

The Effects of Sociolinguistic Differences on Motivation in L2 learners

Steven van den Berg

3785270

BA Thesis English Language and Culture, Utrecht University

Supervisors: Debbie Cole & Aoju Chen

March 2017

Abstract

This thesis was written in an effort to get a better understanding of the relationship between the status of a language in global economy and politics and L2 learners' motivation. To this end, we compare motivational attitudes towards second language learning in Dutch students of English and English students of Dutch and assess whether the differences in linguistic prestige could account for an inclination towards either type of motivation. Twenty-six Dutch and twenty English university students completed a survey consisting of 40 questions, which presented the participants with statements reflecting two types of motivation, i.e. integrative (affective incentives) and instrumental reasons (practical incentives). The results of the study indicated significant differences between the groups on most measures of integrative motivation. In contrast, no significant differences were found on instrumental motivation. The absence of significant differences in some measurements of the variables could be explained by the ever-growing focus of language teaching institutions on creating a curriculum that excites both integrative and instrumental motivation in students. This study proposes that the language education system should focus on perpetually improving their curriculum to make it more engaging and thus more motivating.

Introduction

Motivation refers to goal-directed behaviour within an individual. Gardner and Masgoret (2003) state that "the motivated individual expends effort, is persistent and attentive to the task at hand, has goals, desires and aspirations, enjoys the activity, experiences reinforcement from success and disappointment from failure, makes attributions concerning success and/or failure, is aroused, and makes use of strategies to aid in achieving goals" (p. 128). Together with putting in a great amount of effort and time, motivational capacities have been found to be quintessential to successfully learn a second language. This thesis is concerned with the following research question: do sociolinguistic differences between languages affect the

motivation of second language learners? The study distinguishes between integrative and instrumental L2 learning incentives. On the one hand, integrative incentives entail a genuine interest and eagerness to engage with the target language group. On the other hand, instrumental incentives encompass beliefs where the language is predominantly perceived as a tool that could lead to better professional life outcomes. The aim of this thesis is to examine how significant sociolinguistic differences affect second language learning motivation. Comparing a globally established language of politics and world economy and a more modest language should provide some insight on their respective effects on L2 motivation.

Literature Review

Gardner and Lambert (1959) opened the debate on the effects of motivation on L2 learning and hypothesised that a strong motivation to learn a second language results from positive attitudes towards the target language group and the potential for integrating into that group. Moreover, these researchers were the first to make the distinction between instrumental and integrative motivation. From his initial 1959 paper until a few years ago, Gardner conducted several studies on motivation in relation to second language learning. One finding became apparent and remained consistent throughout all of his research: integrative motivation is superior to instrumental motivation as an impetus to second language learning (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). Gardner (2000) identified three crucial dimensions that come together in his concept of integrativeness. First of all, students need to have a favourable attitude towards the L2 community. Secondly, a general interest in foreign language and therefore, a low ethnocentrism is required. Lastly, most vital of the three according to Gardner, learners ought to have an integrative orientation to L2 learning; a genuine interest to learn about another culture, and a willingness to engage with the target community. Gardner asserts through his three-dimensional concept of integrativeness that motivation is an “attribute of the individual that can be influenced by external forces” (MacIntyre et al., 2002, p. 104).

Dörnyei (2009) criticised the concept of integrativeness on its ambiguity because “it is not quite clear what the target of the integration is, and in many language learning environments it simply does not make much sense” (p. 23). Dörnyei argued that a L2 Motivational Self-System underlies second language learning. This system is made up of two components; the “future self,” which is divided into the “ought to self” and the “ideal self”, and the “student’s learning environment” (p. 13). Dörnyei described the “ought to self” as the “attributes one believes one ought to possess,” and the ideal self as “the representation of the attributes that one would ideally like to possess.” He argued that the “ideal self” is a better motivator out of the two, as it triggers a desire to change the current “actual self” into an “ideal self” (p. 13). Thus, the ideal self serves as a great motivator when good comprehension of a second language is part of the self-image in a learner. On the other hand, “the ought to self” is a self-representation that depends on the perception of others. Nevertheless, the “ought to self” has proven to be a strong motivator for some learners as well. Additionally, Dörnyei (2009) claimed that the student learning environment is pivotal for successful second language learning. A positive attitude towards the teacher, classroom setting, peers and course material all come together and are essential to form a motivated student.

Crookes and Schmidt (1989) also rejected the superiority of integrative motivation over instrumental motivation as it is not clearly supported by empirical evidence. Their review of previous research indicated that nearly every possible relationship between various measures of integrative motivation and measures of proficiency have been found: positive, nil, negative and uninterpretable or ambiguous. In contrast, other studies found that significant correlations tended to change when co-variables as age and sex were controlled statistically (Crookes & Schmidt, 1989). Oller (1981) suggested that results such as these show that the relationship between affective variables, motivation and language learning serves “an unstable nonlinear function that varies greatly across individuals, contexts, and learning tasks” (p. 15).

In contrast, Savignon (1972) proposed the causality hypothesis, which holds that achievement is the cause rather than a result of motivation. Moreover, various researchers (Burstall, Jamieson, Cohen & Hargreaves, 1974; Backman, 1976; Hermann, 1980; Strong, 1984) have found corroborating findings that attributes such as a positive attitude towards the target community and language could result from good performance (Crookes & Schmidt, 1989). Gardner (1985) responded to the emerging criticism following his study that even though it is impossible to come up with unequivocal answers regarding causal questions, his own review of the extensive literature on the matter has shown him that there is “no support for the notion that achievement influences the nature and amount of attitude change” (p. 99). In addition, Gardner confirmed that there is no reason to negate instrumental incentives when assessing motivation. He asserted that instrumental motivation plays a dominant role in some cultural contexts, diminishing the role of integrative effects. Moreover, Gardner (1985) concluded that “the source of the motivating impetus is relatively unimportant provided that motivation is aroused” (p. 169).

In line with the findings of Crooks and Schmidt, Oxford (1996) argued that measures of motivation and attitude on second language achievement are often inconsistent due to differences in linguistic environment, age and cultural background of the students. Culture encompasses a wide range of beliefs, perceptions and values, which all influence second language learning. The influence of culture is reflected in the concept of situated cognition, which holds that the linguistic and cultural setting are inseparable from learning. Thus, second language learning is fully situated within a given cultural context. Hence, the students become encultured through classroom activities, teacher instruction and other forms of cultural modelling. Therefore, the students are “apprenticed into a particular learning culture that in many ways reflects the general culture” (Oxford, 1996 p. 10). Learners of distinct cultures employ different methods and strategies, which all have their effect on second language

learning success. Some research (McCombs, 1982, 1988; Dansereau, 1985) suggested that some of the best learners of a second language utilise both affective and social strategies to control their emotional state, which keeps them motivated. Since each culture has a unique approach to language learning, cross cultural differences are of crucial importance when examining second language motivation and achievement (Oxford, 1996).

Another crucial notion arises when comparing motivation in learners of English and learners of another language. In contemporary times, English is regarded as the uncontested language of globalisation. “Traditionally, social life has been closely tied to spatial proximity, but globalisation acutely undermines this bond, reducing the influence of distance on social activities, which has deep implications for our understanding of social organisation.” (Ryan, 2006, p. 25). Hence, due to the absence of any credible rival, English has earned itself the status of unquestioned voice of globalisation, which substantially influences the way L2 learners perceive the English language. Lamb (2004) argued that English might no longer be associated with particular geographical or cultural communities but with an ever-growing international culture “incorporating business, technological innovation, democracy, world travel and the multifarious icons of fashion, sport and music.” (p. 5) Lamb’s argument was supported by a conducted experiment into L2 motivation in Japanese EFL university contexts. Irie (2003) found a recurring pattern of Japanese students possessing a positive orientation to foreign travel without any aspiration or apparent desire to integrate into the target language culture. Hence, Ryan (2006) challenged the traditional concept of integrativeness in second language learning as it “posits the learner, the language and the language community as fixed entities; globalization, through its capacity to alter time and space relations, changes the demands on both the individual and the community” (p. 16). Ryan suggests recombobulation from the traditional fixed concept of integrativeness as second language learners of English in contemporary times look beyond a simple desire to integrate with speakers from the target

language group. Moreover, a great number of people around the world are feeling or developing a sense of global identity. Thus, an additional source of motivation has arisen especially amongst young people. A willingness to be part of a global community through apprehension of the principal language of globalisation: English.

All in all, Gardner's model featuring the integrative versus instrumental debate has been dominating discussions of motivation and second language learning for many years. However, the model has received a fair amount of criticism in recent years for being too narrow and ambiguous. Many of the criticism has arisen of the need for a more extensive instrumental/integrative framework, which fully accounts for the learners as social beings whose motivation is not a fixed entity but something that changes over time in interaction with other people. Additionally, the notion of a world citizen identity adds a new perspective on Gardner's established theory of L2 motivation.

Research question

In contemporary times, English enjoys much more status and value in global economy and politics than Dutch. Moreover, access to the English language allows its learners to become part of a perpetually growing global community. I therefore hypothesise that Dutch students will have more instrumental incentives to study their course language as opposed to their English counterparts due to the significant differences in prestige commonly ascribed to both languages. A high proficiency in the English language nowadays opens doors to a substantial array of avenues in later professional life. In contrast, enrolling in a Dutch course language does not provide such perks. Therefore, the English students of Dutch are hypothesised to have more integrative incentives to study the language. The overall research question used for this study is as follows: Do English students of Dutch possess more integrative motivation than Dutch students of English?

During my semester as a teaching assistant of Dutch to English students at the

University of Sheffield, I engaged with English students and often enquired about their reasons for studying a language as ostensibly small as Dutch. The reason the students gave were overwhelmingly integratively orientated: I like the way it sounds, I like Dutch culture as a whole etc. The results of the experiment will indicate how the sociolinguistic differences between the groups affects the motivation of the participants and if an inclination to either type of motivation can be identified.

Furthermore, this thesis will allow us to have a better understanding of (a) the potential differences in motivational attitudes and (b) the implications: i.e. how this affects second language learning as a whole. Moreover, this study scrutinises (c) the adjustments that can be made to the classroom setting and educational curriculum to inspire equivocal motivation within students. In general, the English students are expected to score significantly higher on the various measures of integrative motivation. The conducted research examined both instrumental and integrative motivation in Dutch students of English and English students of Dutch. The three-dimensional concept of Gardner (2000) was used to measure the variable 'integrativeness' in both groups of students. As aforementioned, three measures were used to obtain this variable: attitudes towards the language group, interest in foreign language and integrative orientation. The diversity of measures was included into the research design to create a comprehensive overview of how the integrative motivation in every individual student was actually made up. An overview of the predictions is provided below:

Predictions

1. Dutch students will score significantly higher on instrumental motivation.
 2. English students will score significantly higher on integrativeness.
-
- Attitudes towards the language group, interest in foreign languages and integrative orientation are all measures of the variable integrativeness. Therefore, the English are expected to score significantly higher on all of the measures.

Method

Participants

The participants selected for this study were all university students of either Dutch or English. All of the English participants were first to third year students of Dutch at Sheffield University. The Dutch participants in the study were first to sixth year students of English at Utrecht University. At the very beginning of an English course at Utrecht University, the students have to choose whether they prefer to learn to speak with the RP English accent or the GA English accent. Moreover, once one chooses a target accent, from that moment on the student is expected to both write, and speak in a manner that adheres to the rules set for the specific variety. For my study, I exclusively used English students who had chosen the RP accent in their first year. Hence, I was able to create a homogenous group of respondents who were expected to possess a favourable attitude towards the British. Prior to filling in the survey, the students were asked to provide some demographic information, namely: age, sex and year of study. The participants were not asked for their name to ensure confidentiality. Hence, the students were less hindered to give their unmoderated and unbiased opinion. Altogether, 46 participants took part in the questionnaire, of the total group 31 (67%) were female and 15 (33%) were male. The group of Dutch participants consisted of 20 (77%) females and 6 (23%) males. The group of English students was made up of 11 (55%) females and 9 (45%) males.

Instruments

The students completed a survey consisting of 40 items regarding second language learning motivation. The 40 items for the survey were partially inspired by previously conducted studies on second language motivation (Gardner et. al., 1985, 1997; Mun, 2011). Some of the items were copied directly, but most of the statements needed some slight adjustments, as

many items used in previous studies were not relevant for the Dutch and English respondent groups. Moreover, numerous items had to be either rephrased or omitted to ensure applicability for both English and Dutch students. The survey was complemented with statements specifically relevant for the target communities. The survey items for the Dutch students can be seen in appendix A, and the items presented to the English students can be found in appendix B. The participants were presented with statements, which reflected either an instrumental or integrative attitude towards language learning. Subsequently, the students were asked to assign a score on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. Five answer options provided the participants with enough options to give their opinion, but kept it clear and orderly as well. Propositions concerning instrumental and integrative motivation were presented randomly to the participants. The three-dimensional concept of “integrativeness” by Gardner (2000) was used to select and conduct the 30 items measuring integrative motivation. Thus, the students were presented with 10 statements on each of the following measures: attitudes toward the language group, interest in foreign languages and integrative orientation toward learning the language. The remaining 10 statements concerned instrumental motivation, measuring the practical value students ascribed to the L2. Online survey tool Thesistools was used to construct, distribute and subsequently to administer the survey to both respondent groups. Finally, SPSS was used to calculate the descriptive statistics and to carry out statistical analyses used to interpret the results.

Procedure

The survey was constructed online and distributed via internet as well. The students were told that the experiment concerned second language learning, but information regarding the motivational variables under scrutiny was omitted to ensure unbiased participants. Thus, the students received an e-mail enquiring whether they were willing to take part in an online survey about L2 learning. Additionally, their consent to use the (anonymous) results of the

survey in a thesis was asked for. After the students had filled in the survey, the average scores and standard deviations of the two respondent groups on all measures were calculated. The usage of a Likert-scale facilitated the calculations as the respondents' answers had already been converted from text to numbers. The answer options had the same structure for all items and were coded as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree. The assigned codes provided a clear and comprehensive overview of the type of motivation that was most relevant for the L2 students. Subsequently, several statistical analyses were conducted to measure possible significance in the differences between the groups.

Results

In total, 46 surveys were completed by 26 Dutch students of English (mean age: 22) and 20 English students of Dutch (mean age: 19.7). The Dutch students were in their first to sixth year of their studies ($M = 2.27$), whereas the English students were in their first to third year of their Dutch course ($M = 1.9$). The Mann-Whitney test was conducted for analysis as the data did not satisfy the assumptions of the independent t-test. Firstly, for measures of attitudes towards the language group the Dutch students ($Mdn = 18.15$) scored significantly lower than the English students ($Mdn = 30.45$), $U = 121.00$, $z = -3.09$, $p < .05$, $r = -.45$. Secondly, on measures of interest in foreign languages the Dutch group scored significantly lower ($Mdn = 19.94$) than the English group ($Mdn = 28.13$), $U = 167.50$, $z = -2.06$, $p < .05$, $r = -.3$. Thirdly, analysis of the results provided no significant differences between the scores for integrative orientation in Dutch students ($Mdn = 22.60$) and English students ($Mdn = 24.68$), $U = 236.50$, $z = -.52$, $p = .6$, $r = -.07$. The aforementioned measures were used to obtain the variable "integrativeness." Scores on integrativeness in Dutch students ($Mdn = 19.38$) were significantly lower than those in English students ($Mdn = 28.85$), $U = 153.00$, $z = -2.37$, $p < .05$, $r = -.35$. The results of the surveys provided no significant differences for instrumental

motivation in the Dutch students ($Mdn = 24.60$) and the English students ($Mdn = 22.08$), $U = 231.50$, $z = -.63$, $p = .53$, $r = -.63$. The mean scores and standard deviations of the English and Dutch respondents can be seen in table 1 and table 2 respectively.

Table 1

Mean scores and standard deviations of the English respondents

	Attitudes towards the language group	Interest in foreign languages	Integrative orientation	Integrativeness	Instrumental motivation
Mean	4.11	4.53	4.13	4.25	3.74
SD	0.73	0.60	0.73	0.74	0.89

Table 2

Mean scores and standard deviations of the Dutch respondents

	Attitudes towards the language group	Interest in foreign languages	Integrative orientation	Integrativeness	Instrumental motivation
Mean	3.64	4.25	4.01	3.97	3.86
SD	0.9	0.95	0.97	0.97	1.09

Discussion

The three-dimensional model of Gardner (2000) was used to examine integrative motivation in both student groups, which was subsequently compared with their instrumental motivation. As hypothesised, the English students scored significantly higher on the variable integrativeness. The following measurements were used to obtain our scores on integrativeness: attitudes towards the language group, interest in foreign languages and integrative orientation. Surprisingly, as opposed to the other two measurements, scores on integrative motivation did not differ significantly between the groups. Therefore, I conclude that the difference in degree of integrativeness between the groups in this study was primarily caused by the measurements of attitudes towards the language group and interest in foreign languages. The results suggest that the English participants held favourable attitudes towards the Dutch as well as to foreign languages in general. Nevertheless, the outcomes render no significant differences on integrative orientation, which was described by Gardner (2000) as: a genuine interest to learn about another culture, and a willingness to engage with the target community. The findings on integrative orientation do not reflect Ryan's (2006) world citizen theory, which would imply that Dutch students would score significantly lower on this measurement. Nevertheless, the Dutch students' scored barely lower than their English counterparts, which suggests a genuine willingness to engage with the target language group rather than a desire to become part of a global community.

As mentioned before, the Dutch were expected to rely more on instrumental incentives as their main impetus to study a second language, diminishing the effect of integrative motives. Nowadays, a great amount of status and value is ascribed to the English language as the prime language of the globalising world. Therefore, the Dutch were hypothesised to score significantly higher on instrumental motivation. As it turned out, the Dutch group scored slightly higher than the English group on instrumental motivation. However, the differences

between the groups were far from significant and the hypothesis was therefore not borne out. All in all, the results of the experiment imply that students whose L1 is considered relatively more prestigious than the L2 they study tend to have a general inclination for integrative motivation.

Nowadays, universities invest much effort and money in creating a curriculum that challenges and motivates students. All universities have their own approach of how to go about designing a language course that motivates its students both instrumentally and integratively. For example, when enrolled in a language course at Sheffield University, students are obliged to spend at least one semester in the country of origin of the course language to engage with the target community. Utrecht University offers these opportunities to its students as well, but it is optional. These minor differences in course curriculum and student learning environment between the students of both language groups may have affected the results of the study. For example, living and studying a full semester in the country of origin can positively affect one's attitude towards another population, which could lead to an increased eagerness and willingness to engage with the other people. Furthermore, Universities inviting alumni to lecture about their job experiences and offering internships to students can significantly impact their instrumental motivation as well. Through measures such as these, universities have managed to close the gap between instrumental and integrative motivation hence creating a twofold motivational curriculum.

Implications

The outcomes of the survey show that significant differences in types of motivation can be found amongst language students. However, sheer isolation of instrumental and integrative motivation has proven to be an arduous undertaking as many other factors come in play when it concerns motivation. Nevertheless, the results of the English students, scoring significantly higher on integrative motivation despite having reasonable high scores on instrumental

motivation as well, propose an alternative finding: integrative and instrumental motivation can co-exist and both serve as a source of motivation for an individual studying a second language.

Over the last few decades, research has shown that both instrumental and integrative motivation are positively correlated with second language learning success. This suggests that schools and universities should strive to construct a curriculum that excites integrative as well as instrumental motivation in its students. The University of Sheffield capitalises on the great variety of international students that come to Sheffield for a semester or year abroad. The international students are asked to take part in an internship where they function as teaching assistants in instructive language classes of their native language. Hence, the university constructs a semi-natural intercultural language situation where native speakers of two different languages interact with one and another. Moreover, all language students at the University of Sheffield are to spend a year in the country of their course language as it is included as a compulsory part of the curriculum. Obliging the students to spend a year abroad and having students from the country of the course language over through the year ostensibly has a beneficial effect on the integrative orientation of Sheffield's language students. The University of Sheffield's focus on enhancement of the integrative motivation in its students through measures such as these could explain some of the results found in this thesis. The scores of the English students of Dutch reflected a significantly higher level of integrative motivation than the Dutch students of English. Therefore, I would advocate for Utrecht University to include studying in the country of origin for language students as an obligatory part of the course program as well. Universities have found that intercultural and native speakers contact is the key to success in second language learning. Therefore, various ways of expanding and encouraging intercultural contact should remain the focal point for years to come in L2 learning. An indisputable way to do so is for universities to join forces and to

further intensify their cooperation to provide the students with even more opportunities to engage in intercultural communication.

Limitations

In hindsight, the biggest limitation of the conducted experiment is the different baseline of both participant groups. Hence, generalisations based on the findings of the study had to be formulated cautiously due to the differences in background. Ideally, an experiment measuring motivational differences between L2 learners should compare learners with the same L1 to eliminate possible confounding factors related to learners' L1. A related flaw of the current research design is the inability of English students to study a L2 that is as prestigious as English to Dutch L2 learners. It would seem that the L2 of English students may always be a language that has lower value in global economy and politics. Additionally, the sample size of the experiment was relatively small, which has had a negative impact on the overall validity. Lastly, Dornyei (2009) emphasised the cruciality of the student's learning environment for successful language learning. According to Dornyei, attributes such as a positive attitude towards the teacher, classroom setting and course material are pivotal to form a motivated student. The learning environment was not controlled for this study and could have introduced another confounding factor in the data. Therefore, items should have been included regarding the learning environment of the students and how the students perceived the curriculum and teaching approaches of their university.

Future research

For future research, it would be expedient to have a much bigger sample size with two homogenous groups. Having two groups around the same age, all exclusively enrolled in the language course under scrutiny together with the bigger sample size would allow for generalisations to L2 learners with the same L1 and the same L2 to be made. As aforementioned, it would be desirable to choose two groups of participants with the same L1

studying a different L2 to prevent the emergence of confounding factors concerning discrepancies in cultural and linguistic background in the learners (e.g. Dutch learners of English vs. Dutch learners of Italian). Furthermore, the survey should include some items regarding attitude towards the learning environment and curriculum as these might be vital factors in second language learning.

Conclusion

This thesis aimed to gain insight into the relationship between the global economic and political status of a language and second language learning. Significant discrepancies in the scores on integrative and instrumental motivation were expected as both languages represent a considerably different function in global communication. Vigilance with drawing conclusions remains expedient, but the results showed a clear inclination to integrative motivation in the English students. All in all, the outcomes of this study suggest that sociolinguistic disparities might partially account for differences in composition of motivation within an individual.

References

- Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R.W. (1989). Motivation: Reopening the Research Agenda. *Language Learning*, 41, 469-512.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). "The L2 Motivational Self System." In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (eds.). *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. (pp. 9-42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. (1959). Motivational Variables in Second Language Acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13, 266-272
- Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W.E. (1972), *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers
- Gardner, R.C., Lalonde, R.N., & Moorcroft, R. (1985). The Role of Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning: Correlational and Experimental Considerations. *Language Learning*, 35, 207-227.
- Gardner, R.C., Tremblay, P.F., & Masgoret, A.M. (1997). Towards a Full Model of Second Language Learning: an Empirical Investigation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81.3, 344-362.
- Gardner, R.C. (2000). Correlation, Causation, Motivation, and Second-Language Acquisition. *Canadian Psychology*, 41, 10-24.
- Gardner, R.C. & Masgoret, A.M. (2003). Attitudes, Motivation, and Second Language Learning: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Conducted by Gardner and Associates. *Language Learning*, 53.1, 123-163.
- Irie, K. (2003). What Do We Know About the Language Learning Motivation of University Students in Japan? Some Patterns in Survey Studies. *JALT Journal*, 25.1, 86-101.
- Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System* 32, 3-19.
- MacIntyre, P.D., Baker, S.C., Clément, R., & Donovan, L. (2002). Sex and Age Effects on Willingness to Communicate, Anxiety, Perceived Competence, and L2 Motivation Among Junior High School French Immersion Students. *Language Learning*, 52.3, 537-564.
- Oller, J. W. (1981). Research on the Measurement of Affective Variables: Some Remaining Questions. In R.W. Andersen (ed.), *New Dimensions in Second Language Acquisition Research* (pp. 14-27). Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Oxford, R. (Ed.). (1996). New Pathways of Language Learning Motivation. In *Language Learning Motivation: Pathways to a New Century* (Tech. Rep. No. 11, pp 1-8). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii at Manoa, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center
- Ryan, S. (2006) Language Learning Motivation within the Context of Globalisation: An L2 Self within an Imagined Global Community. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 3.1, 23-45.

Savignon, S.J. (1972). Teaching for Communicative Competence: A Research Report. *Audio-Visual Language Journal*, 10.3, 153-162.

Appendix A

Survey items Dutch students

Age.....

Gender.....

Year of study.....

Integrativeness:

Attitudes toward the language group

1. The English are a sociable and warm-hearted people.
2. I would like to know more about English people.
3. The more I get to know English people, the more I want to be fluent in their language.
4. I have a favourable attitude towards the English.
5. The more I learn about the English, the more I like them.
6. I have always admired English people.
7. The English are an example to Dutch people of how to behave socially.
8. English people are friendly and easy to get along with.
9. I appreciate the English for being open and flexible people.
10. The English are a kind and generous people.

Interest in foreign languages

1. When I visit a foreign country, I like to be able to speak the language of the people.
2. It is important for Dutch people to study foreign languages.
3. I wish I could speak another language perfectly.
4. I prefer to read the foreign literature in the original language rather than in translation.
5. I often wish I could read newspapers and magazines in another language.
6. I would really like to learn a lot of foreign languages.
7. If I moved to another country, I would make a serious effort to learn the language.
8. I would study a foreign language in university even if it was not required.
9. I enjoy meeting and conversing with people who speak other languages.
10. Studying a foreign language is an enjoyable experience.

Integrative orientation to learning the language

1. Studying English is important for me, because it allows me to meet and converse with more and varied people.
2. I love English; it is a beautiful language.
3. Studying English enables me to understand English life style and culture.
4. I am interested in English films and music.
5. Studying English enables me to feel more at ease with fellow speakers of English.

6. Studying English enables me to speak like native English speakers: e.g. accent, using English expressions.
7. Studying English enables me to understand and appreciate a 'English' way of life.
8. Learning the language allows me to engage with and become friends with members of English speaking communities.
9. Dutch people should make a greater effort of learning English.
10. I love English because there are many beautiful words and sounds.

Instrumental motivation:

1. I'll need English for my future career.
2. Studying English makes me a more knowledgeable and skillful person.
3. Studying English may someday be useful in getting a good job.
4. Studying English is important for me because people respect me more if I have knowledge of a foreign language.
5. Studying English allows me to seek job opportunities abroad.
6. Studying English allows me to search for information and literature in English for my assignments on the Internet.
7. Studying English will help me when I go abroad.
8. Being proficient in English can lead to more success in life.
9. Studying English is important because it makes me appear more cultured.
10. Studying English is important because it gives me an edge in competing with others.

Appendix B

Survey items English students

Age.....

Gender.....

Year of study.....

Integrativeness:

Attitudes toward the language group

1. The Dutch are a sociable and warm-hearted people.
2. I would like to know more about Dutch people.
3. The more I get to know Dutch people, the more I want to be fluent in their language.
4. I have a favourable attitude towards the Dutch.
5. The more I learn about the Dutch, the more I like them.
6. I have always admired Dutch people.
7. The Dutch are an example to English people of how to behave socially.
8. Dutch people are friendly and easy to get along with.
9. I appreciate the Dutch for being open and flexible people.
10. The Dutch are a kind and generous people.

Interest in foreign languages

1. When I visit a foreign country, I like to be able to speak the language of the people.
2. It is important for English people to study foreign languages.
3. I wish I could speak another language perfectly.
4. I prefer to read the foreign literature in the original language rather than in translation.
5. I often wish I could read newspapers and magazines in another language.
6. I would really like to learn a lot of foreign languages.
7. If I moved to another country, I would make a serious effort to learn the language.
8. I would study a foreign language in university even if it was not required.
9. I enjoy meeting and conversing with people who speak other languages.
10. Studying a foreign language is an enjoyable experience.

Integrative orientation to learning the language

1. Studying Dutch is important for me, because it allows me to meet and converse with more and varied people.
2. I love Dutch; it is a beautiful language.
3. Studying Dutch enables me to understand Dutch life style and culture.
4. I am interested in Dutch films and music.
5. Studying Dutch enables me to feel more at ease with fellow speakers of Dutch.
6. Studying Dutch enables me to speak like native Dutch speakers: e.g. accent, using Dutch expressions.
7. Studying Dutch enables me to understand and appreciate a 'Dutch' way of life.

8. Learning the language allows me to engage with and become friends with members of Dutch speaking communities.
9. English people should make a greater effort of learning Dutch.
10. I love Dutch because there are many beautiful words and sounds.

Instrumental motivation:

1. I'll need Dutch for my future career.
2. Studying Dutch makes me a more knowledgeable and skillful person.
3. Studying Dutch may someday be useful in getting a good job.
4. Studying Dutch is important for me because people respect me more if I have knowledge of a foreign language.
5. Studying Dutch allows me to seek job opportunities abroad.
6. Studying Dutch allows me to search for information and literature in Dutch for my assignments on the Internet.
7. Studying Dutch will help me when I go abroad.
8. Being proficient in Dutch can lead to more success in life.
9. Studying Dutch is important because it makes me appear more cultured.
10. Studying Dutch is important because it gives me an edge in competing with others.