

## **RESPONDING TO GLOBALIZATION: CREATING A NEW L2 MOTIVATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

Su Ching Wu

(ms1688@hotmail.com)

National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan

Shan Mao Chang

(sfchang@cc.ncue.edu.tw)

National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan

### **Abstract**

It is assumed that the increasing power of globalization has been exerting influence on students' motivation for learning English as a foreign language. This study was an attempt to examine and conceptualize a group of L2 students' learning motivation in an EFL context under the influence of globalization. For this reason, we created and validated a questionnaire that investigates students' motivation for learning English as a Foreign Language. The newly designed questionnaire was administered to a group of 132 senior high school students in Taiwan. The validity and reliability of the new questionnaire were analyzed and demonstrated through exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using the statistical packages SPSS and Lisrel Simplis, respectively. Five motivational factors were extracted and verified through the EFA and CFA analysis, revealing that L2 motivation is a multi-faceted phenomenon in nature. Furthermore, some factors identified tend to reflect the influence of globalization and ideal L2 self on the Taiwanese context.

### **1 Introduction**

The results of previous studies of second language (L2) motivation showed contradictory. With the same research condition (university participants in the EFL context), integrative motivation related to goal-directed behaviors, such as the admiration for the English culture, art, and literature, could play a determinant role for learning EFL (Shaaban & Ghaith, 2000) while that associated with integrativeness, like making social connections, was claimed to be negligible (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005; Warden & Lin, 2000). The paradoxical results of integrative motivation seem to come from its multidimensional constructs. Among the multi-dimensions of integrative motivation, undoubtedly, integrativeness has been a controversial issue. The lack of certain communities of target language in the EFL context, however, has not only brought about several criticism against integrativeness (Dörnyei, 1990) but fostered other relevant terms that similar to integrative motivation with more appropriate meanings to the EFL context – International Posture (Yashima, 2000; 2002; 2009), bicultural identity (Lamb, 2004), both of which are related to globalization, and the L2 Motivational Self-system (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005), focusing on the internal of individuals.

### ***1.1 The influence of globalization on FL motivation***

The great influence of globalization on foreign language motivation may be ascribed to economic factors. The more highly the country depends on trade, the more greatly the people of the country tend to be instrumentally motivated in English learning. According to Trade Profiles with statistics database accumulated in 2011 announced by World Trade Organization (WTO), the merchandise trade of Japan, Indonesia, Hungary, and Taiwan has been in surplus for years, suggesting English, the major language in trade field, is crucial to a better career, which definitely stimulates EFL learners' instrumental motivation rather than integrative motivation in English. On the contrary, for the country much less dependent on trade, such as Lebanon, integrative motivation was found to be the determinant of motivation for learning English as a foreign language (Shaaban & Ghaith, 2000). The two motivations that were thought to be parallel without any overlaps before can be reconceptualized as a specific motivation in the EFL context – the L2 Motivational Self-system (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005) because of the trend of globalization, especially in the trade surplus areas.

With the influence of globalization, it does not mean integrative motivation has been extinct in the EFL context but reasonably integrates with instrumental motivation; that is, *Ideal L2 Self*. However, the definition of *Ideal L2 Self*, the core of the L2 Motivational Self-system, seems to be unclear. There are neither relevant explanations nor statistics on what internalized instrumental motives are and how they are related to *Ideal L2 Self*, both of which need further exploration.

Moreover, intrinsic motivation and instrumental motivation are also criticized because of their vague definition. Intrinsic motivation may not merely come from its basic ground, learning for fun, but from individuals' firm beliefs (Ushioda, 2008) while instrumental motivation may not be limited in the utilitarian purpose (Csizer & Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000).

### ***1.2 The purpose of the study***

The purpose of the study is to create a motivation questionnaire of EFL students, to investigate the factors of senior high school EFL students' English learning motivation, and to explore the causes leading to reconceptualization of the English learning motivation in the EFL context. In the light of the purpose of the study, the specific research questions of the study are addressed below:

1. What are the factors of senior high school EFL students' English learning motivation?
2. What are the causes leading to reconceptualization of the English learning motivation in the EFL context?

## **2 Literature review**

### ***2.1 Motivation and globalization***

Integrative motivation refers to learners' admiration for target cultures (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). With the open mind to target language, learners are enthusiastic about understanding custom and cultures of target language and making friends with native speakers (Gardner,

1985; Dörnyei, 1990). Based on the investigation of ethnicity milieu, Clément and Kruidenier's (1983) also proposed "social-cultural dimension," which involved in "an interest in the way of life and the artistic production of the target language group (1983, p. 285)" to prove another aspect of integrative motivation. Gardner's definition of integrativeness (openness to identity with the other community) has received several criticisms from researchers (Dörnyei, 1990). Dörnyei (1990) argued that the concept of integrativeness seems to be idle because there is no salient L2 group in the EFL environment and the L2 is primarily learned as a school subject. He proposed that the identification of the L2 community can be universalized to the cultural and intellectual value associated with the language and to the actual L2 itself.

The world has gone through rapid deregulation since 1970s, which has made it a totally different status from that in 1950s when Gardner and Lambert (1959) first proposed the concept of integrative motivation. With the invention of Internet in 1970s, global information technologies have broken the border between countries (Kramsch, 2014). Some language educators (e.g. Block, 2010; Kramsch, 2010; 212a) regarded the economic interdependence, large-scale migrations, global information technologies and global media as globalization. According to Giddens (1990), globalization refers to "the phenomenon of acceleration and intensification of worldwide social relation which links distant localities" (p. 64). A brand new society has been brought by globalization (Warschauer, 2000) where English does not seem to be associated with any singular communities but with a spreading international culture (Lamb, 2004). Furthermore, globalization has enhanced stronger instrumental motivation of EFL learners to use English in their future careers (Wadell & Shandor, 2012).

## ***2.2 Alternative terms for integrative motivation***

Together with vague or even lack of identification related to native speakers of the foreign language and the self identity tied to learners' position in a globalizing economy (Wadell & Shandor, 2012), other terms appropriately related to integrative motivation in the EFL context emerged.

### ***2.2.1 International posture***

Yashima (2000) proposed "International Posture," referring to Japanese EFL learners' more favorable attitudes toward lingua franca, English, which represents the world around Japan, to seize a tendency related to the international community rather than any certain L2 group. International posture was broadly elaborated in her later research (Yashima, 2009) with two manifestations: (1) attitudinal/behavioral propensity – a tendency to approach and interact with foreigners (openness to foreignness), interest in going abroad to work or participating in international activities, all of which represent integrative motivation, and (2) knowledge orientation – interests in foreign affairs and international news, and having opinions on international matters, both of which refer to instrumentality.

### ***2.2.2 Bicultural identity***

With the influence of globalization, integrative and instrumental orientations can be hardly distinguished from each other (Lamb, 2004). Moreover, English is not merely associated with Anglophone countries any more. Young Indonesian EFL learners were motivated by a

“bicultural identity”, which consists of an English-speaking globally-involved version of themselves and their local L1-speaking self.

### **2.2.3 The L2 motivational self-system**

To respond to the argument of integrativeness, i.e. the increasing detachment between target languages and the cultural contexts, Dörnyei (2005) claimed that EFL students perceive the virtual L2 community as the certain group they intend to become instead of cling to a real native-speaker community. This perception not only strengthens the weakness of Gardner’s controversial integrativeness but lessens the relevance of identification with the actual L2 group (Kormos & Csizér, 2008).

Based on Higgins’ (1987) self-discrepancy theory, Csizér and Dörnyei (2005) proposed the model of the L2 motivational self-system, which is composed of three components: 1) *Ideal L2 Self*, 2) *Ought-to L2 Self*, and 3) *L2 Learning Experience*. *Ideal L2 Self*, subsuming integrativeness, refers to individual’s ideal self-image voicing the wish of being a qualified L2 speaker, which contains a promotion focus. Dörnyei (2009) asserted that “Traditional integrative and internalized instrumental motives would typically belong to this component,” (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 29). *Ought-to L2 Self* includes “attributes that one believes on ought to possess (e.g. various duties, obligations, or responsibilities) in order to avoid possible negative outcomes,” (Dörnyei, 2005, p. 106). Ought-to self guides includes a prevention focus which belongs to the more extrinsic types of instrumental motives (Dörnyei, 2009). *L2 Learning Experience* contains “situation-specific motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience” (Dörnyei, 2005, p. 106).

### **2.3 Instrumental motivation**

Instrumental motivation refers to pragmatic purposes for learning a second language such as a better occupation (Gardner, 1985). The utilitarian benefits, however, might not be related to learning English as a school subject in educational system (Dörnyei, 1994) in that other factors of instrumentality beyond the traditional instrumental end also involved, such as traveling, making foreign friends, and understanding the lyrics of English songs (Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000), both of which suggest that there is no clear-cut instrumental dimension.

## **3 Method**

### **3.1 Participants**

Based on cluster sampling, one intact class was randomly sampled from 21 classes of each year of a boys’ senior high school and the total number of the samples was 132 after eliminating invalid questionnaires.

According to the background information of the questionnaire, among the 132 participants whose average age was 16.47, only 26 had been abroad; 21 were for traveling/vacation while the other 4 were for studying abroad or visiting relatives; all of them stayed in English speaking countries for six months at most. Only the rest one participant had stayed with his relatives abroad for more than one year. Based the information mentioned above, less than 20% of participants (N=132) had been abroad for traveling/vacation or visiting relatives and

only one of them has had practical English studying experience in English speaking countries for more than one year. The English scores of the participants in this study, hence, might not be impacted by their experience of staying abroad.

### **3.2 Instruments**

The Motivation Questionnaire employed in this study (see Appendix A) was adapted based on two Motivational Orientation Questionnaires (Chen, 2008; Lai, 2008) because of the same research context as the present study and reliable internal consistency reliability and acceptable validity. Both Questionnaires (Chen, 2008; Lai, 2008) with the item pool from the three major sources: 1) Interviewing EFL learners, 2) five open-ended questions (see Appendix B), and 3) the published questionnaires related to English learning motivation. Both Chen's (2008) and Lai's (2008) L2 Learning Motivation Questionnaire was established through item analysis on the subscales of motivation, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in AMOS or in Lisrel respectively. The both questionnaires were validated with an extremely reliable internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's Alpha = .94), construct reliability ( $.58 < CR < .91$ ), and acceptable validity (the estimated coefficients were within acceptable limits;  $.50 < \lambda < .95$ ).

### **3.3 Procedures**

A hundred and thirty-six senior high school EFL students completed Motivation Questionnaire for investigating their English learning motivation. Skewness (SK) and kurtosis ( $K_u$ ) of 35 items of the Motivation Questionnaire in this study were calculated respectively, which indicated the distribution of 35 items were within the bell-shape graph ( $|SK| < 3$ ,  $|K_u| < 10$ ; Kline, 2005).

Through item analysis, items that do not fit for factor analysis were eliminated, including those whose item-total correlation coefficient was less than .30 and those non-significant items in independent t-test between the high- (the top 25% of Questionnaire scores) and low-groups (the bottom 25% of Questionnaire scores). Totally, six items (M2, M14, M16, M19, M24, and M28) of Motivation Questionnaire were eliminated. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was executed to extract factors of senior high school EFL students' English learning motivation. Furthermore, reliability analysis measured by Cronbach's Alpha and validity analysis assessed by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for the factors of English learning motivation were executed to verify the fitness of the factors of English learning motivation.

## **4 Results and discussion**

There are 4 major criteria to extract appropriate items with EFA: 1) Bartlett's test of sphericity suggesting whether the correlation coefficients are acceptable for EFA (Chiu, 2005), 2) Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) indicating the appropriateness of each single questionnaire item (Kaiser, 1970; Wang, 2004), 3) Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy representing the appropriateness of the whole questionnaires (Kaiser, 1974; Chiu, 2005), 4) Factor Loadings explaining the variance of percentage (Hair et al. 2006).

Since the factors of *English Learning Motivation* seem to be correlated respectively, oblique rotation seems to be more reasonable than orthogonal rotation (Tacq, 1997). On the other hand, there is no reason to assume that they are completely independent factors; it is always safer to assume they are not perfect independent and to adopt oblique rotation instead of orthogonal rotation. Rotational technique, Promax, rotates the orthogonal factors extracting through Varimax to oblique position, allowing correlations among factors. The fast rotational technique (Promax) can find out the correlation among factors and still keep the simplicity (Preacher & MacCallum, 2003). Based upon the advantages mentioned above, oblique rotation (Promax) was adopted in the study. Through principle components analysis (PCA) and oblique rotation (Promax), 35 items of Motivation Orientation were executed exploratory factor analysis (EFA). M22 was suggested to be eliminated because its communalities overlapped across two factors of English Learning Motivation which might cause confusing solution.

After 7 items (M2, M14, M16, M19, M22, M24, and M28) were eliminated from Motivation Questionnaire, Bartlett's test of sphericity is significantly proved and KMO value indicates a marvelous goodness of fit (KMO = .90) of the English learning motivational factors with 61.65% cumulative percentage of total variance. The reliability of the overall scale (Cronbach's  $\alpha$  =.930) suggests an excellent internal consistency of *English Learning Motivation*.

#### **4.1 Factors of English learning motivation**

Five motivational factors were extracted through EFA and the structure of the five factors, loadings, original classification, sources, the percentage of the variance extracted from 35 items of Motivation Questionnaire, reconceptualization and causes were displayed in Appendix C.

##### **4.1.1 Motivational factor 1 (MF1) intrinsic motivation**

Factor 1 (MF1), labeled as *Intrinsic Motivation*, consists of 8 items, all of which represent intrinsically motivated level of learning behavior. Four reverse scored items, M15, M23, M26, and M30 are classified into the same factor here. They were all recoded in the procedures of item analysis; therefore, the four items should be positively interpreted, for example, M15 should be interpreted as "Learning English is [not] a burden to me [at all]."

Four items, M15, M27, M17, and M21 are classified into intrinsic motivation in the published questionnaire (Dörnyei, 1990; Schmidt, et al., 1996). M30 and M26 are classified into Bad Learning Experiences, which described learners' past failures and attributed it to internal, unstable, and controllable reasons (Weiner, 1979; 1986) in the published questionnaire (Dörnyei, 1990). M31 is classified into Mastery Goal Orientation (Ames & Archer, 1988), whose concept is similar to intrinsic motivation that intrinsically motivated learners insist on language learning because of their own interests (M31 "I am interested in learning something new"). M23 originated from Requirements (Warden & Lin, 2000) whose nature conforms to the values that intrinsic motivated learners place on English learning (M23 "It is necessary to learn English") (Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). Thus, Factor 1 is labeled as *Intrinsic Motivation*.

Based on the eight items of MF1 *Intrinsic Motivation*, this construct does not merely reveal the basic concept of intrinsic motivation, learning for interest and enjoyment (M17, M31, and M27) but includes constitutional satisfaction derived from their positive beliefs in their own capabilities of English learning (M21 and M26) and the self values towards English learning (M23), all of which are reinforced by their pass pleasant experiences (M30) of English learning. The results mentioned above is consistent with the statement of “Motivation from within,” (Ushioda, 2008): “Intrinsically motivated learning is not simply ‘learning for the sake of learning’; nor is it simply learning for fun and enjoyment,” (Ushioda, 2008, p. 21).

The former component of MF1, learning for interest and enjoyment, also coincides with the third elements of Dörnyei’s *L2 Motivational Self-system*, *L2 learning experience* which refers to the extent to which learners like learning the target language (Csizér & Kormos, 2009).

In brief, MF1 *Intrinsic Motivation* refers to the intensity that senior high school EFL students intrinsically endeavor to obtain learning enjoyment, self-efficacy and expected values during their English learning process, all of which are related to how they like English.

#### **4.1.2 Motivational factor 2 (MF2) realistic uses**

Factor 2, labeled as *Realistic Uses*, consists of 6 items, all of which are all related to pragmatic purposes for learning English, laying particular stress on the present use. The factor inclines to specify what special benefits senior high school EFL students are eager to attain. Thus, Factor 2 is labeled as *Realistic Uses*.

M1 is grouped as *Realistic Uses* here, derived from instrumental motivation, but it was classified into *Integrative Motivation* in previous study (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 1990; Gardner, 1985), which seemingly proves the controversy of the ambiguous definition in integrative-instrumental duality but reveals the transition of motivation classification practically. With the universal of computer and the Internet, EFL learners have more chances to communicate with foreigners through the cyberspace for the purpose of improving their English speaking ability without going abroad because they endeavor to pursue a better future career or simply for fun and for making friends with similar habits. The ways of EFL learners’ making friends with foreigners have been changed from abroad contact or mails to domestic contact or Internet because of the rapid globalization, which brings about higher Foreign Direct Investment (Pica & Mora, 2011) accounted for a great number of immigrants coming from multinational corporations and other enterprises (Official Report of Ministry of the Interior of Taiwan, 2011). Although EFL senior high school learners might not have many chances to make friends with those supervisors and technical staffs, they still have more chances to make friends with their households and a great number of foreign labors from different countries, all of whom can be communicated with in the acknowledged lingua franca – English. Moreover, the communication with foreigners may be ascribed to some other pragmatic reasons, such as facilitating communication during senior high school EFL learners’ travel abroad or the visiting of exchange students from foreign countries and promoting their English abilities through the direct contact with foreigners domestically for a better career. Senior high school EFL learners’ willingness to communicate with foreigners can be raised because of the more frequent domestic interaction with foreigners and the increasing positive values in English from news and the surroundings – good English ability

can be helpful to entering famed schools or enterprises for a better future. Thus, M1 is theoretically and practically classified into instrumental motivation.

Unlike Noels' statement – Clément and Kruidenier's (1983) three orientations, the Travel, Friendship, and Knowledge orientations, were highly correlated with the more self-determined and intrinsic types of motivation from the aspect of attitudes toward the learning situation (Noels, 2003), Travel and Requiring Knowledge are grouped into instrumental motivation MF2 *Realistic Uses* in the present study. In Canadian ESL context, traveling to Quebec, French-speaking areas and France, for those students of the University of Ottawa in Noels' research, is to seek a sense of belongingness, which comes from openness to French-speaking Canadians, French-speaking people, and French people of local francophone communities. On the contrary, traveling abroad, for EFL senior high school learners of the present study, is for vacation or visiting their relatives abroad rather than pursuit of a sense of belongingness coming from certain communities abroad. In other words, learning English is for specific pragmatic reasons, such as facilitating communication with foreigners while they travel abroad. Therefore, M5, "Learning English helps me a lot when I travel abroad," is reasonably classified in instrumental motivation, MF2 *Realistic Uses*.

Some research grouped "Travel" with different description to integrative motivation: "Travel overseas" (Mori & Gobel, 2006), "Go to various foreign countries," (Carreira, 2011), and "To travel around English-speaking countries," (Chang, 2006). All the description mentioned above could be interpreted as integrative motivation – admiration for foreign cultures and interests in the target language. To avoid the ambiguity of description, some research adopted two separate items in integrative and instrumental motivation respectively – "Useful for travel," in instrumentality and "Travel to country," in Attitudes toward the L2 speakers/communities (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005), and "help me when travelling abroad in the future," in Instrumental scale and "travel to this country," in affective scale (Humphreys & Spratt, 2008).

M4 also reveals an interest and desire to acquire knowledge that is not limited to language (English) field but to any possible field by using English, the only valid language that everyone can understand all over the world (Sarica & Cavus, 2009). Obviously, English may be used as a tool for a particular pragmatic reason – requiring knowledge.

Consistent with the instrumentality of Knowledge Orientation (Yashima, 2009), one of the two manifestations of International Posture (Yashima, 2000; 2002; 2009), M20 also reveals interest in foreign or international affairs to get more about the latest news in the world by using English.

In short, MF2 *Realistic Uses* refers to the involvement in English learning that instrumentally motivated senior high school EFL students cling to their English learning for the special benefits of present uses, such as communicating with foreigners, getting more knowledge, having a better life, etc.

#### **4.1.3 Motivational factor 3 (MF3) prospective uses**

Factor 3, labeled as *Prospective Uses*, is composed of 4 items, all of which refer to the pragmatic goals or furthering a career for learning English, laying the emphasis on future use.



The pragmatic goals of the factor also directs to the prospective use. Therefore, factor 3 is tagged as *Prospective Uses*.

In a word, MF3 *Prospective Uses* refers to the involvement in English learning that instrumentally motivated senior high school EFL students strive for the pragmatic goals of future uses.

#### **4.1.4 Motivational factor 4 (MF4) performance**

Factor 4, labeled as *Performance*, consists of 5 items. M25 is considered Intrinsic Motivation in the published questionnaire (Schmidt et al., 1996). Based on the purpose of goal orientation theory – focusing on learners’ learning and performance in school setting, learners with performance orientation tend to concentrate on getting good grades in English which is considered an important school subject for acquiring a sense of achievement; namely, it is reasonably classified M25 “Learning English well makes me feel a sense of achievement,” performance orientation. As a result, Factor 4 is labeled as *Performance*.

Performance orientation can be associated with extrinsic motivation that involves behaviors to obtain rewards from outside and beyond learners themselves. Be that as it may, MF4 *Performance* neither reflects learners’ anticipation of tangible rewards nor acts due to some types of pressure derived from avoidance of guilty reluctantly; indeed, it reveals individual judgment and identification on the highly valued goals, regarded as an even more self-determined form of extrinsic motivation – identified regulation, which is much close to intrinsic motivation.

Briefly, MF4 *Performance* refers to the intensity that senior high school EFL students put into their English learning activities for a sense of achievement of outperforming others, derived from identified regulation.

#### **4.1.5 Motivational factor 5 (MF5) sociocultural need**

Factor 5, labeled as *Sociocultural Need*, is composed of 5 items. M9 and M13 were both grouped as Integrative Motivation while M8 was classified into Instrumental Motivation in the published questionnaire (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 1994; Gardner, 1985). The rest 2 items, M10 and M7 are originated from Open-response questions and interviews (Lai, 2008), which is labeled as Sociocultural Orientation.

Both M9 and M13 refer to traditional integrative motivation, whose goal-directed behaviors are derived from an interest in foreign cultures (Gardner, 1985) and cultural products (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983), while M9 and the other three items (M7, M8, and M10) display the instrumentality – promotion, both of which are consistent in the two major components of *Ideal L2 Self*. All explanation will be elaborated in the following section.

Deeply influenced by the positive social values of English (in Taiwan), senior high school EFL learners may desire to make foreign friends who can be communicated in English or even to study abroad based on their reaction to the learning context. Since the ways of EFL learners’ making friends with foreigners (M9) have been changed, EFL learners may make foreign friends domestically or through cyberspace because of globalization and the universal

of the Internet. Making foreign friends is considered an integrative motivation because of its noticeable interests in foreign cultures; in addition, it may be regarded as an instrumental orientation since EFL learners seem to find someone with similar habits to share life experiences with. Making foreign friends (M9), therefore, involves in both integrative motivation and instrumentality.

Although EFL learners may make friends with foreigners without going abroad because of globalization, they still cannot find any certain domestic community, which consists of these immigrants, they desire to integrate with. Therefore, EFL learners will cling to the virtual images of how it would be if they could speak English well, which is consistent in the framework of *Ideal L2 Self*. EFL learners make friends with foreigners partly because of interests in foreign cultures and partly because of pragmatic reasons – sharing life experiences with someone with similar habits.

The universal of computer and the Internet (M8) also triggers both the instrumental and integrative ends of EFL learners' English learning motivation. On the one hand, computer users can facilitate the computer operation if they understand how to manage the English alerts from the operating systems of their personal computers – the instrumental orientation. On the other hand, English, the generally acknowledged language around the world (Sarica & Cavus, 2009), may help netizens (EFL learners) surf the Internet for acquiring information, including language (English) – the integrative motivation, and other fields – the instrumental orientation, and make foreign friends through social networking (Kabilan, et al., 2010) and blogs (Kabilan, et al., 2010; Sarica & Cavus, 2009). Even if English has been reported losing its dominance across the cyberspace with the development of Web and social networking in other languages (Graddol, 2006), it is the prevailing foreign language for EFL senior high school learners because English is not only the major course for admission to higher education and occupation (in Taiwan/in Asian EFL context) for decades but also the only foreign language course involving in compulsory education (in Taiwan/in Asian EFL context).

Obviously, globalization and the universal of the Internet also reinforce senior high school EFL learners' possible selves. The indirect contact with foreigners through cyberspace may lower much EFL learners' anxiety than direct contact and take their possible selves of what they might become and what they would like to become if they can speak English fluently into practice step by step.

The interests in cultural products (M10 “I want to learn English because it helps to read the magazines, novels, and newspapers in English) also include both integrative and instrumental orientation; the former reflects EFL learners' concerns and admiration in foreign cultures while the latter is related to knowledge of other fields except English.

The involvement of “studying abroad (M7)” in both integrative and instrumental orientation can be attributed to EFL learners' attitude toward the foreign country and their instrumental orientation – promotion of a better career. Willingness to go overseas to study not only refers to an attitudinal propensity of International Posture (Yashima, 2009), which represents openness to foreignness – the core of integrativeness (Gardner, 1985) – but comprises their aggressiveness in academic fields for a better future.

In sum, MF5 *Sociocultural Need* refers to senior high school EFL students' interests in foreign cultures and cultural products and pursuit of certain pragmatic benefits with a promotion focus to make them persist in their English learning. The persistence is not related to the openness to other local or foreign communities at all but clings to positive social values of English and its practicality, both of which create virtual images of how senior high school EFL students could be if they could speak English fluently.

#### 4.2 Sociocultural need and ideal L2 self

MF5 *Sociocultural Need* is proved to parallel with *Ideal L2 Self*, referring to traditional integrative (M9 & M13) and internalized instrumental motives by statistics shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Correlation and partial correlation coefficients of motivational factors**

|     | MF1  | MF2  | MF3  | MF4  | MF5                |
|-----|--|--|--|--|--------------------|
| MF1 | 1.000  | .423**<br>(.066)   | .573**<br>(.260**)   | .597**<br>(.251**)   | .679**<br>(.420**) |
| MF2 | ( $r_{12 \cdot 3}$ ) <sup>a</sup> .213**<br>( $r_{12 \cdot 4}$ ).193**<br>( $r_{12 \cdot 5}$ ).240** | 1.000  | .469**<br>(.257**)   | .481**<br>(.262**)   | .384**<br>(.003)   |
| MF3 | ( $r_{13 \cdot 2}$ ).469**<br>( $r_{13 \cdot 4}$ ).413**<br>( $r_{13 \cdot 5}$ ).340**               | ( $r_{23 \cdot 1}$ ).305**<br>( $r_{23 \cdot 4}$ ).314**<br>( $r_{23 \cdot 5}$ ).339** | 1.000  | .471**<br>(.055)   | .533**<br>(.185**) |
| MF4 | ( $r_{14 \cdot 2}$ ).495**<br>( $r_{14 \cdot 3}$ ).452**<br>( $r_{14 \cdot 5}$ ).333**               | ( $r_{24 \cdot 1}$ ).314**<br>( $r_{24 \cdot 3}$ ).334**<br>( $r_{24 \cdot 5}$ ).342** | ( $r_{34 \cdot 1}$ ).195**<br>( $r_{34 \cdot 2}$ ).317**<br>( $r_{34 \cdot 5}$ ).230** | 1.000  | .587**<br>(.264**) |
| MF5 | ( $r_{15 \cdot 2}$ ).618**<br>( $r_{15 \cdot 3}$ ).539**<br>( $r_{15 \cdot 4}$ ).506**               | ( $r_{25 \cdot 1}$ ).145**<br>( $r_{25 \cdot 3}$ ).178**<br>( $r_{25 \cdot 4}$ ).143** | ( $r_{35 \cdot 1}$ ).240**<br>( $r_{35 \cdot 2}$ ).433**<br>( $r_{35 \cdot 4}$ ).360** | ( $r_{45 \cdot 1}$ ).309**<br>( $r_{45 \cdot 2}$ ).497**<br>( $r_{45 \cdot 3}$ ).450** | 1.000              |

*Note.* a= partial correlation coefficients between MF1 and MF2 with MF3 controlled; MF1= Intrinsic Motivation, MF2=Realistic Uses, MF3=Prospective Uses, MF4=Performance, MF5=Sociocultural Need.

As shown in Table 1, the coefficients in the upper part of the matrix are Pearson correlation coefficients while in the brackets are partial correlation coefficients with the other three motivation factors controlled. The lower part of the matrix shows partial correlation coefficients with one single motivation factor controlled.

Both the correlation and partial correlation coefficients between MF5 and MF1 are the highest ( $r = .679$ ;  $r_{15 \cdot 234}=.420$ ) and the partial coefficient with MF4 *Performance* controlled is the lowest one ( $r_{15 \cdot 4}=.506$ ), suggesting the correlation between MF5 and MF1 is related to MF4 the most. Moreover, the correlations between MF5 and the other three motivation factors, MF2( $r_{25 \cdot 4}=.143$ ), MF3( $r_{35 \cdot 1}=.240$ ), and MF4( $r_{45 \cdot 1}=.309$ ), are related to either MF4 (identified regulation) which is close to intrinsic motivation, or MF1 *Intrinsic Motivation*, also revealing the close relationship to MF5, MF1 and MF4. Therefore, the instrumental motivation involving in MF5 *Sociocultural Need* can be reasonably considered internalized instrumental motives.

### 4.3 Reliability analysis

After factor extraction process, five factors of *Motivation* were extracted. The overall and sub-scale reliability for dimensionality and sub-dimensionality of *English Learning Motivation* are listed in Table 2.

**Table 2. Reliability indices**

| Dimensionality                     | Sub-dimensionality       | Cronbach's $\alpha$ | Total Items | Item No.                                |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------|---|
| <u>English Learning Motivation</u> |                          | .930                |             |   |
|                                    | MF1 Intrinsic Motivation | .889                | 8           | M15, M17, M21, M23, M26, M27, M30, M31. |
|                                    | MF2 Realistic Uses       | .808                | 6           | M1, M4, M5, M11, M20, M29               |
|                                    | MF3 Prospective Uses     | .813                | 4           | M6, M32, M33, M34.                      |
|                                    | MF4 Performance          | .804                | 5           | M3, M12, M18, M25, M35.                 |
|                                    | MF5 Sociocultural Need   | .800                | 5           | M7, M8, M9, M10, M13                    |

In Table 2, five extracted factors of Motivation are listed respectively. The first extracted factor of Motivation, MF1 *Intrinsic Motivation*, consists of 8 items (M15, M17, M21, M23, M26, M27, M30, and M31) with credible reliability (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .889$ ). The overall reliability of *English Learning Motivation* is .930 and the sub-scale reliability of each sub-dimensionality is from .800 to .889, both of which indicate credible reliability of the overall and the sub-constructs of *English Learning Motivation*.

### 4.4 Validity analysis

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is a better way of testing how well measured variables represent a smaller number of sub-dimensionality (Bollen, 1989). The proportion of variance will be considered good, if squared multiple correlation (SMC), the proportion of variance in sub-dimensionality explained by all variables, is greater than .30 (Bollen, 1989). The SMC of each sub-dimensionality of *Motivation* are listed in Table 3.

**Table 3. Second-order CFA of English learning motivation factors**

| Dimensionality                     | Sub-dimensionality       | SMC | T-value  |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|----------|
| <u>English Learning Motivation</u> | MF1 Intrinsic Motivation | .53 | 9.16***  |
|                                    | MF2 Realistic Uses       | .76 | 11.78*** |
|                                    | MF3 Prospective Uses     | .47 | 8.48***  |
|                                    | MF4 Performance          | .31 | 6.50***  |
|                                    | MF5 Sociocultural Need   | .53 | 9.17***  |

Note. SMC = squared multiple correlation; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

As shown in Table 3, the SMC of the five sub-dimensionality of *English Learning Motivation* is from .31 to .76, all of which suggest a satisfactory proportion of variance explained by all variables.

Construct validity, referring to the accuracy of measurement, can be assessed by: 1) standardized loading estimates ( $>.50$ ), 2) average variance extracted (AVE  $>.50$ ), and 3)

construct reliability (CR >.70). The three criteria of construct validity are assessed and explained below. First, all standardized loading estimates of dimensionalities — *English Learning Motivation* — are greater than .50. Next, AVE and CR of dimensionalities are listed in Table 4.

**Table 4. Indices of motivational sub-dimensionality**

| Dimensionality                            | Sub-dimensionality       | CR  | AVE |
|---|--------------------------|-----|-----|
| <b><u>English Learning Motivation</u></b> | MF1 Intrinsic Motivation | .89 | .51 |
|   | MF2 Realistic Uses       | .80 | .41 |
|   | MF3 Prospective Use      | .82 | .54 |
|   | MF4 Performance          | .83 | .50 |
|   | MF5 Sociocultural Need   | .80 | .45 |

Note. CR=Construct Reliability; AVE= Average variance extracted.

In Table 4, CR of each sub-dimensionality of *English Learning Motivation* is from .80 to .89 that indicates adequate convergence and its corresponding AVE is from .41 to .51 that suggests adequate convergent validity except for MF2 (AVE = .41) and MF5 (AVE =.45).

#### 4.5 Summary of the findings

The investigation into senior high school EFL students’ English learning motivation has developed a motivation questionnaire validated with credible reliability of the overall and the sub-constructs of English learning motivation and with adequate convergent validity of each sub-dimensionality based on the prerequisite of oblique rotation (promax) rather than orthogonal rotation. The analysis of the survey with the Motivation Questionnaire for EFL learners’ English learning motivation shows two major findings: diversification and reconceptualization of EFL learners’ English learning motivation, both of which can be ascribed to the influence of the EFL context and globalization.

Based on the present study, senior high school EFL students’ English learning motivation consists of five motivation factors: MF1 *Intrinsic Motivation*, MF2 *Realistic Uses*, MF3 *Prospective Uses*, MF4 *Performance*, and MF5 *Sociocultural Need*, all of which comprise three major motivation theories: 1) *intrinsic-extrinsic* dichotomy, composed of MF1 *Intrinsic Motivation* and MF4 *Performance*, 2) *integrative-instrumental* duality, consisting of MF5 *Sociocultural Need*, MF2 *Realistic Uses*, and MF3 *Prospective Use* , and 3) the *L2 Motivational Self-system*, including MF1 *Intrinsic Motivation* (also *L2 Learning Experience*) and MF5 *Sociocultural Need* (also *Ideal L2 Self*), all of which proves that motivation is so multi-faced to be measured in the same way (Macaro, 2003).

The adjacency between MF1 and MF4 indicates that senior high school EFL learners of the present study are both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated indeed and they would benefit from a mixture of these approaches, which corresponds with some researchers’ viewpoints (Story et al., 2009) and proves extrinsic motivation may not undermine intrinsic motivation necessarily.

Some previous research indicated the overlap between instrumental and integrative motivation (Chang, 2006; Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005; Dörnyei, 1990; Warden & Lin, 2000). The overlap between instrumental and integrative motivation may attribute to motivation’s multi-dimensioned construct; integrative motivation has been considered either

intrinsic (Noels, 2001, 2003) or extrinsic (Gardner, 1985) in the ESL context because it has been expounded from different aspects of integrative motivation respectively namely integrativeness and goal-directed behavior. The complicated multi-dimensioned construct will not be elaborated completely until a series of related factors, such as learning context, economic factors originating from globalization, and economic system, are taken into consideration.

It hardly ignores economic factors when it comes to globalization especially for countries mainly depending on trade. Deeply influenced by the positive social values in English – the major language which is useful in both exporting and importing business, senior high school EFL learners in the present study English in order to pursue a better future career; namely, four out of five English learning motivations are related to instrumentality. Moreover, the instrumental superiority in English learning has generally existed in the areas (contexts) whose economic system depends on trade surplus, such as Taiwan (Chang, 2006; Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005; Warden & Lin, 2000), Hong Kong (Humphreys & Spratt, 2008), and Japan (Carreira, 2011; Kaneko & Kawaguchi, 2010). It strongly suggests that economic factors of the learning situation should be taken into consideration besides the language context.

Globalization not only switches integrative motivation to instrumentality (M1) but broadens the conception of integrative motivation combining with internalized instrumental motivation as well. In other words, MF5 *Sociocultural Need* is equal to *Ideal L2 Self*.

Unlike the controversy in the overlap between instrumental and integrative motivation, *Ideal L2 Self* of Dörnyei's *L2 Motivational Self-system* indeed includes internalized instrumental motives and traditional integrative motivation. The overlap between instrumental and integrative motivation in *Ideal L2 Self* is also the effect of globalization. The lack of Integrativeness (openness to identify with the other community) in the EFL context does not mean integrative motivation does not exist at all but depends on how the integrative motivation is defined. Warden and Lin's (2000) statement of lack of integrative motivation (i.e., social contacts) among Taiwan EFL learners may be ascribed to the lack of integrativeness. On the contrary, Yashima's (2002) International posture (similar to integrative orientation) plays a pivotal role in L2 Proficiency through L2 Learning Motivation coming from the effect of globalization. The lack of integrativeness in the EFL context and globalization fortify the concept that English is a global language without involving in any particular communities.

Interestingly, senior high school EFL students in the present study show no *ought-to L2 self* in the present study, asserting the aggressive and positive attitudes toward English learning. Obviously, Dörnyei's *L2 Motivational Self-system* exists in the EFL context of Taiwan indeed without the prevention focus on English learning.

## **5 Conclusion**

Language learning motivation is not stable but changes with the learning context and time. The traditional integrative motivation has been considered an out-of-date term losing its initial explanatory power in the EFL context (Lamb, 2004; Ushioda, 2011; Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2009). In addition to the two elements mentioned above, the third element, economic factor,

should not be ignored for a comprehensive survey in language learning motivation.

The major influence of globalization on EFL learners' English learning motivation is the superiority of instrumental motivation over other ones and the reconceptualization of traditional integrative motivation, which is broadened out with both traditional integrative motivation and internalized instrumental motivation (*Ideal L2 Self*). This reconceptualization strongly depends on the economic system of the learning context; the higher percentages of trade the nation depends on, the more influence of globalization on language learning motivation it may receive.

## References

- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 260–267.
- Block, D. (2010). Globalization and language teaching. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 287–304). London: Routledge.
- Bollen, K.A. (1989). A new incremental fit index for general structure equation models. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 17, 303–316.
- Carreira, J.M. (2011). Relationship between motivation for learning EFL and intrinsic motivation for learning in general among Japanese elementary school students. *System*, 39, 90–102.
- Chang, S.F. (2006). *College students' motivation for learning English as a foreign language*. Taipei: The Crane.
- Chen, J.F., Warden, C.A., & Chang, H.T. (2005). The case of Chinese EFL learners and the influence of culture on motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39 (4), 609–633.
- Chen, W.Y. (2008). *Junior high school students' motivation for learning*. (Unpublished master's thesis). National Changhua University of Education, Chanhua, Taiwan.
- Chiu, H.C. (2005). *Quantitative research and statistical analysis in social & behavioral sciences*. Taipei: Wu Nan.
- Clément, R., & Kruidenier, B.G. (1983). Orientations in second language acquisition: The effects of ethnicity, milieu, and target language on their emergence. *Language Learning*, 33, 273–291.
- Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(1), 19–36.

- Csizér, K., & Kormos, J. (2009). Learning experiences, selves and motivated learning behavior: A comparative analysis of structural models for Hungarian secondary and university learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 98–119). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning*, 40, 45–78.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 273–284.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Kormos, J. (2000). The role of individual and social variables in oral task performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 275–300.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 9–42). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. (1959). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *Why global English may mean the end of ‘English as a foreign language’*. London: British Council.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Higgins, E.T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94, 319–340.
- Hair, Jr. J.F., Black, W.C, Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R.L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Trenton, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Humphreys, G., & Spratt, M. (2008). Many languages, many motivations: A study of Hong Kong students’ motivation to learn different target languages. *System*, 36, 313–335.



- Kabilan, M.K., Ahmad N., & Abidin, M.J.Z. (2010). Facebook: An online environment for learning of English in institutions of higher education? *Internet and Higher Education*, 13, 179–187.
- Kaiser, H.F. (1970). A second generation little Jiffy. *Psychometrika*, 35(4), 401–415.
- Kaiser, H.F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31–36.
- Kaneko, E., & Kawaguchi, T. (2010). A report on an initial study of motivation for learning English: A case study of future information and communication technology professionals (pp. 315–320).
- Kline, R.B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford.
- Kramersch, C. (2010). Theorizing translingual/transcultural competence. In G. Levine & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (pp. 15–31). Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Kramersch, C. (2012a). Imposture: A late modern notion in post-structuralist SLA research. *Applied Linguistics*, 33, 483–502.
- Kramersch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign language in an era of globalization: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(1), 296–311.
- Lai, S.L. (2008). *Vocational high school students' motivation for learning English as a foreign language*. (Unpublished master's thesis). National Chanhua University of Education, Chanhua, Taiwan.
- Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System*, 32, 13–19.
- Macaro, E. (2003). *Teaching and learning a second language: A guide to current research and its application*. London: Continuum.
- Mori, S., & Gobel, P. (2006). motivation and gender in the Japanese EFL classroom. *System*, 34, 194–210.
- Noels, K. (2001). New orientations in language learning motivation: Towards a model of intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations and motivations. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition: Technical Report 23* (pp. 43–68). Honolulu, HI: The University of Hawai'i.
- Noels, K.A. (2003). Learning Spanish as a second language: Learners' orientations and perceptions of their teachers' communication style. *Language Learning*, 53, 99–136.
- Pica, G., & Mora, J.V.R. (2011). Who's afraid of a globalized world? Foreign Direct Investments, local knowledge and allocation of talents. *Journal of International Economics*, 85, 86–101.

- Preacher, K.J., & MacCallum R.C. (2003). Repairing Tom Swift's electric factor analysis machine. *Understanding Statistics*, 2(1), 13–43.
- Sarica, G.N., & Cavus, N. (2009). New trends in 21<sup>st</sup> Century English learning. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 439–445.
- Schmidt, R., Boraie, D., & Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign language motivation: Internal structure and external connections. In R.L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 165–205). Manon, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Shaaban, K.A., & Ghaith, G. (2000). Student motivation to learn English as a foreign language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(6), 632–644.
- Story, P.A., Hart, J. W., Stasson, M. F., & Mahoney, J.M. (2009). Using a two-factor theory of achievement motivation to examine performance-based outcomes and self-regulatory processes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 391–395.
- Tacq, J. (1997). *Multivariate analysis techniques in social science research: From problem to analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Ushioda, E. (2008). Motivation and good language learners. In G. Griffiths (Eds.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp.19-34). UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ushioda, E. (2011). Language learning motivation, self and identity: current theoretical perspectives. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(3), 199–210.
- Ushioda, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2009). Motivation, language identities and the L2 self: A theoretical overview. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 350–356). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Wadell, E., & Shandor, A. (2012). Motivation in a globalizing world. *The Language Teacher*, 36(6), 32–36.
- Wang, P.C. (2004). *Multivariate analysis: Statistical package and data analysis*. Taipei: Edubook Published Inc.
- Warden, C.A., & Lin, H.J. (2000). Existence of integrative motivation in an Asian EFL setting. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33 (5), 535–547.
- Warschauer, M. (2000). The changing global economy and the future of English teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 511–535.
- Weiner, B. (1979). A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 3–25.

- Weiner, B. (1986). Attribution, emotion and action. In R.M. Sorrentino & E.T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior* (pp. 280–312). Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley & Sons.
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J.S. (1992). The development of achievement task values: A theoretical analysis. *Developmental Review, 12*, 265–310.
- Yashima, T. (2000). Orientations and motivation in foreign language learning: A study of Japanese college students. *JACET Bulletin, 31*, 121–133.
- Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*, 54–66.
- Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the ideal L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 145–163). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **The Motivation Questionnaire (English Version)**

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = undecided

4 = agree

5 = strongly agree

1. I learn English to be able to communicate with foreigners.
2. I learn English in order to enter a good school.
3. English proficiency is highly valued by the society.
4. To get more knowledge, I want to learn English.
5. I learn English to communicate easily when I travel abroad.
6. In order to get a better job in the future, I want to learn English.
7. I learn English because I want to study abroad.
8. I learn English because I need it when I use a computer and the Internet.
9. I learn English to make friends with foreigners.
10. I would like to learn English well because it helps me read the magazines, novels, and newspapers in English.
11. English proficiency helps me have a better life.
12. To be a better and more capable student, I want to learn English.
13. I learn English to better understand customs and cultures of foreign countries.
14. I learn English because I want to pass the GEPT exam.
15. Learning English is a burden to me.
16. I learn English because I would like to immigrate to an English speaking country.
17. I learn English because I am interested in the language.
18. I want to be better than others so I learn English.
19. I work hard on English because I want to obtain good grades.
20. Learning English helps me learn about the latest news in the world.
21. I am confident that I can learn English well.
22. I learn English because it helps me in singing English songs or seeing movies in English.
23. I don't think it is necessary to learn too much English.
24. I learn English because America and Britain are powerful countries.
25. Learning English well gives me a sense of achievement.
26. I have given up learning English.
27. I really enjoy learning English.
28. I learn English because people around me are learning English.
29. I want to learn English well because I want to understand the English labels on products.
30. I don't like learning English because I had bad learning experiences before.
31. I learn English because I am interested in learning something new.
32. Learning English well helps me a lot when I am doing my assignments or acquiring new information.
33. I hope that I can speak English fluently.
34. I learn English because it will be very helpful for my future.
35. It is important for me to outperform others in my class.

## APPENDIX B

### Open-ended Questions

| Source                    | The Open-ended Questions  |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b><u>Chen (2008)</u></b> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Why do you think you are learning English?</li><li>2. What are your goals of learning English?</li><li>3. Do you experience difficulties in learning English? If yes, what kind?</li><li>4. How do you feel and what do you do when you have difficulties?</li><li>5. When do you feel it is a joy to learn English?</li></ol>   |
| <b><u>Lai (2008)</u></b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Exact Reasons for Learning English<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Why do you learn English?</li><li>- What do you think are the benefits of learning English?</li></ul></li><li>2. Goals of Learning English<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- What are your goals to learn English? (You can describe past goals, present goals, or future goals.)</li></ul></li><li>3. Difficulties of Learning English<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- In the process of learning English, what kind of difficulty have you ever encountered?</li><li>- When you faced difficulties in learning English, how do you feel? How do you solve the difficulty you encountered?</li></ul></li><li>4. Fun of Learning English.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Is it fun to learn English? Why? Under what condition do you feel happy to learn English?</li></ul></li><li>5. Language Uses<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- What is the best advantage of learning English at present? Do you often use English?</li><li>- When and which condition do you think can you use English (now or future)?</li></ul></li></ol> |

## APPENDIX C

Factor Loadings, Classification, Source of Motivation, Reconceptualization and Causes

| <b>Factor 1</b>                         | <b>Intrinsic Motivation</b>  | <b>loading</b> | <b>Classification (Source)</b>  | <b>Reconceptualization (Causes)</b>                               |
|---|--|----------------|---|---|
| M15                                     | Learning English is a burden to me.  | .87            | Intrinsic Motivation (Dörnyei, 1990; Schmidt et al., 1996).                           |   |
| M27                                     | I enjoy learning English.  | .80            | Intrinsic Motivation (Schmidt et al., 1996).  |   |
| M17                                     | I learn English because I am interested in the language.                     | .79            | Intrinsic Motivation (Dörnyei, 1990; Schmidt et al., 1996).                           |   |
| M21                                     | I am confident that I can learn English well.                                | .76            | Intrinsic Motivation (Dörnyei, 1990; Schmidt et al., 1996).                           |   |
| M30                                     | I don't like learning English because I had bad learning experiences before. | .72            | Bad Learning Experiences (Dörnyei, 1990)  |   |
| M31                                     | I learn English because I am interested in learning something new.           | .69            | Mastery Goal Orientation (Ames & Archer, 1988)  |   |
| M23                                     | It's not necessary to learn too much English.                                | .66            | Requirements (Warden & Lin, 2000)   |   |
| M26                                     | I have given up learning English because I don't think I can learn it well.  | .65            | Bad Learning Experiences (Dörnyei, 1990)  |   |
| <i>(Proportion of Variance: 35.85%)</i> |  |                |   |   |
| <b>Factor 2</b>                         | <b>Realistic Uses</b>  | <b>loading</b> | <b>Classification (Source)</b>  | <b>Reconceptualization (Causes)</b>                               |
| M1                                      | I learn English because it helps me to communicate with foreigners.          | .77            | Integrative Motivation (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 1994; Gardner, 1985)     | Instrumental Motivation (Globalization)                           |
| M4                                      | I learn English because it helps me get more knowledge.                      | .73            | Expectancy & Satisfaction. (Chen, 2008; Open-ended Question); Intrinsic (Noels, 2003) | Instrumentality (Distinction between the ESL and the EFL context) |

| <b>Factor 2</b>                        | <b>Realistic Uses</b>  | <b>loading</b> | <b>Classification (Source)</b>   | <b>Reconceptualization (Causes)</b>                               |
|--|--|----------------|--|---|
| M5                                     | Learning English helps me a lot when I travel abroad.  | .70            | Extrinsic Motivation (Schmidt, et. al., 1996); Intrinsic (Noels, 2003)             | Instrumentality (Distinction between the ESL and the EFL context) |
| M11                                    | I learn English because it helps me to have better life.   | .67            | Instrumental Motivation (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 1994; Gardner, 1985) |   |
| M29                                    | There are many products labeled in English, so it is convenient to learn English well in daily life. | .57            | Extrinsic Motivation (Schmidt, et al., 1996)                                       |   |
| M20                                    | Learning English helps me to get more about the latest news in the world.                            | .54            | Instrumental Motivation (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 1994; Gardner, 1985) |   |
| <i>(Proportion of Variance: 7.96%)</i> |  |                |  |   |
| <b>Factor 3</b>                        | <b>Prospective Uses</b>  | <b>loading</b> | <b>Classification (Source)</b>   | <b>Reconceptualization (Causes)</b>                               |
| M34                                    | I learn English because it is useful someday.  | .83            | Instrumental Motivation (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 1994; Gardner, 1985) |   |
| M33                                    | I hope that I can speak English fluently.  | .82            | Instrumental Motivation (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 1994; Gardner, 1985) |   |
| M6                                     | I learn English because it would help me have a good job in the future.                              | .74            | Extrinsic Motivation (Schmidt, et al., 1996)                                       |   |
| M32                                    | Learning English well helps me a lot when I am doing my assignments or acquiring new information.    | .60            | Utilitarian Purposes (Chen, 2008; Interview Open-ended Question)                   |   |
| <i>(Proportion of Variance: 7.60%)</i> |  |                |  |   |

*Knowledge, Skills and Competencies in Foreign Language Education*

| <b>Factor 4</b>                        | <b>Performance</b>   | <b>loading</b> | <b>Classification (Source)</b>   | <b>Reconceptualization (Causes)</b>                          |
|--|--|----------------|--|--|
| M18                                    | I want to be better than others so I learn English.  | .83            | Performance goal orientation (Ames & Archer, 1989)   |  |
| M25                                    | Learning English well makes me feel a sense of achievement.  | .74            | Intrinsic Motivation (Schmidt et al., 1996)  | Performance Orientation (Performance in school setting)      |
| M35                                    | It is important for me to outperform others in my class.   | .73            | Performance (Ames & Archer, 1988)  |  |
| M3                                     | English proficiency is highly valued by the society.   | .69            | Expectancy & Satisfaction (Chen, 2008; Interview & Open-ended Question)  |  |
| M12                                    | Being a better and capable student, I want to learn English well.                                  | .66            | Expectancy & Satisfaction (Chen, 2008; Interview & Open-ended Question).   |  |
| <i>(Proportion of Variance: 6.30%)</i> |  |                |  |  |
| <b>Factor 5</b>                        | <b>Sociocultural Need</b>  | <b>loading</b> | <b>Classification (Source)</b>   | <b>Reconceptualization (Causes)</b>                          |
| M8                                     | I learn English because I need it when I use computers and the Internet.                           | .76            | Instrumental Motivation (Chang, 2006; Chen, 2008; Lai, 2008; Open-response Questions & Interviews)                   | Integrative Motivation and Instrumentality (Globalization)   |
| M10                                    | I want to learn English because it helps to read the magazines, novels, and newspapers in English. | .72            | Entertainment (Lai, 2008; Open-response Questions & Interviews)  | Integrative Motivation and Instrumentality (Promotion focus) |
| M9                                     | I would like to make friends with foreigners, so I want to learn English.                          | .71            | Integrative Motivation (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 1990; Gardner, 1985) Intrinsic Motivation (Noels, 2003) | Integrative Motivation and Instrumentality (Globalization)   |



| <b>Factor 5</b> | <b>Sociocultural Need</b>  | <b>loading</b> | <b>Classification (Source)</b>  | <b>Reconceptualization (Causes)</b>                          |
|-----------------|--|----------------|---|--|
| M13             | Learning English helps me to better understand custom and cultures of foreign countries. | .69            | Integrative Motivation (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 1994; Gardner, 1985) |  |
| M7              | I learn English because I want to study abroad.  | .66            | Sociocultural Orientation (Lai, 2008; Open-response questions & interviews)       | Integrative Motivation and Instrumentality (Promotion focus) |
|                 | <i>(Proportion of Variance: 3.81%)</i>   |                |   |  |
|                 | <i>(Total Variance%: 61.65%)</i>   |                |   |  |