

FROM EFL TO ESL: THE INFLUENCE OF CONTEXT ON LEARNERS' MOTIVATIONAL PROFILES

Hanqiong Xu
Arizona State University

This study reports on changes in language learners' motivational profiles when they encounter a contextual shift from an EFL to an ESL setting. A pilot study explores the possible changes in learners' motivation orientations and their interrelation with learning effort and self-evaluated language skills. Subjects in an ESL context were surveyed and asked to reflect on their previous experience in an EFL context. Findings suggest that integrative motivation accounted for their increased effort investment and self-evaluated skills. The implications of the study were also discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Motivation is regarded as an important determiner for the success of second or foreign language (L2) learning. Canada, in particular, is the origin for motivational research, “where language learning is a featured social issue – at the crux of the relationship between the Anglophone and Francophone communities (Dornyei, 1994, p.274).” Attitudes and motivation may vary depending on whether learners are learning a second language or a foreign language (Dornyei, 1990; Ellis, 1994; Oxford, 1996; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Much research has directed to EFL settings (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005; Dornyei, 1990; Gao et.al., 2007; Kormos et.al. 2008; Kyriacou & Zhu, 2008; Lamb, 2004, 2007; Warden & Lin, 2000, etc.). However, there has been limited research focusing on the dynamic nature of their motivation profiles when a group of learners encounter a contextual switch from an EFL to ESL setting. The purpose of this study is to understand whether there are any changes in the learners' motivational profiles when they experience a contextual shift from an EFL to ESL setting and what are the possible changes on the different stages of motivation and their possible interrelations. In the following, I present a brief introduction of Gardner's (1985) socioeducational model and Dornyei and Otto's (1998) process model of L2 motivation. Then I discuss several motivational influences within the framework of the process model. I conclude by addressing the importance of the study and presenting the research questions I am proposing in this study.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Due to the complex nature of motivation, researchers have focused on various variables of L2 motivation and constructed different theoretical frameworks as a result of extensive research. However, this research has mainly adopted two important approaches: a social psychological approach and a motivational psychological approach. Social psychologists generally view action as “the function of the social context and the interpersonal/intergroup relational patterns, as measured by means of the individual’s social attitudes (Dornyei, 1998, p.2)”. Gardner’s (1985) motivational theories build on such a social psychological approach. Motivational psychologists tend to look in the individual rather than in the social being for motors of human behavior, focusing on internal factors such as drive, arousal, and cognitive self-appraisal (Dornyei, 1998). Theoretical constructs, such as expectancy-value theories, goal theories, and self-determination theory (Brown, 1981, 1990, 1994; Clement, 1980, 1994; Noels & Clement, 1996; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Ushioda, 1996, 1998), are derived from such an approach. In 1998, Dornyei constructed the process model of L2 motivation based on all the main motivational domains described in the 1990’s research, challenging the traditional notion of static motivation. In the following, I will briefly discuss the socioeducational model (Gardner, 1985) which has greatly influenced research on L2 motivation, and the process model of L2 motivation (Dornyei & Otto, 1998) which is the theoretical framework for the instrument of this study.

Gardner’s Socioeducational Model

A plethora of empirical studies and theoretical frameworks of L2 motivation exist. However, most of the research in L2 motivation has taken social psychological approaches, influenced by Gardner’s (1985) socioeducational model (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991).

Gardner (1985, p.10) defined motivation as “the extent to which an individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity”. It subsumes three components: motivational intensity, the desire to learn the language, and attitudes towards learning the language. The motivational intensity measure focuses on motivated behavior (Dornyei, 1998). It refers to the effort expended achieving goals (Gardner, 1985; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). However, the most important construct of Gardner’s motivation theory is the integrative motive. According to Gardner (1985, p.82), an integrative motive is defined as “a motivation to learn a language because of positive feelings toward the community that speaks that language”. It consists of three sets of variables: integrativeness (including integrative orientation, interest in L2, attitudes towards L2 community), attitudes towards the learning situation (including attitudes towards the language teacher and the L2 course) and motivation (effort, desire, attitudes) (Gardner, 1985; as cited in Dornyei, 2001). As each

variable has its subcomponents, all variables are defined and assessed with the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) (Gardner, 1985). Motivation is one of the subsets of the integrative motive. The interrelations of the three sets of variables can be explained by sustained effort is indispensable to the achievement of L2 proficiency and motivation requires attitudinal/affective support (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993). This model proposed that the two variables of integrativeness and attitudes to the learning situation are correlated and support individual's motivation to learn a second language, which mainly accounts for the second language achievement. Gardner and Lambert (1979) suggested that attitudes affect motivation, which, in turn, had an effect on L2 achievement. The popularity of this proposal that attitudes were determining factors of motivation has contributed to the belief that motivation to learn L2 was a stable variable (1985; as cited by Lamb, 2007).

However, with the renewed interest in L2 motivation in the 1990s, there were calls for broader theoretical frameworks to explain motivation. Researchers such as Crookes and Schmidt (1991), Oxford and Shearin (1994), Dornyei (1994), Tremblay and Gardner (1995) identified broader theoretical frameworks while Ushioda (1996) and Williams and Burden (1997) recognized the dynamic nature of motivation. Dornyei and Otto (1998) constructed a process model of L2 motivation which proposed that different motivational motives may “operate on the individual learner at different stages of the learning process” (Dornyei & Otto, 1998; Lamb, 2004, 2007).

Dornyei and Otto's Process Model of L2 Motivation

Based on Heckhausen and Kuhl's (1985) Action Control Theory, Dornyei and Otto (1998) divided motivation process into three phases: preactional, actional and postactional stages. During the preactional phase, which is also called “choice motivation”, action is induced to take place. Within this phase, three subprocesses are generally distinguished: goal setting, intention formation, and the initiation of intention enactment. When deliberation and decision-making are replaced by the implementation of the action (e.g., enrolling in a language course), well known as crossing the metaphorical “Rubicon”, executive motivation comes into play. During this actional phase, executive motivation is an energizing force for the action being carried out. There are three basic processes during this phase: subtask generation and implementation, ongoing appraisal process, and the application of a variety of action control mechanisms. During the postactional phase, also called retrospection motivation, the action outcome is evaluated and possible inferences for future actions are drawn after action has completed or terminated.

Within these three phases, different motives come into effect. In the following, I will focus on attitudes, and orientations in the preactional phase, effort in the actional phase, and success and failure in the postactional phase according to my research interests in this paper.

Preactional Variables

In the preactional phase, language learners' attitudes and their

motivation orientations play important roles in inducing the action to take place.

Attitudes. Gardner (1985) concluded that attitude measures significantly relate to L2 achievement because research (Roger et al. 1981, as cited in Gardner, 1985) suggests that attitudes have a definite motivational component in that they determine how active individuals are in the learning process. According to Gardner, attitudes can be classified along a dimension of specificity/generality. For example, attitudes towards learning English is specific because the attitude object (i.e., learning English) is clear and one specific activity is described while “interests in foreign languages” is more general because the attitude object (i.e., foreign languages) is a more general construct than only one foreign language and many activities (i.e., learning, speaking, hearing the language) might be involved. Another way of classifying attitudes can be done according to their relevance to L2 achievement or from educational or social perspectives. The common five attitude measures are: attitudes toward learning the L2, interests in foreign languages, attitudes toward the L2 natives, evaluative reactions toward the L2 teacher, and evaluation of the L2 course. The most popular attitude variables that received the most attention are attitudes towards learning a L2 and attitudes towards the L2 community because research suggests that these two are more correlated with L2 achievement (Gardner, 1985). Research also suggested that attitudes toward learning languages are more relevant to achievement than attitudes toward other school subjects (Jordan, 1941, as cited by Gardner, 1985). However, the relevancy is more attributed to affective components rather than simply covarying with ability. Although Gardner claimed that attitudes toward learning the language to be the better predictor of L2 achievement than others, in the study of Kormos et al. (2008), the collected data suggest that though learners’ attitudes to learning English were positive, they did not invest enough effort in language learning and did not possess enough strategies, showing very negative views about their university learning and indicating a low level of learner autonomy. Hence, attitudes toward the learning situation play a very important role in motivating learners.

Orientations. Gardner defined L2 motivation as “the extent to which an individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity” (1985, p10). This definition of motivation does not contain any integrative or instrumental element. Instead, integrative and instrumental motives are regarded as motivational antecedents at the orientation (i.e., goal) level. However, the integrative and instrumental dichotomy has been one of the most well-known concepts related with Gardner’s work in L2 field (Dornyei, 2001). This classic dichotomy has received considerable attention in many empirical studies. According to Gardner, an integrative orientation is the “willingness to be like valued members of the language community” (1959, p271). It reflects “a positive disposition toward the L2 group and the desire to interact with and even become familiar to valued members of that community” (Dornyei, 1994, p274). Therefore, it contains a strong interpersonal quality (Dornyei, 1998). On the

other hand, an instrumental orientation refers to “an interest in learning the language for pragmatic reasons that do not involve identification with the other language community” (Gardner, 2001). It describes reasons for L2 learning, such as getting a better job or achieving an academic goal (Noels, 2001). Though early study (Gardner & Lambert, 1959) suggested that the integrative orientation is a better predictor of L2 proficiency than instrumental orientation, later studies (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Chihara & Oller, 1978; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1991) found that the instrumental orientation is as good as predictor if not better than the integrative orientation (Noels, 2001). Noels (2001) well summarized that both integrative and instrumental orientations help to sustain efforts though the integrative orientation may not exist in particular contexts.

Especially in EFL settings where learners have limited contact with the L2 community or culture, the integrative orientation is less important than the instrumental orientation which helped promote successful L2 learning (Lamb, 2004; Chen et al. 2005; Oxford & Shearin, 1994, Warden & Lin, 2000). In some particular contexts, a required motivation was labeled (Warden & Lin, 2000; Chen et al. 2005). In a study exploring the relationship among these three variables: goal orientations, expectancy, and self-evaluation among Chinese motivation, Chen et al. (2005) found that integration plays no significant role in motivation while required motivation plays an important one. In a globalizing world where English is becoming an international language, another motivation factor emerged as “international posture”, which is “an integration with the global community rather than assimilation with native speakers” (Kormos & Ciszer, 2008). In a study, Kormos et al. (2008) investigated the motivational profile of 20 Hungarian English language university students. Both the qualitative and quantitative data showed that the participants had very positive attitudes towards English, realizing it as an “international posture” rather than showing interest in its Anglophone culture, hence, Gardner’s integrative motives did not show up in the study.

Actional Variable

Motivation orientations provide the underlying basis for action to take place. However, if the motivation is not intense enough, action will never take place (Chen et.al, 2005). Once the initial wish gets enough motivational support, the individual is ready to “cross the Rubicon” (Dornyei, 2001). Once the action started, the biggest group of executive motives involves the appraisal system and the outcome of the appraisal process. The action control process and external influence (e.g., teachers’ or parents’ motivational influence) also have a part to play. However, “the most important influence on ongoing learning is the perceived quality of the learning experience (Dornyei, 2001, p97).” Schumann’s stimulus appraisal postulated five appraisal dimensions (i.e., novelty, pleasantness, goal/need significance, coping potential, and self and social image) along which “the brain evaluates the environmental stimuli it receives and this leads to an emotional, and consequently to a behavioral, response” (Dornyei, 2001, p61). According to Maehr and Archer (1987, as cited by Crookes & Schmidt, 1991), one

important behavioral aspect of motivation is activity level, an equivalent of effort, or intensity of application. Also in Keller's (1983, as cited by Crookes & Schmidt, 1991) motivation system, expectancy concerns perceived task difficulty and the amount of effort required. Gardner (1985, p53) also claimed that "motivational intensity has been assessed by determining the amount of effort the individual expends in order to learn the L2 in the area of second language acquisition." In this study, therefore, executive motives are measured by learners' effort investment and the level of success in that effort (Chen et.al, 2005).

Postactional Variable

Postactional evaluation is vital because it is a process evaluating the accomplished action outcomes and drawing inferences for future actions (Dornyei, 2001). The learner will compare the outcomes with the initial expectancies and form causal attributions. Therefore, the retrospection determines learners' sense of success, achievement and satisfaction, which in turn influences how they approach subsequent learning tasks. In this study, learners' self report of their achievement in L2 learning will be used to reflect their postactional evaluation.

In the socioeducational model (1985), the proposal that motivation was the factor directly linked to the achievement in second language acquisition and attitudes were definite motivational component has led to the belief that motivation to learn L2 was a stable variable (Lamb, 2007). However, Dornyei and Otto's (1998) process model of L2 motivation identifies the dynamic nature of motivation and divides this process into three motivation stages along which different motives come into play. In the preactional phase, a required motivation and international posture motivation were identified besides the classic dichotomy of instrumental and integrative orientations within different contexts. The actional phase includes variables describing the intensity and persistence of motivational behavior and the level of success of effort investment. Learner achievement is generally used to draw inferences for future actions in the postactional stage. As this study is particularly interested in the changes of learners' motivational profiles when they experience a contextual shift from an EFL to ESL setting, specifically, the possible changes on the three stages and possible interrelations, the process model is more helpful in observing the dynamics of their motivational profiles and guiding this study.

METHOD

To investigate the dynamic nature of language learner motivational profiles as a result of a contextual change from EFL to ESL settings, particularly the interrelationship among variables in different phases, a mixed method design will be employed in this study. Dornyei (2001) claimed that "a deep interview with a language learner can provide far richer data than even the most detailed questionnaire" (p193). However, quantitative analysis can be

helpful to determine the relationship between categories to test research hypotheses. This study involves a survey of nine high school students studying in an English country. They were asked to complete a motivation questionnaire (see Appendix B), which was analyzed quantitatively. In addition, two students out of the nine students were interviewed (see Appendix A).

Participants

Nine Chinese students enrolled in high schools in UK, US, Norway participated in the study. Six students were currently enrolled in UK high schools. Two were in US. One was in Norway. Four of them were my former students when I taught them English in China. They graduated and had been studying in these English-speaking countries for at least six months. The remaining five participants are their new classmates in these countries. As the researcher, I gave explanation of the questionnaire to each of my former students since they were easier to contact. Then my students helped to inform the other participants to complete the questionnaire. This was done to ensure the accuracy of participants' understanding of the questions.

Instrument

To investigate the influence of contextual shift on learners' motivation profiles, several distinct motivation components of the L2 motivation process model are measured on the survey questionnaire. For example, integrative, instrumental, and required motivations represent motivation orientations in the preactional phase. Self-evaluated efforts and success represent expectancy in the actional phase. And self-evaluated skills reflect their postactional evaluation. Chen, Warden and Lin's (2005) survey instrument was adapted as it includes these scales. The internal consistency of the items was consistently over .90, and face validity of all questions was also confirmed (Chen, 2005). Respondents were asked to give ratings to each question using five-item likert scale. However, the semantic anchors of the questionnaire differed by section: Motivation Section *Not at all important to very much important*; Expectancy Section *Not at all to Very much effort*; Skill Section *Far below average to above average*. Additionally, the motivation questionnaire asked respondents to recall their previous learning experience. As Dornyei (2001) stated, due to the temporal challenge to motivation research, longitudinal data provides more insights into motivational matters than cross-sectional data. However, longitudinal studies require a significant investment of time and energy before any meaningful result can be obtained. Considering motivation is individual in nature, cross-sectional studies might not be an optimal choice to observe the changes of motivation profile of a group of learners. Taking into account the above factors, a motivation questionnaire including questions about both previous learning experience and present learning experience will be more helpful in observing the changes in their motivational profiles. The questionnaire was distributed by email to nine Chinese students studying in an English-speaking country. To confirm that participants fully understood the

subject matter, a follow-up telephone call was made.

RESULTS

Thirty questionnaires were distributed. Of these, nine complete questionnaires were collected and analyzed, using SPSS16.0. The reliability coefficients of subscales were measured to check item internal consistency. To check whether there were variations in the responses, the means, standard deviations and item-to-total correlations of survey question results were calculated. A paired samples test was also done to see whether there were significant differences between the “past” and the “present” responses. However, it is important to note at the outset that conclusions drawn from these statistical analyses are merely speculative due to the small sample size. The analysis process was completed mainly for my own learning process as a researcher as well as to point out possible directions for further research.

The examination of reliability showed that the preactional phases had acceptable internal consistency, with the Cronbach’s Alpha=.76 for the preactional phase of the past data set and Alpha=.80 for the preactional phase of the present data set. The alpha for the actional phase of the past data set is negative with a value of -.25 and .122 for the present data set. This unreliability is probably due to the small sample size and limited items in this phase. As there is only one item in the postactional phase, alpha was not calculated.

To test if there were at least some variations in the responses, the means, standard deviations and item-to-total correlations of individual survey question results were computed as shown in Table 1. There is a general increase in the means and standard deviations from past to present, which would serve to justify the research. In these two data sets, some of the item-total correlations are with satisfactory values while the other item-total correlations are pretty low. However, it can’t assign conclusions due to the low number of sample size. Therefore, there is no point in excluding some items with low item-total correlations.

Table 1: A Comparison on the Preactional Phases of Past and Present

Participants(N=9)	Past			Present		
	Mean	S. D.	C.I.T.C.	Mean	S. D.	C.I.T.C.
get higher paying job	3.89	0.78	0.07	4.33	1.00	0.83
obtain raise	3.56	0.73	0.39	4.22	0.67	-0.48
change jobs easily	3.56	0.88	0.32	3.78	0.97	0.59
higher job security	3.44	0.53	-0.09	3.56	1.51	0.90
pass entrance exam	3.89	0.93	0.51	4.67	0.71	0.68
pass required class	3.89	0.78	0.02	4.67	0.50	-0.41
pass elective class	3.11	1.17	0.43	3.44	1.13	0.35
pass job exam	3.22	1.09	0.06	4.22	0.67	0.49
travel overseas	4.00	1.22	0.59	3.67	1.32	0.49
make social connections	3.33	1.41	0.88	4.11	1.05	0.79
gain social prestige	3.11	1.17	0.85	3.89	0.78	0.40
understand movies,books,magazines	3.56	1.33	0.49	4.00	1.00	0.47

S.D.= Standard Deviation

C.I.T.C.= Corrected Item-Total Correlation

Table 2: A Comparison on the Three Motivation Orientations

Means	Instrumental	Required	Integrative
past	3.61	3.53	3.5
present	3.97	4.25	3.92

A paired samples test was done to see whether there were changes between the past and the present data set variables. The result was shown in Table 3. In the preactional phase, there is significant change between past and present variable of “obtain raise” with $p = .004 < .01$, and also the variable of “pass required class” and “pass job exam” with respective $p = .008$ and $p = .009 < .01$. In the actional phase, significant changes were not shown. However, in the postactional phase, after a contextual change, learners’ self-evaluated skills significantly changed, with $p = 0.003 < 0.01$. Again, these findings are not reliable since they were drawn upon a very small sample size. To get more convincing results, a much larger sample size such as 100 should be targeted for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and 200 for confirmatory factor analysis (CFA).

Table 3: Pair Sample Test

		N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	Mean Difference	SD Difference	Sig (2- tailed)
Pair 1	job pa.	9	3.89	0.78	0.26	-0.44	0.88	0.17
	job pr.	9	4.33	1.00	0.33			
Pair 2	raise pa.	9	3.56	0.73	0.24	-0.67	0.50	0.00
	raise pr.	9	4.22	0.67	0.22			
Pair 3	job change pa.	9	3.56	0.88	0.29	-0.22	1.30	0.62
	job change pr.	9	3.78	0.97	0.32			
Pair 4	job security pa.	9	3.44	0.53	0.18	-0.11	1.45	0.82
	job security pr.	9	3.56	1.51	0.50			
Pair 5	ent exam pa.	9	3.89	0.93	0.31	-0.78	1.30	0.11
	ent exam pr.	9	4.67	0.71	0.24			
Pair 6	pass class pa.	9	3.89	0.78	0.26	-0.78	0.67	0.01
	pass class pr.	9	4.67	0.50	0.17			
Pair 7	pass elective pa.	9	3.11	1.17	0.39	-0.33	1.66	0.56
	pass elective pr.	9	3.44	1.13	0.38			
Pair 8	Job exam pa.	9	3.22	1.09	0.36	-1.00	0.87	0.01
	Job exam pr.	9	4.22	0.67	0.22			
Pair 9	travel pa.	9	4.00	1.23	0.41	0.33	2.06	0.64
	travel pr.	9	3.67	1.32	0.44			
Pair 10	social pa.	9	3.33	1.41	0.47	-0.78	1.92	0.26
	social pr.	9	4.11	1.05	0.35			
Pair 11	prestige pa.	9	3.11	1.17	0.39	-0.78	1.79	0.23
	prestige pr.	9	3.89	0.78	0.26			
Pair 12	understanding pa.	9	3.67	1.32	0.44	-0.33	1.94	0.62
	understanding pr.	9	4.00	1.00	0.33			
Pair 13	effort pa.	9	3.00	1.32	0.44	-0.56	1.94	0.42
	effort pr.	9	3.56	1.24	0.41			
Pair 14	success pa.	9	3.67	0.71	0.24	-0.22	1.20	0.59
	success pr.	9	3.89	0.78	0.26			
Pair 15	skills pa.	8	3.00	0.76	0.27	-0.75	0.46	0.00
	skills pre.	8	3.75	0.89	0.31			

These statistical analyses have shown that there are variations in the responses, including the changes in the survey question result of means, standard deviations and paired samples test. The changes in the descriptive analysis suggested that there were positive change in language learners'

motivational profiles. All items in different phases increased except the item “travel abroad”. The paired samples test also suggested there were significant changes in some instrumental and required items in the preactional phase and the self-evaluated skills in the postactional phase, such as “obtain raise”, “pass required class”, “pass job exam”, and “self-evaluated skills”. However, the paired samples test did not suggest significant changes among the integrative items in the preactional phase and the items in the actional phase. However, the small sample size might account for these results. In addition, with such a small sample size, exploratory factor analysis or confirmatory factor analysis cannot be done to see the possible moderating or mediating role of the actional phase.

DISCUSSION

Results from the questionnaire data have suggested that there are positive changes in the language learners’ motivational profiles. In an ESL setting rather than in an EFL setting, language learners tend to be more motivated during the preactional phase. They also seemed to invest more efforts in language learning during the actional phase. And they became more satisfactory with their learning outcomes when they were asked to self-evaluate their language skills. The interview data also supported some of the changes and provided insights into further research.

Changes in Learner’s Motivational Profile

As we can see from Table 3, there is a general increase in the means and standard deviations of present variables, compared to the past variables. This change in the preactional phase suggested there were positive changes in learners’ motivation orientations. As shown in Table 4, language learners tended to report almost an overall increase in all the three sets of motivation: instrumental, integrative, and required motivation except the item “travel overseas” which actually decreased by .333, after they changed from an EFL to an ESL setting. The decrease in the means of this item makes sense as language learners have already traveled to and studied in an English-speaking country and the motivation to learn English to travel to an English-speaking country became weaker. In the actional phase, language learners showed an important increase with an increased mean of 3.56 from 3.00 in their effort investment. According to their responses in the questionnaire, all the respondents gave higher ratings to their present effort investment. In addition, their satisfaction of their learning outcomes also increased from 3.67 to 3.89, which, at least, led to the conclusion that they were more confident in their language skills than before. The self-evaluated skills in postactional phase also increased significantly to 3.75 from 3.00.

While the means for most individual items increased, the data from Table 2 also shows that there were increases in the three motivation orientation data sets. However, it was interesting to see that instrumental orientations in the past data set weighed a bit more than required and integrative orientations

while in the present data set, required motivation accounted for a better portion than instrumental and integrative motivation. The result of the paired samples test suggested that significant changes only reflected on instrumental and required orientations: job raise, pass a class and pass a job exam. These can be partially explained by students' statement that they "learned English mainly because it was a required course" and they "wanted to get good scores on tests". It was also well supported by one student's statement that he studied English harder because he wanted to "get good score on the SAT". From Table 3, we didn't see significant changes on integrative orientation responses. However, it must be pointed out that the small sample size might have influenced the result. As a matter of fact, in the open-ended interview questions, students reported a more integrative orientation: a willingness to integrate or interact with valued members of the language community. Both students stated that they learned English because they felt the pressing need for basic communication at the beginning and hopefully they would "gradually be able to interact with friends better later and be included in the community". One participant also stated that he liked music and expressed an integrativeness to American culture through music.

As the interview data revealed a quite different story from the questionnaire data on the weight of the three orientations: instrumental, required, and integrative. Was integrative motivation the main energizing force for their learning? If so, how to explain the data that required motivation in the present data set weighed more than the other two motivations? One possible answer to this question is that it is difficult to distinguish required and integrative orientations in an ESL setting. For example, students wanted to pass a class (a required motivation) because they wanted to "be comparable with native speakers", which is an integrative orientation. There is literature contending the blurry nature of motivation divisions (Dornyei & Schmidt, 2001). If integrative motivation was not the key force to learners' effort investment, which orientation played the key role?

Influence on Invested Effort

As shown in Table 3, there are increases in the means and standard deviations of actional phase responses. The mean of invested effort increased from 3.00 to 3.56. Even though the result of paired samples test on this variable is not significant with $p=.416>.05$, which is probably due to the small sample size, the interviewed students stated they were making more efforts in learning English. One of the students who did not participate in the questionnaire survey even rated 5 for her previous effort and 8 or 9 for present effort on a 10-item likert scale. She explained that the main reason for such increased efforts was she wanted to "integrate with the current community and to be comparable with native speakers in school". The other interviewed student reported that he thought English was more useful and closely connected to his future career or life here (USA) than it was in China because he didn't feel the pressure of learning English well back in China since it was just a required course. Therefore he invested more effort in English learning

after coming to the United States. One student even pointed out the main motivator for more invested efforts are integrativeness rather than instrumental or required orientations. He gave a ratio of 3: 7, with 3 for schoolwork and 7 for integrativeness. His statement was well supported by Dornyei and Clement (2000, as cited by Masgoret & Gardner, 2005) who claimed that integrativeness is the most powerful predictor of language learners' effort investment in the learning process.

Interrelationship of Variables

Both interviewees admitted that their English skills improved rapidly. One student in particular pointed out that he improved a lot in the areas of vocabulary and sentence structure in the course of interaction. He also stated that he was better at writing as he wrote more. Even though they felt they improved their English skills, does their effort investment contribute to the improved performance? In other words, does the actional phase mediate or moderate the relationship between motivation orientations and self-evaluated skills? To answer this question, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) or confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) would be helpful. Hence, further research with a large sample size might produce more illustrative findings.

CONCLUSIONS

It seemed that there are changes in the language learners' motivational profile after they experienced a fundamental change from an EFL to an ESL setting. From the interview data, their instrumental or required orientation seemed to become less dominant in an ESL setting even though the questionnaire data turned to the opposite. In addition, the interview data suggested that integrative orientations played a more important role. They seemed to have a stronger desire to integrate with the target language community. It also seemed that they are investing more effort in language learning to enable them to integrate with the community or society. And they were more satisfied with the learning outcomes. However, whether the actional phase played a moderating or mediating role between motivation orientations and self-evaluated skills cannot be determined since the sample size is too small to conduct EFA or CFA analysis.

IMPLICATIONS

As instrumental motivation and need for achievement play significant roles in controlling an intermediate level of target language proficiency, whereas the desire to go beyond this level is related to integrative motivation (Dornyei, 1990), language educators in EFL contexts might need to make considerable efforts to fostering or developing learners' integrative orientations. However, the important questions are whether it is possible and how to develop learners' integrative motivation in an EFL setting, where the target language use is not ample. There is limited literature specifically focusing on fostering integrative

orientations, however, there is ample literature on how different programs have influenced motivation and language acquisition. As a language teacher and a researcher, I summed up some possible answers to this question: pen pal projects and video-web communication programs at the teacher level; short-term exchange programs with and summer camps in the target language country at the school level; and immersion programs and changing of exam measures at the educational level. However, it must be pointed out that further research should be conducted specifically focusing on the effectiveness of these programs in cultivating integrative motivation.

At the class level, with the enhanced technology, language teachers can try pen pal projects or video-web communication programs to foster integrative motivation among language learners and facilitate their language acquisition. Studies (Yamada & Moeller, 2001, p33) have suggested that a pen pal program “has the potential to motivate students, enhance learning, and develop intercultural skills among language learners”. Through exchanging letters or gifts with their pen pals, it is very possible that language learners develop more interests in the language community or language culture. In other words, learners might develop a more integrative motivation in the language learning. Robinson (1993) claimed that positive attitudes towards the target language culture or an integrative orientation focusing on the similarities between L1 and L2 cultures facilitated language acquisition. In addition, researchers also claimed that pen-pal programs facilitated second language acquisition because learners are given meaningful tasks with a real audience (Au & Carroll, 1997). Pen pal projects provide ample opportunities to get to know or even like the other culture. Video-web communication tools create a motivating virtual communication environment for purposeful interaction between non native and native speakers of the target language (Jauregi & Banados, 2008). This study has shown that video-web communication tools can enrich the quality of foreign language curricula, by facilitating such an interactional environment for language learners to accomplish learning tasks. A video-web communication platform is like a personal meeting room, where students connect through their individual computers. They may attend a meeting, see each other, chat and share documents and collaborate in the process of writing texts on line. As it fosters positive attitudes to different cultures and an authentic learning experience encouraging students’ cooperation and enthusiasm, video-web communication tools promote students’ pragmatic skills and motivation.

At the school level, schools can promote exchange programs or summer camps to the target language country. These short-term study abroad programs create opportunities to expose language learners to the target language community, which might be helpful in fostering integrative motivation as learners have more chance to be stimulated to interact with the target language community. These programs are particularly beneficial to learners as they can become more confident in their language skills and more motivated to deepen their knowledge of other languages and cultures through language study and travel abroad (Ingram, 2005).

At the educational level, immersion programs should be promoted as these kinds of programs provides students with more second language contact and greater opportunities to master the language than do non-immersion programs (MacIntyre, Baker, Clement & Donovan, 2003). The study found that immersion experience seemed to promote an increased willingness to communicate and also frequency of communication in the target language. Therefore, immersion programs are meaningful in developing integrative motivation because “if an appropriate goal of immersion education is to increase students’ willingness to engage in L2 communication, then the evidence obtained here is encouraging for advocates of immersion education” (MacIntyre, Baker, Clement & Donovan, 2003, p.600). Another possible answer at the educational level is to change exam measures. In many EFL settings, particularly in some Asian countries, exam measures have focused more on reading and writing skills instead of listening and speaking skills. If exam measures emphasize more on spoken communication and social interactions, the required training will develop rapidly, and the success on such an exam will bring socially valued results (Chen, Warden, & Chang, 2005).

LIMITATIONS

This pilot study has generated some interesting findings. However, it must be admitted that the findings are based on a small sample size. Conclusions drawn from the study are merely speculative. The interrelationship among variables cannot be determined as EFA or CFA cannot be conducted due to the small sample size. In addition, some measures of the actional phase do not contain any language use components. As language use is an important component in the actional phase, there might be a big difference in learners’ language use in different settings. Therefore, it’s suggested that the instrument for further research should contain this component. Further research with a larger sample size and a more complete instrument measures would be beneficial in producing more illustrative findings.

REFERENCES

- Au, K., & Carroll, J. (1997). Improving literacy achievement through a constructivist approach: The KEEP demonstration classroom project. *The Elementary School Journal*, 97, 203-221.
- Chen F. J., Warden A. C., & Chang H. T. (2005). Motivators that do not motivate: The case of Chinese EFL learners and the influence of culture on motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(4), 609-33
- Crookes, G. & Schmidt, W. R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512
- Csizer, K. & Kormos, J. (2007). An interview study of inter-cultural contact and its role in language learning in a foreign language environment. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 35(2), 241-58
- Csizer, K., Menyhart, A., Torok, D., & Kormos, J. (2008). Great expectations: The motivational profile of Hungarian English language students. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 7(1), 65-82.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Dornyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31, 117-135.
- Dornyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 273-84.
- Dornyei, Z., & Schmidt, R. (2001). *Motivation and second language acquisition*. University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Gardner, R.C., & Tremblay P. F. (1994). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 359-68.
- Gao, Y., Zhao, Y., Cheng, Y., & Zhou, Y. (2007). Relationship between English learning motivation types and self-identity changes among Chinese students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(1), 133-55.
- Hernandez, T. (2006). Integrative motivation as a predictor of success in the intermediate foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(4), 605-17.
- Humphreys, G., & Spratt, M. (2008). Many languages, many motivations: A study of Hong Kong students' motivation to learn different target languages. *System*, 36, 313-35.
- Hu, G. W. (2005). Contextual influences on the instructional practices: A Chinese case for an ecological approach to ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(4), 635-60.
- Ingram, M. (2005). Recasting the foreign language requirement through study abroad: A cultural immersion program in Avignon. *Foreign Language Annals*. 38(2), 211-222.
- Jauregi, K., & Banados, E. (2008). Virtual interaction through video-web

- communication: A step towards enriching and internationalizing language learning programs. *ReCALL*, 20(2), 183-207.
- Kyriacou, C., & Zhu, D. (2008). Shanghai pupils' motivation towards learning English and the perceived influence of important others. *Educational Studies*, 34(2), 97-104.
- Lamb, M. (2007). The impact of school on EFL learning motivation: An Indonesian case study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(4), 757-780.
- Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System*, 32, 3-19.
- Li, D. (2006). Motivation in second language acquisition in Chinese research students in the UK. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 19(1), 38-58.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clement, R., & Donovan, L. A. (2003). Talking in order to learn: Willingness to communicate and intensive language programs. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59(4), 589-607.
- Masgoret, M. A., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language Learning*, 53(1), 123-63.
- Munoz, C., & Tragant, E. (2001). Motivation and attitudes towards L2: Some effects of age and instruction. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 1, 211-24.
- Schunk, H. D., Pintrich, R. P., & Meece, L.J. (2008). *Motivation in education: Theory, Research, and Applications* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Sjoholm, K. (2004). The complexity of the learning and teaching of EFL among Swedish-minority students in bilingual Finland. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(6), 685-696.
- Ushioda, E. (1996). Developing a dynamic concept of motivation. In T. Hickey, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Language, education and society in a changing world* (pp. 239-245). Dublin/Clevedon: IRAAL/Multilingual Matters.
- Yamada, Y., & Moeller, A. J. (2001). Weaving curricular standards into the language classroom: An action research study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(1), 26-34.

APPENDIX A

Interview Questions

1. Have your reasons for learning English changed since coming to the US? How?
2. Have there been any changes in how you view English language, native speakers, and its culture now?
3. Do you think you are making more effort in English learning now than previously when you studied in China? If yes, why?
4. Do you think you have improved your English skills after one-year stay here? If yes, why?

APPENDIX B

Motivation Questionnaire

We would like to ask you to help us by answering the following questions concerning foreign language learning. This is not a test so there are no “right” or “wrong” answers and you don’t even have to write your name on it. We are interested in your personal opinion. Please give your answers sincerely as only this will guarantee the success of the investigation. Thank you very much for your help.

In the following sections, we would like you to answer questions by simply giving marks from 1 to 5.

5 = very much, 4 = quite a lot, 3 = so-so, 2= not really, 1 = not at all.

I. Preactional phrase:

Instrumental

One part of this study is your opportunity to gain monetary benefit from your English skill. These questions concern only your own opinion about yourself.

1. To what extent did you think previously you need these skills to help you obtain a higher paying job (past)?
2. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you obtain a higher paying job (now)?
3. To what extent did you think previously you need these skills to help you obtain a raise (past)?
4. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you obtain a raise(now)?
5. To what extent did you think you need these skills to help you change jobs more easily (past)?
6. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you change jobs more easily (now)?
7. To what extent did you think you need these skills to help you have higher job security (past)?
8. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you have higher job security (now)?

Required Motivation

One part of this study is your opportunity to satisfy requirements that require your English skill. These questions concern only your own opinion about yourself.

9. To what extent did you think previously you need these skills to help you pass an exam for further study at a university (past)?
10. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you pass an exam for further study at a university (now)?
11. To what extent did you think previously you need these skills to help you pass a required class (past)?
12. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you pass a required class (now)?
13. To what extent did you think previously you need these skills to help you pass an elective class (past)?
14. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you pass an elective class (now)?
15. To what extent did you think previously you need these skills to help you pass an exam for a job position (past)?
16. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you pass an exam for a job position (now)?

Integration

One part of this study is your opportunity to gain cultural integration from your English skill. These questions concern only your own opinion about yourself.

17. To what extent did you think previously you need these skills to help you travel overseas (past)?
18. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you travel overseas (now)?
19. To what extent did you think previously you need these skills to help you make social contacts (past)?
20. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you make social contacts (now)?
21. To what extent did you think previously you need these skills to help you gain social prestige (past)?
22. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you gain social prestige (now)?
23. To what extent did you think previously you need these skills to help you understand foreign movies, books and magazines (past)?
24. To what extent do you think you need these skills to help you understand foreign movies, books and magazines (now)?

II. Actional Phase

One part of this study is your expectation and experience of studying English. These questions concern only your own opinion about yourself.

25. How much effort did you previously make to improve these skills (in the past)?

26. How much effort do you presently make to improve these skills (present)?
27. How successful were you previously at improving these skills (in the past)?
28. How successful are you now at improving these skills (now)?

III. Postactional Phase

One part of this study is your actual English skill levels. These questions concern only your own opinion about yourself.

29. How did you rate your previous ability in these skills?
30. How do you rate your present ability in these skills?