots of this new theory are set in previous research into the L2 field, the system, however, presents a new and reformed way of motivational thinking, focusing on the learner’s ‘self’ (9). The model has grown out of two significant theoretical developments, one is taking place in the L2 field and the other in mainstream psychology.

The first important theory, which is part of the L2 field, is Gardner and Lambert’s influential concept of *integrativeness* and *integrative motivation* in 1959. Their theory has been for the last twenty years a growing concern among researchers and it has been debated in every way possible. The reasons for disagreement among the scholars has been caused due to the lack of links that the theory of *integrativeness* has offered to the new cognitive motivational concepts, which started to emerge in motivational psychology (such as the self-determination theory), and partly because the theory is rather limited and ‘labelled’ to a certain kind of community and learning environment. The second theoretical development, which has influenced the origin of the ‘L2 Motivational Self System’, is one that has taken place in psychology, the research on the ‘self’. Accordingly, this led to a convergence of ‘self theory’ and ‘motivation theory’ in mainstream psychology and to the creation of ‘possible selves’ and ‘future self – guides’, as the biggest contribution from psychology to the new L2 motivational movement (9-10).

Psychology has always been fascinated with the ‘self’. For example, in the ‘PsychINFO’¹ database there are thousands of articles which have this term in their titles, and other terms deducted from it (self-esteem, self-determination etc.). A subgroup of this term are the two items, *possible selves* and *future self – guides*, which have brought wealth in the psychology of personality. The emergence of the subfield has become a link between personality psychology and motivational psychology. One of the most powerful concept which has been determined to make the link explicit was proposed by Markus and Nurius (1986) in their theory that centred around the concept of ‘possible selves’ (11). The term,

¹ American Psychological Association

possible selves, indicates rather a future than current-self state. Markus and Nurius explain this notion as how people conceptualize themselves as their “yet unrealised potential” (qtd. in Dörnyei 2009, 11). In other words, possible selves act as ‘future self-guides’ that one owns and serves to him/her as a forward-pointing concept to the future of themselves (11). In their seminal paper, Markus and Nurius write about three types of *possible selves*: (1) ‘ideal selves’, that we would like very much to become, (2) ‘selves that we could become’, and (3) ‘selves we are afraid of becoming’ (qtd. in Dörnyei 2009, 12). Dörnyei 2009 explains these variants as follows:

The ideal or hoped-for selves might include ‘the successful self, the creative self, the rich self, the thin self, or the loved and admired self’, whereas the feared selves could be the ‘alone self, the depressed self, the incompetent self, the alcoholic self, the unemployed self, or the bag lady self’. (...) the ‘selves that we could become’ (...) can be seen as merely a synonym of the generic term ‘possible self’ (because possible is what ‘we can become’), which was surely not the authors’ intention. So, it is more likely that these selves refer to ‘expected’ or ‘likely’ selves, that is, to the default option. Thus, the three main types of possible selves proposed by Markus Nurius refer to the best case, the worst case and the default scenarios. (12)

Possible selves often refer to ‘future self-guides’, but according to the types described above, not every type has a guiding function. The selves that we could become might be influenced by an outside person, such as family or friends, someone who expects something from us; and the feared selves serve to us as more of a setback, instead of pushing us to go forward or achieving our idealise self version. Consequently, Higgins (1987; Higgins *et al.* 1985) has divided the self theory into two concepts, ‘ideal self’ and ‘ought self’ (qtd. in Dörnyei 2009, 13).

The ‘ideal self’ refers to the representation of attributes that one would ideally like to possess (i.e., representations of hopes, aspirations, or wishes), while ‘ought self’ refers to the representation of attribute one believes one ought to possess (i.e., representation of someone else’s sense of duties, obligations or moral

responsibilities) and which may bear resemblance to one's own desires or wishes. (Dörnyei 2009, 13)

What these two concepts have in common is the property of imagination, the *ideal self*. One imagines her/himself personally as someone they would like to become, and the *ought self* is imagined by someone else, how others imagine our achievements. Aristotle defined the image in the soul as the primary motivating force in human action. He believed that if a human had an image of something to be pursued or avoided, his/her soul was moved in the same manner as his imagination, giving such effect that the making of the objects of desire felt materially present (qtd. in Dörnyei 2009, 16). This theory, works for language learners as well. Dörnyei (2009) used the concept of 'ideal L2 self and 'ought-to L2 self' in his research to proving that the term *integrativeness* is not a satisfactory variable of motivation, instead, it should be substituted with the variable: 'ideal L2 self'. The dissatisfaction with Gardner and Lambert's concept is the other trait that has led to the creation of the 'L2 Motivational Self System'. *Integrativeness* refers to the desire to learn a L2 of a valued community so that one can communicate with members of the community and sometimes even become like them. Gardner (2201) characterised the concept as follows:

Integrativeness reflects a genuine interest in learning the second language in order to come closer to the other language community. At one level, this implies an openness to, and respect for other cultural groups and ways of life, In one extreme, this might involve complete identification with the community (and possibly even withdraw from one's original group), but more commonly it might involve integration within both communities. (qtd. Dörnyei 2010, 75)

The concept of *integrativeness* is truly an enigma. It has no ambivalent equivalent in any theories in mainstream motivational and educational psychology. Moreover, the term is ambiguous, since one does not know what the target of integration is, and in many language learning environments it does not make sense. For example, classes of English in the Czech Republic, where students are introduced to the English language as a school subject, without any direct contacts with its native speakers. What is even more problematic for the second language learners is the worldwide globalisation process and the growing dominance of

Global/World English as an international language. For learners, the pressure is to form a bicultural identity in which one part of their identity is rooted in their local culture and the other to the 'global' so the latter one links them to the international mainstream. What this brings is a confusion to the language learner, that is, one does not know who is the real 'owner' of the L2. This is exactly why Gardner and Lambert's theory lacks a target for integration. Who owns the correct version of English as an L2, which the learners should blindly follow and get closer to? In Toronto's environment, the situation was clear. It is a city where two communities (French and English) exist. They are officially recognized and can interchangeably integrate among each other, therefore, this is impossible for monolingual states. Under these circumstances, Dörnyei in 2005 created the context of imagery, of *possible selves*, a superordinate vision that would keep the learners on track. The phenomenon of individuals imagining themselves has brought many results in sports, where the athlete biggest drive towards winning is the imagination of gaining the prize. This could apply to learners of an L2 as well. A prove to this statement is Dörnyei's first empirical study in Hungary, which suggested that the motivational variable 'integrativeness' could be reinterpreted as the 'Ideal L2 Self', and Taguchi *et al.*'s (2009) comparative study in Japan, China and Iran, whose aim was to examine if Dörnyei's 'Motivational L2 Self System' was country-specific.

III. The Hungarian and Asian study

This chapter summarizes two main motivational studies referred to above; both undertaken as part of the 'socio-dynamic' period, one in Hungary and the other in Asia. The Hungarian study was conducted by Dörnyei and it represented the largest motivational study at the end of 2004. The study's point of reference was students' motivation towards studying five target languages: English, German, French, Italian and Russian. Research questionnaires were administered to over 13,000 middle school students in Hungary in an interval of three years. As a consequence, the research results enabled Dörnyei the formulation of a new motivational concept – the 'L2 Motivational Self System'. A further piece of research that stemmed from Dörnyei's original study was that undertaken by Taguchi *et al.*'s comparative study. One of its main purposes was to validate Dörnyei's 'L2 Motivational Self System' in

three important Asian contexts, namely, in Japan, China and Iran. The latter study served as guide to my own research, where one of my objectives was also to validate whether Dörnyei's concept could be extended and applied to two additional countries, the Czech Republic and Poland, in which English is taught as a second language.

3.1 The Hungarian study

The Hungarian study was developed in collaboration with one of Robert Gardner's associates, Richard Clément, therefore, *integrativeness* and *instrumentality* had a prominent place in it. Apart from these two dimensions, Z. Dörnyei and R. Clément also measured several other attitudinal, motivational dimensions, such as: *Direct contact with L2 speakers* (i.e., learner's attitudes towards meeting L2 speakers and travelling to their country), *Cultural Interest* (i.e., learner's interest in the target's language media; e.g. pop music, magazines, films; books and art etc.), *Vitality of L2 community* (i.e., learner's perception of the importance and wealth of the target community), *Milieu* (i.e., learner's general concept of the importance of foreign languages, and their friends' and parents' views) and *Linguistic self-confidence* (i.e., confidence in practical usage of the target language) (Dörnyei 2010, 75-76). The survey Dörnyei and his co-workers conducted among the students was a close-ended questionnaire where every section contained topic related questions (of the motivational dimension they belonged to). The results were computed in correlations of the various motivational dimension in relation to the 'criterion measure', *Language choice*. The term 'criterion measure' refers in this case to the degree of the learner's desire to learn a particular L2. From the results, it was surprising that when the researchers computed those multiple correlations, the *criterion measure* had the highest correlation with *integrativeness*, which showed that *integrativeness* played an important role in learner's motivational disposition. These results, did not made sense, since Hungary is a monolingual country and in such environment 'integrating' was not meaningful (since there was nothing really to integrate into). Accordingly, Dörnyei concluded that they need a new theory in order to explain the new findings: the conceptualization of 'possible selves', and the theory of the 'Ideal L2 Self' and 'Ought-to L2 Self' (Dörnyei 2010, 77-78). According to Dörnyei (2010): "if our ideal L2 self is associated with the mastery of an L2, that is, if the person that we

would like to become is proficient in the L2, we can describe Gardner’s terminology as having an integrative disposition” (78).

3.2 The comparative study among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian students

Taguchi *et al.* tested Dörnyei ‘Self’ theory in Asia, using very similar methods to the Hungarian study. Questionnaires with close-ended questions were given to over 5000 students of English. The close-ended questions belonged to particular motivational dimensions. The difference between the Hungarian and the Asian study was that Taguchi *et al.* apart from using the same motivational dimension as the Hungarian study, they added several new dimensions to their questionnaire, such as: *ideal L2 self* (refers to the ‘L2-specific facet of one’s ideal self’), *ought-to L2 self* (measures the attributes one believes one ought to possess, such as: duties, obligations, responsibilities etc.), *family influence* (how much family and friends influence one’s learning), *instrumentality – promotion* (measures the regulation of personal goals to become successful, such as getting high – proficiency certificate in English in order to make more money or find a better job), *instrumentality-prevention* (measures one’s motivation to learn English only to such extent as passing an exam), *attitudes to learning English* (measures the immediate relationship of the learner with the English language) and *attitudes to the community* (measures learner’s attitudes towards the community of the English language) as two separate groups. The *criterion measure*, *integrativeness*, *instrumentality* and *cultural interest* remained the same as in the Hungarian study (68-76). Another noticeable difference between the studies, is that in Asia, Taguchi *et al.* focused on the English language only, and they administered the survey among middle school students, University students (English majors), University students (non-English majors) and adult learners, whereas in Hungary the survey was given out to middle school students only.

By using a similar way of data analysis, i.e., correlation relations between the variables, Taguchi *et al.* found a good confirmation for the proposed ‘self’ system. The study specifically tested the relationship between *integrativeness* and the *ideal L2 self*, which produced a correlation of ‘0.54’². This meant that the two concepts were closely related.

² Dörnyei (2007: 223) says that correlations of 0.3 to 0.5 can be meaningful, and when two variables show correlations of 0.6 and above, they measure more or less the same thing

Also, the *ideal L2 self* was consistently found to correlate high (42%) with the intended effort (*criterion measure*), as well as *integrativeness*, but the correlation number was slightly less high (32%). This meant that students' effort to learn English was closely connected to their 'ideal L2 self'. Then, imagining being successful in the learning stimulated their effort to be more proficient (78).

IV. Uncovering the L2 Motivational System among Czech and Polish students

4.1 Purpose of the study

The study was conducted in order to discover whether Dörnyei's proposed Self System was country-specific, and if the 'Ideal L2 Self' played a prominent role in learner's motivation to learn English as an L2 in countries such as Poland and the Czech Republic. To date, as far as I am aware, a study of this kind has not been carried out in these two countries, but other researchers, in Asia, have confirmed that Dörnyei's theory is valid in countries such as: China, Japan and Iran. Similarly to Taguchi *et al.*, my study also observed the relationship between *integrativeness* and the *ideal L2 self*, meaning, how closely they are related and if they are interchangeable. Apart from this, the relationship of the *ideal L2 self*, *integrativeness*, *ought-to L2 self*, *instrumentality*, *cultural interest*, and *family influence* with the *criterion measure* was analysed; and lastly the *attitudes to learning English*, *attitudes to L2 community*, *family influence*, *cultural interest* and *integrativeness* were compared between the two countries based on students' responses on the Likert scale. The research was inspired by Taguchi *et al.*'s comparative study conducted in Japan, China and Iran. Programs used for the analysis of the data were: Calc, Excel and SPSS version 24.

4.2 Participants

The total number of participants in the study was 65, from which 32 students were from Poland, and 33 were from the Czech Republic. Four of the surveys (two from Poland and two from the Czech Republic) had missing data, not every item was answered by the student. Therefore, these four surveys were eliminated from the research, leaving 30 surveys from Poland and 31 from the Czech Republic. The participants were University students, studying double major, English philology with either German, Spanish, French or Italian philology, in both countries. Students' other major than English is not relevant for the analysis of the data. Students from first, second and third year, of Bachelor Degree participated in the research. The number of female students was superior to that of males, with six males and 'twenty-four' females in Poland; five males and 'twenty-six' females in the Czech Republic (see Table 1).

The data were collected in both countries in February to March, 2016. The surveys were conducted during classes in which there was the highest number of attending students.

Table 1 An overview of survey participants

Place	Total	Gender		Year of study		
		Female	Male	First	Second	Third
University of South Bohemia	31	26 (84%)	5 (16%)	1 (3%)	9 (29%)	21 (68%)
Jagiellonian University	30	24 (80%)	6 (20%)	0%	5 (17%)	25 (83%)

Note: Eliminated questionnaires not counted

4.3 University of South Bohemia and the Jagiellonian University – a cultural backdrop

The research was conducted at two universities in two different countries, the University of South Bohemia (the Philosophical faculty) in the Czech Republic and the Jagiellonian University (Faculty of Philology) in Kraków, Poland. Geographically these countries are neighbours. The languages spoken, Czech and Polish, belong to the West-Slavic subgroup of Slavonic languages which belong to the Indo-European group of languages.

Until 1948, German was the compulsory foreign language, officially taught in schools in the Czech Republic and Poland. After 1948 the official foreign language became the Russian, which was taught in primary and secondary schools, but also very frequently chosen by the students in their University studies. French and German remained as the second best chosen languages in the countries (Novotná. R 8). English was not as quite popular as the Romance languages. With the change of political systems and laws and the rise of the American Pop Culture, the interest for the English grew. In order to avoid misunderstanding, the English language has always been present but the number of students who chose it as their second language was not as great as the number of students studying German. After 1973, in Poland, the numbers of students picking the English language as their best choice arose. According to Jane W Bancroft, these are the percentages calculated from her research on *Foreign Language teaching in Poland*: “English – 49 %; Russian – 30%; German – 14%; French – 7%” (162).

The culture of the nations and their connection with foreign languages plays a prominent role in the results of my research, since it focuses on the influence the

motivational aspects have when one learns a second language, more specifically English. The position of the cities in the world and considering English as a 'lingua franca' makes a huge impact on the availability of the English language in these cities and the frequency of its usage. The motivational dimensions which influence the frequency of the English language are: 'attitudes to learning English', 'attitudes to L2 community' and 'cultural interest'. English, nowadays, remains as a second language for most people, since its usage is prominent in administration, education, and government as a means of communication between speakers of diverse languages.

One could notice significant differences when considering the cultural presence of English in these two cities. Kraków is the second largest city in Poland and it is called Poland's capital of culture. The city owns the best museums in the country and can boast with some of the best theatres. It is home to a venerable and distinguished university in Europe, the Jagiellonian University, and also to many famous writers, painters and musicians. The city was named as the European City of Culture in 2000 and since 2013 UNESCO has proclaimed Kraków as the City of Literature (Strzala, M.). With its great population of over 700,000 citizens, Kraków is indeed a multicultural city, from which over 250,000 are students only, and one can surely notice the youthful heartbeat of the city. Being a student – resident in Kraków for five months, I can confirm the busyness and lively atmosphere of the city. Foreigners and tourists roam the city bringing diversity and cultural wealth. In Kraków it is very common to notice sign stickers such as 'WE DO SPEAK ENGLISH HERE' on the windows or doors of cafés, pubs, banks, shops. On the contrary, in České Budějovice it is difficult to arrange certain requests from public institutions without the help of a native speaker. In most of the shops and cafés, the staff is more commonly known to speak German. Furthermore, one of the most ubiquitous elements of Kraków is the religion. There is a vast number of churches and synagogues around, each one of them is unique due to its architecture and style which awakens a certain wash of emotions when one passes them by. It is a very popular attraction among the tourists. They are reminders of the most creative periods and the dreadful past of Poland during the World War I and II, since most of Poland has been burned down and many cities had to be rebuilt, except for Kraków who has remained as the most authentic one and the Poles are very proud of it. In Southern

Czech Republic, České Budějovice is mostly known among foreigners for its enterprises such as brewery and industries producing technical products and stationery. With a population of 93,000 people, it is the biggest city in Southern Bohemia, and its biggest treasure is the historical centre with numerous valuable religious and secular buildings.

4.4 Survey design

Since the current study is to validate Dörnyei's L2 motivation theory by replicating Taguchi *et al.*'s research, the statements and questions (further called items) were chosen from *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing* by Z. Dörnyei and T. Taguchi (2010) (139-152). Some of the items were newly designed³, some slightly modified⁴ and the rest of the items was copied⁵. Some of the original items used in Z. Dörnyei and T. Taguchi (2010) did not relate to the university environment, the content of the items was more suitable for secondary school – students, therefore, content-wise, a certain number of the items was changed.

The study employs the same survey in both countries. Each questionnaire is comprised of three parts: the first consists of forty statement-type items, and the second of ten question-type items. The items in both parts are parted in nine different groups of motivational aspects/dimensions⁶, such as: Criterion measure (six items), Ideal L2 self (five items), Ought-to L2 self (four items), Family influence (six items), Instrumentality (six items), Attitudes to learning English (six items), Attitudes to L2 community (six items), Cultural interest (six items) and Integrativeness (five items) (see Table 2). The order of the items was mixed in order to avoid monotonicity in the survey. The third part of the survey consists of three tick-box items. The students were asked to complete the information regarding their gender, the university they attended and the year of study. The difference in the number of items in each group does not influence the research or manipulates the results because the correlation (which showed the relationship between the dimensions) are between the sum of the value codes in each dimension. The items in the first part are measured by

³See Appendix 1, items no.: 8, 9, 10, 14, 18, 19, 25, 27, 28, 31, 33, 36, 39 and 40

⁴ See Appendix 1, items no.: 6, 16, 21, 24, 29, 30, 32, 34, 38, 47, 48, 49 and compare with Z. Dörnyei and T. Taguchi (2010, 139-152)

⁵ See Z. Dörnyei and T. Taguchi (2010, 139-152)

⁶ The meaning of each dimension is explained in the previous chapter

six-point Likert scale, while the second part by six-point rating scales with ‘not at all’ anchoring left end and ‘very much’ anchoring right end (see Table 3). In the data analysis these two types of items were treated equally.

Table 2 Survey structure – number of items testing each motivational dimension

Motivational dimension	Number of items
Criterion measure	6
Ideal L2 self	5
Ought-to L2 self	4
Family influence	6
Instrumentality	6
Attitudes to learning English	6
Attitudes to L2 community	6
Cultural interest	6
Integrativeness	5

Table 3 Value distribution

Value	Label	
	Part 1	Part 2
1	Strongly disagree	Not at all
2	Disagree	Not so much
3	Slightly disagree	So-so
4	Slightly agree	A little
5	Agree	Quite a lot
6	Strongly agree	Very much

4.5 Data analysis

Before the data were transferred from paper to computer, the questionnaires were labelled with codes which made the division to groups easier in the later on process. Each questionnaire was labelled by the researcher according to which country and university it belonged. Questionnaires administered in the Czech Republic were labelled as CJ1-31 (Czech; Jihočeská) and a number from 1 to 31 which labelled the student; the Polish

questionnaires were labelled as PJ1-30 (Poland; Jagielloński). The data from paper were transcribed on the computer in Calc. During this procedure the mixed order of the items from the questionnaire were regrouped according to the motivational dimension they belong to, and every value code (number from the rating scale which the student has circled) was transferred to each item. The items in Calc were not inserted in words (as in the actual questionnaire) but by their given number they had in the survey. For example, items from criterion measure were statements no. 1, 9, 10, 19, 27 and 36 (see Table 4).

Table 4 Assortment of items in their motivational dimensions

Motivational dimension	Item no.
Criterion measure	1, 9, 10, 19, 27, 36
Ideal L2 self	2, 11, 20, 28, 37
Ought-to L2 self	3, 12, 21, 29
Family influence	4, 13, 22, 30, 38, 46
Instrumentality	5, 14, 23, 31, 39, 41
Attitudes to learning English	6, 15, 24, 32, 40, 42
Attitudes to L2 community	7, 17, 26, 34, 35, 44
Cultural interest	16, 25, 33, 43, 47, 49
Integrativeness	8, 18, 45, 48, 50

After labelling the questionnaires, the researcher identified items which the student has forgotten or purposely failed to answer. These questionnaires were eliminated due to the missing data. Two were from the Czech Republic, which reduced the number of questionnaires to 31, and two from Poland, reducing the number to 30.

Once the data were input in Calc, the statements in part one, which have been adopted from Z. Dörnyei and T. Taguchi (2010) and slightly modified in their wording by changing it into negative statements, for example no. 10, 27, 28, 37 and 40, the Likert scale for them had to be reversed in the statistics program SPSS, i.e if someone answered with a 6 (which in Likert scale is ‘strongly agree’ then reversed value code would be 1 (‘strongly disagree’), 5 would be reversed to 2 etc., Therefore, for negative statements the value codes needed to be reversed so they were consistent with the positive statement-type items’ value codes.

When the distribution of answers was made, and the total sums of the value codes that the students circled for each statement and question in the questionnaire were transferred into percentages, I noticed that statement no. 7 was inconsistent with the others statements belonging to the same dimensional group, ‘attitudes to L2 community’ (see Table 5). Therefore, item no.7 was removed from the survey.

Table 5 Observation of an inconsistent answer distribution of a particular item

no. of item	Location	no. of responses	Strongly disagree/ Not at all	Disagree/ Not so much	Slightly disagree / So so	Slightly agree/ A little	Agree/ Quite a lot	Strongly agree/ Very much
7	University of South Bohemia	31	51.61 %	22.58%	9.68 %	6.45%	6.45%	3.23%
	Jagiellonian university	30	53.33%	26.67%	3.33%	13.33%	0.00%	3.33%

By reviewing every item by its answer distribution, the researcher can observe if the value codes given to each item, which belong to a single motivational dimension, are consistent. In some dimensions, the consistency of the value codes was disagreeing, therefore, every motivational dimension needed to be analysed in ‘Cronbach Alpha’. This tool is part of the SPSS program and it tests the reliability of every item (further called variable) in the dimension they belong to.

4.6.1 The procedure for Cronbach Alpha analysis

The primary data from Calc were transferred to Excel, since the program SPSS works better when importing data to it from Excel. Before the data was imported, it needed to be modified. The first step of modifying was with the ‘transpose’ function which changed rows into columns and columns into rows because in SPSS program the variables are the items (statements and questions) whose data were put into columns and students’ data were put into rows, whereas in Excel it was the other way around: the students’ data (CJ1-31; PJ1-30) were put in the columns and the items’ data in the rows.

After transposing the data and identifying the negatively written statements, I imported the data in the SPSS program where I created two sheets, one for the Czech

students and one for the Polish. The next step consisted of modifying the variables for data analysis in the SPSS, by labelling each variable with the number it has in the survey and initials from the dimension it belongs to, for example: criterion measure, variable no. 10 would be labelled as QS.CM10; negatively asked variables were labelled with the suffix 'neg', as in negQS.CM10. Further in the process, the 'measure' for every value code in the Likert scale was changed from 'nominal' to 'ordinal'. Ordinal means that the order of the value codes is important, i.e., '1' is the lowest and '6' is the highest value code. Nominal measure is used when the researcher does not care about the order, that happens when s/he asks about year and place of birth, gender etc. After the variables were modified for data analysis I did 'reliability' analysis using 'Cronbach Alpha measure of internal consistency'. The answers (values codes) in each motivational dimension should be consistent, which proves that the differently structured statements and asked questions in every single dimension aim towards the same thing and they represent the same dimension. The 'reliability analysis' functions by choosing each variable from each dimension, which in result gives a table with total Cronbach alpha score for every variable. This score is from 0 to 1, and as a rule of thumb it should be above 0.7 and it never should be under 0.5. The Cronbach Alpha also shows what the result would be if we eliminate a variable in order to get a better result. The 'score if item removed' tool was used in order to carefully remove a variable which lowered the Cronbach Alpha score. After each removal the 'reliability analysis' of the certain dimension were ran again (see table 6).

Table 6 Composites of attitudinal/motivational variables with Cronbach Alpha coefficients in the Czech Republic and Poland.

Motivational variable	Czech Republic		Poland	
	Item no.	α	Item no.	α
Criterion measure	1, 9, 10, 19, 27	0.642	1, 9	0.583
Ideal L2 self	11, 20, 28, 37	0.730	2, 11, 20, 28, 37	0.521
Ought-to L2 self	3, 12	0.734	3, 12, 29	0.556
Family influence	22, 30, 38	0.771	4, 13, 22, 30, 38	0.714
Instrumentality	5, 14, 23, 39, 41	0.723	5, 14, 23, 31, 39, 41	0.792
Attitudes to learning English	6, 15, 24, 32, 40, 42	0.765	6, 15, 24, 32, 40, 42	0.604
Attitudes to L2 community	26, 34, 35, 44	0.670	17, 26, 34, 44	0.668
Cultural interest	16, 25, 43, 47, 49	0.729	25, 33, 43, 47, 49	0.599
Integrativeness	8, 18, 48, 50	0.622	8, 18, 45, 48, 50	0.626

In result, almost every motivational dimension lost a couple of variables for a more precise result, which made the dimensions more reliable for correlational analysis.

4.6.2 Correlational analysis

Correlational analysis is used when the researcher wants to observe the relationship between two things, in this case motivational dimensions. According to Dörnyei (2007) correlations between 0.3 to 0.5 can be meaningful, and when two variables show correlations of 0.6 and above, they measure the same thing (223). For the correlational analysis I had to make a new variable in SPSS for each motivational dimension. Every variable is a sum of the questions'/statements' value codes of each dimension. It was done by the function 'compute variable' where one can add questions/statements together: Q1+Q9+Q10+Q19 etc. The variables which were eliminated by Cronbach Alpha analysis were not included. Correlational analysis can be run between two sum variables called 'bivariate correlation', in SPSS. For Table 7 and 8 was used Pearson's correlation with a two tailed significance. When the correlation is not significant the result cannot be taken into consideration. On the other hand, when the correlation is significant then the result demonstrates a certain relationship between the variables.

In Table 7 the correlation between 'ideal L2 Self' and 'integrativeness' among Czech students is very high i.e., 0.656. According to Dörnyei, a coefficient higher than 0.6 means that the dimension can be equated, they measure the same thing. On the contrary, in Polish students the correlation coefficient is low, only 0.284, it is very close to 0.3 which gives an initiative of proposing that it could be meaningful, but the numbers simply do not reach a meaningful result. In Poland, the 'ideal L2 self' and 'integrativeness' do not tap into the same construct, they have no significant relationship between each other, which causes confusion since every study before resulted in these two dimensions being closely related. This unexpected result in Polish students might be influenced by the low Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the ideal L2 self ($\alpha = 0.521$). The low coefficient results in low reliability of the 'ideal L2' self motivational dimension among Polish students.

Table 7 The relationship between the *ideal L2 self* and *integrativeness*

	Correlation
University of South Bohemia	0.656
Jagiellonian University	0.284

Note: Czech correlation is significant at $p < 0.01$ level

Polish correlation is not significant (p above 0.5)

Table 8 shows the individual relationship of the ‘ideal L2 self’ and ‘integrativeness’ with the ‘criterion measure’. The ‘criterion measure’ stands for the intended effort a learner makes in order to learn a second language. In the questionnaire it is represented by a variable such as: “If a course was offered off university, somewhere else, I would like to take it.” The correlation gives information about which of these two dimensions does a better job at explaining one’s intended effort to learn English as an L2. Even though in both countries the correlations are meaningful, ‘integrativeness’ exceeds ‘ideal L2 self’ more explicitly among Czech students. As already discovered, the low Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the ‘ideal L2 self’ in Poland, influences the relationship with the ‘criterion measure’ as well, therefore, the correlation between the ‘criterion measure’ and ‘integrativeness’ is higher. On the other hand, the ‘ideal L2 self’ of Czech students has a high Cronbach Alpha coefficient which implies the higher correlation. High correlation means that ‘integrativeness’ and the intended effort measure the same thing, in other words, the intended effort comes from learner’s aspiration to integrate in the foreign society. Even though there is no official community to integrate into, the ‘integrativeness’ may be interpreted as learner’s desire to integrate with the global community of English speakers.

Table 8 The relationship of the *ideal L2 self* and *integrativeness* with the *criterion measure*

		Correlation
University of South Bohemia	Ideal L2 self	0.347*
	Integrativeness	0.592**
Jagiellonian University	Ideal L2 self	0.306*
	Integrativeness	0.394**

Note: * correlation is not significant: p above 0.05

** correlation is significant $p < 0.05$

Table 9 shows how much the learners were influenced to put in effort while learning English based on their ‘ought-to-L2 self’. This motivational dimension represents attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e., representation of someone else’s sense of duties, obligations or moral responsibilities), such as: ‘I study English because close friends of mine think it is important’ or ‘If I fail to achieve a high level of proficiency in English, I’ll be letting other people down.’ Neither in Poland nor in the Czech Republic the correlations are meaningful. The students effort to study English is not influenced by an external factors, but rather internal ones, such as ‘integrativeness’ as seen in table 8.

Table 9 The relationship between *ought-to L2 self* and the *criterion measure*

		Correlation
University of South Bohemia	Ought-to L2 self	-0.264
Jagiellonian University	Ought-to L2 self	0.210

In table 10 there is a noticeable difference between the two countries. Students of South Bohemia do not show any meaningful correlation of ‘instrumentality’ with the ‘criterion measure’. ‘Instrumentality’ as one of the motivational dimensions dwells on the prosperity one can have when mastering English on a proficiency level, for example: finding a better job. Among the students of Kraków, the correlation is very high (0.546), i.e the ‘criterion measure’ and ‘instrumentality’ measure the same thing. This fact might explain the lower correlation between ‘integrativeness’ and the ‘criterion measure’ in Poland. The results imply that Polish students are highly driven by ‘instrumentality’ while learning English as their major at university. Czech students’ ‘integrativeness’ and intended effort measure the same thing ($\alpha = 0.592$), which explains the non-significant relationship between ‘instrumentality’ and their intended effort ($\alpha = 0.100$).

Table 10 The relationship between *instrumentality* and the *criterion measure*

		Correlation
University of South Bohemia	Instrumentality	0.100
Jagiellonian University	Instrumentality	0.546*

Note: * $p < 0.01$

Table 11 shows the fact that students’ intended effort to learn English is influenced by their ‘cultural interest’ towards the country. In both universities the correlation is meaningful,

almost the same. This result was expected since the correlation between ‘integrativeness’ and the ‘criterion measure’ was as well meaningful. When learners want to integrate in a foreign society they also have positive attitude towards the culture of the community. In the survey, students gave consistent values codes to variables such: ‘I really like American Pop Culture’, ‘Do you like the music of the English speaking countries?’ or ‘Do you like the films of the English speaking countries?’.

Table 11 The relationship between *cultural interest* and *criterion measure*

		Correlation
University of South Bohemia	Cultural interest	0.494*
Jagiellonian University	Cultural interest	0.462**

Note: *p < 0.01; **p < 0.05

Table 12 implies that the correlation of ‘family influence’ with the ‘criterion measure’ in both countries is not meaningful, therefore, family does not play a major role in the learners’ effort to succeed in their English studies.

Table 12 The relationship between ‘family influence’ and ‘criterion measure’

		Correlation
University of South Bohemia	Family influence	-0.260
Jagiellonian university	Family influence	0.185

In table 13, the mean of the value codes, given by students, was calculated in these dimensional groups: ‘attitudes to learning English’, ‘attitudes to L2 community’, ‘family influence’, ‘cultural interest’ and ‘integrativeness’. The results between the two universities are similar. In the dimension ‘attitudes to learning English’ the Polish students have a higher average than the Czech students, i.e., on the Likert scale they fall closer to the value label ‘Agree’ (value code no. 5), and students from South Bohemia fall to the label ‘slightly agree’. Accordingly, Czech students gave smaller value codes to variables such as: ‘I like the atmosphere during my English classes’, ‘I feel calm and confident (to talk and share my opinion in English) in the company of English native speakers’ or ‘I always look forward to attending most of my English courses’. Polish students, on the contrary, have answered with higher values. In the next dimension there is almost no difference in the mean. Their

'attitudes to the L2 community' are at the same level. Even though the students want to integrate into the English culture, it does not mean that they would have an idolised relationship towards its native speakers at the same time. To variables such as: 'Mostly I like travelling to English speaking countries' or 'The British are open minded and friendly people' they have answered with lower values. In the next dimension, 'family influence', students from Kraków have a slightly higher average value code than students in South Bohemia. They both 'disagree' with 'family influence' having a prominent part in their studies, but Polish students are slightly more influenced, their mean is almost by 0.5 higher, which means that they gave higher value codes to variables such as: 'My parents encourage me to study English', 'I must have a very-well skilled knowledge of English, because, If I don't, my parents will be disappointed with me' or 'How much do your parents speak the language?'. Compared to the correlational analysis of 'family influence' with the 'criterion measure', the coefficient showed no meaningful relationship, but implied a small tendency to be close to a significant one.

The mean of the values codes of the 'cultural interest' is higher among the Polish students, in general, we can even claim that it equals to '5' on the Likert Scale ('Agree'). Considering the environment where the learners study, Kraków is a multicultural city where foreign languages are used frequently, mainly the English. When Kraków is considered a single entity, then most of the citizens are likely to have a positive attitude towards speaking the English language, since the number of tourists who visit and foreign students which choose this city as a foreign destination for temporary studies is high. According to Mucha Kinga – Drechy, the total number of students studying at the Jagiellonian University is 41,818 and over 200.000 students come to study every year in Kraków. The continuous contact with students from abroad makes the use of the English language very prominent so the attitude towards the English culture is shaping in its own unique way.

The mean of the last dimension analysed, 'integrativeness', is comparable in both countries. On the Likert scale the mean is between the value codes '4' and '5', which means that learners 'agree' with statements such as: 'I would like to move permanently to an English speaking country', and they 'quite a lot' 'like the English language' and would like

to ‘become similar to the native English speakers’. This result is supported as well by the significant coefficient of the correlational analysis between ‘integrativeness’ and the ‘criterion measure’.

Table 13 The mean of value codes of attitudes to learning English, attitudes to L2 community, family influence, cultural interest and integrativeness, on the Likert scale

	University of South Bohemia	Jagiellonian University
Attitudes to learning English	4.11	4.55
Attitudes to L2 community	4.16	4.13
Family influence	2.17	2.55
Cultural interest	4.9	4.61
Integrativeness	4.51	4.77

4.7 Results discussion

Every result was calculated after doing the Cronbach Alpha analysis of the items. As consequence, the number of items in some dimensions had significantly decreased, but not equally in both countries. In order to make the dimensional group as reliable as possible, items were eliminated depending on the value codes the students provided. The dimensional group is ‘reliable’ once the Cronbach Alpha coefficient is over 0.7, when it is between 0.5 and 0.6 it is considered as ‘poor reliability’. Accordingly, in table 6, the number of items eliminated in the dimension ‘criterion measure’ in the Czech Republic is not equal to the number of items eliminated in Poland. This means that Czech students have provided answers with higher consistency. If in some dimension no items were eliminated then they did not decrease the reliability of the dimension they belonged to. Therefore, students answered with similar value codes to items which belonged to the same motivational dimension, even though the order of the items in the survey was mixed. Among the Polish students the Cronbach Alpha analysis resulted in almost every dimension low, which implies them answering inconsistently through out the questionnaire.

When the first correlational relationship was calculated between the ‘ideal L2 self’ and ‘integrativeness’ in table 7, the value was very low in Poland. What could influence this result? In comparison to the studies made in Asia by Taguchi *et al.* and Dörnyei’s study in Hungary, the results seem even wrong. In those countries the correlations between the ‘ideal

L2 self' and the 'criterion measure' were above 0.4, and that explains Dörnyei's Motivational Self System. On the other hand, Czech students measure higher correlation than the Asian and Hungarian students. The correlation result (0.6566) among Czech students implies that the 'integrative' motivation, proposed by Gardner in his Canadian study, is interchangeable with the 'ideal L2 self' proposed by Dörnyei. Students of English language at the University of South Bohemia do not live in a country where the English language is considered as a first language, therefore, an English community in which they could possibly integrate to does not exist. Therefore, imagining themselves as part of the L2 community provokes a certain kind of integration. However, the low correlation among Polish students could suggest that the two dimensions, 'ideal L2 self' and 'integrativeness' measure two different things, and that students at the Jagiellonian University do have an L2 community where they could integrate to, since 'integrativeness' influences the effort they put in their studies (see Table 8). This impossible result could be reasonably denied by the Cronbach Alpha analysis, where the coefficient of the 'ideal L2 self' is too low ($\alpha=0.521$) among Polish students. Accordingly, this influenced the low correlational result as well.

In table 8, 'integrativeness' exceeded 'ideal L2 self' in relationship with the intended effort. In the Czech Republic this was expected, since the correlational result between the two dimensions, in Table 7, resulted in the two being equated, but in Poland 'integrativeness' plays a significantly more prominent role than the 'ideal L2 Self'. Could this be explained by suggesting that learners in Poland are more in touch with native speakers of English, or travel and work more to English speaking countries? Do they think that their level of English is so high, that they are already integrated in some way in the English community and have no need of imagining themselves as part of it? Hypothetically, this suggests a reasonable answer, since their 'instrumentality' correlation result with the intended effort is significantly higher than the one of the Czech students (Table 10). In addition, table 13 shows a significant support for the 'integrative' motivation among Polish students. The use of the English language as 'lingua franca' in the environment they live in could be the trigger for them feeling already integrated in a Global English speaking community.

The results in table 9 and 12 complement each other. In table 9, the correlational analysis of the 'Ought-to L2 self' with the 'criterion measure' are similar to the correlational analysis of 'family influence' with the intended effort. There is not a clear line of division between the meaning of the 'ought-to L2 self' and the 'family influence', since both dimensions represent an external influence on the learner's effort. As a possible difference which could be implied is that 'family influence' limits its scope to family and relatives' expectations only, whereas 'ought-to L2 self' includes the aspirations of the society where the learner is encountered.

4.8 Conclusion

Several main conclusions may be drawn from my research conducted in Poland and the Czech Republic. Firstly, Dörnyei's 'L2 Motivational Self System' seems not to apply to the students of the Jagiellonian University. Only students from the University of South Bohemia validated the interchangeable relationship between the 'ideal L2 self' and 'integrativeness'. The relationship between the 'ideal L2 self' and 'integrativeness' could not be equated after analysing the Polish data. The correlations were not meaningful since the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of Polish 'ideal L2 self' was very low. These findings could be explained by the relatively small number of participants in my survey. Dörnyei and Taguchi *et al.* ascertained their results by distributing their survey to thousands of learners; I ascertained my findings on 65 learners only. Secondly, students' intended effort in both countries is influenced by 'integrativeness'. In Poland, however, there is a high correlation of the intended effort with 'instrumentality'. Contrary to my findings, Taguchi *et al.*'s results showed a high correlation of the 'criterion measure' with the 'ideal L2 self' and high correlation of 'instrumentality' with the intended effort (62) as seen among the Czech students. Taguchi *et al.* explained the high coefficient of 'instrumentality' as a matter of different 'self-perspective' among the students. When learners aspire to get a good job by using their proficient knowledge of English, it does not mean that learners' effort to be successful in their field is inspired only by 'imagining' themselves receiving financial wealth. Even though, for some learners this could be the main 'self-image' which encourages them to work more on their proficiency (62). 'Instrumentality' is a phenomenon which is

possessed by the learners and they manage its drive through-out their studies. This fact is applies to every motivational dimension.

In the comparative study among Czech and Polish students, the results showed that learners of English were not immensely influenced by their family while studying their major. There was a small difference in the mean of the value codes, calculated in table 13, where the Polish students have answered with slightly higher value codes, since their mean was higher than the mean of Czech learners. Moreover, Polish learners exhibited more positive ‘attitudes towards learning English’ since the content of some the statements/questions, belonging to the dimension, was contrasted with the learners’ other major they are studying simultaneously at university. An example of such variables are: “I think time passes faster when I am studying English”, to which they have given higher value codes, or have answered with lower value codes to a statement such as: “I think time passes faster when I’m studying my other major than English”. According to the mean analysis, Czech learners of English have given slightly lower or higher value codes, depending on the content of the variable. In both countries the means of the ‘attitudes to L2 community’ were similar. The average did not reach a strong positive attitude, since their mean on the Likert scale crosses slightly over ‘4’. The result implies that learners of English in both countries do not idolize strongly the speakers of the L2 community, apart from reaching a native-like proficiency.

Notably, the ‘cultural interest’ of the Polish students is higher than the one among Czech students, as discussed in table 13, and the average of ‘integrativeness’ is very similar in the countries, which is not surprising since the Alpha coefficient of ‘integrativeness’ in the Cronbach analysis reached almost the same result (0.622 in the Czech Republic; 0.626 in Poland).

To conclude, the data analysis between the learners of English at the University of South Bohemia and the Jagiellonian University suggested two main differences. Firstly, Dörnyei’s ‘L2 Motivational Self System’ was validated only among Czech students, the Polish students suggested results which according to Dörnyei and Taguchi *et al.* would be labelled as unacceptable, due to the high correlation relationship of ‘integrativeness’ with the ‘criterion measure’ and the unreliable Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the ‘ideal L2 self’. Even

though, the ‘integrative’ dimension among Czech students was significantly high, the correlations showed that the ‘ideal L2 self’ measured the same values as ‘integrativeness’. Secondly, students from the Jagiellonian University showed a considerably high correlation of ‘instrumentality with the ‘criterion measure’. This result implies that Polish students are highly interested in the employment of their knowledge in the future, whereas the Czech students showed meaningless correlational relationship between the two dimensions. In addition, the two universities showed moderately significant differences between the rest of the motivational dimensions – the calculated average values differed in decimals.

Considering the creation of the variables’ content in the survey, its administration could have been done in a different way in order to bring more consistent results. Taguchi *et al.* carried out an extensive piloting for each country before creating the surveys for China, Japan and Iran separately. While comparing the studies I concluded that cultural background is very important when researching learners’ motivation to learn another language. Even though the border between Poland and the Czech Republic is geographically shared, their cultural and educational background is different. Consequently, there were variations in the results, for example, low Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the motivational dimensions, which suggested poor reliability of the motivational variables.

Psychology termed ‘motivation’ as a very broad concept which creates difficulty for scholars to define, but with the creation of ‘reductionist models’, researchers managed to identify key motivational dimensions under which a large number of triggers can be listed. Consequently, ‘reductionist models’ helped to more easily identify and define different types of behaviour, for example, the motivational dimensions presented in my research. These dimensions were outlined as the most important aspects in learner’s acquisition of an L2, which is an undermined process by internal and external influences in the learner’s world. In the comparative study among learners of English at the University of South Bohemia and at the Jagiellonian University, the ‘ideal L2 self’ motivational dimension resulted to be of poor reliability mainly among the Polish learners of English. Due to low Cronbach Alpha coefficient, the ‘ideal L2 self’ was eliminated from correlational analysis in both countries. Nevertheless, the empirical findings suggested ‘integrativeness’, instead of the ‘ideal L2 self’, as a dimension of great importance in the learners’ effort to study English. In both

countries, the correlational relationship between 'integrativeness' and the 'criterion measure' had the highest coefficient. Under these circumstances, the results suggest a different interpretation of the meaning of 'integrativeness' in the Czech Republic and Poland. The learners of these countries aspire to 'integrate' and become part of a 'global English society' rather than a purely 'English' one.

Works cited

- Bancroft, W. Jane. "Foreign Language Teaching in Poland." *The Modern Language Journal* 59.4 (1975): 161-67. Web.
- Beck, Robert C. *Motivation: Theories and Principles*. 5th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 2004. Print.
- Bolhuis, Johan J., Gillian R. Brown, Robert C. Richardson, and Kevin N. Laland. "Darwin in Mind: New Opportunities for Evolutionary Psychology." *Public Library of Science: Biology*. N.p., 19 July 2011. Web. 03 July 2016.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán, and Tatsuya Taguchi. *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2010. Print.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. "Researching Motivation: From Integrativeness to the Ideal L2 Self." *Introducing Applied Linguistics: Concepts and Skills*. Ed. Susan Hunston and David Oakey. London: Routledge, 2010. 72-83. Print.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. "The L2 Motivational Self System." *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Ed. Zoltán Dörnyei and Ema Ushioda. Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2009. 9-42. Print.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum, 2005. Print.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán, and Ema Ushioda. *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. 2nd ed. Harlow, England: Longman, 2011. Print.
- Judy Pearsall, ed. "Motive." Def. 1. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*. 10th ed. Oxford: Clarendon, n.d. 929. Print.
- Mareš, Jiří. *Pedagogická Psychologie*. 1st ed. Praha: Portál, 2013. Print.
- Mucha, Kinga Drechny. "Facts and Figures - UJ." *Facts and Figures - UJ*. Jagiellonian University in Krakow, 31 Dec. 2015. Web. 15 July 2016.

- Novotná, Radana. "Výuka Cizích Jazyků Od 90. Let Po Současnost – Z Pohledu Vzdělávací Politiky." Diss. Masarykova Univerzita in Brno, 2007. Masarykova Univerzita. Web. 1 July 2016.
- Reber, Arthur S. (1985) "Motivation." Def. 1. *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology*. 1st ed. London: Penguin, 454-55.
- Strzala, Marek. "Kraków, the City of Culture." *Kraków Culture*. Marek Strzala, n.d. Web. 29 June 2016.
- Taguchi, Tatsuya, Michael Magid, and Mostafa Papi. "The L2 Motivational Self System among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian Learners of English: A Comparative Study." *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Ed. Zoltán Dörnyei and Ema Ushioda. Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2009. Print.
- "Urząd Statystyczny W Krakowie." *Urząd Statystyczny W Krakowie*. 66-97. Print. Web. 29 June 2016.
- Woodworth, Robert Sessions. *Dynamic Psychology*. New York: Columbia UP, 1918. *Internet Archive*. Web. 2 July 2016.
- "České Budějovice." *Brief History*. Statutární Město České Budějovice, Web. 30 June 2016.

Appendix 1: English Learner Survey

Dear colleague,

I would like you to help me by answering the following questions concerning learning English as a second language. This survey is conducted by me, Elena Dacheva, from the University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Czech Republic. In this survey there are no “right” or “wrong” answers and you do not have to write your name on it, it is anonymous. Just tick the university you attend to, your gender and year of study at the end of the survey. The survey consists of three sections. Please read the instructions and write your answers. I am interested in your personal opinion. Please give your answers sincerely, as only this will guarantee the success of the study.
Thank you very much for your help.

Part 1

In this part, I would like you to tell me 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 the items.

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

E.g. If you strongly agree with the following statement, write this:

I like ice cream very much.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. If an English course was offered off university, somewhere else, I would like to take it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I can imagine myself as someone who is able to speak English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I study English because close friends of mine think it's important.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. My parents encourage me to study English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Studying English is important to me because it might be useful in getting a good job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I like the atmosphere during my English courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Learning English makes me fear that I will feel less native (of the country you belong to) because of it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I would like to move permanently to an English speaking country.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I like to work on improving my English in my free time, even if I'm not required nor need it for school purposes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I would rather spend time studying my other major. (other	1	2	3	4	5	6

language/field than English that you study at University)	
11. I can imagine myself speaking English as If I were a native speaker.	1 2 3 4 5 6
12. I consider learning English important because the people I respect think I should do it.	1 2 3 4 5 6
13. My parents encourage me to attend extra private English classes.	1 2 3 4 5 6
14. With a high level of English proficiency, I will be able to make a lot of money and get a good job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
15. I feel calm and confident (to talk and share my opinion in English) in the company of native English speakers.	1 2 3 4 5 6
16. I love reading English magazines, newspapers and books.	1 2 3 4 5 6
17. The British are open-minded and modern people.	1 2 3 4 5 6
18. I like meeting foreigners from English speaking countries.	1 2 3 4 5 6
19. After receiving my Bachelor degree, I would like to continue studying courses concerning the English language/literature only.	1 2 3 4 5 6
20. Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using English.	1 2 3 4 5 6
21. Studying English is important for me only because an educated person should be able to speak English in a native-like way.	1 2 3 4 5 6
22. Being successful in learning the English language is important to me so that I can please my parents/relatives.	1 2 3 4 5 6
23. The things I want to do in future require me to use English.	1 2 3 4 5 6
24. I find learning about the English language really interesting.	1 2 3 4 5 6
25. I really like American pop culture.	1 2 3 4 5 6
26. The British are kind and friendly.	1 2 3 4 5 6
27. After receiving my Bachelor degree, I would like to continue on studying something else than the English language/literature.	1 2 3 4 5 6
28. I don't imagine myself using English in my professional career.	1 2 3 4 5 6
29. If I fail to achieve a high level of proficiency in English, I'll be letting other people down.	1 2 3 4 5 6
30. Learning well my other major, rather than the English, is important to me in order to bring honors to the family.	1 2 3 4 5 6
31. Studying English is important to me because it offers a new challenge in my life.	1 2 3 4 5 6
32. I always look forward to attending most of my English courses.	1 2 3 4 5 6
33. Most of the people I look up to are from an English speaking	1 2 3 4 5 6

country.	
34. Mostly, I like travelling to English speaking countries.	1 2 3 4 5 6
35. I like the way Americans behave. (north America)	1 2 3 4 5 6
36. I like talking in English with my friends/colleagues off classes as well.	1 2 3 4 5 6
37. I don't see English as a crucial factor in my future career.	1 2 3 4 5 6
38. I must have a very well-skilled knowledge of English, because, If I don't, my parents will be disappointed with me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
39. English proficiency is necessary for promotion in the future.	1 2 3 4 5 6
40. I think time passes faster when I am studying my other major than English.	1 2 3 4 5 6

Part 2

These are new questions but please answer them in the same way as you did before.

Not at all	Not so much	So-so	A little	Quite a lot	Very much
1	2	3	4	5	6

E.g. If you like ginger very much, write this: Do you like ginger? 1 2 3 4 5 6

41. How much do you think knowing the English language would help you to become a knowledgeable person?	1 2 3 4 5 6
42. Do you think time passes faster when you're studying English?	1 2 3 4 5 6
43. Do you like the music of the English speaking countries?	1 2 3 4 5 6
44. Would you like to know more about the people from the English speaking countries?	1 2 3 4 5 6
45. According to your opinion, how important is learning English in order to learn more about the culture and art of its speakers?	1 2 3 4 5 6
46. How much do your parents speak the language?	1 2 3 4 5 6
47. Do you like the films of the English speaking countries?	1 2 3 4 5 6
48. How much would you like to become similar to the native English speakers?	1 2 3 4 5 6
49. Do you like the TV programs from the English speaking countries?	1 2 3 4 5 6
50. How much do you like the English language?	1 2 3 4 5 6

Part 3

Please provide the information by ticking in the box.

University University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice

Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Poland

Gender Female Male

Year of Study 1st 2nd 3rd