



# L2 Motivational Self System, international posture and competitiveness of Korean CTL and LCTL college learners: A structural equation modeling approach

Ji Hyun Kong<sup>a</sup>, Jeong Eun Han<sup>b</sup>, Sungjo Kim<sup>c</sup>, Hunil Park<sup>d</sup>, Yong Suk Kim<sup>e</sup>, Hyunjoo Park<sup>f,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Arabic Department, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, 107, Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul, South Korea

<sup>b</sup> Department of Chinese Interpretation and Translation, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, 107, Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul, South Korea

<sup>c</sup> Institute of Language Research and Education, Yonsei University, 50, Yonsei-ro, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul, South Korea

<sup>d</sup> English Department, Cyber Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, 107, Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul, South Korea

<sup>e</sup> School of Liberal Arts, Korea University of Technology and Education, Gajeon-ri, Byeongcheon-myeon, Dongnam-gu, Cheonan-si, Chungcheongnam-do, South Korea

<sup>f</sup> Department of English Language and Literature, Hongik University, 94, Wausan-ro, Mapo-gu, Seoul, South Korea

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 18 July 2016

Received in revised form 20 November 2017

Accepted 23 November 2017

### Keywords:

L2 Motivational Self System

International posture

Competitiveness

CTL/LCTL

Korean socio-educational context

## ABSTRACT

The present study compares L2 learning motivation between commonly taught language (CTL) and less commonly taught language (LCTL) learners in university settings in South Korea, mainly focusing on Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) L2 Motivational Self System. A total of 1296 Korean college students, including 638 CTL and 658 LCTL learners, participated in a questionnaire survey, and the main analysis method was a multi-group structural equation model (SEM). The results support the validity of Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System in comparing and explaining Korean CTL and LCTL learners' motivation. For both CTL and LCTL groups, L2 learning attitude appeared as the most influential factor influencing learners' intended effort, followed by the ideal L2 self. The impact of the ought-to L2 self on L2 learning effort was relatively low. Two variables, international posture and competitiveness, which were assumed to be influenced by the Korean socio-educational context, were also observed in the SEM analysis. More specifically, their impact on the ideal L2 self, L2 learning attitude, and the ought-to L2 self were compared between CTL and LCTL groups. This comparison revealed the differing patterns of relationships among the variables between the two groups. This study provides pedagogical implications based on these key findings.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

In studies on the acquisition of a second language, such languages (L2) are often classified into commonly taught languages (CTLs) and less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) (Brown, 2009). A few comparative studies have been conducted to

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [zahiya@hanmail.net](mailto:zahiya@hanmail.net) (J.H. Kong), [amoremio11@hanmail.net](mailto:amoremio11@hanmail.net) (J.E. Han), [sungjo@yonsei.ac.kr](mailto:sungjo@yonsei.ac.kr) (S. Kim), [phunil@gmail.com](mailto:phunil@gmail.com) (H. Park), [yongkim@koreatech.ac.kr](mailto:yongkim@koreatech.ac.kr) (Y.S. Kim), [hyunjoopark21@gmail.com](mailto:hyunjoopark21@gmail.com) (H. Park).

explore CTL and LCTL learners' motivation, identifying different motivational patterns between the two groups. Nevertheless, previous L2 motivational studies have been mainly conducted with CTL learners, leaving LCTL learners' motivation as an understudied area.

Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System, which is considered a valid tool in explaining complex and multi-faceted L2 learners' motivation, has been tested on language learners, but with only a few exceptions (e.g., Xie, 2014), has been limited to CTL learners. To overcome this imbalance and investigate its applicability to LCTL learners in addition to CTL learners, this study compares the two groups' motivation using a multi-group structural equation modeling (SEM) in the framework of Dörnyei's System. It does so specifically by examining university students in South Korea (henceforth, Korea) learning CTLs (English and Chinese) and LCTLs (Spanish and Arabic) as their L2.

It is a nation's educational policy and political, economic, and social situations that determine which languages are classified as CTLs or LCTLs (Gor & Vatz, 2009). It therefore seems reasonable to pay attention to contextual variables that strongly influence CTL and LCTL learners' motivation. Keeping this in mind, the present study has included two extra variables, international posture and competitiveness, in addition to the three key components of Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System. These two variables are expected to capture the prevailing socio-educational conditions in Korea and to provide pedagogical implications specific to the two groups.

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1. CTLs and LCTLs in L2 education

The concept of CTLs and LCTLs exists globally, though there is no firm consensus among scholars regarding how to strictly classify them. Various criteria have been adopted to determine whether an L2 should be considered a CTL or LCTL. In Magnan, Murphy, and Sahakyan (2014), the classification criterion was whether they are taught at high schools, while Godwin (2013) categorised them based on whether L2 learners have easy access to L2 learning opportunities at colleges. Brecht and Walton (1994) used the number of L2 learners at educational institutions as a criterion and established more detailed LCTL sub-categories such as principal less commonly taught languages, much less commonly taught languages, least commonly taught languages, and rarely taught languages. As has been the case with these previous studies, generally accepted criteria in classifying L2s into CTLs and LCTLs include the availability of or access to L2 learning opportunities and the number of L2 learners.

A few studies have been conducted to compare CTL and LCTL learners' L2 motivation and learner characteristics (e.g., Bao & Lee, 2012; Brown, 2009; Magnan et al., 2014). Brown (2009) investigated students enrolled in 83 beginner level courses for 9 languages at a large American university and revealed that, while CTL learners showed high levels of short-term, extrinsic motivation, LCTL learners' motivation tended to be long-term and intrinsic. Bao and Lee (2012) found lower anxiety, higher integrativeness, and more positive attitudes toward the learning environment among LCTL learners compared to CTL learners. Magnan et al. (2014) compared CTL and LCTL learners enrolled in 31 language courses at 11 American universities and found that LCTL learners were more motivated in their L2 learning than CTL learners. Moreover, it was revealed that sociopolitical, economic, historical, and geographical contexts of the L2 influenced the learners' motivation. These studies have collectively identified motivational differences between CTL and LCTL groups, suggesting a need to develop and apply educational approaches tailored to the different motivational characteristics of each group.

### 2.2. L2 Motivational Self System

Early studies on L2 motivation actively investigated L2 learners' integrativeness, the key concept of Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model. However, this concept of integrativeness has been challenged by L2 motivation researchers (e.g., Dörnyei, 2005, 2009; Lamb, 2004), who argued that it cannot fully explain complex and context-dependent characteristics of L2 motivation, especially failing to address an ever-diversifying L2 learning environment and emerging global English. In order to determine an alternative approach ensuring a better understanding of L2 learners' motivation, Dörnyei (2005, 2009) proposed the L2 Motivational Self System, which consists of three key components: the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self, and L2 learning experience or attitude.

The ideal L2 self refers to a positive future image of the L2 self. For example, learners who have developed a vivid ideal L2 self are likely to endeavour to learn an L2 by imagining themselves communicating fluently using the L2 in the future. On the other hand, the ought-to L2 self is a passive self, imposed by external factors; in this case, learners learn an L2 in order to avoid possible negative outcomes from learning failure or to merely satisfy expectations of important people in their lives, including their parents. L2 learning experience is related to the learners' environment including teachers, peer groups, curriculum, and their attitudes toward L2 learning.

Since the L2 Motivational Self System was proposed, there have been multiple empirical investigations on the framework (e.g., Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Islam, Lamb, & Chambers, 2013; Kang, 2014; Kim & Kim, 2014; Kormos & Csizér, 2008; Kormos, Kiddle, & Csizér, 2011; Lee & Ahn, 2013; Magid, 2009; Papi, 2010; Taguchi, Magid, & Papi, 2009; Xie, 2014; Yashima, 2009). Those studies have confirmed its effectiveness in explaining L2 learners' motivation in various contexts. The impact of each of the three key components on learners' intended effort or motivated behaviour in L2 learning can be summarised as follows.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6849422>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6849422>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)