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Abstract

Dörnyei’s (2005, 2006) groundbreaking L2 Motivational Self System Theory has been developed to explain the relationship between motivation and L2 learning through three components: ideal self, ought-to self, and L2 learning experience. He proposed that these three factors correlate with the self-reported intended learning efforts of the learners, which he viewed as an indicative of the learners’ proficiency levels. However, the effect of these three factors on L2 achievement was not sufficiently established either by Dörnyei or other advocates of his theory. This study was conducted to determine if the three factors have an actual effect on the learners’ L2 achievement or not.

A mixed approach was used, with a primary quantitative research instrument being supported by secondary qualitative data. A total of 360 male and female participants were asked to complete a questionnaire containing statements representing the three theorized components. The participants were, then, asked to do an English proficiency test (reading and writing tasks; excerpts from IELTS). This was followed by a set of semi structured interviews in which 21 participants of the larger sample were asked questions about their goals and orientations related to their English learning as well as their future selves and imaginations.

Descriptive and referential statistical procedures were used to analyse the quantitative part of the data. The results reinforce the validity of Dörnyei’s key constructs: ideal self and ought-to self, and uncover two underlying dimensions within the L2 learning experience scale and the intended learning efforts scale. Both types of selves and both types of experience were good predictors of the learners’ intended learning efforts. However, none of the above were good predictors of either the reading or the writing scores of the participants. On the other hand, the qualitative data analysis findings revealed that both self-guides motivate Saudi learners to learn English. Most importantly, the findings highlighted the role played by role models and action plans in the development of the L2 learners’ future selves.
Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Researchers from different fields of knowledge have been investigating the process of second language acquisition and learning. Along this journey of research and inquiry undeniable links were recognized and acknowledged between language learning and other disciplines and fields of study including psychology, neurology, sociology, and so on. Thus, the field of Applied Linguistics was born as a field of an interdisciplinary nature, and so began the exploration of second language acquisition (SLA) theory and practice (Smith, 2001). One of the major SLA theories, the Interactionist Theory, views language as a process that is mediated not only by cognitive, but also by social and affective variables (Norris & Ortega, 2003). Whereas these variables, particularly motivation and attitudes, have been the foci of frequent research in different contexts around the world, not as many studies investigated the role of these variables in L2 learning in Saudi Arabia. A few Saudi studies have tried to study the relationship between motivation and L2 proficiency, but most dominantly such studies investigated this relationship in the light of either the Self Determination Theory or more frequently based on Gardner’s Socio-educational Approach (as will be demonstrated later in the literature review chapter). Yet, no Saudi study to date, to the best of our knowledge, examined the relationship between motivation and second language learning from the point of view of the self approach, which has been validated in different contexts around the world in the past few years.

Thus, the current study aims at studying the affective factors that influence L2 learning, and particularly examining the role that motivation plays in learning English as a foreign language in Saudi Arabia, where there seems to be a consensus between the language practitioners about the general low level of English proficiency processed by most Saudi students (Albousaif, 2011; Alfallaj, 1998; Alrabai, 2010; Syed, 2003). This project studies the relationship between motivation and L2 learning among Saudi learners of English using a recently developed theoretical framework in the field of
motivational second language acquisition, i.e., the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) (see Dörnyei et al., 2006; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009).

This study goes beyond the traditional way of researching motivation within the L2MSS paradigm, which normally relies on utilizing intended learning efforts, i.e., self reported intentions, as a predictor of L2 proficiency, by employing a language test in hopes of uncovering the true capacity of Dörnyei’s self-motivational factors to predict actual L2 achievement.

The current chapter introduces the research project and establishes its relevance to the Saudi context and to the L2MSS research globally. The chapter explains why this topic has been chosen for investigation, what the significance of the study is to the field of motivational SLA, and what research questions will be answered. The chapter is concluded with a brief description of the research site and the current situation of teaching English as a foreign language in Saudi Arabia.

Chapter two provides a comprehensive review of the relevant literature on the topic of motivation in general and more particularly within the L2MSS theory. The literature review starts with a critical discussion of the concept of L2 motivation and the major L2 motivation theories that have shaped our perception of it. It includes a discussion of the most influential theories in cognitive psychology as well as social psychology, the different types of L2 motivation discussed from the point of view of the different theories, the shift in scope from the socio-educational approach, the concept of self and identity in motivational L2 research, and finally a through description of the L2 Motivational Self System as well as the research that has been conducted on it so far.

Chapter three introduces and discusses the research design and methodology employed in this project. It includes a description of the participants followed by an elaboration on the data collection tools and processes. This is a mixed method study that involved a number of data collection methods of both quantitative and qualitative data from a relatively large number of participants. The discussion of the methods includes a description of the questionnaire, the language proficiency test as well as the interview, and how each of these instruments was used to collect the data. The chapter concludes with a screening of the questionnaire data to be discussed in more detail in Chapter four.
Chapter four is the quantitative analysis and discussion chapter. The quantitative analysis is divided into two stages, viz., preliminary and main analyses. The preliminary analysis includes the factor analyses, computation of variables, normality check, and so on. The main part of the analysis includes analysis of variance tests (ANOVA) utilized in exploring the impact of the differences between the participants on their motivation. The second part of the main analysis looks into the strength and direction of the relationship between the different variables using measures of correlation and regression. A comprehensive description of the results is presented together with an analytical discussion of these results in the light of the previous studies’ findings.

Chapter five is devoted to the qualitative analysis and discussion of the data. This chapter serves in developing a deeper understanding of the findings through the analysis of the rich data collected using the interview. It also sheds more light on the overall L2 learning process as well as the formation process of the future selves among the participants. Like the quantitative analysis chapter, the qualitative chapter brings together the results yielded from the interviews, and relates these findings to the relevant literature.

Chapter six concludes this thesis and presents a summary of its key quantitative and qualitative findings as well as its contributions to the wider L2MSS research. This chapter also discusses the major limitations that came into play during the different stages of the study. The chapter and the thesis is concluded by outlining some recommended future research trends to improve EFL teaching/learning motivational research as well as some technical considerations to be taken into account when conducting future research within the L2 Motivational Self System.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Although some studies addressed the issue of motivation and L2 learning within the Saudi context (see Al-Kahtany, 1995; Al-Otaibi, 2004; Moskovsky & Alarabi, 2009), an original new approach was proposed by Dörnyei (Dörnyei et al., 2006; Dörnyei, 2009), which is expected to provide a more adequate theoretical explanation of the issue under investigation. The general scarcity of L2MSS research in Saudi Arabia is well-recognized; with the exception of Al-shehri’s (2009) study, which only investigated the
role of imagery and aimed at investigating the relationship between the visual style of learning and Dörnyei’s theory of motivation among Saudi learners of English, the relationship between motivation and L2 learning has not been sufficiently investigated so far in the light of the newly emerging theoretical framework. The majority of the L2 motivation research in Saudi Arabia has almost exclusively studied the relationship between motivation and L2 learning based on Gardner’s (1985) integrative/instrumental model. To the researcher’s best knowledge, there has not been a single Saudi study that has gone beyond the traditional way of researching motivation and used the newly developed L2MSS theoretical framework to assess the role played by motivation in L2 learning. It is therefore appropriate to conduct a more comprehensive study that investigates the different components of Dörnyei’s (2006, 2009) theory and examine their role in redefining motivational L2 learning research within the Saudi context.

1.3 Significance of the Study

The importance of this study to the field of motivational SLA is well-established since it is both timely and important not only to establish the cross-cultural validation of the L2MSS in a new context, but also to test the theory’s actual power in explaining variation in actual L2 attainment levels. This project attempts to address some of “the problematic key issues” discussed by Dörnyei and Ushioda regarding the L2 Motivational Self System theory (2009, 350-354), as well as those raised from the studies conducted on the theory so far. One of these key questions in this regard is the need for investigation of the nature of the self-guides; whether the two self-guides can be referred to as two separate selves as proposed by Dörnyei (2006, 2009) or if they are simply two facets of one broad future self.

The present research also tries to address the issue reported by Macintyre, Mackinnon and Clement (2009b) in which the need for incorporating quantitative systematic research within the L2 Motivational Self System Theory was highlighted since most of the research on motivation on this theory has been conducted using qualitative research instruments. Thus, this study uses a questionnaire adapted from instruments used in previous motivational SLA studies and includes new items that address the different components of L2MSS more accurately (see section 3.3.1).
In addition, most of the contemporary studies within the L2 Motivational Self System have not used an actual L2 proficiency exam to assess the participants’ L2 proficiency (Kim, 2009; Ryan, 2008; Taguchi, et al., 2009), rather most of the quantitative investigations within the L2 motivational Self System realm used ‘the intended efforts in learning the target language’ as the criterion measure instead of utilizing an actual L2 proficiency exam to reflect the L2 learners’ actual proficiency levels. The intended learning efforts scale is used to elicit information about how important learning English for the L2 learners is and the efforts they are willing to expend in order to improve their L2 learning outcomes with the assumption that it is a predictive of actual L2 achievement. The use of this scale as the only predictive variable of the participants’ level of proficiency in the target language is problematic and puts the validity of the findings of these studies under question; as to whether the criterion measure used in these studies accurately reflects the proficiency levels of the participants or not (see Ryan, 2008).

This project extends the already existing self framework by adding English language proficiency scores as the criterion variable in the self model of L2 motivation. This allows us to explore the relationship between motivation and L2 proficiency level using an actual language proficiency test which is expected, in turn, to add more validity to the research findings (Ryan, 2008), and can therefore be anticipated to produce substantive new findings. Dörnyei (2010) admittedly reports that one of the reasons that could have been responsible for the high correlation levels between motivation and L2 attainment in the majority of the previous studies is related to the criterion measure used in the assessment of the relationship between motivation and L2 learning. He explains that (2010, p. 248):

\[ \ldots \text{[When]} \text{ the criterion measure is related to learner behaviours rather than holistic proficiency measures (e.g., the extent of learners’ participation in a task rather than, say, TOEFL scores), the correlations with motivational factors can exceed 0.50 and multiple correlations involving all the assessed motives together can reach 0.70.} \]

Furthermore, this research sheds some light on the formation process of the future selves within the mind of the L2 learners and taps into the issue of the sources of the
learners’ ideal and ought-to self-guides, a currently debatable issue, using a combined method of data collection in which both quantitative and qualitative instruments are utilized to explain in more detail the topic under investigation.

This research contributes to the growing field of motivational SLA within the L2MSS as the study has yielded results which will enable a better understanding of the major components in this theory and its cross cultural validity. This research has also provided valuable insights into the role of motivation in the process of L2 learning, particularly within the Saudi context. Such results will certainly inform future research on motivation inside the classroom which is currently regarded as a primary focus in the field of Motivational SLA.

1.4 Goals of the Study

This research aims at presenting an investigation of the applicability of Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System in the Saudi context. In particular, the main objectives of this study are as follows:

- To review and critically evaluate existing approaches that address the issue of motivation and SLA.
- To redefine the parameters of Motivational SLA within the Saudi context, using contemporary theoretical frameworks.
- To collect data about the different types of motivators existing within the learners of English in Saudi Arabia.
- To design a scale to assess possible selves as a source of language learning motivation.
- To examine the data collected about the three components of L2 Motivational Self System and investigate its significance in the variability of attainment levels of the L2 among Saudi learners.
- To provide some insights on how the two self-guides develop in the minds of the learners.
- To provide the motivational SLA research community with more empirically grounded support on the relationship between motivation and achievement in SLA.


1.5 Research Questions

The overarching question is:

Does the L2 Motivational Self System, with its strong focus on the individual, operate in Saudi L2 classrooms which traditionally have strong collective orientation?

More specific research questions include the following:

Q1: What types of self-guides motivate Saudi learners to learn English?

Q2: What are the sources of the Saudi L2 learners’ self-guides?

Q3: Does Dörnyei’s Motivational Self System theory account for the difference in attainment levels in L2 within the Saudi context?

A mixed-method research design has been utilized in order to collect the data necessary to address the research questions above.

1.6 Research Hypotheses

This study is expected to yield results in favor of Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System as it is predicted that this model will appropriately redefine the nature of the relationship between motivation and L2 achievement in the Saudi context. The research is expected to yield results that validate Dörnyei’s distinction between the two self-guides. The study is also expected to yield results favoring the effectiveness of having a stronger ideal self over an ought-to self with regard to the level of attainment of L2. Finally, this study is expected to provide more insights on how these future self images develop in the minds of the learners. The results of the interview are expected to demonstrate that the majority of the Saudi L2 learners have motivators stemming from social obligations placed on them from outside, rather than having future images more internalized and related to the ideal self.

It is hypothesized in the present research that:

1. The ideal and ought-to will emerge as distinct self-guides among Saudi learners of English as a second language.
2. A relationship will exist between the self-guides and L2 proficiency, whereby this relationship may be mediated by the learners’ motivated behaviours, i.e., *intended learning efforts*.

3. The relationship between the ideal self and the English language proficiency scores will be stronger than the relationship between the ought-to self and the proficiency scores.

4. The future images that the Saudi L2 learners have of themselves stem from motivators more pertinent to the ought-to self rather than the ideal self.

1.7 Contextual Framework

Saudi Arabia is a country of great importance in the Islamic world and globally. The religious significance for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is derived from the fact that in it lie the two sacred cities Makkah and Madinah (Farsy, 1986), where the house of God and the house of his final Prophet are located. These two places are symbols of faith for over one billion Muslims around the world. In fact, Islam obliges all Muslims to visit the holy city of Makkah at least once in their life time if they are able to (Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, 2010). Therefore, large numbers of Muslims from different parts of the globe visit Makkah in Saudi Arabia as pilgrims to perform certain Islamic rituals, viz. Hajj pilgrimage and Umrah.

From a global perspective, Saudi Arabia is the world’s largest oil producer and exporter. This has made Saudi Arabia one of the fastest-growing economies in the world (Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, 2010). The rapid changes in the economy led to a huge foreign labor influx in the Saudi work force. The need for communication between Saudis and all these non-Arabic speaking immigrants underlies the necessity for a common global language to be used as a lingua franca, which in this case is the English language. It is also very essential in training manpower since most experts and engineers in these industries and companies are non-Arabs. Moreover, Al-Maini (2006) reports that the rise in the oil industries in Saudi Arabia, has also led to a sharp increase in contact and trade with English-speaking partners not only in the private sector level, but on the government level, as well.
Competence in English for career-related purposes has also been proving to be one of the main and most desirable skills to be possessed by Saudis in the present time. English proficiency is an important job requirement now in both the public and private sector in Saudi Arabia. Major petroleum companies, for instance, require an eloquent command of both spoken and written forms of English for employment and career advancement purposes. Gaining English competence to qualify for such positions have always been among the motives to many high school and university graduates. English is also the official language used for communication in the health sector in Saudi Arabia, which highlights the importance of English competence for communication with doctors, pharmacists, and nurses. The need for English for vocational purposes in Saudi Arabia covers a wide range of technical and professional domains, e.g., health institutes, military and security institutes, etc.

In addition to the religious and professional aspects associated with learning English, English itself has become a part of the twenty-first-century youth culture around the world, and Saudi Arabia is no exception. English constitutes a major part of Saudi youngsters’ everyday life outside work and education. For instance, English mass media as well as English satellite TV, radio channels, Video Games, and popular pop and hip hop cultures are all taking the Saudi youth by storm. Youth lifestyle and eating habits are becoming more similar to those in the west through the wide spread of McDonalds, Burger King, Pizza Hut, KFC, Starbucks, and so on. Most of such international fast-food chain restaurants are served by employees who use English as the primary means of communication. Although Arabic is the official language in Saudi Arabia, English is normally used alongside Arabic in road signs and names of shops. Official documents, receipts as well as most of the paper work carried out in banks, airports, and post offices are usually in both English and Arabic. In fact, in the main shopping districts in the cosmopolitan cities such as Jeddah and Riyadh, names such as Toys”R”Us, Mango, Mother Care, are only written in English, and have become household names in the life of Saudi families.

1.8 Teaching English in Saudi Arabia

As far as education in Saudi Arabia is concerned, the Saudi government has recognized the importance of English, and as a result the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia has
initiated a program making English an obligatory subject in almost all levels of the Saudi school system.

Public education in Saudi Arabia is free for every citizen and is composed of three levels, namely, elementary, intermediate, and secondary (high) schools. The elementary (primary) level spans over six years while the intermediate and secondary levels require three years each to finish. Tertiary (university) education in Saudi Arabia usually requires a minimum of four years in the field of humanities and social sciences, and five to seven years in the medical and engineering fields. The two sexes are generally segregated in the Saudi educational system based on some religious and cultural considerations.

Initially, English teaching in Saudi Arabia unfolded in the 1920s (Al-Sugayyer, 2006), but has officially been introduced into the public school curricula in the 1950s (Al-Shammary, 1984). English as a subject was obligatory only in the intermediate and secondary stages (years 7-12), but it has recently been introduced to the final three years of the primary school curriculum (years 4-6).

The Ministry of Education provides prescribed English syllabi to be taught in the different stages in all Saudi schools. The most recent English syllabus is developed as a six-level English language course for each of the three schooling levels, i.e., primary, intermediate and secondary; each of these six books covers one semester of the Saudi Arabian academic year. The English textbook series prescribed for primary schools is entitled “Get Ready”; the one for intermediate schools is entitled “Lift Off”; while the one for secondary schools is entitled “Flying High”. Each textbook in these three series contains eight units presenting students with new vocabulary, structures, phonic practices, and literacy skills as well as four units of revision. Each semester every student receives a free English Pupil’s Book, which combines the textbook and the workbook, as well as an audio CD for listening, while English teachers are provided with an additional teacher manual referred to as the Teacher’s Book in addition to some teaching aids, e.g., posters and flash cards. The purpose of the teacher’s book is to set out an outline of the lesson objectives and a detailed procedure on how each lesson can be presented. All these materials as well as other supporting training and teaching resources and suggestions are provided to the teachers on a website devoted to each of
the previously mentioned six-level courses, i.e., to each of the schooling levels (see for example www.macmillanenglish.com/GRSA).

At the university level, English is the only medium of teaching at some Saudi universities like King Fahad University for Petroleum and Minerals. English is the primary medium of communication and instruction in several science-based faculties and colleges such as the faculties of medicine, the faculties of engineering across the country. In the English departments at Saudi universities, the students normally focus on consolidating the four basic language skills, i.e., listening, speaking, reading and writing, in the first three or four semesters before they get introduced to the linguistics, translation and literature courses.

More recently, a relatively large number of Saudi undergraduate and post graduate students have chosen to undertake their studies abroad. King Abdullah scholarship program which was initiated in 2005 has enabled around 200,000 Saudis to travel abroad, mostly to English-speaking countries, for undergraduate and postgraduate studies’ purposes.

According to Aldosari (1992) teaching English throughout this lengthy period in the Saudi educational system should by now have enabled students to develop the four basic language skills and communicate effectively in the target language. Unfortunately, however, even in this new century the level of attained proficiency has yet to reach this goal among the majority of the students, due to several reasons (Al-Awad, 2002; Albousaif, 2011; Alfallaj, 1998; Al-Qurashi, 2002; Al-Otaibi, 2004; Alrabai, 2010, Al-Wahibee, 2000; Syed, 2003). This low level of proficiency can justifiably be attributed to not only cognitive factors, e.g., aptitude, but can also be associated with affective factors, which have not received sufficient attention in the Saudi literature so far. Thus, the focus of this research is to investigate motivation, which is unequivocally acknowledged as a key factor with a critical role in relation to the success (or lack thereof) in attaining L2 proficiency and which has been extensively researched worldwide, but not sufficiently within the Saudi context.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

2.1 Motivation and Second Language Acquisition

It is generally accepted that normal people acquire their L1 easily and successfully, albeit there is variation in the actual language use among the speakers of the same language. However, it is almost equally accepted that not many L2 learners achieve native-like fluency; particularly adult learners learning the target language in educational settings (Brown, 1973). The difference in L2 attainment levels have been attributed to factors related to both cognition and affect, with a more direct emphasis placed on the former than the later, at least initially. The age at which the learner is first introduced to the second language was viewed to be the single factor that affects L2 learning most and that could cause some learners to acquire a high level of L2 fluency while others to acquire only a few stumbling words (Lenneberg, 1967). In addition, the focus on biological factors has usually led some L2 researchers to place a primary focus in the process of L2 learning on topics, such as Universal Grammar, the role of language transfer, and the order of acquisition in L2 which has led to a downplaying of the role of the cognitive and affective factors in L2 research (Sorrentino & Higgins, 1986). More recently an integrative view of the factors affecting L2 acquisition has emerged and has been gaining wider and wider support. This integrative view has aptly been summarized by Birdsong (2006, pp. 36-37):

Ongoing research in L2 acquisition must account not only for the typical decline in L2 attainment with age but also for the nativelikeness that late learners are manifestly capable of. To do so adequately will require clear-eyed and open-minded attempts to integrate biological, cognitive, experiential, linguistic, and affective dimensions of L2 learning and processing.
In the 1950s and 1960s SLA research started to investigate the role of more cognitive and affective factors in relation to second language learning. Intelligence, aptitude and personality attributes, including attitudes and motivation, have been theorized to affect L2 learning the most. Nonetheless, even when the role of the nonlinguistic factors was, later, recognized, the level of attainment of L2 was usually more closely linked to the learners’ aptitudes and levels of intelligence (Carroll, 1962). Aptitude, which refers to the learned capabilities of an individual which are needed for successful SLA, was assumed to include phonemic coding ability, grammatical sensitivity, inductive language learning ability, and the memory and learning ability (Carroll, 1965). L2 research found several correlations between factors such as cognitive styles (McDonough, 1981), degree of acculturation (Schumann, 1978) as well as aptitude (Skehan, 1989) and SLA success, or lack thereof.

In spite of the undeniable links that were established between the cognitive factors and L2 learning, there was a need to incorporate the affective side of the learners in the process of L2 learning, as well. Brown (1973) points out that certain affective factors that are fundamental to human behaviour would be neglected if SLA research was focused on cognitive considerations only. Krashen (1981) also acknowledges the importance of both aptitude which he sees as disposition and motivation which he sees as willingness in second language learning. However, unlike motivation, aptitude was found to be a stable state among the L2 learners which cannot be easily modified (Skehan, 1989). This finding has resulted in undermining the importance of researching the role played by aptitude in language learning since language learners and teachers can only do a little to improve it, and led to a shift in the focus of investigation towards other factors that could have a bearing on L2 learning (Ehrman, 1996). Thus, the role of the affective variables including motivation and attitudes became more widely recognized in the process of SLA in an immense amount of SLA research (See Dörnyei, 1998, 2001, 2003; Dörnyei et al. 2006; Gardner & Lambert, 1972, 2001).

Motivation is identified as a key element that provides the L2 learner with the momentum needed to initiate and sustain the usually time and effort consuming L2 learning process (Dörnyei, 2000; Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008). Historically, L2 motivation research dates back to the late 1950s and early 1960s and the pioneering works of the Canadian social psychologist Gardner and his colleagues Lambert and
Clément (Dörnyei, 2001a). However, as SLA researchers worldwide recognized the important role of motivation in accounting for the variability in the levels of L2 attainment, several motivational theoretical frameworks have been proposed to elucidate the role of motivation in SLA in different contexts around the world. In this section, I examine motivation as a concept: motivational theories and how the study of motivation has evolved over the past few decades. I will provide a broad overview of the concept of motivation, the main motivational theories, and a historical outline of the theoretical advancements that have taken place in the field of SLA motivation research. I will finish with a detailed description of the L2 Motivational Self System, and review the most influential motivational studies’ that have been conducted within the self framework.

2.2 Defining Motivation

Before embarking on the task of defining motivation, it is important to understand the significance of studying motivation in relation to second language learning. A brief look at SLA literature shows the growing consensus towards the significance of researching motivation in the overall process of second language learning. According to Schmitt (2002, p. 172) “Motivation is often seen as the key learner variable because without it nothing happens”. Yet, it is important to highlight the fact that motivation is only one of the factors that play a role in language learning, and that the relationship between motivation and language achievement, albeit a significant relationship, can only be an indirect one as motivation and attitudes affect learning behaviours which in turn are believed to influence language learning achievement (Dörnyei et al., 2006). Nonetheless, it is crucially important to study motivation as it does not only inform us about why learning another language occurs, but also gives us valuable insights into how the L2 learners relate to their immediate social environment and even the world at large (Ryan, 2008).

According to Dörnyei (2014, p. 519):

[M]otivation has been considered as both affect (emotion) and cognition; it has been used as both a stable variable of individual difference (i.e., a trait) and a transient-state attribute; and it has even been characterized as a process that is in
constant flux, going through ebbs and flows. Furthermore, motivation has been considered as both a factor internal to the learner (e.g., individual curiosity or interest) and a factor externally determined by the sociopolitical setup of the learner's environment (e.g., language attitudes influenced by the relationships within language communities).

Although motivation is a very common word to be heard in different learning and teaching situations, there is a lack of consensus in the field of motivational SLA when it comes to defining the concept of motivation. Most motivation researchers agree that motivation is concerned with “the fundamental question of why people behave as they do” (Dörnyei, 2014, p. 519). Zoltan Dörnyei himself refers to motivation as “one of the most elusive concepts in the whole domain of the social sciences” (Dörnyei, 2001b, p. 2). Scovel also (2001) argues that it is difficult to “get a fix on” the common meaning of motivation. Other linguists have been more forthcoming and have made valuable attempts to attribute a meaning to the concept of motivation. Some linguists define motivation as a complex cluster of variables that gives both the driving force and direction to human behaviour (Hilgard, Atkinson & Atkinson, 1979, p. 281; Myers, 2001, p. 425).

When we analyze people’s everyday actions and choices, we can clearly see that the reasons for them to do these actions have a multidimensional nature. Any human behaviour can either stem from the general attitudinal factors that include the idiosyncratic likes and dislikes of the individuals, the temporal interconnection between these choices and their antecedents, or from the social norms and practices of those who live around us (Ryan, 2008). Brown (1994) goes even further to define motivation as a driving force that not only affects the extent to which individuals make choices about the goals to be achieved, but also the effort expended in the pursuit of these goals. This view is supported by most linguists who define motivation as “internal processes that activate, guide, and maintain behaviour over time” (Baron, 1998, p. 383). Gardner sees L2 learning motivation as “the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity” (Gardner, 1985, p. 10). Dörnyei’s (2014, p. 519) way of describing motivation seems to be the most comprehensive approach of defining motivation as he refers to
motivation as the factor “responsible for why people decide to do something, how long they are willing to sustain the activity, and how hard they are going to pursue it”.

In order to comprehend motivation in SLA more accurately, it is important to understand the relevant theories, models and elements pertinent to the research of motivation as a contributing factor in L2 learning. The next section will provide a general overview of some of the most relevant theories that have shaped our understanding of the relationship between motivation and SLA for the past few decades.

2.3 Theories in Motivational Psychology

2.3.1 Self-Determination Theory

Self-Determination theory has been an influential theory in the field of Motivational SLA. It argues that all humans have tendencies to explore new situations throughout their lifespan and integrate this accumulated acquired knowledge into their cognition through. It was proposed by Deci and Ryan in 1985 and was adapted by Noels in 2001 into the Language Learning Contexts. This theory is most famous for its distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as well as its investigation of how individuals translate their wants into goals through expending the needed effort in doing so. Before elaborating more on the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, it is crucial to understand that within this theory it is believed that humans have two basic needs which are autonomy and relatedness. Autonomy refers to the belief that individuals make their own decisions autonomously while relatedness refers to the individuals’ need to function in relation to a social world (Deci & Ryan, 2002). This means that humans’ actions are not simply reactions to external stimuli, but are also self-determined in the sense that humans make and sustain efforts on tasks when they feel competent and enjoy these tasks.

An important key element of this theory is ‘the concept of internalization’ which is identified as the process in which humans’ motivation can change along the motivation continuum from extrinsic to intrinsic; gradually transforming the socially accepted norms and practices into personal self-regulations and values. This is in contrast to the common misconception which represents the self determination theory as dichotomous
separation between the two types of motivation (Deci & Moller, 2007, p. 589). The distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation implies that the individuals that are intrinsically motivated to learn an L2 do so because they find this experience enjoyable in itself, so their learning is viewed as an end rather than a means (Noels, Pelletier, Clément, & Vallerand, 2000). However, different individuals and different activities can vary in the degree of internalization. For example, individuals may realize the importance of certain social norms, but not necessarily integrate them into their sense of self.

Vallerand (1997) proposed that intrinsic motivation relates to exploring and gaining knowledge, to achieving a desired goal, or to enjoying the pure esthetic sensation of learning something new. Extrinsic motivation is related to learning a language for external rewards, so the extrinsically motivated learners tend to learn an L2 as a means rather than an end (Dörnyei, 2001a). Vallerand (1997) categorizes the different types of extrinsic motivations along a continuum grading from the most to the least extrinsic. According to Vallerand (1997) the learners’ external motivations to learn an L2 belong to one of three categories: external (which refers to the type of motivation that comes as result of an outer stimulant either encouraging or inhibiting an action), introjected (which refers to the motivation that the learners draw from committing themselves to do something and continue doing it to avoid feeling guilty), and finally identified regulation (which is related to the learners’ motivation to do an activity because they value its usefulness). An example of this type of motivation is the relentless efforts that the learners may make in their L2 learning to achieve the desired L2 proficiency. The most important contribution of the self determination theory is its explanation of human behaviour as not simply a reaction to external stimuli, but rather as self-determined actions.

2.3.2 Goal Constructs

2.3.2.1 Goal-Setting Theory

Goal theories are based on the assumption that goals regulate human actions. Thus, individuals have to set goals to pursue in order for these actions to take place. The key properties discussed in Locke and Latham’s (1990) goal setting theory are the goal
difficulty, specificity, intensity and commitment. It is believed that the more difficult the goal is, the more efforts the learners will expend to achieve it which, in turn, leads to better performance. In addition, performance of the individuals with clearly articulated goals is found to be better when compared to individuals with vague goals who tend to usually do their best and hope for the best (Locke, Saari, Shaw & Latham, 1981). Goal intensity refers to the process of setting a goal and how to achieve it which is explained in terms of the importance of the goal, the amount of effort required, and the context of the goal setting. It is also believed that the higher the intensity, the better the performance. The theory also asserts that the individual’s commitment to a goal, which can be achieved through enhancing self-efficacy about the goal, is important to attain better performance. Finally, consistent and timely feedback about performance is considered a crucial part of the goal setting theory (Locke & Latham, 1990).

2.3.2.2 Mastery and Performance Goal Orientations

Goals orientation is not simply a distinction between general and specific goals “but represents a general orientation to the task that includes a number of related beliefs about purposes, competence, success, ability, effort, errors, and standards” (Pintrich, 2000, p. 94). As a theory with a goal orientation, the theory of mastery and performance focuses on both the general goals pursued by individuals and their reasons for the pursuit. General achievement goals are referred to as mastery goals while more specific goals relating to assessing one’s achievement in relation to others are called performance goals. According to Ames (1992) the basic distinction between a mastery-oriented individual and performance-oriented one is that while the first may engage in a learning situation to learn a specific task or get a sense of satisfaction or personal growth with the completion of the task learned, the later usually engages in the task to demonstrate their self worth in relation to others regardless of the actual mastery of the task. When comparing these two types of goal orientations with the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, it is noticeable that intrinsically motivated individuals engage in learning tasks out of the sense on enjoyment that they get from the task whereas learners with mastery goal orientations can engage in the task focusing only on the successful completion of the task regardless to enjoying it or not. On the other hand, while extrinsically motivated learners are usually driven by external incentives, learners with
performance goal orientation are usually prepared to sacrifice external rewards as long as the significance of their achievement is recognized by others (Ames, 1992).

2.3.3 Expectancy-Value Theory

The main proposition of the theory is that individuals’ expectancies of future success and the subjective value attached to this success affects the motivation levels to perform tasks (Wigfield, 1994). One of the most influential theories proposed within this realm was Atkinson’s (1966) Achievement Motivation Theory. This theory evolved from earlier drive theories that addressed the satisfaction of the different individual physiological needs, such as hunger and thirst which was broadened later to include psychological needs, such as belongingness and achievement as regulators of human behaviour (Covington, 1984). Atkinson’s (1966) theory proposes that there are two determinant factors for each action. These two factors are the desire to achieve success and the desire to avoid failure. The motivation to success is supplemented by the fear of failure which shapes the way individuals behave in different situations. This means that motivation increases in cases of failure when it comes to highly motivated individuals. On the other hand, failure can lead to a decrease in motivation if the individuals already have low levels of motivation (Atkinson, 1966; Atkinson & Birch, 1978). Atkinson mainly attributes individuals’ success, or lack thereof, to one’s childhood experiences which are largely influenced by the parental pattern of reward and punishment. Nonetheless, immediate situational factors, such as the value of the achievement to the individual and its applicability are also viewed as important determinants of the achievement tendency within this model (Covington, 1984).

Broadly speaking, the Expectancy-value Theory has two components, namely value and expectancy of success. The value component of the theory has been defined in terms of four components: intrinsic value, extrinsic value, attainment value, and cost. While the two concepts intrinsic and extrinsic value are similar to Deci and Ryan’s (1985) intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, attainment value relates to the importance that the individuals attribute to success at a given task. Cost refers to the anticipated efforts to be expended on the task in addition to what the individual has to give up in order to complete the task successfully (Eccles et al., 1983). On the other hand, the expectancy
component is determined by different variables discussed in the attribution theory, self-efficacy theory, and self-worth theory. The following is a more detailed discussion of these theories.

2.3.3.1 Attribution Theory

Attribution theory succeeded achievement theory in dominance after the seventies and was originally proposed by Weiner (1985). Weiner challenged the significance of Atkinson’s hope for success and fear of failure as causes for future achievement, and proposed that ability, effort, luck and the ease or difficulty of task are the major determinants of achievement (Covington, 1984). One important aspect of this theory is its views on human behaviour as having both antecedents and consequences. This theory stipulates that the outcomes resulting from human behaviour are rarely responsible for the way humans behave in certain situations. Rather, it is the subjective interpretations that individuals attribute to success and failure in these situations, usually in relation to subjective interpretation of past experiences, which actually shape future behaviour of these individuals. These causes of success and failure are usually identified by different individuals as being internal like effort and ability, or external like luck or other environmental factors.

In his theory, Weiner refers to this property, which is concerned with locating the different factors as internal or external, as locus (1985). Another underlying causal property identified in this theory is stability which refers to the duration of the cause whether changing over time or not. The third and final property in the theory is controllability which refers to how controllable the factor is by the concerned individual. For example, shyness as a personal attribute can be described as a reason for not learning the second language. In this case, the factor is internal, usually stable and less controllable. On the other hand, a learner who attributes his failure to learn the second language to the poor teaching strategies of the language instructor sees this reason as external, unstable because it usually exist for a relatively short period of time, and controllable as long as the learner understand that s/he can change teachers. These interpretations of the factors affecting the different learners’ situations are believed to have a bearing on the motivation levels of the individual which, in turn, affect the choices to expend and sustain the needed efforts for achieving the desired goals.
2.3.3.2 Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy theory is most readily associated with the works of Albert Bandura (Bandura, 1977, 1997). This relates to the individuals’ self beliefs in their own capabilities to reach specific attainments which are believed to affect the degree of efforts expended to pursue certain goals and their levels of persistence in the pursuit. These beliefs can cause individuals with low self-efficacy to perceive new tasks as threats to be avoided while driving individuals with high self-efficacy to perceive the same tasks as challenges to be approached confidently. These judgments are shaped in accordance with other factors. One of these factors is past experiences. This is the key aspect of this theory and it has to do with the individuals’ assessments of their past successes or failures and relating them to the present experiences.

Another factor affecting these efficacious beliefs is vicarious learning in which individuals establish comparisons between themselves and others in order to use other peoples’ experiences and actions as a role model to be followed in approaching the present task or tasks. Verbal encouragements, or otherwise, are also believed to play a crucial role in developing self-efficacy. One of the most attractive aspects of the self efficacy theory is its accounting for the individuals’ affective states. Thus, negative emotional or psychological states, such as anxiety, can be related to the individual’s behaviour and are believed to have a negative impact on it.

2.3.3.3 Self-Worth Theory

Beliefs about the individuals’ own ability play a prominent role within the self-worth theory. Covington (1992) argues that the individuals’ attempts to maintain positive sense of their abilities are critical to save their self-worth. Thus, this theory forms a conceptual rapprochement between Atkinson’s achievement motivation theory and Weiner’s attribution theory. Within this model, perceived abilities about success play as an important role as the learned-drive of approaching success and avoiding failure which is usually linked to self-worthlessness and social disapproval. Ability is perceived as a major source of success, which in turn reflects positively on the individual (Covington, 1984). The three components of the theory are perception about ability, efforts and performance. Ability and efforts are believed to affect self-worth
both directly and indirectly. The theory postulates that self-worth is automatically enhanced when an individual has positive beliefs about his own abilities regardless of the actual accomplishments.

In addition, the individual’s self-worth is also reassured by other individuals in the society as soon as they realize that the individual is making effort. Both beliefs about abilities and efforts are viewed as components of successful performance which, in turn, feeds into the individual’s self-worth beliefs. This means that an individual striving for success is not only driven by the personal and social benefits that result from that success, but also by the feeling of self-worth that results from that success, as well (Covington, 1984).

2.4 Theories in Social Psychology

2.4.1 The Socio-Educational Approach

Gardner’s Motivational Theory was the first widely recognized theory in the field of SLA that presented a shift in the view of second language learning as simply a product of aptitude. Rather, this theory recognized the crucial role played by motivation in the process of SLA. Due to the theory’s wide impact on motivational SLA research, I attempt to explore this particular theory in more detail. The first attempts of studying the nature of second language motivation was produced by Gardner and Lambert (1959) who found that attitudes were an important factor in language learning among the Francophone high school students in Quebec. These studies were concerned with the learners’ attitudes toward the culture from which the target language originates, and thus added a social dimension to the investigation of SLA which was mostly focused on the learners’ ability and aptitude at that time (Koike & Tanaka, 1995).

Gardner’s first studies looked into Mowrer’s (1950) work on first language acquisition in which he found that the reason for a child to learn his first language is his ‘identification’ of his parents language and his attempting to imitate them (Mowrer, 1950). Thus, Gardner coined the term ‘integrative motivation’ to describe the social motive, rather than the biological one explained in Mowrer’s (1950) theory, for a target language learner trying to learn that language in order to identify with its speakers
(Gardner, 2001a). This theory is most widely known for its introduction of the integrative orientations to learn the target language. Gardner’s integrative motive has been one of the most influential and widely cited and discussed concepts in the field of motivational SLA (Dörnyei, 2009) although Gardner identified another type of orientation within this motivational theory and called it instrumental motivation.

Whereas integrative motivation means learning the L2 for interpersonal reasons and for integrating with the L2 group, instrumental motivation is related to leaning an L2 for utilitarian and practical purposes, such as finding a job or improving one’s status (Krashen, 1981). Nevertheless, the socio-educational model is more than just a dichotomy between integrative and instrumental motivation. One of Gardner’s most elaborate versions of the theory was proposed in Gardner (2000). In his model, Gardner describes second language acquisition as interplay between language aptitude, integrative motivation and other factors.

1. **Language Aptitude**

Language aptitude refers to the ability characteristics that determine the attainment levels of the target language learners (Carroll, 1965). This means that learners with higher aptitude to learn languages can learn them with less effort and in less time than those with lower language aptitude levels. Nonetheless, Dörnyei (1998, p. 120) asserts that “high motivation can make up for considerable deficiencies both in one’s language aptitude and learning conditions.”

2. **Integrative Motivation**

Integrative motivation here refers to the complex construct that comprises motivation, attitudes towards the learning situation and integrativeness (Gardner, 2001c).

   (a) **Motivation**

Gardner (1985, p. 10) defines motivation to learn a language as “the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity.” Thus, motivation within Gardnerian-based studies is usually measured in relation to three variables:

   o Attitudes towards learning the language: how do the learners feel while learning the language?
○ Desire to learn the language: To what extent are the learners willing to achieve competence in the target language?
○ Motivational intensity: To what extent are the learners willing to expend effort on language learning?

(Masgoret & Gardner, 2003)

(b) Attitudes towards the learning situation

This factor is pertinent to how the learners feel while learning the target language in a formal setting. This factor is usually assessed in relation to variables evaluating the course, teacher, teaching material and learning environment (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003).

(c) Integrativeness

Integrativeness refers to the learner’s willingness to identify with the target language group. The scales usually used to measure integrativeness relate to the following three variables:

○ Attitudes towards the target language group: The key concept here is that favorable attitudes towards the target language group lead to an openness to identifying with them and increase the levels of motivation towards learning the target language, and vice versa.
○ Interest in foreign languages: This variable relates to the favorable attitudes to people other than the target language group.
○ Integrative orientation: The key concept here is that learning the target language in order to communicate with its native speakers leads to better learning.

(Masgoret & Gardner, 2003).

3. Other factors

These variables include classroom anxiety and instrumental orientation. Classroom anxiety was first believed to play an important role in language learning within the first versions of Gardner’s theory. However, further investigation undermined its significance within the socio-educational model (Gardner, 2001b). Instrumental orientation, which refers to learning the language for utilitarian reasons, was usually considered a secondary factor with a limited effect on language learning within
Gardner’s model (Dörnyei et al., 2006). Nevertheless, it is believed that instrumental motivation plays an important role in language learning in contexts where interaction with the native speakers of the target language is limited or virtually non-existent (Dörnyei, 1990).

2.4.2 Problems with the Socio-Educational Approach

Gardner’s studies have provided the body of motivational research with several valuable findings. His studies revealed significant relationships between motivation and the decision to continue L2 learning or not, motivation and the level of second language achievement, motivation and the level of retention of the second language, and integrative and instrumental motivation and the acquisition of L2 vocabulary (Clément, Smythe & Gardner, 1978; Gardner & Lysynchuk, 1990; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1991; Gardner & Smythe, 1981, cited in Gardner, 2001b). Yet, the most attractive aspect about Gardner’s theory, beside its methodological robustness, is its recognition of the language learner as a social being and language as an important aspect of the learner’s identity.

Despite the immense value of Gardner’s motivational studies and their contribution to our understanding of the role of motivation in SLA, his Socio-Educational Model did not go unchallenged (Oxford & Sherian, 1994). One of the main criticisms of Gardner’s motivational theory is that it does not provide an “education-centered approach to motivation” (Dörnyei, 1994, p. 273). Dörnyei argues that Gardner’s framework should focus more on providing the teachers with the strategies and the practical procedures needed to motivate the students to learn the L2 inside the L2 classroom. In addition, Dörnyei suggests that Gardner’s two types of motivation do not encompass all the orientations and reasons that drive a person to learn an L2 in different contexts. In 1983, Clément and Kruidenier designed a different instrument from the one usually used in the Gardnerian studies to investigate the influence of the social milieu and the different orientations to study L2. Their findings revealed orientations other than integrativeness and included knowledge, travel, friendship, and instrumentality (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983). Orientations such as traveling or learning a new language for knowledge or
undertaking challenging experiences were never accounted for within Gardner’s motivational theory (Dörnyei, 1994).

One other limitation always associated with this theory is pertinent to the inconsistency and vagueness related to the concept of integrativeness (Oxford & Sherian, 1994). This has resulted in significant misconceptions and misinterpretations of the relationships between language learning achievement and the different concepts of integrativeness, integrative orientation, and integrative motivation (Dörnyei et al., 2006). Furthermore, as English has become a global language that is spoken by more non-native speakers than native speakers; English is no longer associated with a specific nation or culture which makes the definition of the target language group within the theory problematic to say the least (Graddol, 2007; Yashima, 2000). It seems more appropriate now to talk about what Dörnyei et al. (2006) refer to as ‘World English Identity’ or what Yashima (2000) describes as ‘International Posture’. Unlike integrativeness which generally refers to identifying with a specific cultural group, world English identity and international posture include interest in and readiness to communicate with international people in addition to non-ethnocentric attitudes towards other cultures (2000). Lamb (2004, p. 3) helps in describing this shift:

> In the minds of learners, English may not be associated with particular geographical or cultural communities but with a spreading international culture incorporating (inter alia) business, technological innovation, consumer values, democracy, world travel, and the multifarious icons of fashion, sport and music.

Finally, generalizability of the theory on different contexts has been an area that the critics of the social psychological model have always seized upon. Although, the validity of the theory has been established by an immense amount of research by Gardner and his colleagues, several other studies outside the Canadian context found that interpreting language learning in relation to the concept of integrativeness was irrelevant especially in contexts where learners had no direct contact with the target language speakers (see Au, 1988; Warden & Lin, 2000; Young, 1994).
2.5 **Shift in the Scope of Motivational Theories**

2.5.1 **Shift from the Socio-Educational Approach.**

The 1990s witnessed a shift in focus within the field of L2 motivation towards actual L2 learning in the foreign language learning classroom. Oxford and Shearin (1994) pointed out the perceived need to expand the current theoretical framework to include classroom learning aspects and make it more relevant to the L2 learning situation. In addition, a shift towards viewing motivation as a lengthy process rather than a state was proposed by Ushioda (Ushioda, 1996a; Ushioda, 2001) and Dörnyei (Dörnyei & Otto, 1998).

The work of Ushioda (Ushioda, 1996a; Ushioda, 2001) presented a shift in motivation research on two accounts. First, it investigated motivation using qualitative type of methodology which was not very common within the Gardnerian tradition of motivational research. Secondly, motivation within Ushioda’s investigation was not viewed as an individual characteristic; rather as a process that is mediated by the social context of the learner. Her theory postulates that the more experienced and proficient the learner gets in L2, the more his/her proficiency shifts from the causal dimension, which relates the present motivation to past experiences, to the teleological dimension, which directs future behaviour.

Dörnyei (1994) identified three basic constituents of the learning process namely: the learner, the language and learning situation. Although Dörnyei retained the main aspects of Gardner’s model in relation to the role played by the learner’s attitudes towards the cultural values pertinent to the language and its speakers and the individual anxieties of the learners, he emphasizes the significance of the learning situation in the foreign language learning process. This constituent focused on investigating the role of the teacher, peer group and teaching material on the L2 learning. In 1998, Dörnyei and Otto schematized the three stages of the motivation process model. The first stage is the preactional stage. In this stage the learner forms the intention to act, make certain choices in setting goals, construct an action plan to achieve these goals, and initiates actions. The Second Stage is the actional or executive stage. This stage relates to evaluating and sustaining efforts to achieve the goals set in the preactional stage. The last stage is the post actional stage in which the learner evaluates his/her action and relates it to the execution of the subsequent action (Dörnyei, 2001b).
Despite the value of the theory in recognizing learners’ behaviour as having both antecedents and consequences, Dörnyei et al. (2006) posits that his model implies that the actions undertaken by the learners in the actional stage have clear-cut starting points and endings. However, it is difficult, in actual learning environments, to specify when each action starts and ends. In addition, these actional processes are likely to overlap and happen at the same time as others which makes it nearly impossible to identify each actional process in isolation from the other actions that are taking place at the same time. This demonstrates how difficult, and at times futile, the attempts to conceptualize and operationalize motivation in SLA have been.

2.5.2 The Concept of Identity in Motivational SLA

With the growing dissatisfaction with the existing motivational constructs in the field of second language acquisition, there has been a dilemma facing the field of motivational linguistics as to whether the existing motivational theories should be refined or abandoned all together. Kim (2005, p. 307) argues that alternative frameworks should be constructed as the concept of refining existing theories always has the potential of having motivational theories with “inherent limitations from the start.” On the other hand, the proponents of maintaining the existent models present a persuasive argument of preserving and building on the valuable advances that have been obtained for over 30 years of research within the Gardnerian tradition, and urge us to “advance our understanding rather than rephrase it” and that we should “avoid the temptation to throw out the baby with the bath water” (Macintyre, Mackinnon & Clement, 2009a, p. 58).

A shift towards the theories pertinent to self and identity seemed like a fruitful direction to be followed in investigating motivation and SLA. According to Ushioda (2011, p. 222):

> These developments are happening both in mainstream motivational psychology as well as in the second language motivation field, and concern a shift away from individual-cognitive perspectives on motivation towards dynamic perspectives integrating internal, social and contextual processes shaping motivation.
This push towards the reconceptualization of L2 motivation in relation to self and identity provoked many theoretical advances in the field, the last of which has been the L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). However, the role of self-concept and identity in relation to language learning has been identified by psycholinguists decades ago. In fact, one of the first psychological conceptualizations of the self was offered in 1890 by James who according to Oyserman (2011, p. 118) defined the self “describing it as both a cognitive structure (e.g., differentiating that which is me vs. not me, that which is current me. Vs. future potential me)” and a content which he used to refer to all the qualities possessed by the person as well as all the emotions and actions associated with them. He proposed that people are usually inclined to the idea of becoming all the positive future selves simultaneously if it was not for the fact that these multiple possible future selves are incompatible. Another rationale he provided in relation to the incapability of incorporating all the possible future selves, which is very relevant to today’s self and identity-based L2 motivation research, is related to either inability or lack of strategies leading to the achievement of these future desired states. The perceived inability to incorporate certain possible identities into one’s future imagined self leads to blocking these impossible-to-attain future selves, to avoid the negative feelings associated with failure to attain these desired selves. Thus, self-regulation within James’ model is implied to be associated with self-esteem “operationalized as proportionate success, the ration of selves one is attempting to become to selves one is succeeding in attaining” (James, 1890, 1920, as cited in Oyserman, 2007, p. 443).

The concept of social identity as the sense of belonging to a social group associated with the target language has not been new to the field of language learning at all either. Torrey (1971, p. 232), for instance, explains that “learning a second language entails accepting another culture and therefore, to some extent, a new identity.” Tajfel (1981, p. 251) defines social identity as a “part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group or groups together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership.”

Moreover, Guiora and Acton use the term ‘language ego’ to refer to the psychological experience that many language learners share and describe as the feeling of being like a different person that one gets when speaking another language which usually compels
him/her to act differently (Guiora & Acton, 1979). Gardner (2005, p. 8) commented on the concept of learners with multiple selves saying:

It is quite possible that individuals who are high in integrativeness may have different perceptions of their self and their ideal self, particularly as they relate to the second language . . . In any event, research will be needed to establish whether there is any relation between the two conceptualizations.

Even before that, integrativeness has been defined in terms of the attitudes held by the language learners towards the target language group and the extent to which the learner desires to identify with that group (Gardner, 2000), which in itself entails accepting the concept of a new identity associated with the second language and its culture. However, there are cases in which the target language learning occurs in isolation from the target language group where the learners have virtually no contact with the target language group. Also, as English has no longer been associated with a specific cultural group (Graddol, 1997), English learners tend to develop a sense of having an international identity in addition to their local identity (Arnett, 2002). Ushioda (2011, p. 226) debated the relevance of Gardner’s (1985, 2001) integrativeness within the SLA field, especially “in the modern globalised world, particularly where the learning of English as target language is concerned, given the status of English as an international language and increasingly as a basic educational skill in many curricula.” Norton (2001) proposed the concept of imagined community to accommodate this shift towards globalization. Imagined community refers to people that are neither tangible nor accessible but can still be contacted through the power of our imagination (Kanno & Norton, 2003; Norton, 2001).

In an attempt to integrate the discussion about language learning and identity to the field of language learning, the concept of learners having more than one identity was proposed by Zimmerman (1998). His model identifies three layers in which learners adopt different identities according to the different context and discourse within which they interact with others. The first one is the discourse identity where the learner adopts an identity appropriate to specific communicative tasks and to the roles at a given interaction, i.e., the default situation inside a classroom and the position of the teacher in relation to his students as well as the organizational demands related to that
discourse, e.g., listening to the teachers instructions, asking questions, giving instructions, etc. The second identity is called situated identity which is broader than the first one and relates to the different interactional roles assumed by interlocutors at a given situation which are explicitly conferred by that particular context of communication, e.g., teacher-student identity in a classroom context, doctor-patient in a hospital context and so on. Transportable identity is the third recognized identity within the theory and is described as latent and implicit, but can be invoked in different situations. It is associated with the different cultural and physical identity characteristics the learners bring to the different interactional situations for certain reasons. For example, a student might mention inside the classroom some information related to his/her non-classroom identity as a student, but associated with his other social identities and memberships, such as being a good football player, a loving husband, or a devout believer.

Zimmerman’s (1998) theory provides valuable insights on the concept of multi-identity learners, and inspires L2 learners to feel motivated and encouraged to communicate and share their interests and life experiences with the other learners in the different interactive opportunities that take place inside the classroom. However, in most educational settings that strive to promote learners’ autonomy, it is always difficult to create equal or even fair opportunities for all the learners to make active choices that guide their own learning (McCaslin, 2009). Moreover, the applicability of the theory in educational contexts is limited due to Zimmerman’s focus on only the context of conversational interaction within his theory.

Oyserman’s work on identity-based motivation (IBM) theory has also been one of the recent advancements in identity-focused research of L2 motivation (2007, 2009). The first versions of this theory focused on two components ‘action-readiness’ and ‘procedural-readiness’. Action-readiness involves “self-controlling, self-regulating behaviours and embodied stances—how one stands, moves, dresses, and talks . . . [it also involves] readiness to take action congruent with attaining desired identity goals and avoiding undesired identities” while procedural-readiness refers to “sense-making about the social and non-social world, with social and personal identities differing in whether an individual or collective mindset is cued” (Oyserman, 2009, p. 252). In the most recent works of Oyserman, she focused on investigating the role of the L2
learners’ individual identities as well as their cultural and socio-economic backgrounds in their future identities formation (see Oyserman, 2011, 2013; Oyserman et al., 2006). What is novel and unique about the IBM approach is that “it sheds light on dynamic identity processes and provides testable predictions about how and under which circumstances school focused identities matter, improving school engagement and likelihood of success for low-income and minority children” (Oyserman, 2013, p. 184).

Oyserman’s IBM does not only look into the effect of the socio-economic factors affecting language learning, but it also tries to link them to the complex elements of identity-based motivation which she claims are predictive of action, e.g., studying, doing extracurricular activities, and so on. These three elements are dynamic construction of a plausible individual self that is congruent with the identities relevant to one’s social context, operationalization of the appropriate cognitive processes and behavioural self-regulating strategies, and perception of difficulties as indicators of the importance of the goal rather than impossibility (Oyderman, 2011). Oyserman’s work on IBM theory continues to make great contributions to gain a better understanding of the identity-based language learning motivation processes among learners from different races, ethnicities and socio-economic backgrounds. Nonetheless, the most valuable contributions of this theory are most suitable for understanding L2 motivation in contexts where learners come from different ethnicities representing varying socio-economic situations, which limits the applicability of the theory only to contexts where these ethnic and social identity differences are more highly pronounced.

2.6 The Self Theory

2.6.1 The L2 Motivational Self System

After leading the Hungarian, and probably the international, motivational research team for decades, Dörnyei (Dörnyei et al., 2006) introduced a novel line of research which has the potential to revolutionize the field of motivational SLA research by outlining the basis of SLA motivation and the ‘self’ theory (Dörnyei, 2009). The emergence of the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) groundbreaking theory was essentially the result of the empirical challenge faced by Dörnyei and his colleagues to interpret the interesting findings of a series of Hungarian studies (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei & Csizér,
Although it was initially believed that learners who do not have direct contact with the target language group would be instrumentally motivated to learn the target language, the findings of the Hungarian studies revealed that integrative motivation was still the most dominant type of motivation among the English learners in the Hungarian context. Integrativeness always correlated higher with the criterion measure than all the other variables did in these studies; it “explained almost as much of the variance of the criterion measures as all the motivation components together” (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002, p. 453). Nevertheless, integrativeness was always found to be reinforced by the learners’ instrumental motivators and their positive attitudes towards the target language speakers (Ushioda, 2011). This finding was a provocation for a new interpretation of the nature of the concept of integrativeness as being an important part of a larger concept which Dörnyei later referred to as the “ideal self”. The foundation of this new self theory was laid down by Marcus and Nurius’ (1986) theory of the “possible selves”. They postulate that those possible selves possessed by the individuals present their imagined ideas of what they hope to be like, what they try very hard not to resemble, and what they are most likely to be like in the future. To make the distinction clear, examples will be provided. The ideal self, the one the learner hopes to be like, can be explained as the self image of a successful future second language learner who lives in the target language culture and is fully integrated within the L2 group which the learner admires dearly, for instance. In contrast, the feared self, can be explained as the type of self image which the learner does not want to resemble; it is usually coupled with negative qualities, such as unemployment or incompetence in the L2, for example. The third self lies in the middle of the continuum between the two aforementioned extremes, and presents the self image which is most likely or expected for the L2 individual, i.e., the default self (Dörnyei, 2009).

Drawing on Higgins’ (1987) work, Dörnyei presents only two possible selves in his theory: the ‘ideal self’ and the ‘ought-to self’ (Dörnyei, 2009). Yet in both theories the self concept derives from “complex fusion of our hopes, fears, aspirations, obligations, duties and expectations.” (Ryan, 2008, p. 105). Boyatzis and Akrivou (2006) made a valuable attempt to explain the ideal and ought-to selves. They describe the ideal self as a personal vision of one’s self that is socially influenced and relate to the person’s future hopes and dreams. The main components of their ideal self are having future vision and having realistic hopes. On the other hand, the ought-to self is defined as the ideal self
vision held by others of how a person should be. Nevertheless, this image, though not stemming from the individual, can be internalized gradually and could at some point feed into that individual’s ideal self (Dörnyei, 2009; Kim, 2009a; Ryan, 2008). These two selves “are often called future self-guides since they [are believed to] have the capacity to regulate behaviour” (Magid, 2014, p. 229).

Within Dörnyei’s theory the ideal L2 self “is the L2-specific facet of one’s ideal self”, which usually has a promotion function of the positive connotations associated with the future success in the L2 while the ought-to self refers to “the attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e., obligations, responsibilities, or expectations from others) in order to avoid possible negative outcomes”, thus, having a prevention function of negative connotations (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 29). It is important within this theory, however, to distinguish between empty hopes and fantasies on the one hand, and visions that have future behavioural consequences on the other. Not every vision translates into action unless coupled with a systematic regulation of how to turn these hopes and dreams into future plans. One essential theory that offers a way to explain the process of turning future dreams into realities is Higgins’ (1987) self discrepancy theory. The key concept of Higgins’ theory is the gradual process in which the person tries to reduce the incongruity between their current self and their hoped for ideal self through evaluating and re-evaluating both their obligations and their aspirations until their characteristics match that of the ideal/ought-to self.

Moreover, an important point that needs to be established about the L2MSS theory is that of its imagery module. Imagery and imagination are key components that play a major part in Dörnyei’s L2MSS. In fact, the images that the learners have about their future selves must have an experiential aspect rather than an abstract state in the future in the minds of the learners in which the learners try to actualize the ideal self through experience as much as possible (Dörnyei, 2009). Marcus and Cross (1994) argue that for the ‘possible selves’ to have a strong influence on the learner’s behaviour, those possible selves should be vivid (Marcus, 2006; Marcus & Cross, 1994). Thus, active imagination plays a crucial role in constructing the different selves and controlling the learner’s motivation, so the learner should have a well-elaborated and frequently primed plausible image of his future self (Dörnyei, 2009). The final component of Dörnyei’s tripartite theory is the L2 learning experience. This third component identifies the
importance of the whole L2 learning situation in relation to past learning experiences, and is more specifically concerned with the impact of the different classroom variables including the teacher, the learner’s group, the curriculum and so on (Dörnyei, 2009; Ryan, 2008).

What distinguishes Dörnyei’s (Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei et al., 2006; Dörnyei, 2009) L2MSS theory the most is its accounting for the findings of the previous advances in SLA motivation theory. Although the L2MSS seems to be a theory of a very unique nature in the field of SLA motivation, this theory is not incompatible with the previous theoretical frameworks at all. A closer look at Gardner’s integrativeness which is basically the individual’s desire to identify with the L2 group, does not contradict with Dörnyei’s ideal self. Thus, an individual can have a vivid image of himself in the future enjoying social and professional success in the L2 culture and living among the target language group that he admires dearly.

On the other hand, another individual can have a future vision of himself in a better job as a result of his L2 learning, and this again is well-matched with Gardner’s instrumental motivation. Even in Gardner’s latest versions of his construct he mentioned that motivation is determined through three concepts: integrativeness, instrumentality, and attitudes towards the learning situation, which closely resemble Dörnyei’s tripartite model (Dörnyei, 2009). According to Lamb (2012, p. 1000):

The L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei, 2009) represents a more substantial reconceptualization of motivation to learn languages, in a way that builds on understandings gained from the socio-educational model, but makes them relevant to global English in the early 21st century. The key difference between the models is that the motivationally important identifications are not with others but with future versions of the self.

As far as similarities between Dörnyei’s theory and the Self-Determination theory, a clear relationship can be identified between the L2MSS guides and the Self-Determination intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. That is, the strong relationship between the ideal self and intrinsic motivation on one side, and the ought-to self and extrinsic motivation on the other.
In addition to the compatibility between Dörnyei’s L2MSS and both Gardner’s Socio-Educational Approach and Deci and Ryan’s Self Determination Theory, there are noticeable correspondences between Dörnyei’s theory and the main components of the Goal and Expectancy Value Theories. Self-efficacy’s vicarious learning which relates to comparing one’s performance to that of others, and the relationship between achievement, self-worth and social approval or disapproval which are central components of the expectancy value theories can be paralleled with the Dörnyei’s L2 learning experience and ought-to L2 self. Moreover, the self guides within Dörnyei’s theory can be looked at as goals to be attained in the future despite the fact that Dörnyei’s future selves have more of an experiential side which is lacking in the goal theories. Nevertheless, undeniable links can still be noticed between the L2MSS and the goal theories.

The main properties of the goal-setting theory, namely: specificity, intensity and commitment can be paralleled to Dörnyei’s self-guides’ conditions which will be explained later. Dörnyei (2009) explained that these conditions are very essential for the self-guides to exert their full motivational power and lead to behavioural consequences. Also, the key assumption of the goal achievement theory is that hope for success and fear of failure are the two most important motivators driving human actions. Hope for success is very interrelated to the ideal self, which according to Dörnyei (2009) has a promotion function of positive connotations, while fear of failure can be viewed as the driving force of the ought-to self within Dörnyei’s model. The two orientations of goal mastery and performance can be related to the ideal and ought-to self respectively since both mastery goals and the ideal self guide stem from inside the L2 learners and relate to the sense of satisfaction or personal growth associated with learning while both performance goals and the ought-to self are strongly associated with the role of social pressure placed on the learner from the people surrounding him.

The L2 Motivational Self System presents a broader view about language learning motivation than does the concept of ‘goals’ within the ‘Goal’ theoretical framework as Dörnyei emphasizes the importance of the experiential dimension within his model when he says that the L2 learners’ images of their possible future selves “are more than mere long-term goals or future plans in that they involve tangible images and senses; if we have a well-developed possible future self, we can imagine this self within vivid and
realistic future scenarios” (Dörnyei, 2014, p. 521). According to Erikson (2007) “a possible self . . . should include an experience of what it would be like to be in this state (i.e., an experience of the state from “the inside” and not just an abstract belief that the state is desired or undesired or more or less likely).” As Ryan (2008, p. 113) puts it:

the ideal L2 self emerges from characteristics of individual personality, aspects of the learner’s social environment, and socio-cultural values present in the context in which language learning is taking place . . . [which are aspects that stem] from the socio-educational model and Dörnyei’s own three-level framework of language learning motivation.

2.6.2 The L2 Motivational System Components:

Dörnyei’s (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009) L2 Motivational Self System has three components:

1- Ideal L2 Self. This is the self that the learner tries to become similar to in the future to reduce the discrepancy between him/herself now and his/her future ideal self (Higgins, 1987). This self has a prompting function and is usually associated with the positive motivators and outcomes related to learning an L2 to be educated, rich, competent and, perhaps, fully integrated into the target culture and its group. Most of the motivators related to this type of selves reflect the learners’ linguistic self confidence. In addition, those motivators within this self usually belong to the integrative and internalized type, and the individuals who have strong ideal selves usually want to learn the language as a result of having intrinsic type of motivation (Dörnyei, 2009, 2014).

2- Ought-to Self. This self is usually linked to the extrinsic type of motivation. Learners with strong ought-to selves usually learn the language because of the fear of the negative notions associated with the possible future failures which might include being unemployed, socially abandoned, or simply incompetent in L2. Alternatively, the learners might learn an L2 only to meet the expectations set by significant individuals to the learners rather than the learners themselves. In this case, the learners might make more effort in learning the L2 to avoid disappointing their parents, for instance. Either way, the driving force for the L2 learning comes from the outside rather than the inside (Dörnyei, 2009).
3- The L2 Learning Experience. This component is conceptualized within a different level from that of the two aforementioned self-guides as the focus within this component lies in the present, not the future, e.g., “the positive impact of success or the enjoyable quality of a language course” (2014, p. 521). It basically relates to the situated type of motivation associated with the immediate learning process that the learners are experiencing during their learning of L2. So, it is related to the classroom, the teacher, the curriculum, the learner group and so on (Dörnyei, 2009).

2.6.3 The Self-Guides Conditions:

Dörnyei (2009, pp. 33-38) sustains that for the self-guides to exert their motivational power, six conditions are to be present in these self-guides:

1- The learner must create a vision of himself in the future. Dörnyei (2009) argues that the first step towards success in this model lies in helping the learners in creating a future image of themselves. Oyserman (2013, p 179) explains “Having an idea of who or what one wants to become or avoid becoming – how one wants to ‘end up’ is assumed to be essential in making plans and staying motivated.” This part usually has more to do with selection rather than creation of the future self. According to Dunkel et al. (2006) learners produce different images of possible future selves during the years of adolescence and ‘try on’ without complete commitment. Those images usually stem from the images that others hold for the learner. Those images can be determined with relation to the views held by the learner’s parents or peer group (Boyatzis & Akrivou, 2006; Zentner & Renaud, 2007, as cited in Dörnyei, 2009). Alternatively, those images can be associated with other role model that the learner admires on T.V., for instance, or in real life. So, it is a crucial task for L2 teachers to guide their students through the different ideal selves that they have in their minds.

2- This constructed vision has to be strengthened. Dörnyei (2009) regards the variation in the levels of motivation towards L2 learning to the variation in the levels of elaboration and vividness that the learners have of their future selves (Dörnyei, 2009). It has been proven in the psychological research that imagery enhancement through the use of guided imagery could help people in different fields including sport, medical practice and education (Arnold, Puchta & Rinvulucri, 2007; Gould,
Damarjian & Greenleaf, 2002; Hall, et al., 2006, as cited in Dörnyei, 2009). In this guided imagery, the individuals try through different exercises to construct a very elaborate image of their future selves starting with very simple images to very complex ones in which they are manipulating and controlling the content of their image sequences.

3- This created image has to be plausible. For the possible self to be effective it needs to be realistic within the learner’s circumstances. Dörnyei reports that the higher the likelihood for the learner to succeed in his perception, the higher the rates of his expected success are (Dörnyei, 2001b). Pizzolato (2006, p. 59) suggests that “The relation between what students want to become and what students actually become may be mediated by what students feel they are able to become (i.e., expected possible selves).” Furthermore, Oyserman (2013, p. 179) argues that “school-focused expectations and aspirations predict action if at the moment of judgment, they are accessible (come to mind) and feel relevant, [i.e., congruent with the expected social identities, associated with behavioural study strategies, and strengthen rather than weakened by the obstacles faced along the way].” Oyserman (2013, p. 187) also posits “[s]pecifically, motivation increases with experienced difficulty if difficulty is understood as meaning that the identity is important and decreases with experienced difficulty if difficulty is understood as meaning that the identity is impossible to attain.”

4- This future self needs to be activated and primed regularly. This relates to strategies and techniques used by the teachers to keep their students in an engaging framework keeping the motivated students engaged in the activities taking place inside the classroom and keeping the less motivated learners thinking (Dörnyei, 2009). These strategies include warmers and icebreakers that the teachers use at the beginning of classes (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003). It can also include watching or reading about the learners’ role models or even inviting those admired role models to the class to keep the learners’ visions alive.

5- This image has to be operationalized and supported with an action plan. For the future image to be effective it needs to be accompanied by a set of concrete self-regulatory strategies. A successful action plan should include not only motivation issues like a set of future goals, but also methodological issues like study plans and strategies for it would not be of any considerable value to have the most elaborate
image of the future self without the concrete pathways leading to attaining it. So, along with the vision there should be an action plan which is divided into several goals that can be modified, changed and celebrated when attained. In addition, new hopes and aspirations are to be regularly added and fears to be repeatedly examined (Hock, Deshler & Schumaker, 2006).

6- The constructed image should regularly be counterbalanced. This condition implies that the learner should always be reminded with the ought-to self component and what he/she committed themselves to. In addition, the dreaded self should be activated regularly, and the negative connotations associated with it should be considered alongside with the encouraging dreams and aspirations associated with the ideal self (Oyserman & Markus, 1990).

It is notable that in 2014 Dörnyei added two more prerequisites for the self guides to reach their full potential. The two added conditions concern the significance in difference between the current self and the future desired self, and the level of ease or difficulty needed for the attainment of the future desired self. These conditions are very similar to what Oyserman and James (2011) referred to as the ‘interpretation of difficulty and certainty’ while describing how behaviour can be influenced within their identity-based motivation (IBM) theory. They explained that “If experienced . . . ease is interpreted as meaning that attaining the possible identity is a sure thing, current action is less likely” (2011, p. 137). Similarly Dörnyei suggests that the self-guides will not reach their full potential if the desired future self is not sufficiently different from the L2 learner’s current self, or if the learner believes that the future desired self will happen automatically, “without a marked increase in expended effort” (Dörnyei, 2014, p. 522).

2.6.4. The L2 Motivational Self System Research

For many years researchers have been struggling to find a new way of explaining motivation that goes beyond the tradition set by Gardner and his associates in defining motivation through the concept of the integrative orientation which has undisputedly been the central concept of motivational SLA studies (Macintyre, Mackinnon & Clement, 2009b). Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei 2005, 2009) offers a construct that builds on research “in personality psychology on possible selves, identity,
self-regulatory processes, and self-discrepancy theory” (Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009, p. 66). Thus, the main concepts of Dörnyei’s theory have attracted a considerable amount of attention and have been the foci of investigation in a number of recent motivational studies.

Taguchi, et al. (2009) was the largest of several quantitative studies (see collection of studies in Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009) conducted with a primary objective of validating Dörnyei’s Hungarian study’s findings in other contexts. This study employed a three-version questionnaire that was adapted for use in the three different contexts on nearly 5000 students (1,586 Japanese, 1,328 Chinese, and 2,029 Iranian students). The main objective of this comparative study was to test whether integrativeness was also going to account for the major part of the learners’ L2 motivation regardless of the absence of a salient L2 group, or if the results of the Hungarian studies were simply country-specific. The study also addressed the nature of instrumentality being of the promotion or prevention type in relation to the two self-guides within Dörnyei’s new construct. Notably, the most important contribution of this study was the incorporation of the third component of Dörnyei’s tripartite, i.e., the L2 learning experience, which was never investigated along with the ideal and ought-to selves in one study, not even in Dörnyei’s Hungarian longitudinal series of studies.

The study employed a questionnaire consisting of items measuring the learners’ general attitudes and motivation on the one side, and language learning scales on the other. As this study was mainly a replication of Dörnyei’s Hungarian studies, the main components in the questionnaire came from the original Hungarian questionnaire including items measuring cultural interests, integrativeness, attitudes towards the L2 communities, the ideal self, ought-to self, and finally the criterion measure. The criterion measure in this study was participants’ intended learning efforts; the latter was defined as a combination between the value associated with learning the TL, the desire to learn it and the efforts that learners are willing to expend to achieve this goal. The collected data was analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM) which was used to determine the causal relationships between the variables and factors making up the construct.

The study revealed that instrumentality can be classified in relation to promotion versus prevention according to the internalization level of these instrumental motivations.
among the learners. In addition, the correlation coefficients revealed that the ‘ideal L2 self’ guide has an overall greater capacity (34%) than integrativeness (17%) to explain variance in the dependent variable (i.e., intended learning efforts). Overall, the SEM analysis employed in this study confirmed the validity of the entire tripartite of the L2 Motivational Self System in the three investigated contexts.

In an attempt to replicate Taguchi et al.’s (2009) comparative study in a different context, Kim and Kim (2012) used the similar instruments used in the aforementioned study to validate Dörnyei’s (2005, 2009) L2 Motivational Self System in Korea. A survey was administered on 495 Korean students (277 middle school students and 218 school students). The survey focused on six variables, namely, the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self, integrativeness, instrumentality-promotion, instrumentality-prevention, and motivated behaviour and efforts as the criterion measure. Similar to Taguchi et al.’s (2009) major reported findings, there was a positive correlation between instrumentality-promotion and both the ideal and ought-to selves while instrumentality-prevention only correlated positively with the ought-to self. More importantly, the findings confirmed the validity of Dörnyei’s tripartite model in the Korean context. The ideal self confirmed its superiority over Gardner’s (1985, 2001c) integrativeness and instrumentality in explaining the motivated L2 behaviour variance among secondary school Korean students.

In a European study, Csizér and Kormos (2009) investigated the role of the different components of the L2MSS in language learning in two populations of learners: secondary school and university students in Budapest, Hungary. The criterion measure used to assess the language achievement level of the learners in this study was again the intended learning efforts while the three antecedents linked to the criterion measure were the ideal self, ought-to self and the L2 learning experience. The ought-to self in this study was proposed to be affected by the views of the learners’ parents on the importance of learning the language, the instrumental value that the learners attributed to language learning as a means of acquiring knowledge, which was referred to as knowledge orientation, as well as international posture which was defined as the learners’ views on the role of English as an international language. On the other hand, the formation of the ideal self was postulated to be determined by the L2 learning experience, the ought-to self, and international posture.
Each of these variables was represented using a number of five-point likert-type scale items in a questionnaire that students from both secondary and university level had to respond to. Multiple-group structural equation modeling was applied to analyze the relations between the variables investigated in the study. Both international posture and parental encouragement were found to not significantly affect the ought-to self. In addition, some relations were found to be only significant among one population, but not among the other. For example, the ought-to self positively correlated, although insignificantly, with the intended learning efforts only among the university students. On the other hand, parental encouragement was only a significant determinant of in the formation of the ought-to self among the secondary school students who’s ideal selves were also mediated by their ought-to selves. More importantly, the study found that the ‘ideal self’ ($R^2 = .37$ for secondary and .49 for university) and the L2 learning experience ($R^2 = .58$ and .49 for secondary and university respectively) played a more significant role in predicting the L2 motivated learning behaviour than the ‘ought-to self’ ($R^2 = .12$ and .13 for secondary and university respectively) in both populations.

Lamb’s (2012) investigation was the only study, to our best knowledge, that employed a language proficiency test (C-test) to establish the extent to which L2 proficiency covaries with the components of the L2MSS. The research set out to compare the impact of the components of the theory on 527 young (13–14 years of age) pupils in three different socioeconomic contexts in Indonesia, namely, a metropolitan city, a provincial town, and a rural area. These students completed a 50-item motivation questionnaire targeting eleven constructs (based on Dörnyei et al., 2008; Ryan, 2008) then answered a C-test, consisting on five short texts containing words with missing second halves, to assess the students L2 proficiency. The main comparisons between the groups revealed that the rural group students had the weakest ideal selves and indicated less international posture than the two other groups. The students’ attitudes towards the L2 learning experience were the biggest predictor of their willingness to invest effort in L2 learning, and anxiety was also found to moderately contribute in predicting the learners’ intended learning efforts. As far as the relationships between the different variables and the L2 proficiency, of the motivational variables, both positive views of the school L2 learning experience in school as well as the ideal L2 self predicted proficiency. Nevertheless, regional differences were found to be the biggest predictor of L2 proficiency within this population followed by the parents’ level of English and level of education. Although,
this study had a great potential of providing empirical evidence on the relationship between the three components of Dörnyei’s theory and actual L2 proficiency, the remarkably low reliability of the ought-to scale led to its removal from the regression analysis, which undermined the overall value of the findings of the this study in this respect.

In addition to the quantitative studies that were mentioned earlier, Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System theory has been used for interpreting data from qualitative studies, as well. There have been a few longitudinal studies on L2MSS involving much smaller numbers of participants, however. Lamb (2009) conducted a longitudinal study to track the levels of motivation of Indonesian high school students over the period of two years. Although, Lamb’s study employed a mixed-method for collecting the data combining surveys and interviews as well as class observations, the main findings of his studies were discussed in relation to the data that was collected qualitatively. The overall results of the survey indicated very high levels of motivation among the learners, and most of their responses were found to relate to either the “promotion” or “prevention” type of motivators which are the basic distinctive features of Dörnyei’s “ideal” and “ought-to” selves respectively. In his discussion, Lamb (2009) referred to the contrast between two of the participants in his study, Lamb asserted that Dewi, who had a stronger ideal L2 self orientation, and Munandar, who had a stronger ought-to L2 self orientation, were not particularly identified as prototypical cases of Dörnyei’s self-guides, but rather the distinction between the two students can display important properties of learners with ideal and ought-to selves. These differences between the two students were discussed to emphasize the contextual effects of these learners’ differences on the formation and operation of the two self-guides.

Lamb (2009) reported that the two learners showed very different patterns with regard to willingness to communicate in English, self regulatory learning and amount of time and effort expended in learning the L2, and reactions to the L2 classrooms. Lamb asserted that Dewi, the learner with the ideal self, was more forthcoming about communicating in the L2, and used to spend more time on extracurricular activities that helped her improve her L2 proficiency. Unlike Munandare, who was assumed to have an ought-to self, Dewi did not enjoy being in a traditional classroom setting in which only little opportunity was given to students for meaningful participation and
communication, and where most of the classroom talk was dominated by the L2 “incompetent” teacher. Yet, she managed to overcome her unpleasant L2 learning experience, and self regulate her learning outside the classroom in a way that gradually improved her L2 use. Thus, Lamb reported that having an ideal self is more favorable than having an ought-to self since the possession of the ideal self results in a more committed approach to L2 learning despite difficulties, and more openness to practice that language which ultimately leads to better language learning (Lamb, 2009).

Another qualitative study that used The L2 Motivational Self System for interpreting language learners’ attitudes towards and behaviour in language learning was conducted by Kim (2009a). In his study, Kim tried to reinterpret Dörnyei’s two self-guides in the light of the Vigotskian Sociocultural Theory that views language learning motivation as a reciprocal process between the subject (language learner), object (language learning) and is mediated by a variety of instruments that help the learner attain their intended learning goals. The analysis of the language learners’ behaviour is also based on Engeström’s Activity Theory which views factors like the community, its rules and the different goal-oriented actions performed by the members of the learning situation to be among the most influential dynamics that determine language learning (Engeström, 1999, as cited in Kim, 2009a).

Kim’s (2009a, 2009b) study was a longitudinal case study of ten Korean university students learning English in Toronto, Canada. The study incorporated the use of different qualitative instruments for purposes related to data collection including interviews, classroom observations, picture-cued recall tasks and learners’ autobiographies with the first instrument (interviews) receiving the most attention as the basic instrument for data collection. In the reports of his main findings, Kim (2009a) focuses on two language learners, Joon and Woo, as the prototypical cases of L2 learners with different levels of goal-internalization, which, in turn, leads to having two different self-guides. Kim claims that although Joon’s basic motivator to learn English was more pertinent to learning the language for integrative purposes, which in this case was communicating with an English speaking close friend, in addition to instrumental purposes, the lack of consistency and non-clarity in vision with regard to the instrumental goal, which in this case was a future preferred career, was interpreted as a lack of the required goal internalization needed to transform Joon’s ought-to L2 self into
an ideal L2 self. On the other hand, Kim interpreted Woo’s clearly developed future career plans and his affective communication with the L2 community, e.g., the home stay owner and Woo’s girlfriend, as the factors that helped him in establishing an interface between the two self-guides which eventually had a positive impact on his L2 use (2009a, 2009b).

The significance of Kim’s findings lies in its confirmation to Dörnyei’s (2006) argument in which he states that “depending on the extent of the internalization of the extrinsic motives that make up instrumentality, the instrumentality can be either ideal L2 self or the ought-to L2 self” (Dörnyei et al., 2006, p. 93). Thus, it was found that internalizing utilitarian and practical reasons for learning the L2 consequently improves the language learning outcomes through the relentless efforts extended by the language learner to reach these fully internalized goals. These findings definitely enrich our understanding about the relationship between the concept of internalization and the formation process of Dörnyei’s two self-guides. However, since no language proficiency test was administered to assess the learners’ levels of language attainment in this study, it is difficult to assume the actual impact of either self-guides on language learning achievement. Furthermore, as it is the case of most case studies, the focus of investigation in this study was only on very specific cases of L2 learners which makes the possibility of generalizing the findings of this research on a larger context extremely limited.

It is noteworthy that neither of the two qualitative studies above collected language data in relation to learners’ actual L2 proficiency.

Ryan’s (2008) investigation of the ideal self and identity among Japanese learners of English was one of the few studies that used a combined method in investigating the relationship between the L2 Motivational Self System and L2 learning. Ryan’s investigation was consistent in manner with Dörnyei’s line of research within the Hungarian context. The main aim of Ryan’s research was to empirically test the concept of ‘ideal self’ and most specifically within the Japanese context (2008). The research data in this study was collected using a Motivational Factor Questionnaire similar to the one used by Dörnyei in his series of Hungarian studies (see Dörnyei et al., 2006) as well as a series of interviews aimed to more elaborately explore the relationship between the questionnaire’s different motivational variables.
A total of 2397 Japanese male and female secondary and university level students participated in the main part of the study, i.e., the questionnaire survey. The survey consisted of 100 likert-point items eliciting data about 18 different motivational variables most of which were a part of Dörnyei’s Hungarian studies with a few adapted from previous Japanese motivational studies and two new scales addressing the two self-guides that were newly developed for the study. These variables included the learners’ attitudes towards L2, its community, and foreign languages in general. It also addressed issues related to ethnocentrism and international empathy and contact, interest in travel and other cultures as well as the instrumental value of learning English. The questionnaire also tapped into issues related to milieu and parental encouragement in addition to the learners’ anxieties, willingness to communicate and self confidence, as well. The learners’ language proficiency levels were assessed using the “intended learning efforts” scale which was based on the Hungarian studies’ scale “intended effort” that was used as one of the most important antecedents of language learning achievement.

The findings of Ryan’s study show a strong correlation between the main motivational variables and the intended learning efforts and most specifically among the university students which validate the theoretical conclusions resulting from Dörnyei’s (2005) study. The most staggering similarity between the findings of both studies was how integrativeness was remarkably found to mediate the relationship between all the other motivational variables and the intended learning efforts which proved that integrativeness was only one facet of a border concept that is even more significantly related to language learning behaviour, i.e., ideal self. All in all, the data provided by this study strongly supports the calls to use the concept of the ideal self in reinterpreting the relationship between motivation and language learning.

Although the main focus of the previously conducted L2MSS research was to test the capacity of the L2MSS components in predicting to the L2 learners’ intended learning efforts, which were assumed to predict their L2 achievement, a few other studies focused on investigating the relationship between the learners’ perceptual learning styles and their future selves (see Alshehri, 2009; Kim & Kim, 2011; Yang & Kim, 2011). The focus of these studies is not strongly related to our research. However, it is noteworthy that some of these studies made a good contribution to the L2 Motivational
Self System literature by not relying fully on the ‘intended learning efforts’ scale as the only criterion measure, rather by using the students’ English courses’ grades as another indicative of these students’ L2 achievement. For example, Yang and Kim (2011) conducted a research on the role of the visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles on the ideals self and motivated learning behaviour of 100 Chinese, 70 Japanese, 104 Korean and 56 Swedish high school students. Except for the Korean learners, who showed auditory style dominance, the students in the three other contexts showed more of a visual style preference. Despite the motivational differences between the four countries, positive correlations were found between the visual learning styles and the learners’ ideal self and motivated learning behaviour in all four countries. Among the study’s main findings, the ‘ideal L2 self’ demonstrated a substantial capacity to explain the variance of the learners’ L2 motivated behaviour ($R^2 = .52$), but was not a good predictor of academic achievement. Notably, participants’ course grades were used as a measure of their L2 achievement.

In a similar line of research, Kim and Kim (2011) included the students’ English grades as an additional criterion measure to their motivated learning behaviour. In their study, they investigated the relationship between the three aforementioned perceptual learning styles, the learners’ ideal self, intended learning behaviour, and English academic achievement among 495 secondary school students. Despite the low correlations between imagination and all the perceptual learning styles, the study reported positive correlations between the ideal English self and visual and auditory learning style preferences, albeit a weaker correlation between the ideal self and the auditory style than with the visual one. Another major finding confirmed the power of the ideal L2 self in predicting the learners’ L2 motivated behaviour. It was found that the ideal self and visual learning style explain more than half the variation in the learners’ motivated learning behaviour. However, although the motivated learning behaviour explained 5.6% of the learners’ academic achievement, the learners’ ideal self and visual learning styles were not good predictors of the learners’ academic achievement. Kim and Kim (2011) explained this unexpected finding as a function of the predictable strong relationship between test results, i.e., academic achievement, and the ought-to rather than the ideal self. Unfortunately, no information was elicited on the ought-to self in this study. It was still very interesting to find that motivated L2 behaviour was not able to directly induce academic L2 achievement in this study. Nonetheless, this was another
occasion in which the ideal self stood short in explaining variations levels on L2 achievement, and raised questions about the true capacity of the ‘ideal self’ in explaining different levels of actual L2 proficiency among L2 learners.

As for the studies focusing on the relationship between imagery and possible selves, Dörnyei and Chan’s (2013) study was one of the most recent investigations on the role of mental imagery on the intensity of the L2 learners’ motivation. Specifically, focusing on a sample of 175 Chinese-background learners aged between 13 and 15 year old learning two target languages, viz. English and Mandarin, in Hong Kong. The study aimed to collect data about the relationship among the participants’ learning characteristics pertinent to sensory and imagery aspects, the learners’ future L2 self-guides, and learning achievement. This study used both intended learning efforts and participants’ L2 achievement as criterion measures. The main findings of this study included a confirmation of the power of the self-guides (more specifically of the ideal self) to predict motivated language behaviour, i.e., intended learning efforts, and L2 achievement, i.e., L2 course grades. Nonetheless, the self-guides’ correlations with actual grades were lower than with the intended effort, and its difference reached significance only for the Ideal Mandarin self. As for the ought-to self, although it correlated positively with and predicted the intended effort in both languages, it was not successful in predicting the L2 learners’ grades in neither language. The other major finding was related to the role that mental imagery plays in the development of the future selves. It was found that L2 learners’ vision was of a multiple nature involving not only the L2 learners’ visual learning style, but enforced by the learners’ auditory style as well. Last but not least, the study findings confirmed that while the future selves are functional regardless of the different target languages that the L2 learners aim to learn, these different languages are associated with distinct ideal language selves and are related to different future visions (Dörnyei & Chan, 2013).

A third group of researchers chose to look into the effect of gender differences on future selves. There studies confirmed a notable influence of gender differences on the development, maintenance and outcomes of the possible selves (see Henry, 2010a for a review of these studies). The development of more interpersonal and communal qualities in the possible selves as well as the increase in motivation, attitudes towards learning the L2, and motivated L2 behaviour with age were found to be more strongly
pronounced among female L2 learners (see Anthis, Dunkel & Anderson, 2004; Henry, 2009; Henry, 2010a; Knox, 2006). Other studies argued that when the L2 learners are studying more than one L2, the negative function of the English language ideal self as a normative referent in creating a negative impact on motivation to learn other foreign languages is more noticeable for boys (Henry, 2010b).

Henry and Cliffordson’s (2013) study was one of the most recent systematic investigations that looked into the impact of gender differences on future self-guides. Their sample consisted of 271 secondary school Swedish students learning English as a second language as well as either Spanish, French or German as a third language. The findings of the research indicated no difference in the learners’ L2 possible selves based on gender. However, gender differences predicted differences in the learners’ L3 future selves and this relationship was mediated by interdependent self-construal. Females were found to have more elaborate future self images as a function of their greater focus on interpersonal relationships. The focus on interpersonal relationships and interactions fed into more elaborate future imagined situations as it allowed these female learners to envision interacting and communicating more extensively than males did, and ultimately led to having better future selves.

One of the most under researched areas within the L2MSS theory which needs far more attention is the development of the future self guides (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2009, 350-354). To date, not many studies have tried to look into the development process of the learners’ future selves and the factors that affect this process. One of the few studies that tried to address this problem was a qualitative study conducted by Sampson (2012). His study was an action research project conducted to focus on the self regulation strategies, which Dörnyei (2009) referred to as the conditions needed for the operation of the L2MSS, and how the L2 learners can use these strategies to reduce the discrepancies between their current selves and their future selves. The study was conducted on 34 female Japanese students from the faculty of International Communication in a rural Japanese university, and whose average age was 19. The study was administered in three cycles.

In the first cycle, the learners were asked to write about their best possible future selves. In the remaining two cycles and based on the analysis of the data collected in the first cycle, a variety of activities helping the learners achieve their ideal future L2 selves
were suggested based on Nunan’s (2004) task based learning concept. The students were asked to reflect upon these strategies at the end of each class, which resulted in more emphasis being placed on the favorite strategies in the remaining classes. These goal-achievement action strategies included activities focusing on the construction, making plausible, strengthening, and activation of the ideal self as well as others concerned with the development of action plans to face the L2 learning difficulties and achieve the desired future images while not forgetting about counterbalancing these desired hopes with feared possible failures in other activities. These activities were carried out over the course of 15 lessons for the semester. The results demonstrated that this possible selves enhancement program was able to create the environments needed for these L2 learners to transform their vague future images into more vivid and elaborate clearer images of both ideal and ought-to L2 selves with more motivating power to learn the L2. This was documented in the students’ reflections in the learning journals, questionnaires and reflective skits that were used to collect the data for this study.

In a similar and a more recent project Magid (2014) developed a program based on the L2MSS to motivate elementary school students in Singapore to invest more time and effort in their L2 learning. This study was longitudinal and used a mixed method consisting of a series of questionnaires and interviews in order to measure the participants’ motivational development throughout the four-month training program. The study built on Oyserman’s motivational intervention program aimed to enhance the students’ abilities to imagine themselves as successful language learners in their future careers (Oyserman, Bybee & Terry, 2006; Oyserman, et al., 2004). The sample in Magid’s study involved 16 participants (10 boys and 6 girls) with a mean age of 11. These participants were divided into two groups of 8. The training program consisted of a series of workshops delivered to both the experimental and the control groups, with an addition of scripted imagery situations’ activities practiced with the participants in the experimental group as well as strategies to help these participants to enhance their abilities to imagine their future selves, develop specific goals, and implement action plans to improve their L2 learning experience.

The main findings revealed that 90% of the participants in the experimental group improved on the three targeted categories: motivation, confidence and positive attitudes
towards learning English as a result of the program. On the other hand, only half the participants became motivated, 75% became more confident, and 90% improved their attitudes toward learning English in the control group. One important result emerging from both the quantitative and qualitative data analyses was that there was an increase in the strength of the participants’ ideal L2 self as a result of the training program. This finding showed the possibility of enhancing L2 learners’ vision of their future L2 selves through visualisation training and in a relatively short amount of time.

Given the fact that the studies reviewed above were conducted in a variety of socio-educational contexts, using different qualitative and quantitative data collection instruments, and had diverse foci, the convergence of these studies’ findings has been regarded by many researchers as a strong validation of Dörnyei’s tripartite model. That said, it is important to be mindful of the fact that most of the studies conducted to endorse Dörnyei’s model (incl. Dörnyei’s Hungarian study itself) did not collect any data of the learners’ actual L2 achievement. Instead of measuring learners’ L2 achievement, they relied on a scale called ‘intended learning efforts’ as the criterion measure, assuming—but not demonstrating—that these intended efforts actually predict and translate into L2 achievement. The use of ‘the intended learning efforts’ scale as the only criterion measure puts the validity of the findings of these studies under question; as to whether the reported ‘intended learning efforts’ accurately reflect the proficiency levels of the participants or not. It is noteworthy that research in psychology has found that in 30% or more of humans, there is a mismatch between intentions and actions, i.e., people’s intentions do not always translate into actual achievement (Godin & Conner, 2008; Sheeran, 2002).

Indeed one of the key findings in Ryan’s (2008) study was that not all positive attitudes have behavioural consequences and the author recognized the “need for a greater role for observation of actual behaviour rather than a reliance on reported intentions” (p. 275). In addition, most of the qualitative research that has been done within Dörnyei’s theory does not use reliable methods in measuring the learners’ language attainment levels which makes their claims about changes in the learners’ proficiency levels over a certain period time unreliable, not to mention the unfeasibility of generalizing the findings of such small scale research on a wider population (see Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Kim, 2009).
Even in the more recent studies that used course grades or C-tests along with the intended learning efforts as an indicative of the L2 learners’ proficiency (Dörnyei & Chan, 2013; Kim & Kim, 2011), inconsistent results were highlighted with regard to the power of the self-guides in predicting the learners’ intended effort in comparison with their actual L2 achievement. It is also difficult to rule out the effect of having a strong ought-to self, which is the less-internalized form of motivation usually associated with short term goals, on the learners’ academic achievement, and in turn on the correlation levels between academic achievement and the ideal self. Kim and Kim (2011) acknowledged the possibility of L2 having learners with high ought-to self who expend great efforts to perform well in exams as a result of the pressures placed on them from their parents or teachers. Thus, the strong correlation between the ought-to self and academic grades could simply be a result of the nature of the ought-to self, i.e., being associated with academic performance and fear of failure in exams, and could result in a downplaying to the role played by the ideal self in explaining academic achievement.

It would therefore seem that ‘intended learning efforts’ or school grades are not truly indicative of L2 achievement, and that the capacity of L2MSS’s components to predict achievement may be impossible to establish without actual L2 proficiency data.

Furthermore, in what could be regarded as another weakness of previous research on L2MSS, the ought-to self scale in the previously mentioned studies only included items pertinent to the social obligations placed on the L2 learner while the fear of the negative notions associated with future failure in general, which Dörnyei (2009) identifies as an important part of the ought-to self, was never appropriately accounted for in the process of questionnaires writing in these studies. A third weakness is related to the interpretation of the third component of Dörnyei’s (Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei et al., 2006; Dörnyei, 2009) theory which is the L2 learning experience. Dörnyei (2009) conceptualizes this component in his theory as a situated type of motivation that relates to the learners attitudes toward the classroom, the teacher, the peer group and the curriculum. However, in the previously discussed studies the L2 learning experience was basically assessed using some unspecific items addressing the overall experience with no specific reference to the components that make up this experience.

As far as the Saudi context is concerned, despite having an immense potential of being a very fruitful direction in reinterpreting the relationship between the L2 learners’
motivation and L2 learning in the Saudi Arabia, the L2MSS was never appropriately investigated within the Saudi context. When examining the literature related to motivation and L2 learning in Saudi Arabia, we can easily notice that most of the relationships that have been established between motivation and language achievement have been interpreted from the perspective of the Gardner’s Socio-educational Model or the Self-Determination theory. Some studies discussed the general effects of attitudes and motivation on L2 learning (see Al-Kahtany, 1995; Syed, 2003) while some more relatively recent studies tried to explain the role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations in relation to L2 proficiency (Al-Otaibi, 2004; Moskovsky & Alrabai, 2009).

The only study which utilized Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System in investigating motivation and language learning in the Saudi context was conducted by Al-shehri (2009). In this study the role of imagery was highly emphasized and the visual learning style was found to positively affect the construction of the different self-guides within Dörnyei’s theory (Dörnyei, 2009). However, it was not the focus of that study to establish a relationship between The L2 Motivational Self System and L2 learning achievement within the Saudi context. These studies have definitely contributed to broadening our understanding of the most influential motivational theoretical frameworks, but say little about their practical classroom applications in the sense that none of these studies related the self-guides to actual L2 achievement. Therefore, it is essential to conduct more studies within Dörnyei’s most up-to-date L2MSS theory with the aim to provide a cross-cultural outlook that can contribute to our understanding of this relatively new theory of SLA motivation and can test its claim of being able to ultimately predict L2 achievement.

The study reported here has been designed to build on the strengths of previous research and to avoid its weaknesses. The survey scales we used contained items relating to fear of possible future failure (as part of the ‘ought-to’ self), and also items relating to specific dimensions of the participants’ previous learning experience (incl. attitudes to the teacher, the textbook, etc.). Last but not least, in contrast to the vast majority of previous research, our study used actual L2 proficiency, not intended learning efforts, as the main dependent variable—measured with a dedicated (reading and writing) proficiency test.
Chapter 3

Design and Method

3.1 Introduction

This study employed both quantitative and qualitative instruments in order to meet its objective, to explore the self-guides motivating Saudi students learning English at a university level, and to investigate the relationship between these self-guides and L2 proficiency. This chapter provides a description of the methodology used in this research: the data collection process, sampling, instruments, and the methods employed in the data analysis process as well as the ethical considerations related to the construction and administration of the data collection instruments. After introducing the participants, I describe the data collection methods and discuss the appropriateness of the specific data collection instruments. The following sections describe the process of data collection, and outline the procedures used in analyzing the data collected, before providing the preliminary analysis of the data.

3.2 Participants

The sample in the current study consisted of Saudi L2 learners (N = 360), majoring in English at King Abdulaziz University and Taif University in Saudi Arabia. Of the 360 participants, 225 (62.5%) were males and 135 (37.5%) were females. All the participants were full-time students who speak Arabic as their first language. The age range of participants who responded to the age question was between 19 and 31. For ethical reasons, the participants were assured that their responses were purely voluntary. As a result, some respondents chose to not answer all the questions. Of the participants who responded to the question on age (n = 341, 94.82%), the majority (n = 276, 80.94%), were between 19 and 23, which is the typical age for university students in Saudi Arabia, and 65 (19.06%) were between 24 and 31. The data in Table 3.1 show the age and gender information of the participants.
Table 3.1

Age and gender distribution of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the participants who responded to the question on the type of schooling attended before enrolling in university \((n = 336, 93.30 \%)\), the largest group \((n = 291, 80.80\%)\) were taught in public schools, followed by 32 \((8.90\%)\) participants who were taught in private schools, followed by those who had attended both public and private schools before enrolling in university \((n = 13, 3.60\%)\). Of the participants who responded to the question on living in an English speaking country \((n = 339, 94.20\%)\), the largest proportion of the respondents \((n = 297, 82.50\%)\) reported that they had never travelled or lived in an English speaking country for over 3 months, while a smaller proportion \((n = 42, 17.50\%)\) reported having lived in an English speaking country for at least 3 months at some point in their life.

The majority of participants \((n = 285)\) came from the Western region of Saudi Arabia (see Figure 3.1). That was probably because the two universities from which the data was collected lie on the Western part of Saudi Arabia. The overwhelming majority of the participants also reported that their fathers had a higher level of education than their mothers did (see Table 3.2), which was possibly due to the fact that female education was frowned upon by the Saudi society a few decades ago. Most participants did not rate their parents’ English language speaking proficiency very highly (see Table 3.3),
Figure 3.1 Regional distribution of the participants. There was missing data in this category ($n = 33, \text{9.17\%}$).

Table 3.2

*Education levels of the participants' parents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no schooling</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgrad</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>351</strong></td>
<td><strong>351</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. There was missing data in this category ($n = 9, \text{2.50\%}$).*

Table 3.3

*English proficiency levels of the participants' parents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of English</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speaks well</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaks not well</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no English</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>352</strong></td>
<td><strong>352</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. There was missing data in this category ($n = 8, \text{2.22\%}$).*
with only 75 (21.31%) reporting that their fathers spoke English well and 20 (5.68%) reporting the same for their mothers.

These participants were recruited from two Saudi universities using cluster random sampling in which 16 English classes in the 3 campuses were randomly selected to participate in this study. These campuses were: King Abdulaziz University Males’ Campus (KAUMC), Taif University Males’ Campus (TUMC), and Taif University Females’ Campus (TUFC). The distribution of the selected classes across the campuses is shown in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4

Campus and group distribution of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>KAUMC</th>
<th>TUMC</th>
<th>TUFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 360

The students in these classes were at least in their second year at university, because large numbers of Saudi students are usually undecided about their major during their first year, and some of them drop out, while some others change majors. This way, the
researcher ensured that most if not all the participants in the study were, to some extent, committed and motivated to learn the L2 and expend the needed effort in doing so. In addition, this also means that these students had sufficient basic English skills to allow them to understand and respond to the questionnaires without difficulty.

### 3.3 Data Collection

For the data collection, two quantitative instruments (questionnaires and an English language proficiency test) and one qualitative instrument (interviews) were employed to collect data on the variables of interest in the study. The questionnaires and interviews were used to collect data about the learners' motivation, and the proficiency test was used to collect data on the English proficiency levels of the learners. According to Grotjahn (1987) quantitative and qualitative approaches can be distinguished using different parameters, including the type of data collected, the manner of data collection, and the method of analysis of the collected data. The major characteristics of the two approaches are summarized in Table 3.5.

**Table 3.5**

*Main differences between quantitative and qualitative research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantitative Research</th>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Objective and removed from the data</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Hypothesis-testing, hypothesis-deductive, verification</td>
<td>Hypothesis-generating, discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oriented, confirmatory</td>
<td>oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Outcome-oriented</td>
<td>Process oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td>Reliable, involving &quot;hard&quot; and replicable data</td>
<td>&quot;Soft&quot; data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical analysis</td>
<td>Statistical analysis and mathematical models</td>
<td>Interpretive analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmatory</td>
<td>Descriptive, exploratory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The summary is based on a work by Maarafi (2004, p. 104) and Mackey and Gass (2005, p.2). The table indicates that each of the two types has inherent limitations. For the purposes of the present study, in which learners’ motivation is understood as a complex construct involving both subjective and objective factors and processes, it was considered that the best way of overcoming these limitations was by looking at the two research types as complementary rather than dichotomous. Dörnyei (2001, p. 129) asserts that although questionnaires offer little in-depth explorative scope for analysis, “their flexible nature makes them ideal to be used in complex research paradigms in concert with other data collection methods.” Semi-structured interviews, on the other hand, enable an in-depth exploration of a specific phenomenon, although only small numbers of participants can typically be involved. Hence, both instruments were used in this study as a form of triangulation in the hope that their combination will be conducive to a greater depth of investigation and will yield more reliable results.

### 3.3.1 Questionnaire

This study employed a five-point-Likert-scale-type questionnaire. There is a debate as to whether an odd or even number of points on a scale can elicit the best responses. The main problem associated with the use of the odd-number-Likert-scale lies in the middle category which indicates neutrality, which might yield less reliable results because of the indecision of the respondents. According to Dörnyei (2003), some researchers try to avoid using an odd number of responses in their questionnaires because of the concern that respondents may choose the middle category just to avoid making a real choice. However, research indicates that the inclusion or the exclusion of the middle category does not modify the results significantly as it does not appear to have much bearing on the proportions of the honest answers elicited from the respondents (Robson, 1993). This study employed the five-point-Likert-scale-type questionnaire not only because the original Likert scale had only five responses (Likert, 1932), but also because it has been the tradition to use this type of instrument in the most recent and the most influential studies in the field conducted by Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh in the Hungarian studies. Besides, using the same scale will enable easier and more trustworthy comparisons between the results from the current study with those of the previous studies (see Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Dörnyei, 2005; Taguchi et al., 2009).
In order to collect the quantitative data on a single occasion, questionnaires and a proficiency test were combined into a single instrument with three parts. Parts A and B constituted the questionnaire survey while part C included the L2 proficiency test. Part A and B consisted of 55 items. The first section of part A included 48 Likert-scale-type items with ‘strongly agree’ anchoring the left end and ‘strongly disagree’ anchoring the right end while part B included 7 questions eliciting some demographic information about the participants.

Part A was used to elicit information about the type of self-guides responsible for creating images that the learners have of themselves in the future. This part of the questionnaire was mainly adapted from Taguchi et al.’s (2009) comparative study on the L2 Motivational Self System of middle school students, university students, and working professionals in Japan, China and Iran. Moreover, drawing on Lepp-Kaethler and Dörnyei’s (2013) study emphasizing the important links between spiritual vision and L2 vision, a few new items relevant to the new research context, i.e., items relating to cultural and religious obligations (see appendix A, questionnaire items 37, 42, 45 and 46), were designed and added to the original questionnaire. The first section of the questionnaire (part A) sought information on four variables (see Appendix A for the complete survey). These four variables are:

1- The Ideal Self (10 items): this variable addressed the desired hopes and aspirations of the L2 learners in the future and was basically adapted from the comparative Chinese/Japanese/Iranian study conducted by Taguchi et al. (2009) without alterations. Information on this variable were elicited using the Ideal Self scale which included items like:

   - *I imagine myself as someone who is able to speak English.*

2- The Ought-to Self (15 items): the ought-to self scale in the original questionnaire designed by Taguchi et al. (2009) only included items pertinent to the social obligations placed on the L2 learner to learn the language while the fear of the negative notions associated with failure was originally assessed using another scale that Taguchi et al. referred to as "instrumentality prevention". However, based on Dörnyei’s (2009) proposition that the ought-to self relates to both the social obligations placed on the learner to learn the language and the fear of the undesirable connotations associated with failure, the two scales
(ought-to self and instrumentality prevention) are combined into one broad scale as the "ought-to self" in the current study. This scale addressed the attributes that the learner thinks he or she ought to possess (obligations and duties) as well as the feared outcomes associated with failure to achieve competency in L2. This scale included items like:

- **Learning English is necessary because people surrounding me expect me to do so.**
- **Without learning English it will be difficult to find a prestigious job in the future.**

3- The L2 Learning Experience (15 items): in addition to the "ideal self" and the "ought-to self" scales a third scale was used to assess the learners' satisfaction with the overall L2 learning experience. Dörnyei (2009) conceptualizes this component in his theory as a situated type of motivation that relates to the learners’ attitudes toward the classroom, the teacher, the peer group and the curriculum. Since the original scale developed by Taguchi et al. (2009) assessed the L2 learning experience using some unspecific items addressing the overall experience (see Appendix A, questionnaire items 3, 8 and 11), more items evaluating the separate components of the L2 learning experience (adapted from Gardner's 2004 Attitude/Motivation Test Battery) were added to the scale. Thus, the L2 learning experience scale within this research project was used to elicit information on how the learners evaluated the overall L2 experience as well as how they evaluated the English language teacher, books, peer group and L2 classroom anxiety. This scale included items like:

- **I would rather spend more time in my English classes and less in other classes.**
- **My English teachers are better than my other subjects' teachers.**
- **I find the English books that we are studying really useful.**
- **I am sometimes anxious that the other students in class will laugh at me when I speak English.**

4- The Intended Learning Efforts (8 items): the last scale used in section A of the questionnaire was the intended learning efforts. The criterion measure in the original Hungarian studies was divided into two scales labelled "language
choice” and "intended efforts" (Dörnyei, 2005). However, in later studies within the L2 Motivational Self System, these two scales have been adapted and combined into a larger scale labelled "the intended learning efforts" which was used to describe both the learners’ present and future motivated behaviour towards their L2 learning (see Ryan, 2008; Taguchi et al., 2009). The scale is used to elicit information about how important learning English is for the L2 learners and the efforts they are willing to expend in order to improve their L2 learning outcomes. Although in this study language achievement is assessed using a language proficiency test, the intended learning efforts scale was still used as a part of the questionnaire as they were expected to mediate the relationship between the L2MSS components and language achievement among the Saudi learners. This scale included items like:

- *I would like to spend lots of time learning English.*
- *If an English course was offered at university or somewhere else in the future, I would like to take it.*

The second section of the questionnaire (part B) asked about some demographic information that was expected to influence the participants’ formation process of the self-guides. It included questions asking about the respondents’ age, type of schooling and whether or not they had lived in English speaking countries for over 3 months. It was also anticipated that the region which the participants come from as well as the level of education and English proficiency of the participants’ parents would have an effect on the English proficiency and motivation levels of the participants. Hence, questions about the participants’ region of origin, levels of parents’ education and English language proficiency were also included in this section.

The third section (part C) of the questionnaire contains the language proficiency test, presented in detail in the following section.

### 3.3.2 Language Proficiency Test

The dependent variable in this study is the learners’ English proficiency level. Most of the previously conducted studies within the L2 Motivational Self System have used ‘the
intended efforts in learning the target language’ as the criterion measure, presented by items, such as “I am working hard at learning English” or “I would like to spend lots of time studying English” (Taguchi et al., 2009). Nevertheless, relying on this scale as the only indicative of the participants’ level of proficiency in the target language puts the validity of the findings of these studies under question since positive attitudes and self-reported intentions do not always have behavioural consequences (Ryan, 2008). This consideration highlights “the need for a greater role for observation of actual behaviour rather than a reliance on reported intentions” (Ryan, 2008, p. 275). The present research extends the already existing Self Framework by adding English language proficiency scores as the criterion variable in the Self Model of L2 motivation. One of the main goals of this study was to explore the relationship between motivation and L2 proficiency level using an actual language proficiency test - an adapted version of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), thus strengthening the validity of the research findings.

IELTS is one of the best-known tests of English proficiency worldwide, with a well-established validity, which is used by over 6,000 organizations in over 135 countries. Its content is internationally focused and it has been developed as a result of an extensive program of examination and validation led by some of the world’s most reputable language assessment institutions including the British Council, IDP: IELTS Australia and the University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations (Cambridge ESOL). It was developed to assess the four basic language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. For time and money considerations associated with both administering the live (IELTS) test and analyzing the test scores, an adapted version of the test assessing the participants’ reading and writing skills was used in the current study (see Appendix D).

The reading part of the test was used to elicit data about the learners’ receptive skills while the writing part was used to elicit data about the learners’ productive skills. The IELTS reading questions are of the objective type, so they were straightforward to score. However, the writing proficiency levels of the test takers were scored according to the IELTS writing band descriptors. These descriptors assess the test taker’s performance against four criteria: task achievement, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource, and grammatical range and accuracy (see appendix D for more details on the IELTS writing band descriptors). To minimize the effect of scorer subjectivity, it was
deemed appropriate that the language proficiency test not be scored by the researcher. Consequently, the test was scored by an independent scorer at the Foreign Languages Department at Taif University who had ample experience in the field of L2 learning and teaching, and had taught several courses at Taif University including the reading and writing skill courses at the Foreign Languages Department. First, the means of the reading scores across campuses were calculated separately and were found to be 2.85 at KAUMC, 2.63 at TUMC and 1.90 at TUFC out of 9. After that, the mean scores for the writing section were calculated and were found to be 3.10 at KAUMC, 2.64 at TUMC, and 3.08 at TUFC out of 9. Missing values were replaced with the mean values. The results of both the reading and writing sections were reported as band scores on a scale from 1 (the lowest) to 9 (the highest), with the writing section being scored based on the IELTS Writing Band Descriptors (see Appendix D). The results for the whole sample on reading and writing are shown in Figure 3.2 and 3.3.

![Figure 3.2 Reading proficiency scores.](image)

**Figure 3.2 Reading proficiency scores.** (Median = 2.00, M = 2.45, SD = 1.89, N = 360). Measurement was on a 9-point-IELTS-scale. Higher scores indicate higher proficiency level.
Figure 3.3 Writing proficiency scores. (Median = 3.00, M = 2.10, SD = 1.58, N = 360). Measurement was on a 9-point-IELTS-scale. Higher scores indicate higher proficiency level.

As the bar charts show, the overwhelming majority scored between 1 and 4. None of the participants were at the 9 proficiency level at writing and only a few were at such level at reading. Overall, regardless of the high academic level of the respondents, the IELTS scores revealed a very poor English level among them with a mean score ranging between 1.90 and 3.08.

3.3.3 Questionnaire Trial

To ensure the appropriateness and the clarity of the questionnaire items, the survey was piloted on a dozen students who volunteered their participation. These students were native Arabic speakers learning English and were at a similar level of English proficiency as the target population. As a result of the pilot administration, the content and the format of the questions were re-evaluated. The appropriateness and difficulty of the proficiency test was evaluated as well as the length of time needed to complete it. Some preliminary analyses were performed on the pilot data in order to calibrate the coding of categories and test whether meaningful relationships emerge.
3.3.4 Validity and Reliability of the Questionnaire

Creswell (2008) summarizes the criteria for validity of the data collected as having basically three forms: content validity, criterion validity, and construct validity. Content validity is assessed through examining whether the questionnaire items used in the study are suitable for answering the research questions or not. In this respect, three supervisors and the Confirmation and Ethics committees at the University of Newcastle reviewed and approved the questionnaire as having adequate content validity. Criterion validity is established by comparing the instrument in use to other instruments whose validity have already been established in the research tradition (Creswell, 2008). As previously mentioned, the self-guides and intended learning efforts scales used in the present study were adapted from Taguchi et al.’s (2009) comparative study on the L2 Motivational Self System in Japan, China and Iran. Components of the L2 learning experience scale were adapted from Gardner’s (2004) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery which is one of the most widely used scales in the field of motivational SLA. As for construct validity, which is interpreted as the extent to which the data is meaningful and purposeful (Creswell, 2008), it appears that the data collected in the current study is interpretable and meaningful enough to establish relationships between the tripartite theoretical construct and the L2 proficiency levels among the study population. The other central issue in research design is to ensure reliability, which is often judged on the basis of the size of a reliability coefficient (Gregory, 2000, p.95). Reliability coefficients and descriptive statistics for the initial indices were assessed in some preliminary analyses as reported in section 3.4.

3.3.5 Recruiting Procedure and Survey (Administration)

In setting an initial target sample size for this study, close attention was given to the advice from Dörnyei (2003, p. 74):

Because in L2 studies meaningful correlations reported in journal articles have often been as low as 0.30 and 0.40, a good rule of thumb is that we need around 50 participants to make sure that these coefficients are significant and we do not lose potentially important results. However, certain multivariate statistical
procedures require more than 50 participants; for factor analysis, for example, we need a minimum of 100 but preferably more subjects.

Accordingly, the target number of participants for this study was set at a minimum of 100 male English major students at King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia. Prior to the commencement of the data collection process, an application for expedited review of the study was submitted to the Human Research and Ethics Committee (HREC) at the University of Newcastle. An HREC approval No. H-2011-0076 was granted in the spring of 2011. In the spring of 2011 and prior to recruiting participants for the main study, a formal invitation was extended to the Head of the European Languages Department at the Faculty of Arts and Humanities of King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia, asking him to grant the researcher permission to administer the study on students studying English at the European Languages Department. As the questionnaire was administered during class time, special attention was paid to choosing a suitable administration time of the survey so that no disruptions could occur in any test preparations or any other major tasks taking place during that class. Permissions to administer the survey during class time and arrangements of the most suitable time of the questionnaire administration were discussed with the respective teachers. Seven classes were randomly selected for the administration of the questionnaire survey.

On the day of recruitment, the classes were approached and the researcher briefly provided the potential participants with information on the study as well as instructions on how to complete the questionnaire. Then, the researcher extended an invitation to the participants to fill out the questionnaire explaining that participating in this study would give the participants the chance to enter into a draw for an iPhone 4. At the same time, the participants were reminded that their participation in this study was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time without having to give a reason. They were reminded that all their responses would be treated confidentially and would not be disclosed to any persons other than those in the research team under any circumstances. The researcher then handed out the questionnaires to the participants who agreed to take part in the study. After the completion of the questionnaire, the researcher extended an invitation to the participants to take part in the second stage of the study which is the interview. The researcher collected the names of the participants willing to attend the interviews, along with their contact information.
A total of 106 questionnaires were completed. Despite the overall better than expected response rate, the quality of the collected data was below expectations since a large proportion of the respondents did not complete the reading and writing tasks fully (nine did not complete the reading task and 30 did not complete the writing task). In order to compensate for the missing data from respondents at KAU, it was deemed appropriate to recruit additional participants from English majors at another Saudi University, namely Taif University, after HREC at the University of Newcastle approved the recruitment of additional participants at a second research site. Again, formal permission was granted by the Head of the English Department of Taif University and all the arrangements with the respective teachers were made to visit their classes and administer the questionnaires. To ensure having a large enough sample, it was also suggested by the Head of the English Department to collect data from the female section. When this opportunity of including female participants alongside their male counterparts arose for us, we believed it would be enlightening to have a motivational L2 study in Saudi Arabia whose study sample includes both males and females, which is very rare in the Saudi context. Thus, four male classes and five female classes were randomly selected then approached for the administration of the questionnaires following the same procedures that were used previously at King Abdulaziz University. A total of 254 questionnaires were completed at the second research site, which brought the total number of participants in the study to 360.

3.3.6 The Interview

Since this study sought to gain some understanding of the sources and development of self-guides within learners, it was foreseen that more in-depth exploration would be desirable, to add to the insights from the quantitative survey. Interviews have been used in many high quality SLA studies as an instrument to collect rich and exploratory data which integrated more interpretive data analysis strategies in the field. According to Cohen et al. (2001, p. 309) the interview can serve many purposes:

First, it may be used as the principal means of gathering information that bears directly on the research objectives; . . . [it] makes it possible to measure what a person dislikes (values and preferences) and what a person thinks (attitudes and beliefs). Second, it may be used to test hypotheses or to suggest new ones; or as
an explanatory device to help identify variables and relationships. Third, it may be used in conjunction with other methods in a research undertaking.

Gillham (2000) strongly urges survey researchers to use semi-structured interviews along with questionnaires in order to better understand what the numerical responses elicited using the questionnaire really mean. Dörnyei (2011, pp. 44-46) argues that the combination of different research methods leads to a better understanding of the phenomenon in question, as adding qualitative methods tends to harvest rich data that serves not only to “put flesh on the bones”, but also helps in achieving a multi-level analysis of complex issues that incorporates analysis on both individual and social levels. In addition, Brewer and Hunter (1989, p. II) state that different ways of collecting data can offer potential explanations for each other’s problems, and as Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 310) point out, “quantitative and qualitative inquiry can support and inform each other [and that] narratives and variable-driven analyses need to interpenetrate and inform each other.” Lyons (2009) also demonstrated that the qualitative data collected using semi-structured interviews helped in interpreting the lack of correlation between the learners’ motivation and their L2 achievement, that was reported in the quantitative part of his data analysis.

As triangulation of the data obtained is needed to establish more validity and reliability to the research findings and improve the overall quality of the research outcomes, this research used a two-phase design that incorporated both quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments. Twenty one participants (5.83%) of the total sample self-selected to take part in semi-structured interviews. All these participants were males, as it would have been very difficult and culturally inappropriate for the researcher to conduct individual interviews with female participants in Saudi Arabia. Each participant was interviewed individually for 30 minutes and was asked questions relating to the different components of the L2 Motivational L2 System (see appendix F). These questions were designed to elicit the general attitudes of the learners toward their L2 learning, their reasons for learning the L2, and whether or not they imagine themselves in future situations where they use English for communication and other purposes. The interviews aimed not only at enhancing the reliability of the quantitatively collected data, but also at providing valuable insights and a more detailed explanation of the sources of the self-guides prevalent within the target population.
Because of the desirability of being able to make connections between comparable or partly comparable studies, the interview questions developed for this study were based on Ryan’s (2008) Japanese study interview questions. Ryan’s (2008) investigation of the concept of the ideal self was conducted in a manner consistent with Dörnyei et al.’s (2006) Hungarian studies in order to replicate this in the Japanese context; thus, it utilized all categories of questions from the Hungarian study. However, the focus of the present study was not on comparing Gardner’s integration and Dörnyei’s ideal self, as both of the aforementioned studies did. As a result, only the questions related to the L2 Motivational Self System theory were maintained in the current study. These included questions relating to: the learners’ language learning experience, their goals and orientations, their obligations and need to learn English, and their ideal selves.

Additional questions were introduced, in response to Dörnyei’s (2009) specification of several conditions for the self-guides to lead to optimum L2 learning. Among these conditions he mentioned that the learners should have plausible, elaborate and vivid images of their future selves, which are frequently primed and supported with a set of self-regulatory strategies needed to translate the hopes into attainable future selves. He also asserted that these images should regularly be counterbalanced with the fears of negative notions associated with a possible failure to attain these desired selves in the future. As a result, more questions addressing the concept of the ideal self and its formation in the minds of the learners were added in the interview part of this study. These questions aimed to provide answers about the source of the imagined situations in the minds of the learners, the frequency of their occurrences; their plausibility; and the existence, or lack thereof, of accompanying action plans that would enable these learners to achieve these desired selves in the future. Some of the additional questions were designed to address the issue of fear of future failure and its implications for the learners’ futures and plans, while others targeted the effect that the learners’ religious culture might have on their motivation to learn English.

Moreover, the language learning experience section in Ryan’s (2008) interview guide included broad questions addressing the learners’ enjoyment level of the learning experience in general. The interview in the current study included a few more explicit questions tapping into the issues of the learners’ evaluation of the teachers, text books, peer group, and the learning institutions in a more specific manner that was hoped to
capture of the participants’ attitude towards the separate components that make up their L2 learning experience.

Before commencing each interview, the researcher explained the study briefly and reminded the participants that their participation was voluntary and that their anonymity would be ensured throughout the research project. The researcher also explained the procedure and informed the interviewees that their answers would be written down and recorded using a digital voice recorder during the interview. He informed the participants that they may be quoted anonymously in reports of the research and asked them to sign the consent forms before actually commencing the interview. All of the interviews were conducted in English. Only in a few cases, some participants were more comfortable in expressing their ideas in Arabic, so the researcher allowed for code switching. After that, the researcher translated the Arabic responses into English. The interviews were, then, transcribed and the main themes discussed by the participants were identified and categorized for further analysis. The processes of conducting and analysing the interviews are discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

3.4 Screening the Questionnaire Data

The responses from the 360 questionnaires were coded and entered into an SPSS (v.19) file. Then, the data entered was screened to check for accuracy. After that, the values of negatively worded items were reversed and all variables were checked for normality of distribution. Skewness and its Standard Error (SE) and kurtosis and its Standard Error were used as indicators of normality of distribution – whenever the ratio of Skewness to its SE and of kurtosis to its SE exceeded 3.27 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p80), a variable was considered to be non-normally distributed. Square root and logarithmic transformations were used to bring non-normally distributed variables to normality (see Tabachnick & Fidell for explanation of procedures).

As previously mentioned, Part A of the questionnaire sought to elicit information on the ideal L2 self (10 items), ought-to L2 self (15 items), L2 learning experience (15 items), and intended learning efforts (8 items). As a next step in the preliminary analysis, the reliability alpha coefficient test was conducted to measure the internal consistency of each cluster of variables that was assumed to represent a separate scale in the survey.
Alpha coefficients of .60 and above were considered adequate based on Dörnyei’s (2001, p. 204) guidelines:

Internal consistency estimates for well-developed attitude scales containing as few as ten items ought to approach 0.80. L2 motivation researchers typically want to measure many different motivational areas in one questionnaire, and for that reason they cannot use very long scales (or the completion of the questionnaire would take several hours), which necessarily depresses the alpha coefficient. However, even with short scales of three or four items we should aim at reliability coefficients in excess of 0.70, and if the Cronbach alpha of a scale does not reach 0.60, this should sound warning bells.

If the items were found to form a reliable scale, an index for the construct was computed as the average of scores. The indices were examined for normality of distribution and, if found non-normally distributed, were subjected to square root or logarithmic transformations. The descriptive statistics and the reliability coefficients for the initial indices as they emerged from these screening analyses are summarized in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Skew (SESkew)</th>
<th>Kurt (SEKurt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Self</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.93 (.55)</td>
<td>.40 (.13)</td>
<td>-.02 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ought-to Self</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2.13 (.47)</td>
<td>.36 (.13)</td>
<td>.10 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2LE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2.70 (.47)</td>
<td>-.35 (.13)</td>
<td>.36 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILE*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.99 (.54)</td>
<td>.23 (.13)</td>
<td>-.08 (.26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *= transformed variables (square root transformation). L2LE= L2 Learning Experience; ILE= Intended Learning Efforts. Measurement on a scale 1 to 5 and lower values indicate more of a given variable.

Based on the results from the initial analyses displayed in Table 3.6, the initial scales in this study have adequate internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of above .60, which Dörnyei describes as a reasonable reliability level, and the majority of item-total correlations of above .30. This indicates that all the items within each of the
four scales in Table 3.6 measure the same construct, which is in line with the findings of previously conducted L2 Motivational Self System studies (see Ryan, 2008; Taguchi et al., 2009). These initial groupings of items were subjected to further analyses in order to answer the first research question about the nature of the self-guides that motivate Saudi students to learn English, and the third question which is concerned with assessing the relationship between the L2 Motivational Self System and the attainment level of English among Saudis. These analyses are presented in the following chapter (Chapter 4). The analysis of the qualitative part of the data is presented in Chapter 5.
Chapter 4

Analysis and Results of the Quantitative Data

4.1 Introduction

The results from the quantitative analyses are presented in this chapter; the results from the qualitative analyses are presented in the next (Chapter 5). A key question for empirical investigation in this study was to determine whether the ideal and ought-to selves differ or are simply two representations of one broad future self. As noted in previous chapters, the nature of the two self-guides within the L2 Motivational Self System has not been researched enough to answer this question. In order to address this issue, the ideal and ought-to self-guides scales were subjected to exploratory factor analysis. This in turn inspired an exploration into the two remaining constructs in the theory, i.e., L2 learning experience, and intended learning efforts, in order to uncover the underlying dimensions within them, as well. After that, the reliability of the new underlying dimensions within each of the theory’s constructs was assessed. When items’ loading on each factor was found to form a reliable scale, an index for each of the newly emerging sub-constructs was computed as the average of scores. Then, the newly computed indices were examined for normality of distribution, applying square root or logarithmic transformations when necessary. After that, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed in order to determine whether respondents differed on these variables as a function of their age, region of origin and family background. As a second major step in the quantitative analysis phase, correlation and regression analyses were performed on the new dimensions within the self, the L2 learning experience, intended learning efforts and the IELTS scores in order to examine the direction and the strength of the relationship between these variables.
4.2 Underlying Dimensions of the Motivational Constructs

4.2.1 The Self

4.2.1.1 Dimensions of the Self-Guides

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS v.19.0) was used to analyze the quantitative part of the data. First, the values of the negatively worded items were reversed and all missing values were replaced with the mean. Then, all items were checked for normality, and the items that were not normally distributed (most of which had positive skewness and kurtosis levels) were transformed using either the square root transformation techniques for items that had moderate non-normal skewness or logarithmic transformations for the items with substantial non-normal skewness (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 89).

Although the reliability alpha coefficient test was conducted to measure the internal consistency of each cluster of variables that was assumed to represent a separate scale in the survey, and ideal and ought-to self indices were computed as discussed in the previous chapter, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the 25 items comprising the ideal and ought-to self-guides scales in the questionnaire in order to identify the underlying dimensions within these scales. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009, p. 251) assert that:

The first broad issue [that needs further investigation] concerns the uniqueness of the self-guides. The key question in this respect is whether learners have several different desired possible self images of themselves (as Markus and Nurius, 1986, assume) or only one broad ideal self with various facets (as Higgins, 1987, proposes).

Thus, it was deemed appropriate to investigate the nature of the self concept within this relatively new construct, in order to answer Dörnyei’s question about whether the two selves differ or are simply two representations of one broad future self.

Most of the previous research within Dörnyei’s theory focused on validating the relationship between the criterion measure used in these studies – the intended learning efforts – and the concept of the self and most specifically the ideal self as the most dominant factor in motivational SLA, replacing the previously dominant concept in
SLA motivational research, identified by Gardner as integrative motivation (see Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Dörnyei, 2005; Ryan, 2009; Taguchi et al., 2009). The only study that tried to tap into the issue of the nature of the self was conducted by Macintyre et al. (2009b). Their main focus, however, was deciding whether the self characteristics described by the learners were part of a present self or a future self. For the purposes of their study the questionnaire used included items describing the self at present and in the future. The extraction of the Principal Component Analysis using the eigenvalue-greater-than-one rule showed several factors within the present L2 self (seven factors) and the future self (four factors). However, after the scree plots analyses, they found a clear break after the first factor, so they “determined a preference for a one-factor solution” (p. 199).

Similarly, to determine the underlying dimensions within the self scale in the current study, a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was conducted. In line with the results of Macintyre et al.’s (2009b) study, when all the eigenvalues greater than one were examined, it appeared that the self scale had seven dimensions within it. However, Dörnyei’s L2 motivational self system theory suggests that the learners’ self-guides comprise of only two selves; namely ideal and ought-to selves (Dörnyei, 2009). In addition, when we examined the scree plot, there was a clear break after the second factor, which suggested that there were two dimensions under the self scale (see Figure 4.1). Thus, given the debatable reliability levels of the eigenvalue rule (Cliff, 1988), and in line with Dörnyei’s (2006, 2009) theory, the two-factor solution was selected.

**Figure 4.1** Scree plot of all the self scales on the L2 among Saudi learners of English questionnaire.
### Table 4.1

*Factor loadings for the self scale when two factors were extracted with an Oblimin rotation and Kaiser normalization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagining living abroad in the future</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>-.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining being able to use English like native speakers</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>-.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining studying at a University using only English language</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining using English in a future career</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining living abroad and communicating in English effectively</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining being able to write emails in English</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things to do in the future depending on learning English</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to imagine having English speaking friends</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future dreams depending on learning English</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English to be able to spread Islam</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to speak English like an important role model</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English because of being expected to by others</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English to gain more respect</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying English to avoid bad marks</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying English to not be considered a weak student</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English to avoid ending up with a low-paying job</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English because being expected by society</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English to get a good job</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English because important people think it is important</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English to be able to use computers effectively</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English because of being expected to as a Muslim</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two different components emerged from the extraction. The first component explained 23.33% of the variance, and the second component explained 8.38% of the variance. The two factors correlate at .29. These two components are very compatible with what Dörnyei (2009) describes as the ideal L2 self and the ought-to self respectively. The first self is the ideal self, which is described as the type of self associated with the hopes and dreams of the learner, and which usually has a promotion function of positive connotations associated with successful L2 learning. On the other hand, the ought-to L2 self relates to either the social obligations placed on the learners from the outside, or the
general fear of the undesirable connotations associated with future failure in L2 learning which lends a prohibition function to it. Note that from this point onward the ideal L2 self and the ought-to L2 self are referred to as ideal self and ought-to self, respectively.

Table 4.1 shows the criteria for the ideal self (Component 1), as being future images of the self, aspirations, and positive connotations linked to future success in L2 learning and arising from within the individual, precisely apply to all the items in the first category except for one item. It was expected that the ‘Learning English to be able to spread Islam’ item would load higher on the second category, which represents the ought-to self since it reflects a type of obligation placed on the learner from the outside, i.e., the overall religious upbringing of the society and culture of Saudi Arabia.

However, the item had a higher loading on the ideal self. This can potentially be explained through the concept of internalization. Internalization was identified as an integral part of Deci and Ryan’s (1985, 2002) Self-Determination theory and was recognized as an important concept within Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System (2009). Internalization refers to the change of humans’ motivation along the motivation continuum from extrinsic to intrinsic, which can gradually transform the socially accepted norms and practices into personally accepted self-regulations and values. It appears that the high degree of internalization of this outside motivator changed this type of motivation, which usually belongs to the ought-to self, into a part of the Saudi learners’ identity more pertinent to their ideal selves.

The reliability of the new scales was assessed. Since the items loading on each factor were found to form reliable scales ($\alpha = .80, M= 1.90, SD= .50$ for ideal self, and $\alpha = .67, M= 2.08, SD= .61$ for ought-to self), an index for each construct was computed as the average of scores. The two indices were examined for normality of distribution, and they were both found to be normally distributed. The items ‘Learning English because important people think it is important’ and ‘Learning English to be able to use computers effectively’ were eliminated because they had a loading > 0.3 on both factors. Similarly, the item ‘Learning English because of being expected to as a Muslim’ was also eliminated because it had a loading < 0.3 on both factors. The descriptive statistics and the reliability coefficients for the ideal and ought-to self indices as they emerged from these screening analyses are summarized in Table 4.5. Additionally, a zero order correlation conducted between the two indices – the ideal self
and the ought-to self – revealed that although there was significant correlation between the two variables ($r = .38$), the correlation was $< 0.6$. Dörnyei (2007a, p. 223) indicates that correlations of 0.3 to 0.5 are regarded as meaningful, but when the correlation value between two variables is 0.6 and above, they usually measure the same thing. This also validates the initial assumption of the L2 Motivational Self System theory that the ideal self and the ought-to self are actually two separate selves and not simply two facets of one broad self.

Furthermore, in order to check the general ideal and ought-to self tendencies among the respondents, a basic frequency check was used. This frequency check revealed that the number of the participants who scored moderately on both the ideal and ought-to self scales was larger than those who ranked either high or low on both scales. Almost half the participants, 47%, had moderate ideal self tendencies while 26% had high and 27% had low ideal self scores. Similarly, 43% had moderate ought-to self tendencies while 26% scored generally high and 31% scored generally low on the ought-to self scale.

After that, another PCA was conducted on the male and female participants separately to check whether the two genders have two similar self-guides or other different dimensions within their self concept. The results showed that the two self-guides in both males and females were reflected using the same statements. Nonetheless, two of the ought-to self items loaded on the ideal self component among the female population. For the female participants, the ideal self factor received loadings from the items ‘learning English because being expected to by society’ (.314) and ‘learning English to get a good job’ (.358). These items loaded on the ought-to self at .228 and .260, respectively. However, the two items did not score significantly $> or < 0.3$ on either factor. Moreover, the rest of the statements had similar loadings on the two self-guides in both males and females to those represented in Table 4.1. Hence, the same items were used in the computation of the ideal and ought-to indices for both genders.

The difference in the construction of the ideal self between male and female participants is nevertheless worth a comment. The interpretation of the distinction between the ideal and the ought-to self motivators is a function of the extent of internalisation of these extrinsic motives by the L2 learners (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005a, Dörnyei et al., 2006). Having a statement like ‘learning English to get a good job’ as a part of the female participants’ ideal selves reflects how the nature of the Saudi society, and more
specifically how the Saudi workforce being mainly dominated by males, may be placing a heavier burden on the Saudi females to work harder to claim their rightful place in the workforce. This could be associated with pressures on Saudi females to gain more qualifications and acquire more skills, including language skills, to prove both their competencies and capabilities to take over their male counterparts in the Saudi job market. These gender related job hunting pressures could have resulted in higher levels of internalization of these extrinsic motivators by females to the point that made them more relevant to their identities, i.e., their ideal selves.

Yet, it is very interesting to find that females in Saudi Arabia would consider the expectations of the society and the importance of L2 proficiency as a part of their ideal self when it is not a part of their male counterparts’. Nevertheless, after a closer look at other cultural and social practices adopted by the Saudis, the high level of internalization of such outside motivators can be elucidated. As a collectivist society career related achievements are highly regarded by both the male and female participants’ friends, family and the society by large. Nonetheless, it may be a more specific societal role expectation for Saudi females (at least for those in tertiary education) to become highly qualified and to have good jobs, which in turn ultimately increases their chances of getting a good husband and leading a better life.

It is obvious that Saudi Arabia, being the heart-land of Islam, is highly influenced by Islamic traditions, which people continue to enact in their everyday lives (Farsy, 1986). According to a prophetic narration, the only two important criteria that should be looked for in man to be accepted in marriage are piety and good manners (Tirmidhy, nd). However, in another narration, Prophet Muhammad stated that “A woman is married for four things, and he mentioned her wealth, her family status, her beauty and her piety” (Bukhari, 870). This tradition is still very highly salient for contemporary Saudi women, influencing females more than males to internalize the importance of having a good career which is supposedly going to grant them a higher socio-economic status, and ultimately a good marriage and a better future. There were indications of a somewhat similar phenomenon in the Iranian context, as discussed by Taguchi, Magid and Papi (2009). They reported that in Iran, a strongly theocratic country with long-standing traditions of arranged marriage, parents usually deliberate over the socio-economic
status and educational level of the potential spouse before making a decision on their eligibility for marriage.

4.2.1.2 Differences among Respondents on the Self-Guides

The demographic data collected in section two of the questionnaire survey was used to compare the effects of four factors on each of the two self-guides. The four factors that were expected to have an effect on the different constructs in this study were campus, gender, age and the levels of education and English of the respondents’ parents. The effect of these factors was first assessed on the ideal self scale. As the data was collected from three different campuses, one-way ANOVA was used to assess the differences on the ideal self scale based on campus differences. The results showed no significance difference based on that factor. To compare between the respondents based on gender and age, the independent-samples T-test was run. Unlike previous studies which reported a positive effect of gender on the learners’ future selves (see Henry, 2009; Ryan, 2008), the results of the T-test in this study were in line with other studies, e.g., Henry and Cliffordson (2013), that showed no significant difference between the respondents’ ideal selves based on gender. However, there was a significant effect of age on the ideal self, $t(339)= 3.109, p=.002$ with participants belonging to the younger age group, i.e., typical university age group, displaying stronger ideal self ($M= 1.837, SD= .491$) than those belonging to the older age group ($M= 2.004, SD= .490$). Note that the measurement in the questionnaire was on a scale 1 to 5 and lower values indicate more of a given variable. After that, correlations between the ideal self and the levels of education and English of the parents were run to uncover correlations between these variables. The only significant, although weak, correlation appeared between the ideal self and the level of the fathers’ English ($r= .109, n= 353, p< .041$). After that, the effect of the factors: campus, gender and age groups was also assessed on the ought-to self. None of the three factors appeared to have an effect on the ought-to self, either. However, when correlations between the ought-to self and the parents’ levels of education and English were run, there appeared to be one positive correlation. This correlation this time was between the ought-to self and the level of English of the mother ($r= .108, n= 353, p< .042$).
Previous research reported that parental level of education can impact the learners’ self-regulated learning as well as their classroom learning (Schlechter & Milevsky, 2010). Oyserman, Johnson and James (2011, pp. 487-488) also reported that “as parental education and occupational status increase, parents may be more able to model specific strategies—for example continued effort and getting along with teachers and others at school, which can support students’ academic efforts.” In the current study, the correlation between the participants’ ought-to selves and the parents’ level of English was anticipated, as it was expected that the more proficient in English the parents are, the more parental encouragement the learners would receive both directly and indirectly. Parents with good English were expected to not only be good role models who would inspire their sons and daughters to learn English, but would also value the importance of learning English and perhaps try encouraging their sons and daughters to learn it, as well. This finding is in consistence with Csizér and Kormos’ (2009) Hungarian studies in which they reported that parental encouragement positively influenced the learners’ ought-to selves. This finding is also in line with both Higgins’ (1987) and Dörnyei’s (2009) definition of the ought-to self as being determined and affected by environmental influences and significant others, who are primarily the participants’ parents in the Saudi context.

The importance of family and the parents’ influence on their children’s decisions is very high in the Saudi context mainly because of the religious background of the country. Saudi Arabia is officially a religious country; and Islam specifically highlights the importance of obeying one’s parents, being dutiful to them and fulfilling their wishes. Quran stipulates that one should be dutiful, humble and merciful towards their parents and never raise their voice at them, and to obey them in everything they command unless they ask their sons and daughters to do something that goes against the other teachings of Islam (Quran 17:23-24; Quran 31:13-15). Not only that, but it was also reported that a man came to Prophet Muhammad to ask for his permission to participate in Jihad (struggle against the non-believers), whereupon the Prophet asked the man if his parents were still alive, and upon the man’s confirmation, the Prophet told the man “then, your Jihad would be with them”, i.e., in looking after them and being at their service (Bukhari, 870). In the Saudi culture, a lot of people actively incorporate these well-known religious texts and teachings into their personal lives. Hence, in this cultural
context, the parental influence is undoubtedly a significant factor in the formation of both the participants’ ideal and ought-to selves.

The statistically significant correlation between the fathers’ level of English, not the mothers’, and the participants’ ideal selves is, nonetheless, worth a note. Dörnyei (2009, p. 33) proposed that the source of the imagined selves of the L2 learners can be either related to the ideal-self, stemming from role models that the L2 learners admire dearly and desire to be like in the future, or the ought-to self, associated with the L2 learners’ need to conform with how other people expect or hope for these learners to be like in the future. Oyserman and James (2011, p. 128) affirm that “possible identities are influenced by salient stereotypes”. In a distinctly patriarchal society, such as Saudi Arabia, male parents are typically more highly regarded and treated as role models. In fact, a large proportion of the participants in this study reported that both their fathers’ level of education and English was higher than their mothers’ (as discussed in chapter 3). This has probably made a stronger connection between the learners’ future selves and their fathers’ levels of English rather than their mothers’. In addition, the fathers’ higher levels of education and English must have created better career prospects for them than did the mothers’. This may have indirectly compelled most of the participants to construct role models, i.e., ideal selves, in their minds more pertinent to their fathers rather than their mothers at least on a career related level.

On the other hand, the statistically significant correlation between the mothers’ level of English and the participants’ ought-to selves may be associated with mothers’ role in instructing their children about conforming with external, societal expectations. Females in other studies were found to rank the likelihood of their feared, i.e., ought-to related, selves becoming realities significantly higher than their male-counterparts (Knox, Frank, Elliot & Bush, 2000; Anthis, Dunkel & Anderson, 2004, as cited in Oyserman & James, 2011). Thus, the effect of the mothers’ level of English on their children’s L2 learning tendencies and decisions might, either consciously or unconsciously, be guided by their ought-to orientation towards L2 learning.

Another noteworthy point is connected with the first research question – whether there are actually two selves, i.e., ideal and ought-to selves, or just one broad self with different facets within the L2 Motivational Self System. The fact that each guide
correlated with a different demographic variable further supports the idea that the self is not a monolithic construct, but rather of a dual nature.

### 4.2.2 Dimensions in the L2 Learning Experience Scale

Additional PCAs were conducted on the third component of Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System ‘L2 learning Experience’ to check for the underlying dimensions within this construct. The initial PCA extraction of the L2 learning experience (L2LE) scale based on eigenvalues greater than one and the examination of the scree plot suggested at least 4 dimensions within this component (see Figure 4.2).
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**Figure 4.2** Factor loadings for the L2 learning experience scale when two factors were extracted with an Oblimin rotation and Kaiser normalization

Dörnyei (2009) conceptualizes this component in his theory as a situated type of motivation that relates to the learners’ attitudes toward all the factors that could have a bearing on the L2 learning experience including the classroom, the teacher, the peer group, the curriculum and so on. However, creating four or more separate indices within this component was not the best option as there were only 15 items in the L2 learning experience scale. Dörnyei (2002, p. 34) emphasizes that it is customary to have between 4 and 10 items in each scale since having less than 4 items would jeopardize the psychometric reliability of the scale. When PCAs were run again extracting 2 factors with Oblimin rotation Kaiser normalization, it appeared that all the items describing the positive factors in the L2 learning experience would cluster on one side, and all the negative ones would cluster on the other. Again, items that had a loading > or < 0.3 on both factors were eliminated, and only items that had a loading of > 0.3 on one
component were selected as representing items of the component. The loading matrices are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

*Factor loadings for the L2 learning experience scale when two factors were extracted with Oblimin rotation Kaiser normalization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation of the atmosphere in the L2 classroom</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation of L2 teachers in comparison with other teachers</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying learning English</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferring to spend more time in L2 classes compared to other classes</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying the L2 class’ activities more than other classes’ activities</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation of the teaching styles of the L2 teachers</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation of the books’ usefulness</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation of the classmates’ friendliness</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation of the books’ level of interest</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of desire to learn L2</td>
<td>-.326</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of interest in the L2 classroom</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear of being laughed at for having a poor command of English</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation of the L2 teachers’ ways of teaching</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation of the L2 books’ level of interest</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety about the L2 proficiency level in comparison with other students</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There appeared to be two underlying dimensions within this scale. The first component explained 19.80% of the variance, and the second explained 14.24 of the variance. The two components correlate at .09. The first component was related to the positive aspects of the L2 Learning Experience and was referred to as Positive L2 Learning Experience (Positive L2LE), and the second one related to the demotivating considerations and aspects within the L2 Learning Experience, and was referred to as Negative L2 Learning Experience (Negative L2LE). Two items – ‘negative evaluation of the books’ level of interest’ and ‘loss of desire to learn L2’, were eliminated because they had a loading > 0.3 on both factors.
Similar to the procedures performed on the two scales within the self construct, the reliability of the new scales was assessed. Since the items were found to form reliable scales ($\alpha = .69$ for Positive L2LE, $\alpha = .59$ for Negative L2LE), an index for each of the two constructs was computed as the average of scores. The two indices were examined for normality of distribution, and the indices were found to be normally distributed. The descriptive statistics and the reliability coefficients for the initial indices as they emerged from these screening analyses are summarized in Table 4.4.

The effects of campus, gender, age group and the levels of education and English of the respondents’ parents were assessed on the L2 learning experience scale. The results showed there was a significant effect of campus on the L2 Learning Experience, $F(2.357) = 6.971, p = .001$. Tukey’s post hoc test revealed that the King Abdulaziz University Males’ Campus (KAUMC) scored higher ($M = 2.573, SD = .474$) than Taif University Males’ Campus (TUMC) ($M = 2.757, SD = .421$) and Taif University Females’ Campus (TUFC) ($M = 2.758, SD = .468$). Note that lower scores mean higher values. KAUMC is located in a different city from the two other campuses and also has a different administration and policies from the two other campuses which are two branches of one University. This might explain the difference in this category between KAUMC on one side and TUMC and TUFC on the other. There was also a significant effect of gender on the L2 Learning Experience, $t(358) = -2.414, p = .016$ with males ($M = 2.636, SD = .465$) showing more positive attitudes than females ($M = 2.759, SD = .469$) towards their L2 Learning Experience. These findings are against previous research which argued that females tend to show a higher motivation for L2 learning, have more motivational intensity, attribute more importance to learning English, and demonstrate a great overall commitment to learning it than their male-counterparts (Clark & Trafford, 1995; Dörnyei and Csizér, 2002; Dörnyei et al., 2006; Powell & Batters, 1985, as cited in Henry, 2009). Henry (2009, p. 178) pointed out, however, that such gender-related trends are typically established in European contexts where English is regarded as a first or a second formal language, which might explain the varying result in the Saudi context.

The age group also had a significant effect on the L2 learning Experience, $t(339) = -1.878, p = .016$ with the older group scoring lower ($M = 2.737, SD = .442$) than the
younger group ($M=2.640, SD=.495$). However, there were no correlations between the L2 learning experience and the levels of education or English of either of the parents.

The effect of the demographic factors was also examined on each of the two dimensions within the L2 learning experience. First, the effect of these factors was assessed on the Positive L2 Learning Experience. There was a significant effect of campus on the Positive L2LE, $F(2.357)= 5.708, p=.004$. Tukey’s post hoc test revealed that the King Abdulaziz University Male Campus scored significantly higher ($M= 2.096, SD=.522$) than Taif University Male Campus ($M= 2.313, SD=.667$) and Taif University Female Campus ($M= 2.300, SD=.587$). There was also a significant effect of gender on the Positive L2LE, $t(358)= -2.059, p=.040$ with males ($M= 2.170, SD=.583$) scoring higher than females ($M= 2.301, SD=.588$) on this construct, which means that males are more positively affected by the positive L2 learning experience than females. Age did not have any effect on the Positive L2LE, nor were there correlations between the Positive L2LE and the levels of education or English of the parents.

After that, the effect of the demographic factors was examined on the Negative L2 Learning Experience. There was a significant effect of campus on the Negative L2LE, $F(2.357)= 3.331, p=.037$. Tukey’s post hoc test revealed that KAUMC scored significantly higher ($M= 3.187, SD=.784$) than TUMC ($M= 3.298, SD=.661$) and TUFC ($M= 3.411, SD=.700$). Similar to the Positive L2LE, there was a significant effect of gender differences on the Negative L2LE, $t(358)= -2.348, p=.019$ with male respondents ($M= 3.225, SD=.746$) scoring higher than female respondents ($M= 3.412, SD=.700$), which means that the male respondents are less affected by the negative L2 learning experience than their female counterparts. Turning to the effect of age, there was no effect of age group on the Negative L2LE, nor were there correlations between the Negative L2LE and the levels of education or levels of English of the parents.

### 4.2.3 Dimensions in the Intended Learning Effort Scale

The same extraction techniques were used to explore the underlying dimensions within the intended learning efforts’ (ILE) scale. As this scale only contained 8 items, and based on the eigenvalues-greater-than-one rule, it was suggested that the intended learning efforts’ scale had two dimensions; the two components correlated at .38. The
first of these dimensions explained 36.30% of the variance, and was referred to as Intended Learning Behaviour (ILB). It describes the learners’ actual motivated behaviour towards L2 learning, e.g., doing extracurricular activities that could help improve the L2 proficiency level of the learner. The second dimension explained 13.81% of the variance, and was referred to as Perceived Learning Efforts (PLE) which was a combination of the L2 learners self beliefs in their own capabilities and how they evaluate their own learning efforts in relation to successful L2 learning. One item ‘The importance of learning the L2 to learner’ was eliminated because it had a loading of > 0.3 on both factors. The loading matrices on these subscales are shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor loadings for the intended learning efforts scale when two factors were extracted with Varimax rotation Kaiser normalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking optional L2 classes in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending a lot of time learning the L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying the L2 even if not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to radio stations and watching T.V in the L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of learning the L2 to learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluation of how hard the learner is working at his L2 learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluation of the learner doing the best they can to learn the L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluation of expending a lot of effort in L2 learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After uncovering the underlying dimensions within the intended learning efforts scale, the reliability of the new scales was assessed. When the items were found to form a reliable scale (α = .65 for ILB, α = .62 for PLE), an index for each construct was computed as the average of scores. The two indices were examined for normality of distribution and both indices were found to be normally distributed. The descriptive statistics and the reliability coefficients for the two indices are summarized in Table 4.4 in the next section.

Again, the effect of campus, gender, age group and the levels of education and English of the respondents’ parents were assessed on this scale. There were no differences between respondents on their intended learning efforts scale across the different
campaigns or between the respondents who belonged to different gender groups. Nonetheless, there was a significant effect of age on the intended learning efforts, \( t(339) = -2.510, p = 0.013 \) as participants from the older age group scored lower (\( M = 2.067, SD = .560 \)) than those from the younger age group (\( M = 1.918, SD = .522 \)). There were no correlations between the intended learning efforts and the levels of education of the parents. There was, however, a positive correlation between the intended learning efforts and the fathers’ level of English (\( r = .122, n = 353, p < 0.022 \)).

After that, the effect of these four factors was assessed on both underlying dimensions within this scale. First, the effect of these factors was assessed on the first uncovered dimension which was referred to as ILB. Similar to the results of the general scale of ILE, there was no difference between the respondents from different campuses or gender groups on the ILB subscale, but there was a significant effect of age on the ILB, \( t(339) = -2.191, p = 0.029 \) as the older group respondents scored lower on this construct (\( M = 2.106, SD = .653 \)) than the younger group did (\( M = 1.952, SD = .630 \)). Correlations between the ILB and the levels of education and English of the parents revealed there was no significant correlation between ILB and the levels of education of the parents or the level of English of the mother. There was, however, a positive correlation between ILB and the fathers’ level of English (\( r = .111, n = 353, p < 0.037 \)). The latter result was expected since the intended learning efforts correlated significantly with the learners’ self guides in several previous studies and similar correlations were anticipated in this study (see section 4.3). Thus, it was predicted that since there were strong correlations between the parental influence and the respondents’ self guides in this study, a significant indirect correlation would occur between parental influence and the intended learning efforts of the participants in this study, as well.

Also, the effects of the same factors were assessed on the second underlying dimension within the ILE which was referred to as perceived learning efforts (PLE). Although there was no difference between the respondents from different campuses or genders, there was a significant effect of age on the PLE, \( t(339) = -2.370, p = 0.018 \) with the older group scoring lower on this construct (\( M = 2.170, SD = .729 \)) than the younger group (\( M = 1.991, SD = .654 \)). There was no significant correlation between PLE and either the parents’ level of education, nor their level of English.
4.2.4 Summary of the Underlying Dimensions

Having collected the quantitative data using a questionnaire survey, the main objective of the preliminary analysis was to check for the underlying dimensions within each of the scales presented in the questionnaire, i.e., self, L2 learning experience, and intended learning efforts. When the data within these scales gathered in meaningful clusters, new indices were created. The measure used to assess the internal consistency between the scales’ items was Cronbach alpha while skewness and kurtosis were the indicators for the indices’ normality. Based on the initial results, items that showed inter-item consistency were grouped together within a single scale while others had to be regrouped. The remaining items that did not have loadings on any of the scales, or had meaningful loadings on different scales were removed. The results from the reliability analyses and PCA conducted on the main L2 Motivational Self System scales and all the subscales in this study are summarised in Table 4.4.

Dörnyei suggests that incorporating a large number of items in the questionnaire can add to both the instrument’s validity, through the inclusion of all of the L2 learning motives, as well as its reliability, within multi-item scales (Dörnyei, 2001c, p. 104). As Table 4.4 shows, the main scales in this study have adequate internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of 0.60 and above (except for the Demotivating L2LE scale) which Dörnyei describes as a reasonable reliability level. He asserts that although it is desirable to have a coefficient of 0.80 or above for a scale to have a good reliability level, it is difficult to reach such high levels of inter-item reliability without ending up with scales that are very long, which in turns results in writing very time-consuming-to-fill questionnaires. Rather, he advises that an alpha coefficient of 0.70 or even down to 0.60 is good enough for scales that have as few as three or four items (Dörnyei, 2001b, p. 204). It should also be noticed that the Demotivating L2LE is only one part of the L2LE, and that the overall L2LE scale has a reliability of $\alpha = 0.68$. This score is moderately low, but the nature of the motivation research has many complexities including the need to create a single scale that incorporates many variables which do not necessarily have a high internal consistency between them (i.e., evaluation of the teachers, the books, the peer group, etc.).
Table 4.4

Descriptive statistics and reliability coefficients of all variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Skew (SEskew)</th>
<th>Kurt (SEKurt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.90 (.50)</td>
<td>.09 (.13)</td>
<td>.34 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ought-to Self</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2.08 (.61)</td>
<td>.05 (.13)</td>
<td>.68 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2LE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.68 (.47)</td>
<td>.35 (.13)</td>
<td>.36 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2LE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.22 (.59)</td>
<td>.46 (.13)</td>
<td>.34 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL2LE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.30 (.73)</td>
<td>.24 (.13)</td>
<td>.02 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.99 (.54)</td>
<td>.22 (.13)</td>
<td>.23 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2.02 (.64)</td>
<td>.19 (.13)</td>
<td>.17 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>2.08 (.69)</td>
<td>.23 (.13)</td>
<td>.33 (.26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: L2LE= L2 Learning Experience; PL2LE= Positive L2 Learning Experience; Negative L2 Learning Experience; ILE= Intended Learning Efforts; ILB= Intended Learning Behaviour; PLE= Perceived Learning Efforts.

Another worthwhile observation from the analyses of variance that were conducted on the different constructs within the theory was the overall effect of age. Dörnyei’s (2009) recommendations based on Zentner and Renaud’s (2007) findings were to advise that the self approach to L2 learning motivation may not be applicable with pre-secondary students. In addition, Csizér and Kormos’ (2009) as well as Ryan’s (2008) results indicated that a stronger correlation exists between the ideal self and their criterion measure, i.e., motivated learning behaviour, among university students than among secondary school students. The current study, however, did not collect any data from high school language learners, but aimed to compare university age learners with older learners. The results demonstrated a decrease in the potential power of L2MSS with age. It may be the case that university age learners possess stronger ideal and ought-to selves than older learners because young adults are generally more open to change and tend to have more hopes and career-related plans than older people. However, it is difficult to explain this finding in the light of previous research since most of the previous studies that investigated the effect of age on L2MSS did not compare university age learners with older learners; but rather with younger learners (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Ryan, 2008; Zentner & Renaud, 2007).
4.3 The Relationship between Motivation, Effort and Proficiency

The main objective of our research was to examine the capacity of Dörnyei’s (2005, 2009) L2MSS to predict L2 proficiency; to achieve this we used the scores from a dedicated reading and writing EFL proficiency test as our criterion variable. In most previous L2MSS research, ‘intended learning efforts’ (ILE) has been used as the criterion variable.

It was hypothesized that the ILE scale will mediate the relationship between the L2MSS variables and the reading and writing scores. As a first step of uncovering the correlations between the components of the theory as well as the direction of these correlations, a zero-order correlation analysis was conducted on the main components of the theory namely: ideal self, ought-to self, L2 learning experience and the intended learning efforts. A strong correlation was predicted between the tripartite of Dörnyei’s theory and the criterion measure used in the previous studies, i.e., intended learning efforts. The results of the correlation analysis are reported in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5
Zero order correlations between the components of the L2 Motivational Self System theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IS*</th>
<th>OS*</th>
<th>ILE*</th>
<th>L2LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILE</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2LE</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: IS= Ideal Self; OS= Ought-to Self; ILE= Intended Learning Efforts; L2LE= L2 Learning Experience.

** p < .01.

It can be noticed that the correlation level between the main component of Dörnyei’s theory, i.e., Ideal Self, and the Intended Learning Efforts is $r = 0.66$ which is within the average rate reported in previous studies (Alshehri, 2009: $r = 0.78$, $p < 0.01$; Taguchi et al., 2009: in Japan $r = 0.68$, in China $r = 0.55$, in Iran $r = 0.61$, $p < 0.01$; Csizér &
Kormos, 2009: secondary level $r = 0.37$, university level $r = 0.49$; Ryan, 2009, $r = 0.77$, $p < 0.001$). It is noteworthy that the ought-to self did not correlate as strongly with the intended learning efforts as did the ideal self, which also lends support to Dörnyei’s contention that the ideal self is the central component within his theory and confirms his statement “The Ideal L2 Self was consistently found to correlate highly with the criterion measure (intended effort)” (2009, p. 31). It was also interesting to find that the L2 learning experience (L2LE) had different correlation levels with each of the self-guides. The L2LE was the construct that had the weakest correlation with the ideal self ($r = 0.29$). Moreover, it did not correlate with the ought-to self at all, which again confirms Dörnyei’s proposition that the L2LE is “conceptualised at a different level from the two self-guides” since it is concerned with “situated, ‘executive’ motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience” rather than the imagined future selves (2009, p. 29).

After that, a regression analysis was conducted to examine the direction and the strength of the relationship between these variables. Generally, it was predicted that the ideal self would be the construct with the highest capacity to predict the participants’ L2 intended learning efforts since the ideal self always correlated highly with the criterion measures in many previous studies (see Al-Shehri, 2009; Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Ryan, 2008; Taguchi et al., 2009), that Dörnyei described as the “most important [studies that were] conducted to test and validate the L2 Motivational Self System” (2009, p. 31). Thus, the Intended Learning Efforts was regressed on the Ideal Self, Ought-to Self, and the L2 Learning Experience. The results for the regression analysis are presented in Figure 4.3. The paths discovered were as follow: the Ideal Self ($\beta = .52$, $b = .57$, $p < .01$), the Ought-to Self ($\beta = .18$, $b = .17$, $p < .01$), and L2LE ($\beta = .24$, $b = .08$, $p < .01$) suggesting that the three constructs were very good predictors of the intended learning efforts and explaining 50% of the variance ($R^2 = .50$). Hence, the higher the ideal and ought-to selves in the minds of the learners, and the more enjoyable their L2 learning experience is for them, the more the learners intend to exert themselves in L2 learning.
As described in section 4.2.2 and 4.2.3, the principal component analysis utilized in the present study uncovered underlying dimensions in both the L2 learning experience and the intended learning efforts scales. In addition, the intended learning efforts scale is not the only criterion measure used in this study. Rather, it was hypothesized that the intended learning efforts scale would mediate the relationship between the theory components and the reading and writing scores. Therefore, another correlation test was conducted to uncover the correlations between these subscales and the proficiency measures in this study, as well. These tests of correlation revealed several correlations between the different scales and subscales of the theory in addition to correlations between the components of the theory and the proficiency measures of the participants (see Table 4.6).
There were significant correlations between all the components of the L2 Motivational Self System. The most striking relationships, however, were found to exist between the actual proficiency measures, i.e., reading and writing scores, and all the other variables. The reading scores had weak and negative correlations with every other variable except the writing scores. The writing scores also had weak and negative correlation levels with all the other variables except for a positive, albeit weak, correlation with the ought-to self. To examine the direction and the strength of the relationship between these variables, regression analyses were conducted. Generally, an indirect path was hypothesized between the measures of proficiency (Reading and Writing Scores) and (a) the two selves and (b) the two L2 learning experience subscales (Positive L2 Learning Experience and Negative L2 Learning Experience). This relationship was expected to be mediated by the two intended learning efforts subscales (Intended Learning Behaviour and Perceived Learning Efforts). So, based on Dörnyei’s (2009) idea that Learning Experience was a different level variable and on the lack of correlation between this variable and the Ought-to Self guide, within this study it was
hypothesized that the L2 learning experience would be influenced by the ideal and the ought-to selves of the respondents. A similar directional link was hypothesized in Papi’s (2010) study. The three components, the two self-guides and the learning experience, together would predict the learners’ intended learning efforts which, in turn, would predict actual proficiency.

The regression analyses proceeded in the following order: (1) the Positive L2 Learning Experience was regressed on the Ideal Self and the Ought-to Self; (2) the Negative L2 Learning Experience was regressed on the Ideal Self and the Ought-to Self; (3) the Intended Learning Behaviour was regressed on the Ideal Self, Ought-to self, Positive L2 Learning Experience, and Negative L2 Learning Experience; (4) the Perceived Learning Efforts was regressed on the Ideal Self, Ought-to self, Positive L2 Learning Experience, and Negative L2 Learning Experience; (5) the Reading Scores was regressed on the Ideal Self, the Ought-to Self, Positive L2 Learning Experience, Negative L2 Learning Experience, Intended Learning Behaviour, and Perceived Learning Efforts; (6) the Writing Scores was regressed on the Ideal Self, the Ought-to Self, Positive L2 Learning Experience, Negative L2 Learning Experience, Intended Learning Behaviour, and Perceived Learning Efforts. The presentation of the results is in Figures 4.4 and 4.5 and their discussion follows.
Figure 4.4 Regression model of the six aggregates as predictors of the Reading Score. IS= Ideal Self; OS= Ought-to Self; PL2LE= Positive L2 Learning Experience; NL2LE= Negative L2 Learning Experience; ILB= Intended Learning Behaviour; PLE= Perceived Learning Efforts; RS= Reading Score.

* p < .05. ** p < .01.

The paths discovered were as follows: the Ideal Self ($\beta = .36, b = 1.51, p < .01$) and the Ought-to Self ($\beta = 0.14, b = .49, p < .01$) predicted the Positive L2 Learning Experience and explained 19% of the variance ($R^2 = .19$). Hence, the higher the Ideal and Ought-to Selves in the minds of the learners, the more enjoyable their L2 Learning Experience is for them. The two selves also predicted the Negative L2LE. The Ideal Self ($\beta = .11, b = .57, p < .05$) and the Ought-to Self ($\beta = -.32, b = -1.40, p < .01$) predicted the Negative L2 Learning Experience and explained 9% of the variance ($R^2 = .09$). This means that the higher the Ideal Self in the mind of the learners, the less effect does the Negative L2LE have on their learning process. On the other hand, the higher the Ought-to Self in the mind of the learners, the more the Negative L2LE hinders their learning process. The Ideal Self ($\beta = .54, b = .70, p < .01$), the Positive L2LE ($\beta = .24, b = .08, p < .01$), as well as the Negative L2LE ($\beta = -.08, b = -.02, p < .05$) were good predictors of the
**Figure 4.5** Regression model of the six aggregates as predictors of the Writing Score. IS= Ideal Self; OS= Ought-to Self; PL2LE= Positive L2 Learning Experience; NL2LE= Negative L2 Learning Experience; ILB= Intended Learning Behaviour; PLE= Perceived Learning Efforts; WS= Writing Score.

* p < .05. ** p < .01.

Intended Learning Behaviour explaining 44% of the variation of the Intended Learning Behaviour expended by the learners in their L2 learning process. This means that the higher the Ideal Self in the mind of the learners and the more enjoyable the L2 Learning Experience is, the more the efforts the learners expend in learning the L2. On the contrary, the lower Ideal Self and the less enjoyable the L2 Learning Experience for the learners, the less Intended Learning Behaviour they expend. The Ideal Self ($\beta = .17, b = .25, p < .01$), the Ought-to Self ($\beta = .16, b = .21, p < .01$), as well as the Positive L2LE ($\beta = .39, b = .14, p < .01$) were good predictors of the Perceived Learning Efforts, explaining 32% of the variation. Hence, the higher the Ideal Self and the Ought-to Self in the minds of the learners and the more enjoyable the L2 learning experience is, the better the learners’ evaluation of their success and capabilities in achieving their goals in the L2.
The reported paths were predicted based on the results previously reported in the L2 Motivational Self System literature (see Ryan, 2008; Taguchi et al., 2009). In essence, higher ‘ideal’ and ‘ought-to’ selves, and a more enjoyable L2LE are related to higher ILEs. It is also notable that the effect of the Ideal Self was higher on the PL2LE, NL2LE, ILB and ILE than that of the Ought-to Self, which confirms the supremacy of the Ideal Self over the other L2MSS components.

As regards ILB and PLE, our expectation was that – as components of ILEs – these two would feed directly into L2 proficiency. Contrary to expectations, PLE did not predict achievement, while ILB was negatively correlated with achievement.

However, the paths emerging from the subscales of the theory’s tripartite and the intended learning efforts on one hand and the reading and writing scores – the language proficiency measures in this study – on the other, were unexpected. The Ideal Self predicted the Reading Scores and the Writing Scores both directly and indirectly through the Negative L2LE and the Intended Learning Behaviour. The unexpected findings, however, were the negative correlations between the Ideal Self, the Intended Learning Behaviour and the Negative L2LE on one side, and the Reading and Writing Scores on the other. This means that participants with low Ideal Selves, who are not demotivated by the Negative L2 Learning Experience, and who do not expend lots of efforts in their L2 learning are likely to have high Reading and Writing Scores. The Ought-to Self predicted only the Writing Scores directly and indirectly through the Negative L2LE. In other words, the participants with a high Ought-to Self and who are not affected by the Negative L2LE can be expected to have high Writing Scores.

The correlation between the Ought-to Self and the Writing Scores is both predicted and consistent with Dörnyei’s (2009) theory and its advocates’ representation of the two self-guides. In his definition of the ought-to self, Dörnyei basically relates it less to the communicative aspect of the language and more to the functional use of the language for instrumental reasons (2009). Furthermore, in the studies that were conducted to validate Dörnyei’s 2006 Hungarian studies’ findings (Dörnyei et al., 2006), the ideal self is usually reflected using statements describing communication with English speakers in the future, while the ought-to self is represented using statements describing external obligations and fears as well as short-term career related goals. It would make sense that a learner who has a stronger ought-to self rather than ideal self might be more
concerned with and maybe more focused on improving their writing skill, which they would probably need in their future careers more than communication and interaction in English per se. However, it is rather difficult to explain the other correlation in which the learners with low ideal selves, who are not demotivated by the negative L2 learning experience, and who do not expend extensive efforts in their L2 learning are likely to have high reading and writing scores.

Overall, the frequency check revealed that the number of the participants who scored moderately on both the ideal and ought-to self scales was larger than those who ranked either high or low on both scales. Almost half the participants, 47%, had moderate ideal self tendencies while 26% had high and 27% had low ideal self scores. Similarly, 43% had moderate ought-to self tendencies while 26% scored generally high and 31% scored generally low on the ought-to self scale. These self-guides predicted the intended learning efforts, i.e., the criterion measure used in the previous studies and claimed to predict L2 proficiency. However, when actual proficiency measures, i.e., reading and writing tasks, were used, these self-guides were not successful in predicting the participants’ L2 proficiency levels in the expected way.

Since the ideal self is the central component of Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System, and since it explained 23.33% of the variance compared to only 8.38% explained by the ought-to self within the current study, we decided to examine whether the different levels of the ideal self, i.e., high, moderate and low, among the learners would correlate differently with the proficiency measures in this study. Therefore, a one-way ANOVA was used to assess the differences on the reading and writing scores based on the differences in the respondents’ level of the ideal self.

There was a significant effect of group-by-level-of-ideal-self on the reading scores $F(2,311)=8.87, \; p=.000, \; \eta^2=.05$. Levene’s homogeneity test was statistically significant ($p=.000$); therefore we ran Games-Howell post hoc test. The first group, i.e., participants with high ideal selves, was statistically different from the second group ($p=.007$), and from the third group ($p=.003$). Those participants who had high ideal selves scored significantly higher on the reading task ($M=3.34, \; SD=2.61$) than those who had moderate ($M=2.32, \; SD=1.71$) and low ideal selves ($M=2.16, \; SD=1.71$). In other words, there was no statistically significant difference on the reading scores between those with moderate and low ideal selves. There was, however, a statistically
significant difference between the respondents with high ideals selves and the other two groups, but the effect size of .05 suggests that in practical terms this difference does not have much impact on the reading scores.

Additionally, the effect of the different levels of ideal selves was assessed on the writing scores. There was a significant effect of group-by-level-of-ideal-self on the writing scores $F(2, 286)=8.03, p=.000$, $\eta^2=.05$. Levene’s homogeneity test was not statistically significant ($p=.071$); therefore, we ran Scheffe post hoc test. The third group, i.e., participants with low ideal selves, was statistically different from the first group ($p=.000$), and from the second group ($p=.038$). Those participants who had low ideal selves scored significantly lower on the writing task ($M=2.38, SD=1.52$) than those who had moderate ($M=3.03, SD=1.68$) and high ideal selves ($M=3.49, SD=1.92$). In other words, there was no statistically significant difference on the writing scores between those with moderate and high ideal selves. Although there was a statistically significant difference between the respondents with low ideals selves and the other two groups, the effect size of .05 suggests that in practical terms this difference does not have much impact on the writing scores either.

It is noteworthy to mention that Dörnyei himself acknowledges that one of the reasons that has led to high correlation levels between motivation and L2 learning is significantly related to the criterion measure used to predict the L2 level of attainment in most of the previous studies in the field of motivational SLA, i.e., through the use a criterion measure “related to learner behaviours rather than holistic proficiency measures (e.g., the extent of learners’ participation in a task rather than, say, TOEFL scores)” (Dörnyei, 2010, p. 248).

The quantitative data collected in this study does not provide a firm basis for explaining the unexpected relationships between the self-guides and the learners’ L2 achievement, i.e., reading and writing scores, and one can only speculate on the reasons that may have resulted in these unpredicted outcomes. One possible explanation might lie in the exam-oriented system of assessment in the Saudi context and the resultant mismatch between what the students’ perceive as successful L2 learning and their actual proficiency level. Saudi learners’ perceptions of successful learning may be defined in terms of their success in midterm and final exams. In other words, Saudi learners might perceive their achievements in the tests as an indicative of their English language proficiency level.
even though such test results do not usually reflect actual L2 proficiency. Thus, even learners with low English proficiency could have scored high on some of the intended learning efforts scale’s items, such as “I am working hard at learning English” and “I think that I am doing my best to learn English” based on their achievements in their exams. Similar explanations were offered to explain mismatches between the students’ self reported motivation and their actual motivated behaviour in similar contexts (see Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012).

In addition, some have argued that L2 proficiency is not a product of motivation; rather is an antecedent to it. Ushioda (1996b) proposes that L2 success stimulates motivation; MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) and Sparks et al. (2000) propose that an individual’s L2 achievement gives rise to their motivation and other psychological properties rather than be the result of them. Furthermore, Papi (2010, p. 470) argues that “Motivation is only indirectly related to learning outcome/achievement as it is by definition an antecedent of behaviour rather than of achievement (which is itself determined by multiple factors)”. Hence, high levels of motivation represented by the self-guides within the L2MSS do not necessarily reflect on L2 achievement. Oyserman and colleagues reported that “self-regulation is best achieved when the possible selves are detailed and contain strategies for both personal goal focused action and for dealing and engaging with the social context in which the goal is to be achieved” (Oyserman, Bybee, Terry & Hart-Johnson, 2004, p. 133); possible selves that are not coupled with action plans can be inaccurately construed as future-oriented self goals, but do not necessarily enhance L2 learning motivation or lead to better performance. They also asserted that for the possible selves to exert their full power, they have to be associated with action plans and be constantly counterpoised by fear of failure (Oyserman, Bybee & Terry, 2006). Although the respondents in the current study were found to have moderate ideal and ought-to selves, it was not clear if they had incorporated the successful action plans needed for them to succeed in their L2 learning or not.

An inherent weakness with the instrument used to collect the quantitative data, i.e., questionnaire survey, in the current study was its disregard for the pivotal role played by the accompanying procedural plans needed to translate motivation and intentions into actual behavioural consequences. These action plans had not previously been tapped into by quantitative research within the L2 Motivational Self System research realm,
either. The questionnaire survey used in this study was essentially adopted from previous studies (see Ryan, 2008; Taguchi et al., 2009). Thus, data pertinent to the specific action plans and strategies used by the participants to minimize the discrepancy between their present selves and their future selves was not collected in any section of the quantitative part of the study. The Intended Learning Efforts’ scale items were rather inadequate for this job – they are mostly vague, general and worded as preferences, e.g. ‘I think that I am doing my best to learn English’ and ‘I would like to spend lots of time learning English’. Moreover, they were describing activities that are not really much of an action plan, e.g. watching TV or listening to radio in English.

The interview data offers some insights into these results and suggests that the operationalization and measurement of ILB and PLE could indeed be the source of the negative correlation these two variables had with proficiency measures in the current study. A more detailed discussion of the action plans utilized by the participants and their role in approximating toward their future selves is presented in Chapter 5. This, however, still highlights the importance for future research to do better in terms of designing quantitative measurement that takes into consideration the presence, or lack thereof, of action plans needed to realize the full potential of the L2 Motivational Self System.

### 4.4 Summary of the Quantitative Analysis

One of the key objectives of the current study was to uncover whether the two self-guides that Dörnyei (2005, 2009) conceptualized in his L2 Motivational Self System are actually two separate selves or are simply two facets of one broad self, which is why the self-guide scales were subjected to exploratory factor analysis. The factor analysis has shown that two selves very similar to the two selves identified by Dörnyei (2005, 2009) exist within the Saudi learners, which confirms Dörnyei’s proposition of the two selves, i.e., ideal self and ought-to self. Each of the two self-guides also correlated with different demographic variables, which lends more support to this proposition. The additional factor analyses that were conducted on the remaining constructs within the theory revealed that two subscales exist within the L2 learning experience scale, i.e., positive L2 learning experience and negative L2 learning experience, and two subscales within the intended learning efforts scale, i.e., intended learning behaviour and
perceived learning efforts. After that, the reliability of the new uncovered subscales was assessed, and a separate index was computed for each subscale. Afterwards, these indices were examined for normality of distribution, then, transformed when needed.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) used to determine the effects of the different demographics on the main and sub-constructs of the theory revealed a positive correlation between the level of English of each of the parents and each of the two self-guides. This not only supports the existence of two separate selves, but also highlights the direct role played by the parents in encouraging their sons and daughters to learn English, and the indirect role they provide by being English speaking role models to their son and daughters, as well. This finding is consistent with previous research that highlighted the role of parental influence on the formation process of the learners’ future selves (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Dörnyei, 2009; Higgins, 1987). Moreover, parental influence was found to have a bearing on the intended learning efforts, which was anticipated to translate into actual L2 proficiency. This analysis has also found that males are generally more affected by the positive L2 learning experience, and less affected by the negative L2 learning experience than their female counter-parts. These different levels of satisfaction with the L2 learning experience were reflected in variation from participants belonging to different campuses, as well.

One of the most significant findings to emerge from this analysis was the effect of age on the different constructs of the theory. Harter (2005) argues, that learners do not select from among the many possible selves they have until they establish their own self-standards and develop the “ideals toward which the self aspires” which normally does not happen till these learners reach their late adolescence years (p. 618). It was found in this study that correlations between the different variables within the theory and the younger age group participants were more significant than with those participants belonging to the older age group. It is important to remember is that the younger group in this study was represented by students who were of the normal university age (19-23 years old), while older students (24-31 years old) were placed in the older group. This finding is difficult to explain in comparison with previous research which compared university age with younger age L2 learners, i.e., university students compared with adolescents and secondary level students (see Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Ryan, 2008; Zentner & Renaud, 2007).
The correlation and regression analyses revealed different relationships between the constructs of the theory. It was anticipated that the ideal self would play the most important role in predicting the learners’ intended learning efforts, which was the criterion measure in most of the L2 Motivational Self System previous studies. This prediction was supported by the results of the correlation and regression analyses. The ideal self emerged as the variable that predicted the intended learning efforts construct the most followed by the L2 learning experience, and finally the ought-to self. This result was in line with most of the studies that have been conducted to validate Dörnyei’s assertion about the ideal self being the supreme predictor of motivated language behaviour (see Al-Shehri, 2009; Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Ryan, 2008; Taguchi et al., 2009). However, when further correlation and regression analyses were performed on the new dimensions within the self, the L2 learning experience, intended learning efforts and the IELTS scores, unexpected results were discovered. Even though the data showed that the respondents had moderate levels of both ideal and ought-to self orientations that predicted motivated language behaviour and, in turn, were anticipated to reflect on the participants’ L2 proficiency, these self-guides did predict the L2 proficiency levels of these participants, but not in the expected direction. Learners with low ideal selves, who are not demotivated by the negative L2 learning experience, and who do not expend extensive efforts in their L2 learning were found to have high reading and writing scores.

One explanation may be that L2 achievement is not always a consequential result of having high levels of motivation, as some previous research suggests that the causal relationship between motivation and L2 achievement is contrary to the common belief. That is, motivation can be a consequence of L2 achievement, rather than the other way around (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991; Ushioda, 1996b). Moreover, Kormos et al.’s (2011) ‘interactive model of motivation’ suggests a reciprocal relationship between the L2MSS variables and motivated behaviour. It can also be argued that motivated language behaviour self-reports do not always have actual behavioural consequences, i.e., it does not always reflect on the learners L2 proficiency. Oyserman and colleagues (2004, p. 131) confirm that:

While in laboratory settings, shifts in goals, personal strivings, or self-motivation clearly influence mood, behavior, and outcomes… in more
naturalistic settings, personal striving, possible selves, goals or resolutions are often vague and not connected with action plans that detail when, where, and how to proceed toward the goal. To regulate behavior, the self-concept must contain not only goals or desired end states, but also strategies about how to behave in order to reach the desired end state.

Thus, future self-guides and intended learning efforts may not necessarily lead to better L2 achievement especially when not coupled with procedural plans that help in translating these intentions into actual L2 learning plans (Oyserman, 2008). Even Dörnyei admits that having these self-guides is not ever sufficient for them to turn hopes and dreams to actual realities (2014, p. 522):

[T]he effective functioning of these self-guides is dependent on several cognitive components, most notably on the learners' appraisal of their own capabilities and their personal circumstances to anchor their vision in a sense of realistic expectations . . . learners also need a good repertoire of task-related strategies that can be activated by the ideal language self—after all, even Olympic athletes need coaches and training plans in addition to their vivid vision of achieving excellence.

Ushioda and Dörnyei (2012, p. 402) recognize that “[i]n L2 motivation research as in much SLA research in general, there is increasing recognition that mixed methods approaches can help to capture more of the complexity of the issues under investigation”. Thus, more insight into the unexpected results of our study is gained through the qualitative part of the research, as discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter 5

Analysis and Results of the Qualitative Data

5.1 Introduction

In the context of this study’s main goal in exploring the Saudi learners’ motivation from the perspective of the L2 Motivational Self System, Chapter 4 provided valuable insights into the underlying dimensions within the different components of the theory and how they correlated with participants’ levels of proficiency. This chapter proceeds to report the results from the analysis of the qualitative data (the interviews). The interviews were conducted to develop a deeper understanding of the Saudi learners’ motivating future selves as well as their overall satisfaction with their English learning experience. Dörnyei (2011, p. 43-34) defines data triangulation as “combining quantitative and qualitative data sources . . . to help reduce the inherent weaknesses of individual methods by offsetting them by the strength of another, thereby maximizing both the internal and external validity of the research”. The data collected using the interviews was also used to shed more light on the conditions that Dörnyei (2009) described as essential for the L2 Motivational Self System to exert its full potential. According to Sampson (2012, p. 319):

If we take concepts of the self as central to motivation, it would seem that qualitative, or mixed-methods research with a large qualitative component – in providing a more detailed account of the learner’s experiences and conceptualizations in the learner’s own words – might give greater insights into the internal–external dynamic interaction that takes place between the three identified components of the L2 Motivational Self System.
In the current study the main focus of the interviews was to answer the second research question about the source of the imagined self-guides within the learners, and how these self-guides develop over time.

Prior to commencing the qualitative analysis, we review the main aspects addressed in the process of making the qualitative instrument, i.e., the interview, used for collecting data in the current study. This is followed by a description of the self-guides that motivate Saudi learners to learn English. After that, the effects of religion and society, and family related factors are discussed in relation to these self guides. The second part of the chapter investigates the nature of the participants’ imagined future selves and how these imaginations develop in the minds of these participants. This section also discusses these future selves in relation to the conditions that Dörnyei hypothesized as critical in order to turn these hopes and dreams into actual future realities. The last part of the chapter reports the learners’ evaluation of their success in their L2 learning as well as their evaluation of the different components that played a role in their L2 learning experience including the teachers, books, peer group, general classroom atmosphere, and aiding facilities.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, to ensure comparability between this study’s findings and those of previous studies, the interview questions developed for the current study were based on Ryan’s (2008) Japanese study interview questions. Ryan’s (2008) investigation of the concept of the ideal self, however, aimed to produce a replication of Dörnyei et al.’ (2006) Hungarian studies within a Japanese context; thus, it utilized all Hungarian studies’ categories. Unlike the two aforementioned studies, comparing Gardner’s integration and Dörnyei’s ideal self was not the focus of the current study, so only questions related to the L2 Motivational Self System theory were maintained in the current study. These included questions relating to: the learners’ language learning experience, their goals and orientations, their obligations and need to learn English, and their ideal selves.

Dörnyei’s (2009) asserted that certain conditions have to be met to ensure an optimum operation of his L2MSS (see section 2.6.3). In response to that, additional questions aiming to assess the level of elaborateness and vividness of the future selves were introduced to the interview guide used in the current study. Specific questions related to the self-regulatory strategies needed to translate the learners’ hopes into attainable
future selves were also added. Moreover, questions aiming to provide answers about the source of the imagined situations in the minds of the learners, the frequency of their occurrences; their plausibility; and the existence, or lack thereof, of feared future failure and its implications for the learners’ futures and plans, as well as questions targeting the effect that the learners’ religious culture might have on their motivation to learn English were developed. Finally, more explicit questions tapping into the satisfaction levels with the specific L2 learning experience components were added. These included questions related to: the learners’ evaluation of the teachers, text books, peer group, and the learning institutions in a more specific manner than the language learning experience section questions in Ryan’s (2008) interview guide.

For cultural considerations, it was deemed appropriate for the interviews to be only conducted with male participants of the larger research sample. At the time of the questionnaire administration, the participants were briefed about, and encouraged to take part in the interview. There were 21 participants who volunteered to do the interviews. As discussed before, the original purpose for conducting the interviews was to answer the second research question concerning the formation process of the self-guides. Thus, no need for linking the interviewed participants with their questionnaires or IELTS scores was established initially. So, to protect the privacy and the anonymity of the participants, the IELTS results were not linked to individual participants in the interviews. As a result, the interviewed participants’ L2 proficiency was only assessed through their speaking performance in the interviews, using the IELTS speaking band descriptors. The 21 participants in this study were later divided into two groups according to their speaking proficiency in the interviews, namely, 9 upper-proficiency participants and 12 lower-proficiency participants. The interviewer used IELTS descriptors to assess the speaking proficiency levels of the interviewees based on the IELTS speaking band descriptors. These descriptors assess the speakers’ performance against four criteria: task achievement, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource, and grammatical range and accuracy (see Appendix G for more details on the IELTS Speaking band descriptors).

Each participant was interviewed individually for 30 minutes and was asked questions relating to the different components of the L2 Motivational L2 System (see Appendix F). At the beginning of each interview, the researcher explained the research focus and
aims briefly and reminded the informants about the voluntary and anonymous nature of these interviews. The researcher also explained the procedure of the interviews and sought the participants’ permission for using a digital recorder and for anonymously quoting their responses in reports of the research. The interviews were conducted in English, but the researcher allowed for code switching whenever participants demonstrated difficulty in expressing themselves in English. After that, the researcher translated the Arabic responses into English. When the English responses of the participants were comprehensible, no alterations were made on them regardless to the correctness of the structure. The interviews were, then, transcribed, coded and categorized into themes in preparation for further analysis.

5.2 Analysis of Data

5.2.1 The Learners’ Goals, Orientations and Self-guides

All the participants asserted their awareness about the role played by the English language in today’s world. The majority of them described English as the most important language of the modern world and the lingua franca that connects people coming from different backgrounds and ethnicities. They ascribed distinct importance to learning English in relation to all walks of life. The majority of the participants viewed learning English as a path to a future career, while others did not seem to regard learning English as a means of getting a good job in the future as a primary focus, rather, as a medium of communicating with people from different backgrounds. Even those participants who had a connection in mind between learning English and future occupations varied on the level of how internalized these career related goals seemed to be within their identities, and on the clarity level of these future plans. This is in line with Taguchi et al.’s (2009) inclusion of career related statements in both the ideal and ought-to self scales which were also used in the quantitative part of the current study. It also confirms the findings of the quantitative analysis part of this study in which all the items from the self scale were subjected to a factor analysis that revealed two types of selves (ideal self and ought-to self) each of which had an item associated with career related plans among the items making up that scale. The findings of that factor analysis are reiterated in this chapter as they were also used as an assisting guide of criteria
differentiating between participants’ ideal and ought-to selves (see Table 5.1). A more detailed discussion of the findings on these two selves is included in the following sections of the chapter.

Table 5.1

*Criteria for the ideal and ought-to self scales based on the factor analysis of the self scale using Oblimin rotation and Kaiser normalization.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal Self</th>
<th>Ought-to Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagining being able to use English like native speakers.</td>
<td>Learning English to gain more respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining studying at a university using only English language.</td>
<td>Learning English because of being expected to by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining living abroad and communicating effectively in English.</td>
<td>Studying English to not be considered a weak student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things to do in the future depending on learning English.</td>
<td>Studying English to avoid bad marks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to imagine having English speaking friends.</td>
<td>Learning English to avoid ending up with a low-paying job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining using English in a future career.</td>
<td>Learning English to get a good job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to speak English like an important role model.</td>
<td>Learning English because being expected by society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining living abroad in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future dreams depending on learning English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English to be able to spread Islam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining being able to write emails in English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1.1 *Career vs. Communication*

*Interviewer: Do you have clear learning goals? Can you explain? How would a command of English enrich your life?*
The quantitative analysis showed that the majority of the participants who completed the questionnaire had moderate ideal and ought-to self tendencies at the same time, while only a few of these participants had either very high or very low ideal and ought-to self tendencies. According to Oyserman et al. (2006), idealized and ought-to selves do not have to be in opposition, rather learners who have both ideal and ought-to selves can generate a combined effect larger than that made by learners who are motivated by either of the two self-guides separately. Ryan and Dörnyei (2012, p. 96) endorse the idea that for an adult L2 learner the lines can get blurred between the different “L2-specific parts of the self system” and other domains and report that for such a learner:

[I]t may be that the individual feels a strong responsibility as a parent to advance in order to provide for his/her family, or it may be that this motivation comes from a strongly internalised ideal self image as a dependable provider for the family. In both cases we can observe a clear overlap with other domains of the self, such as parent, spouse, and professional; this suggests that the L2 self systems of adult learners are likely to be more complex and interconnected to other parts of the self than in younger learners.

Furthermore, Yashima (2009, p. 146) stated that “It is not realistic to talk about integrativeness as an attitude toward learning English without being influenced by its utilitarian value.” White and Ding (2009, pp. 336-337) also discussed similar classification dilemma in their attempts to distinguish between the self and identity constructs:

Conceptually the main difference seems to be that identity is understood to be external – negotiated during social intercourse, while self is understood as internal – a set of beliefs about who we are. This distinction, however, is rather contrived and over-simplistic since the self is determined by social relationships, while the social personae we create in interaction are based on our notions of self.

White and Ding’s views about the intertwined relationship between the identity and self can be linked to Dörnyei’s conceptualization of the ought-to self and ideal self, respectively. Here, the findings of the qualitative analysis are very similar to those of
the quantitative part. The results of the interviews revealed that half the participants reported that they view both communication and career-related goals as being equally important to them. This is in line with MacIntyre et al.’s (2009a, pp. 58-59) confirmation about the connectedness between the interactive and utilitarian aspects of L2 learning in their study:

There simply is no good reason to believe that a person who sees the value of the target language as a means of communication and social interaction would not also see the value of the language in instrumental terms, and the empirical results support that idea.

Furthermore, Oyserman and James (2011, p. 124) affirmed that the possible identities of young adults always revolve around career-related or family-related issues, e.g. getting married, having children, etc., goals. In the current study, the participants were asked about their reasons for learning English and the benefits that it could bring to them, and the majority of the participants reported the two aforementioned goals as the major driving forces that motivate them to learn English.

In the present study, ten participants reported that career constitutes a major part of their future plans, thus, it is one of their main motivators to learn English. At the same time, they also stated that being able to communicate with foreigners and travel abroad to study or even live are still among their biggest aspirations that they hope to achieve through learning English. One of the participants explained:

English is [an] international language, so you will get a job which is a thing I thought about before joining the department, but for me regardless of the job it was my dream to learn English and be able to speak it and understand other people and their culture because we live in a closed community and I want to travel. So, I can practise English which will give me practice that will lead to better learning. So, for me they’re both important.

Another participant had this to say:

I have a lot of factors that help me learn English. For example, I have my love for the language, the fact that I’m hoping to get a teaching job, and also being
able to communicate my ideas to others. They all kind of contribute to why I’m learning English, but the most important thing is me liking it and wanting to communicate with the British and American people. I feel that they have a fascinating culture and I’d like to learn more about it.

Other participants established that learning English was not their major goal in itself. Rather, they confirmed that learning English was necessary for them to help them build the career they have always wanted. Some of these participants had career related dreams which were strongly related to their English major at the European languages department. One of them reported:

As I said before, I [have] like[d] English since I was a boy, so I’d like to be a translator of course. I want to complete [higher studies] after this. Unfortunately, here at [KAU] university they don’t have translation for the bachelor. There’s only a general major of arts, so I decided to enter here to obtain the BA in arts and after that when I graduate from this uni[versity], I’ll complete my master and doctorate in translation of course.

Another participant said:

My goal is to become an English literature professor plus an author and maybe a producer for some of my movies, my books or TV series, some things that are connected to literature. But, they’re all connected.

It was interesting to notice that almost half the sample reported very high career aspirations, i.e., being a professor at the English department, regardless of their current L2 achievement. This is in line with Oyserman’s (2013, p. 182) comment:

Survey-based research on educational attainment commonly includes two questions. Children and their parents are asked how far they expect to go in school and how far they aspire to go in school. In response, most choose the highest educational attainments. Thus, most (80%) eighth graders expect that they will attend college, regardless of their current academic success or whether they are taking college-preparatory coursework.
This finding might underlie a potential mismatch in the current sample’s future selves when assessed against Dörnyei’s (2009, p. 36) plausibility and of the vision condition. He defines plausibility as having “a sense of realistic expectations”, and identifies it as one of the essential conditions needed for the optimum operationalization of his self system.

In addition to the group that had a very career-oriented future possible self, other learners affirmed that they see learning English only as a means that will enable them to specialize in other fields that are not available for them to study in Saudi Arabia. One participant, for instance, displayed a great passion for music and described it as the reason for him to want to learn English. He explained that learning English will help him realize his lifelong dream of being a rapper and entering the music industry in the future:

I am learning English because it’s a universal language and I can use it in a lot of things. I like it to write poems like rapping and stuff like that. It’s so silly, but it’s my goal. I want to go abroad and make it in the field (like in the show business), but for sure I need it to find a job as well as communicate, but being able to communicate and express my thoughts is more important. That’s why I’m learning English.

A similar thought was reiterated by another student whose dream specialization was not available to study in Saudi Arabia either, so he decided to learn English to be able to travel abroad and study it in the future:

It wasn’t my goal [to study English]. I was planning to become a movie director, but they didn’t have a college here. So, I came here to learn English and after that I’m planning to pursue a career in movie direction, etc., abroad because they don’t have it here.

A third group of participants had a different kind of motivation for learning English. Communication in the English language was in itself a future dream for a significant number of participants. Almost one third of the participants reported that being able to communicate and connect with L2 speakers was their principal motivation to learn English, regardless of what their future career might be. They explained that having a
prestigious job was never the reason for wanting to learn English. Rather, it was their fascination with the L2 culture and its people that inspired them to learn English, which would allow them to travel abroad and communicate using the L2.

I want to be able to communicate with foreigners, and when I travel. I also want to get a job, but it’s not as important. [Learning English] will enable me to communicate with non-Arabic speakers like in hospitals. Also, it will help me when I go abroad and travel.

Another participant also explained:

I would very much like to go abroad and learn from and communicate with native speakers because you know it makes sense. You go there and you have to use the language in all walks of life, which sounds like a pretty good goal in my opinion. like talking to people commonly and professionally which is going to force me to adapt my behavior over there because right here I just don’t have to. You know when you go to talk to the people here, you just use the simple layman term, but when you go there you have got to use it in all walks of life, For example, you talk to people all in English in libraries, government facilities, on the street, etc.

On the other hand, three of the participants had a clear ought-to self tendency. They had a very strong career focus behind their learning of English. Nevertheless, they did not have a very clear vision of what exactly they want to be, or even how to get there. Their focus tended to be on how a good job would enhance their social status and how the people will view them consequently. For example, they mentioned that learning English would create “reputable” job opportunities for them, but they did not specify what these jobs are which was a clear indication of how non-internalized these career related goals were in their minds. Alternatively, they focused on the negative consequences associated with not being able to find a good job. One of these participants asserted that the unemployment rates in Saudi Arabia are really high and asserted that the main reason for him to learn English is to find a good job. “I want to get a job as a teacher in schools or elsewhere. In Saudi Arabia, all you should worry about is finding a job” he explained. Another participant had this to say:
If you have asked me before, I would have said I know exactly what I want to do in the future, but now I’m not sure anymore . . . I’m planning to obtain my master and PhD, then get a job here at university, but I also want the reputation that comes with it not just the position and the job. I want to hear people say this is professor such and such, so if I have the job, I will have a high salary. Now I have a different look towards the future, but before I had different goals when I started learning English. I thought my dad will always be there to support me, but then your mum comes to you and says you’re a big boy now and we should find you a girl to marry, and you start thinking: how am I going to get married and support my family? And also you go with your dad to the supermarket and see how all the prices went up and keep getting higher every day and you realize that your dad’s salary isn’t sufficient anymore. It’s not enough for the family needs. If you don’t have a good job, you won’t be able to provide for your family.

This may be a typical case of many of the participants having dynamic rather than static English learning goals, i.e., future selves, which seems to be consistent with what Giddens (2000) foresaw over a decade ago in relation to learners having multiple identities. He affirmed that adults in the currently globalizing world have to create and recreate their identities “on a more active basis than before” (Giddens, 2000, p. 65). This also connects with Marcia’s (1980) proposed four-stages identity formation in which she stipulated that individuals explore and try on different identities without a full commitment before deciding on the most appropriate developed rational identity to assume. Additionally, in his Korean study Kim (2009) reported that one of the learners had an inconsistency about his future career and was noticed to have changed his motivation to learn English over a period of time which he linked to having non-internalized goals which fed into the learner’s ought-to rather than his ideal self.

The current study also supports Noels’ (2009) argument that ought-to selves can be internalized into ideal selves, but he also reported that identified regulation, i.e., internalized ought-to self goals, can have more behavioural consequences in relation to L2 learning than intrinsic motivation, which is usually associated with the ideal self within Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System (Noels, 2009). Kim (2009b, p. 63) states that “L2 learners’ ought-to L2 self can be transformed into the ideal L2 self when the
learners personalize and internalize the external reasons to learn ESL. The degree of internalization can be confirmed in L2 learners’ goal specificity and persistence.” It is important to note that not all types of instrumentality can be associated with the ideal self, however. According to Kim (2009b, p. 52), “we should not equate integrativeness with the ideal L2 self or instrumentality with the ought-to L2 self. The criteria then seem located in the promotion/prevention focus of the future image.” Dörnyei (2009, p 28) explains “when our idealized image is associated with being professionally successful, instrumental motives with a promotion focus . . . are related to the ideal self,” while “instrumental motives with a prevention focus – for example, to study in order not to fail an exam or not to disappoint one’s parents – are part of the ought self.”

In the current study, several participants reported a change in their motivation to learn English over a period of time. This involved a change in their motivational drives to learn English from fun and entertainment related motivators towards career related motivators, which might be associated with the identity reconstructions that these learners were going through over a period of time, which fed more into their ought-to selves and sometimes into their ideal selves when fully internalized. It is generally assumed within the L2 Motivational Self System framework that the learners with high ideal self tendencies have future dreams that are more pertinent to the communicative function of the language since Dörnyei (2009, p. 27) asserts that one of the central themes of his theory is “the equation of the motivational dimension that has traditionally been interpreted as ‘integrativeness/integrative motivation’ with the Ideal L2 Self.” As a result, it is assumed that learners with high ideal selves would place a heavy emphasis on communication in English and perhaps travelling to English speaking countries, rather than the mere utilitarian use of the language which is usually related to work and career. On the other hand, one of the most important defining criteria of having ought-to self tendencies is having job related goals and ambitions.

It can be misleading, however, to assume that all occupational related motivators are part of the ought-to self. According to Lamb (2012, p. 1000), “The cosmopolitanism associated with English blends both integrative and instrumental motives, making it difficult to maintain the traditional distinction between these two constructs.” We have noticed that in the current study that career related statements fell under both types of selves (see Table 5.1). Human beings are social beings. This compels them to adhere to
social norms that do not always reflect their individual wants or desires (Dörnyei, 2007b, as cited in Dörnyei, 2009). Dörnyei (2009, p.28) made it very clear that although instrumentality, e.g. career related goals, is usually a part of the ought-to self, he asserted that it can sometimes be a part of the L2 learners’ ideal self:

‘instrumentality/instrumental motivation’ mixes up these two aspects: when our idealised image is associated with being professionally successful, instrumental motives with a promotion focus – for example, to learn English for the sake of professional/career advancement – are related to the ideal self; in contrast, instrumental motives with a prevention focus – for example, to study in order not to fail an exam or not to disappoint one’s parents – are part of the ought self.

Nonetheless, Boyatzis and Akrivou (2006) foresaw that a potential confusion is likely to arise in the process of distinguishing the ideal from the ought-to selves relating to the level of internalisation of the ought self. They reasoned that since individuals belong to different reference groups, these memberships have significant effects on the individual as different values get introduced to them and socialization processes are expected of them in order to maintain affiliations with these groups. This, in turn, makes it very difficult to “decide at times of social pressure whether an ideal like self state represents one’s genuine dreams or whether it has been compromised by the desire for role conformity” (Boyatzis & Akrivou, 2006, as cited in Dörnyei, 2009, p.14).

In his Korean study, in which he was comparing two Korean learners of English (Woo who had clear instrumental reasons for learning English and Joon who seemed to have both integrative and instrumental reasons), Kim (2009a) argued that although Woo had a pure career related focus, he displayed an internalized level of motivation and investment in achieving that goal such that it was sufficient to turn his initially extrinsic and instrumental goal into a part of his identity which, in turn, fed into his ideal self. On the contrary, while Joon had integrative as well as instrumental reasons to learn English, his lack of clarity and inconsistency about his future career goals confirmed that his learning goals were much less internalized than those of Woo which, in turn, fed more into his prevention-focused ought-to self rather than his ideal self. It is worth noting that Dörnyei et al. (2006) described instrumental motivation as an immediate antecedent of the ideal self component in his theory. This means that depending on the level of
internalization, job related hopes and aspirations can be arranged along a continuum with the ought-to self, which represents the least internalized goals, at one end and the ideal self, which represents the most internalized hopes and dreams, at the other. In other words, some long term career objectives can be identified as belonging in the ideal self as well, but only when these future goals and imaginations are internalized in the mind of the learner to the point that makes them become a part of the his/her identity, and thus his ideal self.

Although the aforementioned concept of internalization can help in explaining how a future career can be internalized very deeply within the learners to transform ought-to self related external motivators into ideal self internalized hopes and dreams, the data collected in the present study provides us with more insight into the nature of the relationship between career related goals and the self concept. The current proficiency level of the L2 learners was noticed to play a role in defining this relationship. The majority of the learners reported that the ability to speak and communicate in English is more important to them than being able to read and write in English, for example. However, there was a different view-point reported by almost all the upper-proficiency, i.e., high-achieving, participants.

Most of these upper-proficiency participants emphasized that either reading literature or higher level articles and books, or writing in a more academic and professional manner was more important to them than simply being able to verbally communicate their ideas to English speakers. One upper-proficiency learner asserted that he is currently focused on mastering what he referred to as ‘the higher level skills, i.e., reading and writing,’ because he can already communicate in English with ease. Another participant confirmed that his focus on the utilitarian rather than the communicative use of the language is not because he does not acknowledge the importance of communication in English. Rather, it is because he already spends up to seven hours a day communicating in English online and that he would be using English for communicative purposes in his future career anyway. Thus, career was the most important reason for learning English not only to the participants with ought-to selves, but to the participants with the ideal self tendencies who had a high speaking proficiency level in English, as well.

These findings definitely enrich our discussion of the theoretically far-from-straightforward findings of the quantitative analyses, as well.
One of the main findings of the quantitative analysis showed that high levels of the ought-to self correlated positively with the writing scores. It makes a lot of sense that the participants with high ought-to selves would regard the writing skills more important than the communicative skills, i.e., listening and speaking, since they are more concerned with career related rather than communicative goals, and thus are likely to have high writing scores. On the other hand, the second major finding of the quantitative analysis was not as expected. In fact, it was controversial to find a negative correlation between the ideal self and the reading and writing scores of the participants. It appeared that the participants who had low ideal selves, who were not demotivated by the negative L2 learning experience, and who did not expend great efforts in their L2 learning would be likely to have high reading and writing scores. The qualitative data reported in this chapter can point to some of the factors which have produced this unexpected result.

During the interviews, several participants reported that they felt they were already past the point of worrying about communicating their ideas in English effectively. Rather, they were more concerned about their reading and writing skills, which they viewed as more necessary for their future careers. Warschauer (2000, p. 530) affirmed that the long term English learning goal should be to enable the language learners “to use the language less as an object of study and more as an additional language of their own to have an impact on and change the world . . . to express their identity and make their voices heard”. In Oyserman and James’ description of ‘interpretation of difficulty and certainty’ as a crucial condition needed to influence behaviour in the identity-based motivation theory, They confirm that “experience of ease and difficulty in thinking about a future self may be interpreted as implying no action is needed at the moment” (Oyserman & James, 2011, p. 118). They add, “If experienced . . . ease is interpreted as meaning that attaining the possible identity is a sure thing, current action is less likely” (2011, p. 137). This means that L2 learners, who are or view themselves to be at a high level of L2 proficiency, are likely to stop putting a lot of effort into L2 learning since they perceive it as a very easy task not worthy of laborious efforts.

It is noteworthy that the significant difference between the L2 learners’ current and future selves has also been recently recognized by Dörnyei as a prerequisite to the successful activation of the future self-guides in addition to the self-guide conditions
which he specified in 2009. Dörnyei (2014, p. 522) affirms that the L2 learner has effective future self-guides when “[t]he learner's future self is sufficiently different from the retreat self. If there is no observable gap between current and future selves, no increased effort is felt to be necessary and no motivation emerges.” He also adds (ibid.) that the L2 learner is considered to have good self-guides when “[t]he learner's future self image is not perceived as being comfortably certain to be reached, that is, to be within his or her grasp. The learner must believe that the possible self will not happen automatically, without a marked increase in expended effort.”

Thus, it is understandable that the participants with high level of English who viewed communication in English to be “very easy” for them would rank very low on the ideal self scale which was basically represented using statements concerned more with communication than career related goals (See Table 5.1). Moreover, these assumed high levels of English proficiency led these participants to believe and state that they do not need to work hard on their English learning anymore. As a result, it is not surprising any longer that these participants, who seem on the surface to have low ideal selves because they regard reading and writing as being of a superior importance to mere communication, to be likely to score high in the reading and writing tasks, and vice versa.

The results of the qualitative analysis of this study support Lamb’s (2004, p.15) suggestion that “at this stage of the inquiry, qualitative approaches may be more productive than quantitative, because the identification processes being proposed are by definition highly context-sensitive, and Hickey’s (1997, p. 182) statement that, “self-report measures, particularly Likert-style scales . . . don’t capture the full range of responses, making different contexts appear more similar than they really are.” In support of these recommendations emphasising the need for a shift towards qualitative research within motivational SLA, the qualitative data in this study did not only provide important insights into the theory’s different constructs and how they correlate with one another within the identification process of motivation and language learning, but also helped in interpreting the quantitative data collected.

That said, some inherent weaknesses regarding the instrument used in this study may have been responsible for some of the unexpected relationships emerging from the quantitative data analysis. Choosing the ‘reading skill’ as a representative of the
receptive skills (listening and reading) and the ‘writing skill’ as a representative of the productive skills (speaking and writing) as the main proficiency measures in the current study instead of administering a full language test that examines the four language skills, i.e., listening, speaking, reading and writing, was deemed appropriate for the purposes of saving the time and money associated with administering the full language test in this study. In retrospection, using a full test battery targeting all of the four major language skills would perhaps have enabled us to gain greater insights into the relationships between the self guides and the L2 proficiency. For instance, results showing that learners with high ideal selves scored highly on the communicative skills (listening, speaking) would have supported the hypothesis presented above. As it is, however, measuring the participants’ listening and speaking skills and correlating these scores with the L2 Motivational Self System’s tripartite model was out of the scope of the current study. It can only be hoped that such issues be investigated in future studies, although future research in this area should certainly include them.

5.2.1.2 Religious and Societal Obligations


Crystal (1965) was one of the first linguists to highlight the linguistics-faith link that would later come to be known as "theo-linguistics" (Mooney, 2010, cited in Lepp-Kaethler & Dörnyei, 2013, p. 173). Given the fact that “language, identity, and faith are often closely intertwined” (Lepp-Kaethler & Dörnyei, 2013, p. 173) as well as the fact that religion contributes significantly to one’s ideal and possible future selves (Maehr, 2005, cited in Lepp-Kaethler & Dörnyei, 2013), religion was assumed to play a crucial role in the formation of the participants’ perceptions about their learning of the English language in Saudi Arabia, where Islam guides almost every aspect of a person’s life. According to Shafi (1983, p. 35), the English language “has a crucial role to play in the achievement of the ultimate aim of Muslim education,” which is delivering the message of Islam to those who do not speak its language, i.e., Arabic. Previous research found that Saudi Arabian students see learning English as “a religious and a national duty” (Al-Haq & Smadi, 1996, p. 307). Moreover, Al-Haq and Al-Masaeid (2009, p. 283)
report that in the Jordanian context, which is very similar to the Saudi context, students view English as an inevitability for national advancement through the acquisition of the necessary knowledge, skills and understanding of West, with many describing themselves to be “religiously, rather than materialistically, motivated to learn English” since they can use English to spread the true message of Islam.

Thus, it was expected that the religious upbringing and education of the learners in the Saudi Arabian context would place a sense of obligation on most of the learners to use the English language as a medium to spread Islam in the non-Arabic speaking world, for example. Surprisingly, when the factor analysis on the self scale was conducted, learning English for religion related purposes, albeit being more related to obligations that are placed on the learner from the outside, fell within the ideal self subscale rather than the ought-to self one (see Table 5.1).

This finding is difficult to explain since only a few of the interviewees identified religion as a motivating force. Nevertheless, the finding may be explained through the concept of internalization. Saudi Arabia has a very religious upbringing system in schools and within the Saudi communal institutions in general. It appears that this religious upbringing, which starts at a very early age in the case of most Saudis, has resulted in inculcating most of these religious teachings in the minds and the hearts of these learners, and gradually made it a part of their identities.

At least one third of the participants emphasized the importance of learning other languages from the Islamic point of view while others mentioned them among other reasons. These participants explained that Islam encourages people to learn the languages of other people to communicate with these people and get to know them better. They also asserted the importance of having sufficient English knowledge to be able to communicate with non-Arabic speaking Muslims, who go to Saudi Arabia for pilgrimage. Not only that, but also to invite non-Arabic speaking people from other religions to Islam and educate them more about this faith. However, most of the participants did not elaborate much on the importance of learning English for religious purposes. Rather, they confirmed that learning English is not necessary only for Muslims or Saudis, but to everyone in the world as a medium of communication for people coming from different linguistic backgrounds.
Yes [learning English is important] and not only [for] Saudis or Arabs because when you go anywhere and you don’t know English, it’s a big problem. How are you going to talk to these people? [How are you going to] get to know them? And know about them? Although it’s really important for Muslims to use it to teach others about Islam, but not all Muslims will take that path. I’m saying it’s important for all people because they’ll need it. For communication with everyone, you have to learn [an]other language.

Another participant had a similar view point about English being considered and used as a ‘common ground’ and a lingua franca connecting people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. He highlighted the importance of using English as a means of communication not only for social everyday speech and interaction, but also for practical and utilitarian reasons, as well.

Most definitely in this day and age yes of course [learning English is important]. It’s the most important language in the world right now. Even though I support my native language and everything, but when you talk to people from outside, it has to be in English. For example, if you want to talk to Chinese people and conduct business with them in a company meeting or whatever, you have to use English because it’s the common language that everyone uses. It’s the common ground, the middle ground. And anyone who doesn’t know English now will be lacking greatly, and will be dragging everyone around him behind because they have to adapt to his behaviour and talk to him in his native language which will make it hard for him, hard for you and hard for everyone. Imagine if inside a meeting room in a multicultural corporation everyone was using their native language. Imagine all the time that will be wasted in translation from each of the speakers’ languages to all of the other listeners’ languages!

The majority of the participants, nonetheless, highlighted the importance of learning English to Saudis and Muslims in general. Not only for them to be able to explain the Saudi culture to others, but also to be able to cope with the modern times and benefit from the western world’s scientific advances.
Nowadays, I think learning English is extremely important because English now is the language of the world whether the literature world or business world. It’s a way of communication. So, everyone must learn two things: computer and English.

Another participant added:

Not all Muslims should learn English, but it’s a must to speak English because English language [has] become an international language, the dominant language, and the world language. So, most of us should speak English in order to help the Arab world here with the science of the western world and develop scientifically.

A third participant said:

Yes because we are in the twenty first century. Everyone should know at least two languages to be able to communicate with people all over the world, so we can become among the first world countries. we shouldn’t look at the non-developed countries, but we [should] look at the first world countries like America. We are all human. If we work hard, we will be like them.

It is noteworthy that the participants’ perceptions about learning English were not highly affected by the religious educational background of Saudi Arabia. Rather when answering this question, the respondents viewed the importance of learning English from an international outlook, which provides support to Yashima’s (2002, 2009) international posture. Yashima described international posture as “interest in foreign or international affairs, willingness to go overseas to stay or work, readiness to interact with intercultural partners, and . . . openness or a non-ethnocentric attitude toward different cultures” (2002, p. 57). Lamb (2004, p. 16) argued that:

the English language is so important to this ‘world citizen’ identity because it is both the means and the end; that is, it is both a typical attribute of the . . . ‘world citizen’, and also an important means of becoming one, by providing access to financial, social and cultural resources.
This Saudi’s perception of English as the first international language correspondingly supports Crystal’s (2003) argument on how English has not only become a global language (EGL), but is also being perceived as the only global language by the majority of the people in different parts of the world. Canagarajah (1999) emphasizes that in many countries English is looked at as the only lingua franca, and whether it is positive, negative, or value-neutral, English has gradually gained the status of lingua franca (Canagarajah, 1999; Dörnyei et al., 2006, as cited in Kim, 2009).

Although some participants spoke about the importance of learning English to communicate with other Muslims who are non-Arabs, and to invite other people from other faiths to Islam, the majority of the participants attributed the importance of learning English to other reasons. Most of the participants described English as an important language to be learned by Muslims and Saudis to develop scientifically and keep up with the modern times. Other participants referred to English as a global medium of communication to people coming from different backgrounds regardless of their race or religion. It is important to note, though, that the Saudis’ view of international posture is not completely compatible with Yashima’s, Dörnyei’s and their associates’ views of the same concept. Although the Saudi learners of English value the importance of English as a means of communication in the globalized world, which is one of the main features of having an international posture view point regarding English learning, they still associate English with certain language groups and communities, i.e., the British and American people (see section 5.2.2).

5.2.1.3 Obligations vs. Encouragement

Interviewer: Have you ever felt any pressure to learn English? What do other people (family/friends) think about your English learning? Do they support your decision to learn English? How?

After asking the participants about their perceptions about the importance of learning English, it was important to look into what motivates these learners to learn it and whether these motivators stem from within the learners or are forced upon them from the outside. Looking at Saudi Arabia as a collectivist society, it was assumed that the learners’ motivation to learn English would be strongly related to the expectations and
obligations placed on these learners by their family members or other important people in their life. In Hofstede’s (1980) famous classification of the world’s cultures using his four bipolar cultural dimensions, he identified Saudi Arabia, along with most of the Asian countries, as a collectivist society. Research in this framework demonstrated that people in collectivist societies value group memberships, e.g. family relations, and have high levels of integration, collaboration, consensus and interdependence. Conversely, people in these countries showed low levels of individualism and independence (Jones & Alony, 2007). Furthermore, previous research showed that young people in Arabic and Asian cultures are “more susceptible to the influence of significant others”, and are, thus, more likely to have strong ought-to selves (Lamb, 2012, p. 1002).

It was therefore predicted that the majority of the participants in the current study would report a high level of family influence on their choice to learn English as a function of this collectivist nature of Saudi Arabia. Contrary to the prediction, however, only a small number of the participants reported a direct influence from others on their decision to learn English. This is consistent with Martin’s (2007, p. 86) argument that being a member of a collectivist context where the social and cultural aspects are more pronounced “does not mean that selfhood is considered as a communal rather than a predominately individual achievement”. In the current study, only two lower-proficiency participants stated that they were learning English because their parents wanted them to do it. They mentioned that their parents’ desire was to enable them to get good jobs in the future as English teachers, so they did it. Similarly, two other participants said that their fathers and brothers told them it will be very good for their future career to learn English, but they said that learning English was their own decision albeit substantially encouraged by other family members. In addition, one other participant said he was learning English because the society views those who know English as being learned and cultured, but he affirmed that no one told him that he should learn English; rather, it was his own choice.

In addition to these participants who reported that they decided to study English as a result of a direct pressure from others to learn English, there were also a few participants who reported that other important people played an indirect role in encouraging them to learn English. Some of them asserted that learning English has been their dream or means to fulfill their dreams for a long time. Yet, they also reported
that they had family members who speak English fluently and/or studied in an English speaking country, which might have influenced these respondents’ decision to learn English indirectly and made them want to learn English, as well.

Ten years ago [when I was] at the first year in [the] intermediate school, I started learning English for entertainment and movies and games and music because I was young, but when I was fourteen, I started thinking about the future and though there were some other departments that were actually easier to study at, I chose to study English because it is a part of my life and all my brothers know English. My older brother is a lecturer at Tabook University and the other one is an English teacher [in a public school] and so are my sisters. They all, at least, have a BA in English. They are supporting me. They used to translate music, movies and short stories for me, and they still help me to understand all the courses, and my other brother has a master from England. Also, my friends like me learning English because I help them and translate for them movies and songs because I watch 3 movies a day and listen to VOA radio everyday. I think it’s helping my English because I do it for entertainment not learning.

Another participant commented:

My father studied English at a university in America, so he likes that I chose to study English. He told me I can go to university and do wherever I want. So, I said I want to learn another language and he supported my decision. He buys me books to help me. My brothers are very good speakers of English too, and they support me. They only speak English to me at home and even my little brother who is in the second grade is starting to pick up a few words in English…

One other participant added:

Most of my friends came to the English department and I have 3 brothers who speak English, so I decided to do it. One of my brothers has been to Europe (France, Britain) so many times and yeah I want to become like him and travel.

The majority of the participants, however, reported that they have never actually felt any outside pressure from other people to learn English. Rather, their motivation for
learning English came from the inside. Some of these participants said that the main reason for them to learn English was their fascination with western culture. They reported that watching movies and listening to music as well as reading books and magazines coming from America and Britain were their main sources of motivation to want to learn English. They started learning English so that they can understand these movies and books without the need for subtitles or translations, and also to know more about the American and British culture.

To be honest with you what gave me the ultimate motivation to study English is my fascination with the west in general. I love their movies, books, music, Michael Jackson. I hope I can be as good of a speaker as him.

Another participant commented:

I felt a pressure to learn English, not from the society, but right now everything is English oriented, for example, the movies, Internet, forums, chat rooms. You feel like you’re falling behind or less than your peers if you don’t speak English. So it was from the inside like I said it ticked. When I was a child, movies were my only company. They made me laugh, think, and even made me critical, and I just had that impulse. I felt I just have to move forwards and that direction seemed like the normal and natural direction that I should take.

Other participants reported that they were influenced by great teachers who inculcated the love of the language in them which eventually made them decide to learn English:

I decided to learn English when I was in my last year in high school because of a really good English teacher who taught us at the time. I used to hate English before that because my English teachers were always strict, so I hated it till I met him. He made us love English and used to joke with us in English and had great styles and methods of teaching.

Another remarked:

The motivation came from the inside. Actually, I want to be a translator or a man of literature. I have [had] this goal since 7th grade. Actually, I wanted to be
a doctor, but one of my teachers, he’s dead now, but he was the first person that planted the love of English teaching into me and I just wanted to be a teacher since that time or something related to English. It doesn’t matter, but something related to English.

Although the majority of the respondents confirmed that they have never felt any external direct pressure to learn English, all the participants mentioned that they receive a lot of encouragement and support from their families. This support comes either in a form of advice and words of encouragement or actual support that includes paying for these participants’ English language institutions fees, buying them English books, magazines and short stories, and even offering to pay for these participants to go to an English speaking country to improve their English language skills. Some participants even reported that their parents or friends were proud of them for being able to speak English.

I never felt pressure from the outside. I never cared about jobs, either. It is my dream. It is from the movies, but my family members are supporting me. They show me good learning websites and give me English teaching books and short stories like my uncle and aunt and my father. He used to buy me English newspapers every time he comes back from Makkah since I was a child.

Another participant stated:

No one told me I should learn English to get a good job or any thing, but my father supported my decision of wanting to learn it. He said whatever you want to study you can study it. I chose English and he started enrolling me in English classes and institutes and paid for that. My friends and family are very supportive, too. I think my friends and family are also kind of proud of me being able to speak English.

This can certainly be described as indirect pressure. One of the most defining features of human behaviour is approval seeking, i.e., most people do wish to be liked/approved by other members of the community, and would be prepared to do lots of things to achieve
this. In this case one of the reasons the participant is learning English is to get approval by his family and utilize the support they’re offering to achieve this goal.

Within Gardner’s socio-educational approach, he always emphasized the role played by what he referred to as the milieu and how greatly it can impact the learners. Gardner made clear that the milieu does not only refer to the community in which the learner learn the language, but to the learners’ family and especially their parents who can play an “active role in the language learning process by encouraging, supporting, and monitoring the curricular activities of children” (Gardner, Masgoret, & Tremblay, 1999, p. 422). The initial belief in this study was that the collectivist nature of the Saudi community would generally stimulate a manifestation of an ought-to rather than an ideal self orientation among the participants, in which the motivation for learning English would basically be a result of social obligations placed on the learner directly or indirectly from the outside. This held true in the cases of many participants who reported enjoying some sense of pride in the approval they receive from their family and friends with regard to their choice of learning English even though the majority of the participants rejected the proposal of a direct influence from family members or close friends on their decision to learn English. Most of these participants reported that the drive to learn English came from inside them to allow them to communicate in English, pursue a career using English, or study another major in an English speaking country. Some of them mentioned that other family members and English teachers acted like role examples for them, motivating them to follow on their footsteps and learn English. Almost all the participants denied that they were learning English because they felt a direct force from family members or other close people to do it. Nevertheless, they all emphasized that they receive a lot of support and reinforcement from their families and friends, which encourage them indirectly but surly in their English learning process.

5.2.2 Future Selves and Imagination

Interviewer: Do you ever imagine yourself speaking English with English speakers (not necessarily native speakers)? How frequently? Who would you be speaking to? Where would you be speaking?
Dörnyei (2009) confirmed that imagery/imagination plays a crucial role in his theory. Markus and Ruvolo (1989) explained that “imaging one’s own actions through the construction of elaborated possible selves achieving the desired goal may thus directly facilitate the translation of goals into intentions and instrumental actions” (as cited in Dörnyei, 2009, p. 16). Boyatzis and Akrivou (2006, p. 632) also stated “the dream or image of a desired future is the content of the ideal self”. The majority of the participants in the current study recounted that they constantly imagine themselves in future situations where they are using English for communication and other purposes although a few participants reported never having such imaginations. There were in particular two participants, one lower-proficiency and one upper-proficiency participant, who confirmed that they have never imagined themselves speaking in English or even had any similar thoughts. The lower-proficiency participant claimed that he only has time for study and does not like to waste his time doing anything else, while the upper-proficiency participant explained that there is no need for him to imagine speaking with English speakers since he has always been able to communicate with English speakers through online gaming and the internet. He explained “I have been speaking with actual native and non-native speakers of English everyday for years for at least 4 up to 7 hours a day, so there’s no need for imagination”.

It was also interesting that two lower-proficiency participants reported that although they sometimes see themselves in imagined situations communicating in English, their English proficiency in these imagined situations is still low. Perhaps they were being realistic with his imaginations. One of them said that he loves watching movies so much that he sometimes sees himself in these movies acting and interacting with the other actors, but reported that even in his imagined situations his English level is not as good as he hopes for it to be. The other participant also stated that his English proficiency level is low which is why he does not interact with native English speakers. Rather, he specified that even when he has these imaginations of himself communicating in the English language, he is always talking with other non-native speakers of English in Saudi Arabia whose English proficiency is not very high either. He also reported that in these imagined situations he would be using English just to order a meal at a restaurant and such, rather than have full meaningful conversations in English. Dreams like these cannot be a strong motivating force (if at all). If imagined discourse partners have a
similar low L2 proficiency, there seems to be no serious pressure to increase one’s own proficiency.

Nonetheless, the rest of the participants confirmed that they frequently see themselves in imagined situations speaking English with either native or fluent non-native English speakers. Most of them reported that these imagined situations usually take place in an English speaking country. They reported that in these imagined situations they are generally speaking with native speakers using everyday life language for general everyday life communicative purposes. One of the participants said:

Yeah I want to travel abroad and live with the people in that culture and communicate with them and go to the movies with them, etc. So, I imagine it all the time that I’m speaking with British people because I love their accent. So, I imagine myself living there with them, communicating with them, just talking in general, and having British friends.

Another participant commented:

Yeah yeah I have these imaginations a lot. They keep happening to me without any intention. I try to go to sleep early and sometimes I can’t sleep. So, you just close your eyes and start dreaming about stuff that you cannot control, and then you find yourself having dreams in English and you don’t even know how it’s possible. I mean I don’t know much vocabulary. I wonder how I end up writing a good script without knowing good English really! I’m not talking about actual dreams only, but also day dreaming. I find myself imagining full situations talking to people for hours. I swear it’s like a full movie (laughs). They’re mostly American people I’m having conversations with because I don’t like British movies and I also don’t like the British accent, either. Sometimes I rewrite a whole movie I’ve seen in my mind and live in this imaginary world for hours.

A third participant had this to say:

Yes I do have imaginations maybe because I watch lots of movies, but in my imaginations I’m not in hostage situations where I save people with my
language skills, but I’d be using English comonly like you know I just meet some people, Americans mostly (99%) of the time and I just talk to them. The remaining (1%) I could be with some guy that I’m trying to explain the directions to, for example. I’d be like yeah to get to that building make a right turn. Then, walk down the street, and then turn left, etc. But, yeah I usually see myself talking to Americans in New York. I’d be talking about my culture and explaining everything to them and be like you know when you go down to Saudi it’s so easy you know. No one will kidnap you, but don’t stare at women. You can look you know, but don’t stare or you’ll get in trouble (laugh). I feel it’s my responsibility as a citizin here to explain the culture not in a threatening way you know just like putting the dots on the i’s and just information to keep them safe, and tell them that we can’t drink, but if you want to have fun, we have other fun things to do. You can go do this and do that, etc.

This is in line with the findings of other studies. For example, Ushioda’s (2001) study findings showed that her Irish participants had imaginations and hopes for travelling to France and described their visions of communicating and living with the French there. Furthermore, the current study supports previous research that has shown that students’ attitudes towards the importance of learning English as a global language have not only highly motivated the learners to learn English (e.g. Lamb, 2004; Yashima, 2000), but also contributed in the process of building successful future images of these learners in their own minds (Csizér & Kormos, 2009). According to Lamb (2004, p. 3):

In the minds of learners, English may not be associated with particular geographical or cultural communities but with a spreading international culture incorporating (inter alia) business, technological innovation, consumer values, democracy, world travel, and the multifarious icons of fashion, sport and music.

Yet, it was interesting to notice that in contrast to Dörnyei’s (2005) and Yashima’s (2002) claims that globalization has made the English language become less and less associated with a certain people or country and assume more of an ‘international posture’, most of the respondents in the current study always associated English with either the United States of America or the United Kingdom. In fact, it was noticed that the majority of the learners described their future visions taking place in either of these
two countries. This clearly shows that regardless of the monolingual nature of Saudi Arabia and the general lack of direct contact with English native speakers, the TL group remains salient to L2 Saudi learners of English and Saudi learners still associate English with specific cultures and their people (Alrahaili, 2014).

In addition to those respondents who related their future visions of traveling to and living in English speaking countries and communicating with the native English speakers there, other participants described more specific situations relevant to their academic lives and their experiences as English language major students.

I think about that a lot actually. I keep imagining my future and what I might be, and yes I can imagine that I’m going to be a professor and communicating with a lot of other professors and students from different countries of course. I mostly imagine myself talking to other people who are interested in what I do like literature and know what I’m talking about. We would be talking about fiction, the Victorian age, the gothic novels, etc., etc.

Another participant commented:

I don’t have these imaginations all the time, but sometime I can see myself having conversations with people about certain subjects. For example, when I read some literary works, I feel I need to share it with some body else. So, I start imagining having discussions about them with other English speakers here in Saudi.

Several other participants reported they are planning to go abroad to further their education. They said that they keep thinking about how life will be there and imagine the situations they will be in and the conversations that they will be having:

Yes I imagine myself speaking the language like the native speakers and God willing I’ll become like this hopefully. I see myself talking maybe with the doctors as I want to be a teacher in the department. Also, I want to travel to England or America or whatever country that I want to complete my Master and Doctorate in, so I imagine that I will be speaking English well and
understanding every single word they speak and use English both for study and everyday life communication.

Other participants reported having a clear vision of what their future career will be like. One participant said he has a dream to work as an interpreter at the United Nations and described how he sees himself in that job interpreting for world presidents and translating speeches. Another participant who was already a news reporter at a local online newspaper had this to say:

I want to become a better reporter and writer in English or become a TV show host or a reporter at a TV channel or a news anchor abroad. It’s what I imagine myself doing most of the time. I have imaginations of me reporting news on TV in an English speaking channel, and speaking fluently like these TV reporters I see on TV. I think about that a lot.

A third participant reported having imaginations about having an office job working in a big firm ‘just like in the movies’.

I imagine myself working when I’ll be living abroad. So, I’ll be talking to my managers, and colleagues while working there. In these situations, I will be working in a company and work in an office with other English speakers and also I will be talking to colleagues and making presentations, etc.

According to Boyatzis and Akrivou (2006), humans throughout history have been driven by their imagination and their ability to see their desired future selves come true. Leaders, poets, writers, composers, artists, dreamers, athletes have been able to be inspired, stay inspired and inspire others through such images. These images, once shared, have the power to become a force, and in that sense an inspiration for social development and growth, for intentional change at many levels of social organization, not just for the individual (Boyatzis & Akrivou, 2006, as cited in Dörnyei, 2009, p.17).

In summary, although a few participants claimed never having any imagined circumstances where they would be speaking English with either native or non-native speakers of English, the majority of the participants reported that they see themselves speaking English with other people in imaginary situations. While most of them said
that in these imagined situations they mainly use English in a social context to communicate with native English speakers in an English speaking country in common everyday life situations, other participants had imaginations that are related to the careers they wanted to pursue.

5.2.2.1 Source of Imagination

*Interviewer: What would you say the source of these imagined situations is? Would you say they stem from images others have of you? Or are these images associated with a role model you have? If yes who is s/he? Or are there other sources?*

One of the most important objectives of this research is to shed more light on the formation process of the self-guides and address the issue that Dörnyei raised about the sources of change that can lead to significant self developments in the minds of the learners (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 352). Dörnyei argued that the source of the imagined selves that the L2 learners have can be related to role models that the L2 learners admire dearly and desire to be like in the future. The learners can alternatively develop images of their future selves in accordance with how they are viewed by their parents, or with images that are held by other members in the learners’ peer group (Zentner & Renaud, 2007; Boyatzis & Akrivou, 2006, as cited in Dörnyei, 2009, p. 33). All the participants denied that the imagined situations they see themselves in are introjected obligations placed on them from the outside, or have anything to do with what others expect them to be. Rather, they affirmed that these imagined situations stem from inside them. Almost half the participants \(n=10\) reported that the source of the imagined situations they see themselves in is strongly connected to a role model they have or have once had in their lives. Eight of these participants were lower-proficiency participants, and they all reported that their role models were close people in their immediate environment. Generally, these role models fell into the category of either family members or English teachers who had a tremendous positive impact on these participants. The majority of these participants shared a common interest in academia or English teaching as a future career choice. They reported that they dream about furthering their education and obtaining Master and PhD degrees from an English speaking country; then, returning
back to Saudi Arabia to assume teaching positions in the European Languages Department or in public schools. Many of these participants, who reported having a role model in their immediate environments, were particularly influenced by one of the teachers at the department who was reported to be a great inspiration to a several participants in the interviews. One of them commented:

I imagine myself as a doctor teaching at university, so I always imagine and hope to be like Dr X. He is a good English learner and teacher. I would like to be like him in the future. He’s so excellent and a genius, so I’ll be like him in the future.

Another participant had more to say about the effect which that teacher had on him when he was asked the same question about how his future imagined self first developed:

Yes because I want to be a translator. I imagine myself working at the United Nations and translating and interpreting presidents’ speeches. I imagine myself like Dr. X who gives me confidence to become a translator maybe at the United Nations like he used to be. He told me “why not? you can do it like I did”

A third participant added:

These imaginations certainly come from the inside. Although I think it’s difficult to master a language completely, but there was this teacher when I started studying here in the university. He wasn’t a native speaker, but was an Egyptian and his name was X. So, his accent wasn’t perfect, but the situations he got into while learning English have been motivating me ever since he told us about them. He worked at the UN, and he used to translate articles for Bill Clinton. He used to be an interpreter at events that happened in Saudi Arabia that required someone to be good at both Arabic and English. I imagine myself in such situations translating between both languages. My parents also teach Arabic and English so maybe that’s why I want to master both languages.

The collected data on this category, therefore, assists in broadening our understanding of the role played by teachers in the formation process of their learners’ future selves.
This finding in the current study is consistent with that of Lyons (2009, p. 266) where he demonstrated that “[i]f there is a group characteristically associated with the L2 in the learner’s closer social environment, his attitudes toward integration would be most likely related to this group – even though its members are not native speakers.

Furthermore, Yashima (2009) stated that as reaching a native like fluency was reported to be too difficult to achieve by most L2 learners, these learners seem to find it both easier and more realistic to have their teachers as their role model L2 speakers. This also gives support to Dörnyei’s (2009, p. 19) discussion of the significance of having ‘plausible’ goals and end states as a factor that can positively or negatively impact the L2 learners’ ideal and ought-to selves. In other words, the L2 learners try to reduce the discrepancy between their current L2 proficiency level and that of their non-native English teachers’, rather than actual L2 native speakers. Thus, they view their teachers as custom-made images of the future selves which they both hope to be like and are more inclined to resemble in the future.

The other group of these lower proficiency participants reported other family members being the role models for them when it comes to English learning. These family members included close family members like parents and siblings as well as other more distant family members like aunts, uncles and in-laws. Some participants reported that these family members were again English teachers. However, other participants said that their role models were family members whose English language skills and proficiency allowed them to have reputable jobs in big oil companies in Saudi Arabia which is why they wanted to be like them. One participant said:

My neighbor and two of my brothers and cousins are very good at English and work in SABIC and ARAMCO, so I’m trying to become like them. So, I imagine myself like them in an English speaking country speaking with everyone in English: in the street, hospital, etc. Then come back and have a job in a big oil company too. You know, just communicating with the people in English in my job and in the community, in general.

Another added:
I imagine myself living in Canada because I love it. I imagine myself studying there and speaking with people there at uni[versity] about study, and will do a master like my aunt and uncle. I always imagine living there with them. They worked for ARAMCO Company and went to study abroad many many years ago.

The upper proficiency participants, however, reported having distant role models who were not part of their immediate social environment. Rather, they reported that they aspire to be like famous personalities that they have never actually met in real life. One of these participants reported that the Saudi minister of foreign affairs Prince Saud Al Faisal has been a great inspiration to him. He admired his eloquence in other languages and reported that he sometimes imagines himself in his position in the future speaking in English with the same fluency as the prince. Another participant said he was interested in music and rapping and that his lifelong dream has been to become like the famous rapper Eminem. He reported that he frequently imagines himself in the future being a famous rapper like Eminem, which has helped him to actually write some poems and perform them in front of his friends in real life.

The second major source of having the imaginations about possible future selves among Saudi learners of English was found to be strongly connected to watching movies and the new media, e.g. YouTube. Arnett (2002) and Schlegel (2001) state that the younger generation are the most devoted, knowledgeable, and innovative users of the different forms of the new media, which as Arnett puts it works as a “foot in the door that opens the way for other changes in beliefs and behaviour” (2002, p. 774). One third of the participants in the current study mentioned that enjoying watching movies and English media sources were among the most important motivators for them to learn English. These participants reported that they consider movies as the primary source for these imagined situations in which they see themselves speaking in English. Some of these participants mentioned having role model actors like Bruce Willis, Eddie Murphy, Samuel L Jackson and Tom Cruise among other Hollywood movie stars. They said that sometimes when they are bored while stuck in traffic or trying to fall asleep, they start recalling movies they have watched; then, they would start imagining themselves in these movies doing these actors’ parts and imitating the way they speak.
I mostly think about them when I am in bed. My process of sleeping is really kind of weird. I only sleep when I think too hard. You know after I strain my mind really hard thinking about stuff, then, I fall asleep . . . I can say that Eddie Murphy and Bruce Willis were my teachers. I don’t have any brothers nor sisters and when I was a kid, my mother would travel a lot and she would leave me in the house. I know it’s not really good parent behaviour, but I can’t really complain. So, I’d always watch movies and I like this movie die hard 1, 2, and 3. They’re all so awesome. I would watch it once, twice, maybe 3 or 4 times a day and I like to imitate what he says and I would do role play. It was great fun back then, but it aided me greatly. I aspire to be in these actors’ footsteps not an actor wise, but language wise. And I find myself always role playing these parts in my imaginations.

Another participant added:

I don’t think I have a role model. I just have free time and boredom, so I start imagining and even maybe while driving. Some actors like Samuel L Jackson say certain punch lines that stick to your head like saying “I dare you. I double dare you. I triple dare you”. So, I imagine myself saying these lines and connect the characters with another movie and I, then, find myself dreaming without knowing anything. It’s not only actual dreams, but sometimes day dreams, as well. You know you’re driving and the road is blocked and the traffic is terrible, so you start thinking maybe while listening to a song and it leads you to something else or remembering a video clip to a song and start living in that. Even sometimes when I face a certain situation in my life, I think about it and start talking to myself in English. I don’t know why. I don’t have control over this. It may be because I watch so many movies. I don’t know.

It was interesting to hear that this participant among others report that they find themselves thinking in English, talking to themselves and with others in English without intending to do so. This fascinating shift towards the more natural and unconscious use of the target language clearly illustrates that as the L2 learner progresses in his/her L2 process, his/her identity and self transforms along with the transformation of his way of
thinking and the language he starts using for communication which is the language of his future desired self.

In addition to having real life models as well as movie star models, reading novels and short stories, recreating and reliving the lives of the fictional characters in these novels were also among the reasons that incited imaginations in the minds of some participants. One participant reported that he has always been fascinated with the fictional character of Sherlock Holmes. He said that Holmes has always been his greatest role model and inspiration and has always lived with him in his imagined world since he was ten years old. He also mentioned that he started writing short stories and plays of his own inspired by this amazing character. He also mentioned that he always imagines himself being a successful writer of novels that he might turn into movies and plays, too. “Holmes is my inspiration. It’s hard to become a fictional character, but it’s not hard to become the creator of a fictional character as remarkable as the most sharp-witted detective of all time, Sherlock Holmes”, he concluded. Another participant also stated that reading Charles Dickens’ novels was the main reason that made him fall in love with the UK, its people and its culture, and this fascination has led him to always imagine living there and having British friends. These results confirm Csizér and Kormos’ (2008, p. 169) statement that:

[Even though] in certain learning environments, . . . direct contact with L2 speakers is minimal, yet the L2 community may still be well-known to the learners through indirect contact with it, that is, through the learners’ exposure to a range of L2 cultural products and artefacts, such as films, videos, books, magazines, and music.

Csizér and Kormos (2008, p. 179) go on and propose that in foreign language contexts, this indirect contact with the English-language media can even be more effective than some forms of actual contact with native speakers, and that it results in enhancing motivated behaviour and positive attitudes towards learning the target language:

The extent to which students engage in the consumption of English-language media . . . also contributes to students’ displaying more positive language-related attitudes. This finding highlights that in a foreign language setting such as Hungary, indirect contact by means of exposure to English-language media
products, such as television, magazines, and the Internet, might take over the place of direct contact and might exert significantly more influence on attitudes to target language speakers and their culture than direct spoken contact.

Dörnyei (2009, p. 33) assumed that the imagined future selves that the learners have of themselves come about either from the need to conform with how these learners are viewed by family members and other important people, or from having role models who the learners have seen on TV or real life who they aspire to be like. The results in this section of the study showed that having a role model that the participants admired dearly was the main source for the imagined situations that the majority of the participants saw themselves in. These role models varied between participants. Most of the lower-proficiency participants reported having real life role models in their immediate environments who were good English learners themselves who were a strong source of motivation for these participants to be like them. Alternatively, they were enthused to learn English as a result of a great English teacher that implanted the love of English in these participants. Some of the upper-proficiency participants reported that the source of their future selves was a result of their fascination with the English literature and their constant reading of it. Almost half the participants reported that the imagined situations that they see themselves in are strongly related to watching English movies and media sources, in general.

5.2.2.2 Possible Future Selves vs. Empty Dreams and Fantasies

Interviewer: Do you think it is really possible that you will be like that person? Do you have an action plan to achieve this goal? Are you implementing it? Do you ever consider failure in achieving this?

Having action plans to achieve the future hoped for self as well as considering the negative consequences associated with of achieving it are considered two crucial conditions to Dörnyei’s L2MSS (Dörnyei, 2009). Almost all the participants replied affirmatively when they were asked the first question. Their answers varied when the second and the third questions were asked, though. Around one quarter of the participants (five lower-proficiency participants) did not have any plans on how to make
their future dreams come true besides being in the European Languages department and hoping for the best. They seemed to lack what Dörnyei referred to as the “road map of tasks and strategies . . . [needed] . . . to approximate the ideal self” (2009, p. 21). Dörnyei (2009) affirmed that having plausible and realistic future selves can significantly enhance the motivational impact of the ideal and ought selves. One important characteristic Dörnyei identified to increase the likelihood of approximating, and in turn, attaining these future selves is having accompanying action plans and procedural strategies in addition to having future hopes (Dörnyei, 2009, pp. 18-21). The lack of these accompanying plausible action plans turns these future hopes into unachievable empty dreams. According to Kim (2009b, p. 54):

An ESL learner may have a vague or general motive to study English, but the motive is not elaborated into short-term, moderately challenging, and specific learning goals; an ESL learner may keep repeating that he or she wants to achieve high English proficiency with neither formulating specific goals nor making necessary efforts. If no goal is set, the learner’s initial motive cannot be transformed into motivation, which does not have much guiding force to L2 learning processes.

In the current study, not all the participants reported a lack of action plan, however. About one third of the participants, mostly upper-proficiency, reported that they have a future plan that will help them become the future selves they aspire to be. These future plans, albeit vague and not very specific in comparison with Dörnyei’s discussion of action plans (see Dörnyei, 2009), were mostly fixated around the idea of being in the academic field. Several participants reported their intention to join the Saudi scholarship program and travel to an English speaking country to undertake more English courses in order to improve their English proficiency and obtain higher qualifications.

First, I need to get my bachelor’s degree. Then, I’ll travel to England and get three masters: one in translation, another in linguistics, and a third in literature. Then, I’ll get a PhD in literature. Then, write more about literature. My PhD is hopefully going to be in fiction and drama. Then, I’ll start publishing my stories and my plays and my novels. Things will come slowly, but I’ll slowly but surely
reach my goal, and what I’m doing now, studying here is the first step in achieving that. Even if I can’t get three masters, I’ll still get one then do PhD.

A second participant had a similar future plan in order to succeed in realizing his future self.

Mostly it involves the academic field. For sure to take an internship. Also, to apply to be a teacher in this department and this language institution to be a teacher over there like that you know . . . and I know I have to always do something and not just sit around. I always feel like I’m a wheel I have to move forward because if I just sit around and not do anything, things are not going to work out for me. Then, I’ll hopefully go to New York for further studies.

A third participant said a teaching job will help him gain more knowledge and experience, but that will only be his first step before applying to undertake post graduate studies abroad. He explained:

I have the next step figured out, but I still don’t know what’s after that. First, I intend to apply to teach at an English language institution here in Saudi which will be a good opportunity for me to teach and improve both my language and teaching skills. After that, I am not sure yet, but I have also had a look at some master programs at other universities abroad where you can get a degree in both languages English and Arabic. So that seems like the following step.

The remaining group of participants which included both upper and lower-proficiency participants reported that they are already implementing certain steps in order to minimize the discrepancy between their current selves and their desired future selves. One of the upper-proficiency participants who seemed very interested in literature recounted that he reads English novels constantly and has already started writing his own short stories and plays, some of which have actually been performed in the annual theatre festival held at the European Languages Department. He also mentioned that he has already contacted a publishing house in England which offered to support him and publish his works as soon as he graduates and moves there. Other participants reported that they do not have actual formulated plans and steps except for allotting several hours
a day to expose themselves to English through doing online courses, interacting in forums and chat rooms, reading newspapers, listening to music, watching the news, or simply watching television, all in English of course.

I know the desire is not enough, but hard work never lets you down. In the last few months, I started listening to English everyday and speaking in English everyday. I also started reading a lot because reading is also very very important to improve your skills and knowledge.

Another participant added:

I don’t have an actual plan though I try to listen to music and watch movies without subtitles in English. Also, I read newspapers in English like New York Times. I try to always read newspapers or listen to or watch TV in English whenever I have the time to do it. For example, when I go to my job and I’m waiting in the waiting room I start reading the newspaper and if I get bored, I start listening to music or turn on the TV and start watching CNN, BBC news or watch the late show with David Letterman and so on.

Dörnyei (2009, p. 37) refers to the procedural plans that the learners need to achieve their desired future states as the “area where L2 motivation research and language teaching methodology overlap” and he goes on to describe a successful action plan as that containing “a goal-setting component, which is a motivational issue, but it will also include individualised study plans and instructional avenues, which are methodological in nature”. According to Kormos and Kiddle (2013, p. 402):

Self-regulation assists students in organizing and managing their learning, and it includes learners’ control over their thoughts (e.g. their competency beliefs), emotions (e.g. anxiety experienced while learning), behaviours (e.g. how they handle a learning task) and the learning environment.

Oyserman and James (2011, p. 129) draw our attention to the important relationship between the L2 learners’ views of the future proximity and the present step-by-step procedural plans that the learners put into action. They explains that when the L2 learners mark the time for their future to begin after graduation, for instance, they
experience their present as being separate and distal from the future. This may result in them viewing their future as something vague and distant, and this may discourage them from starting the work now for a future that is yet to come. On the contrary, when students view their present to be “connecting fluidly” to their future, they would see their present as the time for “setting the groundwork of what will become possible in the future” (ibid.). Trope and Liberman’s (2003) construal theory posits that thinking about the distal future activates “global and abstract” construal focusing on the overall essence while thinking about recent future event activates more “local and concrete” construal style (Trope & Liberman, 2003, as cited in Oyserman & James, 2011, p. 129). Additionally, Kivetz and Tyler (2007) explain that distant future thoughts activate what they refer to as the unidealistic self, i.e., ideal self, whereas proximal future thoughts activate the pragmatic and instrumental self, i.e., ought-to self. Thus, the differences in perceptions of future as being either distant or proximal seems to bear an effect not only on the activation of different self-guides, but also on the L2 learning processes and strategies that the L2 learners choose to employ to reduce the discrepancies between their current and future selves.

In a similar vein, Muir and Dörnyei (2013, p. 359) suggest:

A vision in isolation however is not necessarily sufficient to inspire motivated action; such daydreams can easily dissolve into mere fantasy. Yet by combining a powerful vision of a future self with a matching and highly structured behavioural sequence, we may be able to consciously create a motivational surge of energy which can focus action towards a specific target in the future.

In this study, the majority of the participants reported that they are confident in their ability to make their future imagined selves become a reality. Most of them explained that they already have made plans to help them achieve their goals. Some of these participants reported that they are already putting their plans into action while others said they have only implemented the first step or two of their plans, and that they are looking forwards to graduation in order to implement the other steps in their plans.

Notably, two upper-proficiency participants and more than half the lower-proficiency participants reported that sometimes they feel afraid that they will not be able to become the successful language learners they have always hoped to be. Perceiving discrepancies
between the current self and the future desired self, or perceiving strong similarities between the current and feared undesired self can be a major source of feelings of guilt, unhappiness or even symptoms of depression in some cases (Higgins, 1987; Oyserman & James, 2011). Ogilvie (1987) even suggested that the negative effect of the fear of similarity with the feared undesired possible future self might be larger on the well-being than that of the discrepancy between the current and desired possible future self due to the more concrete and experience-based nature of the feared possible self. The two upper-proficiency participants explained that they do not constantly think about the fear of not being able to realize their future desired selves. Yet, it lies in the back of their minds which they sometimes think of as a motivator for them to work harder to accomplish their long term goals.

On the other hand, the lower-proficiency participants stated that they always feel afraid of failure, and are generally not happy with their English proficiency. Some said that they are afraid that they “have already wasted many years trying to learn English, but failed in that goal.” Other lower-proficiency participants reported that they always think about failure around the time of examinations, and that they might fail these examinations, which will make it very hard for them to get a job in the future, accordingly. According to Dörnyei (2009, p. 22) “focusing on what would happen if the original intention failed has often been seen in motivational psychology as a powerful source of energy to keep us going . . . This suggests that the most effective condition for future self-guides is a balanced combination of pairs of countervailing selves.” Yet, in the current study thinking about the negative connotations associated with L2 incompetency was not enough for the lower-proficiency participants, who reported their fear of future failure, to succeed in their L2 learning when they clearly lacked on their repertoire of suitable plans and strategies to achieve their goals and avoid failure.

5.2.3 The L2 Learning Experience

Interviewer: Would you say that you enjoy learning English? Can you give reasons? (Why/Why not?)

One of the most important reasons to give rise to a move away from the Gardnerian way of researching motivational language learning is its obvious lack of educational
relatedness inside L2 learning classrooms (Dörnyei, 1994). This has led to a shift in the 90’s towards education-centered approaches, in the hope of enriching the L2 learning process in general and educational settings in particular with more research based findings about the relationship between motivation and language learning. The main aim of these classroom-friendly theoretical frameworks was to provide teachers with applicable knowledge that can inform their L2 classroom practices which can, in turn, lead to a better L2 learning experience (Dörnyei, 2014; Dörnyei and Otto, 1998; Oxford and Shearin, 1994, as cited in Dörnyei, 2001b). Thus, one of the main aims of the present study was to have a deeper understanding of the learners’ evaluation of their L2 progress and their L2 learning environment and overall experience. Unlike most previous studies that focused on the learners’ overall enjoyment of their L2 learning experience, this research looked into the learners’ evaluation of the specific components that make up the L2 learning experience, as well. Dörnyei (2009, p. 29) not only conceptualizes that the L2 learning experience has different components, but he also affirms that:

For some language learners the initial motivation to learn a language does not come from internally or externally generated self images but rather from successful engagement with the actual language learning process (e.g. because they discover that they are good at it).

Dörnyei also affirms that the different classroom factors, viz., the quality of teaching, the personality of the teacher, the usefulness of the content, and cohesion between the learners are responsible for the different levels of intrinsic motivation among learners in different instructed second language learning settings (Dörnyei, 2014; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). The interviews in the current study revealed that when the interviewees were simply asked at the beginning of the interview a general question like “Are you enjoying your English learning experience?”, they all provided positive answers, and started giving more explanation about their reasons for learning English and how they enjoy it. Some respondents reported that they practice English with their friends all the time and that it happens so effortlessly. One of these respondents stated that he enjoys English learning because his way of thinking has changed after he started learning English, and that he even feels like a different person when speaking in English with his friends:
When we talk in English our thought process becomes better in English. That’s one of the things I noticed lately. My thinking process is easier, more stream-lined, smoother and better in English. When I think in Arabic I can’t connect the dots that easily because now I’m just used to English even when I’m around my friends I talk English. I joke in English, and we laugh more in English than in Arabic. So, you know that feeling when you are so familiar with something you feel so natural with it and it comes out of your heart. And I feel I’m more me when I speak English.

This supports Guiora and Acton’s argument for the existence of a different self involved when speaking in the foreign language. They referred to it as ‘language ego’, which is defined as the psychological state that a language learner can experience that makes him/her feel “like a different person when speaking a second language and often indeed acts very differently as well” (Guiora & Acton, 1979, p. 199, as cited in Csizér & Kormos, 2009). Syed (2001, p. 129) also discussed this idea of multiplicity of identities and he proposed that “[j]ust as the self-concept is socially constructed, so is the notion of identity . . . Any given individual will have a number of social identities that operate in different social domains and are contextually triggered.” This finding is also in line with Coetzee-Van Rooy’s (2006) perceptive critique of the ‘simplex’ view of integrativeness as the process in which the L2 learner presumably assumes the identity of a monolingual speaker of the L2 at the loss of his L1 identity; she argues for the existence of multidimensional identities, rather than integration, as a result of learning a new language. Furthermore, Yashima (2009) affirmed that learning another language not only transforms the way we look at and interact with the world, but also intermediates in the way we interact with our own psychological side as well as the way we conceptualize our thinking about ourselves, i.e., future selves (Yashima, 2009).

Among the reasons for enjoying learning English was the fascination with the culture. Some participants indicated that they were enjoying learning English because they were learning so much about the people who speak it, their culture, history and even literary works. Another group of participants started talking about their childhood and teenage years experiences, and how English first became a part of their lives. One upper-proficiency participant commented:
I enjoy learning English very much. I think of it as a future career. That’s not the only reason, though. I’ve been with English since I was 5 years old and it is now a part of my soul. It feels like we’re connected. This is why I enjoy it very much actually. The main reason that made me learn English was a small coincidence, a strange coincidence. When I was a child, I was unconsciously repeating English words. Then my parents decided to make me learn the language. I learned the language thank God and I enjoy it now. I even write stories, novels, books, etc. I read a lot till English has become a part of my soul that can’t be taken away from my soul.

Another upper proficiency participant added:

I have enjoyed it. Since I was a child, it has been fun. I would play games that would require you to solve puzzles. If you don’t have a dictionary, you will not move anywhere, so I used to grab a dictionary and search for the meaning of every word I don’t know or just try to get a grasp of the meaning, generally . . . Since the age of seven, I used to love watching Sesame Street and it was amazing to see people with different eye colors and hair colors and I was like surprised. You know what kind of language do they speak? where did these guys live because all the people I used to see here had black hair and eyes, so I wanted to be able to understand what they say and to visit that place because everything was green and you know our environment is just a desert so I felt the need of being able to communicate with these people. Then I told my brother I want to learn what they’re saying and he helped me with the language. You know he offered giving me money if I could memorize either the Quran or English vocabulary. I went for both for the money (laughs).

In addition to video games and TV shows, movies and music were among the most common reasons that made learning English enjoyable for many participants. The ability to understand the English media was mentioned by several participants as a source of enjoyment of their current English progress. One Lower-proficiency learner commented:
I’ve been interested in English for 18 years because I’m interested in movies and rock music. That’s why I’m studying here in the English department now. This is the main reason because I’m interested. I want to learn more and I’d like to understand everything I hear in the movies and English songs without needing subtitles and without any help. In the past I used to go to my older brother and older sister and ask: what is the translation of this? Now I don’t need to do that.

It was interesting, however, that although the majority of the lower-proficiency learners reported their enjoyment of their English learning too, they only mentioned a few words when they were asked to elaborate on their reasons for enjoying learning English. They attributed their enjoyment of learning English to it being “the most important language of the world”. Some of them explained that they would be able to use it with foreigners or if they travelled abroad. One of the participants explained that he enjoys it because when he speaks English he feels that he “speak[s] a language that the rest of the people in the community don’t speak, so it’s always a good thing and you feel you have something more”. His thought was echoed by another lower-proficiency learner who added “it’s a new language because it’s the language that today’s society requires us to learn. The one who can speak it is seen as learned and cultured and knowledgable about European cultures”.

It is noteworthy that participants drew a clear distinction between learning English in the formal class setting and learning outside the classroom. They reported that they enjoy their English learning experience outside the class.

If I’m outside the formal educational setting I enjoy it. I don’t like the educational atmosphere, in general. I want to learn what I want to learn and leave what I want to leave.

Another participant added:

I most definitely enjoy my English learning experience. It could be hard sometimes because you don’t have that many English speakers right now in this country and when you do have [them], they are artificial you know they’re just wannabes. It’s just not part of their personality. But once you find one guy or two guys and they become your best friends, it gets pretty easy from there. I
made friends with two American guys and we hang together and play basketball and stuff.

It is obvious that the majority of the participants do enjoy learning English, in general. Most of them clarified, however, that they do not enjoy the experience of being taught in a formal classroom setting. Rather, they enjoy it much more when it is in an informal setting where the learning occurs as a result of a fun activity (e.g., watching movies and listening to music). As noted earlier, this research has tried to probe more deeply into the learners’ evaluation of their L2 learning experience and its specific component. The following sections in this chapter will explore the different components of the L2 learning experience in the formal context, the participants’ levels of satisfaction with them, and how their formal learning setting is affecting their L2 learning experience and progress.

5.2.3.1 Self Evaluation of Success in L2

The participants were asked to give their opinions about whether or not they thought they were happy with their English learning progress.

Interviewer: Do you think that you are a successful language learner? Can you give reasons? (Why/ Why not?)

The majority of the participants reported that although they think they have made some progress with their L2 learning, they are still not satisfied with their L2 proficiency. They indicated that they are hoping to make more progress in the future. The majority evaluated themselves to be of average proficiency. The majority gave an answer similar to “in the middle, 50% or 60% maybe, but I’m always hoping to learn more”. One participant indicated frustration that he cannot communicate in English:

Yes I think I am alright, but not very good because I find it hard sometimes when I try to speak with other people outside the classroom, but I want to be more successful and to learn and study more to become like a native speaker.
Another participant described his displeasure with his L2 proficiency level too, and attributed it to the lack of practice and exposure to L2 inside and outside the English classroom:

I hope [I’m a good language learner], but I’m not. I mean I’m trying hard, but here in Saudi [Arabia] we don’t use the language. We don’t talk a lot. Just here in university, but I go home and I speak Arabic. As soon as I get out from class I’m always speaking in Arabic and that’s the problem. The students should talk English to each other, but they don’t. They should do it to practice more. I use it only with the teachers in the class.

On the other hand, one third of the sample reported that they were happy with their L2 achievement levels. They were all upper-proficiency participants who indicated that their L2 skills have improved significantly in the past few years. They were generally confident about their levels of achievement in L2 and optimistic about their future. Some of them seemed more proud of what they have achieved than others, though.

Yes [I think I’m a good language learner] because I have my own website which also helps people with learning English. It’s called ‘English Speak’, and I’m also one of the translators for that website.

Some other participants attributed their success to their hard work, but also acknowledged the role their study at the English department played in helping them develop their language skills:

Yes [I think I’m a good language learner] and I’ve been working hard to do that actually. I can’t also forget the things that my university and schools did for me. They also improved my skills. For example, here at this university I’ve been learning phonology, phonetics, syntax, fiction, drama, etc. They’ve opened my eyes to other fields in this major.

Another participant had this to say:

. . . I think I’ve worked hard and now I’m graduating soon, and I also have a scholarship from the department to go and study in the UK for 1 year. Also, my GPA is excellent, so I’m happy now.
Some participants showed high levels of satisfaction with their L2 progress. Having positive views about the past and the current experience in relation to achievement in L2 learning is believed to play a significant role in motivating language learners to extend more efforts in their present and future L2 learning (Bandura, 1997; Covington, 1984). Nonetheless, the majority of the participants reported that they were not happy although somewhat satisfied with their L2 learning outcomes and their overall L2 proficiency. All in all, the majority of the participants reported dissatisfaction with their L2 progress, and stressed the point about both needing and wanting to improve their L2 skills. Yet, only a few of them elaborated on the action plans needed to reach these goals as previously discussed in section 5.2.2.2.

5.2.3.2 Evaluation of the Teachers

_Interviewer: How would you evaluate your English language teachers? Can you say why? (What do you like about them/ what do you not like about them?)_

Teachers have been found to impact on their learners’ short and long-term motivation to study, not only through their teaching strategies and methodologies, but also through the way they treat their students and relationships they establish with them (Patrick, Ryan, & Kaplan, 2007; Wentzel, 1998). In addition, some of Lamb’s Indonesian study’s most interesting results were found to “suggest that it is indeed the teacher, rather than . . . the region [or even the level of ideal self], that has the greater effect on pupils’ attitudes to the experience of learning English”, and can eventually determine how much efforts they are willing to expend in L2 learning (2012, p, 1010). One of the main contributions of this study is eliciting more accurate and precise information about the different components of the L2 learning process from the learners’ perspective. We have noticed that all the participants reported that they were enjoying their L2 learning experience. However, as they started describing the different components comprising the L2 experience in more detail, it was evident that they had varying levels of satisfaction with their L2 learning in general, and with each of its different components, in specific. First, the participants were asked to give their opinions about their teachers at the English Department and their teaching styles and methodologies. The participants had variant views about the teachers. Only seven participants (three of whom were upper-proficiency participants) expressed satisfaction with their English teachers and their
teaching methods. They were happy with their teachers’ levels of English and their
teaching qualifications as well as their personality traits and mostly described them as
being “friendly towards the students”. Some of them admitted that their teachers use the
classic method of lecturing most of the time, but they reported that they were happy
with that because it has been effective and there has been no need for other activities in
the majority of the courses that they were doing anyway. One upper-proficiency
participant asserted:

They’re really good actually thank God. All the teachers I’ve worked with are
keen, very keen teachers. They have unique ways of delivering information, and
I really enjoy the classes. I really enjoy the classroom activities, actually. [They]
use students’ presentations sometimes and ask for participation from the
students. I think we’re doing a pretty good job.

Another participant added:

I think we have more good teachers [than bad ones]. They make the material in
the easiest way [possible] and use clear info[rmation] and give us clear ideas
about the material. I think the way they explain is clear and the teaching style is
good. They use group work, presentations and make each student present one
chapter in his own way to the whole class. This is interesting and give you
experience on how to face the audience and present. I did it twice, actually, three
times this term.

A third one pointed out:

Most of them have their ups and downs and those who mainly have downs and
they didn’t have a good personality or didn’t take their job seriously, they’ve
already been expelled or forced to retire. But 90% of the teachers now are good.
They do what they are given to do, fullfil their jobs, and things are going great
for them and towards us and it’s like this relationship where the teachers’
success depends on his students’ success, so most of them are pretty good.
Overall, I like their teaching methodology and most of the teachers give us a
chance to participate and discuss. Overall, I think the teaching here is positive
and fruitful.
Nevertheless, the majority of the participants did not feel very strongly about all of their teachers and their teaching styles. They indicated that while they had some very qualified teachers with good teaching styles, they also had some teachers who were not even near as good. The majority of the students reported that the good teachers outnumbered the bad ones in the English Department. Yet, these participants had a few demands and complaints concerning their teachers and their teaching styles. They were demanding the use of more activities and varying teaching styles inside the classroom. They were also asking for a shift from teacher-centered approaches to learner-centered approaches. The most common complaint concerning the “not so good” teachers was their overuse of the traditional method, in which the teacher is lecturing the whole time without allowing any time for student discussion and participation, and the lack of incorporating other teaching methods that allows for more student interaction during class time.

Some teachers are ok. We have good professors, but some are not perfect. The good have a good command of the subject. They teach and they have a good way of getting the information across. [They] allow the students to speak which makes the class interesting, but some just open the book and read it. Some classes are very boring.

Another participant had this to say:

. . . Some professors even when you try to ask them a question, they’d tell you there’s no time so they just want to finish what they have and just leave. Other professors would do everything to help you improve with your English. They even put on some cassettes with different accents so it would help your listening skills which I find really good.

Some students were also not happy about the English proficiency level of some of these teachers. They reported that some of these teachers had pronunciation problems which made it really difficult for the students to understand the material.

[We have] more bad teachers. Some are very good because they have really good English when they talk, discuss and explain very well. But, a few have problems especially when it comes to their accent and pronunciation like the
Asians and some Egyptians. They can’t pronounce certain sounds which makes it harder for the students to understand.

Another participant seemed very frustrated as he was explaining an accidental misunderstanding that happened to him because of this problem:

. . . The Indian and Pakistani ones are really bad and the problem is that they teach phonetics and and they can’t articulate letters and vowels correctly! One of them was teaching us about voiced and voiceless. It was the first class in the semester and he was pronouncing them as “wised” and “wiseless”. He gave us a couple of exercises in the classroom and I honestly thought it was pronounced as “wiseless”, so when I raised my hand and answered that the sound was “wiseless”, he thought I was making fun of him and kicked me out of class.

Moreover, some of the participants attached more significance to the personality of the teachers and complained about the unfriendliness of some of them. One of the participants commented:

Some [teachers are good] and some [are bad]. I would say 50% [of them are] good. I like the way they deal with the students. I’m dealing with my teachers in a good way not because of marks, but just in general and they should deal with us in a good way too. Also, the teaching methods and styles, some of them are so boring they don’t do nothing. All the classes are the same. We just go to the class, sit in our chairs and the teacher talks in the same way. He never does anything new or gives us exercises although in some seminars we learned that teachers should change their teaching styles and even their clothes, and do something new and give us exercises, but they never do. And they require us in exams to just write what’s in the book. We can’t give our opinions or use our words while some are really friendly and treat us like adults and ask for our opinions and take it seriously.

Another student added:

Some [teachers are good] and some [are bad]. What I like about the good ones are their teaching style[s] and information and [they] usually treat us like
brothers and deal nicely with the students, but the bad ones just read and don’t deal nicely with the students and give us lots of homework and bad marks in the exam.

A third participant said:

Some teachers are good and their teaching styles are great, but not all of them. The old ones are not really good most of the time. They’re old fashioned. They think we don’t understand. They think we’re stupid, and treat it that way and say “you don’t understand?” or just ignore us and just sit and talk for the entire lecture. There are some very good ones. The young teachers share information with us and their teaching style is good and they understand us. But unfortunately the bad ones are more.

In China, it has been recognized that the teachers’ provision of enjoyable language lessons was essential for students’ motivation (Chen et al., 2005, as cited in Lamb, 2012). The current study confirms the strong influence that teachers have on L2 learners’ motivation and attitudes towards the L2 learning experience. In the Saudi context although family was found to play an important role in the formation of the participants’ ideal and ought-to selves in direct and indirect ways, it is crucially important to not undermine the direct role played by the L2 teachers in the participants’ learning process either. Noels (2009, p. 304) argues that “in some circumstances the teachers’ impact may be inconsequential relative to the weight that family and community members bring to bear.” This is especially highlighted in this study, where most of the participants reported the crucial impact of their L2 teachers on their future selves’ formation (see section 5.2.1.3 and 5.2.2.1). Although some respondents reported their overall satisfaction with their teachers and the teaching methods they employ inside the classrooms, there was a general dissatisfaction displayed by the majority of the participants towards their L2 teachers.

The participants’ concerns can be divided into two categories, namely: the teachers’ teaching methods and their personal characteristics. While the first issue was predicted to have a pivotal impact on the learners’ overall satisfaction with the L2 classroom experience, it was surprising that the majority of the participants reported how teachers’
personalities affected their L2 learning in more ways than anticipated. This emphasizes the crucial role played by teachers’ personal characteristics in the success or lack thereof of the teaching-learning process inside L2 classrooms. Dörnyei (2007b) posits that a teacher’s democratic rather than a controlling style of leadership in the classroom, and involving students in some of the ‘decision-making processes’ that affect their learning is expected to increase the students’ motivation. Several participants in our study reported that learning activities’ effectiveness does not only depend on the learning task and the learning environment; rather, their participation in these learning tasks is highly mediated by the teachers’ personal characteristics, i.e., friendliness or unfriendliness, and the teachers’ attitudes towards the learners and the learning situations.

5.2.3.3 Evaluation of the Textbooks

Interviewer: How would you evaluate your English textbooks? Can you explain why? (What do you like about them/ what do you not like about them?)

In addition to the learners’ evaluation of the teachers and their teaching styles and methods, this study went further to explore the learners’ satisfaction with other components in the L2 learning experience. Another component that the participants were asked to give their thoughts about was the textbooks that were used for teaching the different language skills and subjects in the European Languages Department. Similar to the results of the teachers’ evaluation, only six (three of whom were upper-proficiency participants) demonstrated satisfaction with the textbooks. They reported that the books used were of a medium difficulty and were very useful to them in improving their English skills significantly. They also described the books as being “not boring at all” and that “they are not too difficult either if you spend enough time studying them”. One participant commented:

I like the books in general. Some are boring of course, but in general they are good and also the price is good compared to the other faculties where they have to pay over 200 or 300 Saudi Riyal to buy one book.
Another participant added:

Some books are really good, but I like the notes and handouts that the teachers distribute during class time more because it’s easier if they are custom made by the teachers. But, mostly the books are good.

During the first year, students at the English section of the European Languages Department are taught only English language skills to consolidate their language skills before introducing them to more advanced courses in linguistics, translation and literature. During this year, the four major language skills, i.e., listening, speaking, reading and writing, are taught separately using separate textbooks. Starting from the second year the students get introduced to different courses in linguistics, translation, literature as well as some education courses. The majority of the participants were generally pleased with the language skill books that are taught in the first year at the English department. They described them as being very useful, interesting and appropriate to the learners’ level of English. Yet, most of these participants had several problems with their second, third and fourth year curricula. Some participants had certain issues with specific courses taught in the department and with their textbooks, accordingly.

I do like the textbooks, but it depends. It is a [matter of] taste. People might have a taste for literature, so everything they find with literature they find really interesting. Some other people find it really boring because they don’t like literature but rather prefer linguistics. Generally, Linguistic books didn’t help improving my English. We study 7 to 9 linguistic courses. It’s not good because in this department we should be studying literature, linguistics and translation. We only study two translation books, for example. So, we should study more literature and less linguistics.

Another participant shared a similar remark:

I like the literature books. I like them all. They are enjoyable and fun, and you can make an argument about everything in literature unlike linguistics. I don’t like linguistics. Regarding the language skills books, I only liked the reading
books. All of them were easy, but I only used to enjoy the reading course maybe because the others skills were taught by other teachers. I don’t know.

A third participant reported:

The reading and writing books were really easy. They were not much of a challenge to me. I enjoyed them a lot, when it comes to other books, it depends on the subject. For example, phonetics is simple [and it has a] simple textbook. You can get the information easily. The same [applies] to introduction to linguistics, but when it comes to phonology, things become a bit complicated yeah phonology is the most difficult major in the language.

Some participants also complained about the difficulty levels of the textbooks used in the department. They said that some books were so difficult, that they were just hoping to pass the exams with any score.

The language skills books were very useful and helped us a lot. They were very appropriate for our level. They were at the same level. But, the linguistics books are really hard. The other books are either too hard or too easy. We need something in the middle.

The level of enjoyment was also discussed by most participants. They described the books as being plain and boring. They described them as being “too academic” in the writing style and wording used which leaves no room for interaction or discussion.

The books are good, but they could use more pictures. It has got to be fun you know like if you have a 200 page book, it’s going to be nice to visualize what has happened in the last 50 pages in one figure or picture. It’s going to be nice in the curriculum. I mean not in the kindergarten sense, but you know changing the mood and changing the pace. I mean yes the books we have are pretty useful. Sometimes they are very poetic and use difficult words, though. So, I can understand why some students fall flat when they read them and just give up, but they do their job although they’re a bit boring.
Other participants described the books as being out of date and suggested to have new books with more up-to-date materials:

The books are outdated. They need to be more up to date. But the language skills books were fantastic. I enjoyed them and they helped improve my language skills a lot. But other books like literature books need to be more up to date.

Some participants reported that they were not happy with the clarity and readability of some of the photocopied materials they had to use in some courses either. They complained about the quality of printing as well as the difficult and incoherent content of these handouts that were obviously taken out of context.

We only used original books the first two years when we studied the language skills. Mostly, the teachers give us handouts or copied materials and sometimes they don’t include complete information. They’re average. Some teachers bring simple and easy to understand handouts, but some bring very difficult to understand and very bad in quality.

The findings from this section confirm that the respondents had varying views regarding the textbooks used in the English department. Even though most learners were generally happy with the English language skills textbooks, the majority of the students had several complaints related to the literature and linguistics books. Some of the participants described these books as boring and difficult. Moreover, other criticisms were not only targeted at the difficulty level of the contents of these books and handouts used in the European Languages Department, but also at the poor readability and general quality of the photocopied materials that were used in the majority of the courses taught there, as well.

5.2.3.4 Evaluation of the Classroom Atmosphere and the Peer Group

Interviewer: How do you evaluate the overall atmosphere of the classroom and the other students in these classrooms? Do they help one another? Would you describe them as being more competitive or more supportive? Do they make fun of the students who cannot speak English properly?
Dörnyei (2014, p. 527) affirms that the group dynamics, viz, group cohesiveness and group norms, have an effect on the motivational state of group members as a whole. He defines group cohesiveness as “the strength of the relationships linking group members to one another and to the group itself” while defining group norms as “the implicit and explicit rules of conduct that regulate the life of the learner group and that make joint learning possible”. One third of the participants in this study had an overall negative L2 learning experience. The issue that generated a high level of dissatisfaction among participants was associated with the over-use of the mother tongue. Some participants reported that English is rarely spoken either inside or outside the classroom. They also stated that in some occasions they were mocked by the other students for speaking English outside the classroom. One student explained:

The boring thing is that we are here in the English Language Department. Yet, some students of the specialization speak Arabic most of the time. You know I don’t like to speak Arabic because you’re here just to learn English, so I prefer, no I actually think it’s a must to speak English. They entered here the English specialization, so they must speak English. It is disappointing thing to me when I hear a lot of students speak Arabic during classroom and outside classroom. I don’t know why. Outside the classroom, sometimes when you speak English, they make fun because they are used to speaking Arabic, so they don’t like to speak the language of the foreigners and their specialization is English. I don’t know how that works for them (laughs).

On the other hand, other participants contested the statement that students would mock one another inside the classroom for speaking English or making mistakes while doing it, but they mentioned other problems:

They don’t necessarily make fun of each other, but they don’t help each other much either. They’re not team members. I think they feel that the task of improving the level of the students’ English falls on the teacher only.

Some complained about the poor English proficiency levels of the majority of the students, and found it very daunting. One participant blamed the teachers for this problem.
Some students come here to learn more and get high marks, but some are not very serious. It is very different between students. Some really struggle, and are not active in class and do not do homework just remain silent because they are not good at English and because they don’t understand material, but I think it is also because the teachers don’t give them a chance to talk and participate and just read while the whole class listen.

Another participant added:

Half the students here are not good at English, but they cheat in the exam or I don’t know [what they do] and [end up] getting better marks than me when I worked and studied really hard . . .

Other participants reported the same problem about the other learners’ lethargy and poor English proficiency, but attributed it to the learners themselves.

Lots of students think this is a language institute. They think that if I come here, I’ll leave with perfect English. They don’t know that you have to have a good foundation. If [you do] not, you might not get through, or you’ll struggle really hard. If they see two students outside the class talking English, they would say they’re just showing off. And even if you look inside the class, you would find one or two good students, and the bad are the majority now. Their English level is really bad.

Nonetheless, two thirds of the participants reported they had a positive overall view about their learning environment in general, and more specifically in relation to their peer group. Some described the learning environment at the English department to be “a million times better than school.” They reported that the activities, discussions and student presentations have been very helpful in improving their speaking skills and boosting their confidence to speak in public. Most of the participants said that they have been finding the other learners to be very supportive rather than competitive. Even though they maintained that most of the learners do not have a good command in English, they explained that the good learners always offer help to the less successful
learners. They said that they have a cooperative learning environment, and that help and support are there if they are sought after.

I’ve been studying here for 4 years, and not once has anyone ever made a remark about anyone who’s lacking command in English. I like that because every one deserves a chance, and no one is born learned and one has to walk before he can run. So, that’s their understanding in this department that we’re all here to learn and no one is perfect.

One participant actually reported that he enjoys the time given to the good students to talk and discuss during class time, and described it to be very helpful for the lower-proficiency learners to listen to those upper-proficiency learners’ English and learn from them:

I like when some of my friends who are really good at English get a chance to speak in the class, and I get to listen to their reading or their discussions with the professor and I learn from them.

Another participant added:

No one laughs at the learners with poor English skills, but they help each other and maybe some students make mistakes and maybe other students correct them. They never laugh or anything like that.

Some other participants even reported that having these good students in the classroom have been motivating for them to work harder on their English to reach such good competency levels. Ryan (2008) stated that positive and encouraging peer group relationships are likely to lead to expending more learning efforts and eventually inspire better L2 learning. Murphey and Arao (2001) also stated that L2 users are usually easier role models to identify with for other L2 learners. They emphasised the significance of “near peer role modelling” in English classes as a key factor that helps in transforming the learners’ mere hopes and dreams into attainable future selves. They said that observing successful L2 learners stimulates and inspires the other learners’ potential future success, i.e., their desired future selves (Murphey & Arao, 2001, p. 2, as cited in Yashima, 2009).
The learning environment among other factors determines to a large extent the impact of the L2 Motivational Self System constructs on the overall L2 proficiency. The significance of the L2 environment in achieving the full potential power of the different constructs of the theory was profoundly underlined in Dörnyei’s motivational framework (see Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). The formation of the learner’ possible selves can be significantly promoted or hindered by the other environmental factors that can consequently play a major role in these learners’ L2 achievement. According to White and Ding (2009, 347):

‘Possible selves’ are powerful motivators, shaped and realised within experiences, activities and practices mediated by others . . . [The] contingent nature of . . . learning experiences comprised of a wide array of encounters, relationships, events and exchanges during which identities were [noticed to have] shaped, maintained, challenged and negotiated.

The main findings here suggest that some of the participants had unpleasant incidents with other learners at the English section of the European English Department. These bad experiences included over-use of the mother tongue, ridicule when using the English outside the class, and being surrounded by discouraging classmates with low English proficiency. However, these negative experiences were not shared by all the participants. Most participants reported never having been negatively affected nor verbally abused by other learners either inside or outside the L2 classrooms. These feelings and views were typically affirmed by all the upper-proficiency participants. This is in consistence with other findings where some L2 learners had personal motivators, i.e., strong motivating future selves, that were strong enough to overcome the unpleasant experiences encountered in the L2 learning environment and throughout the L2 learning experience. For example, White and Ding (2009, p. 347) reported that several participants in their study were motivated by an ideal self based on “personal, individual achievement with a minor role assigned to the impact of their actions on learners or on their relationships with others.” In fact, the majority of the participants in the current study found the learning environment at the English section of European Languages Department very healthy and the other learners in it as being very supportive and helpful. They highlighted the importance of the positive peer group effects not only through actual engagement with them in the different classroom activities, but also in
inspiring them to reach such high levels of proficiency in the L2 and, in turn, reaching their future hoped for selves.

5.2.3.5 Evaluation of the Facilities

*Interviewer:* How do you evaluate the facilities provided by the English Department? Do you have enough facilities or do you think you need more? What other facilities do you need?

According to Oyserman (2008, p. 274) “In under-resourced contexts, school-focused possible selves and strategies to attain them are unlikely to be automatically cued; these contexts are less likely to present easily accessible models to guide success.” As with the previous point, a small number of participants indicated that there were no facilities to help the learners improve their English at all. They requested incorporating different media, listening materials, and power point presentations in the English lessons inside the classroom. They also suggested having an all-English-book library inside the department although they admitted that they had never borrowed any English books from the university general library. However, the majority of the participants reported they were generally happy about the facilities provided to them. They reported that they were very grateful that they had free access to the library, computers and internet in the department. They were particularly pleased about the English club that the department established to create more opportunities for the learners to practise English. One participant commented:

We have the listening and speaking lab which is good actually. We have this language club which gives us many activities like meeting and spending time with [native English speaking] professors, planning small field trips and excursions, and encouraging students to write plays. For example, my play is meant to be performed to the whole department next week.

The majority of the participants said they had a good library and English laboratories that are available for the students to improve their English. However, they confirmed that these facilities are not utilized the way they hoped for them to be.
I do like the environment. Everything is being prepared, but not used. This club and the library are being used, but we still need more English books in the library. Also, language labs we don’t use a lot. For example, in phonology, the professor doesn’t really make use of it, and we only have access to these labs during class time.

Another participant voiced a similar opinion:

I think we have enough facilities, but most of them are not really used like the computers and projectors in the labs. The students don’t use these facilities and the department doesn’t encourage the students to use them. For example, most of the doctors don’t use the libraries or labs or the computers and projectors there.

Some participants suggested that the department can do more to help the learners.

Even though, we have labs, but they have never been used by the teachers. Only by one teacher I remember who used to use the projector, but the lab never. I remember I was only using the computers in the lab for facebooking. This club is doing a great job. They just need more financing. The department should teach the student how to use technology like the good iPhone apps, for example. This iPhone is really useful, so the teachers should know how to use it and also teach the students.

Other participants asked for a more active role of the department in improving the learners’ English language skills.

I actually don’t use the facilities because they don’t encourage us to use them. We don’t know what these facilities are for or how to use them to advance our English. I heard about them, but they should make programs to inform the students about them to improve their skills. Also, they should make special coursees and remedial courses instead of letting the students fail and then asking them to go to another department. Why not give us extra help and courses? They know that English teaching that we received in schools was so bad, and they were very weak classes and that most students still lack the basics.
Despite the fact that some participants had a few problems in regard to the facilities provided in the English department, the majority of the them reported they were generally satisfied with the facilities they had. The English club, the library, the language labs were reported to have provided participants with valuable opportunities to practise their English and to improve their language skills. A large number of the sample, however, recommended a more systematic use and integration of these facilities in teaching the different subjects in the English section of the European Languages department in order to achieve the full potential of these facilities in helping the learners improve their English skills.

5.2.4 Summary

The analysis of the qualitative data has shown that learning English for both communication as well as career related goals were among the main reasons that drove Saudi learners to learn English, and in turn influenced the formation process of these learners’ future selves. This was in line with the quantitative data which revealed that the majority of the participants were almost equally motivated by ideal and ought-to selves. It was reported in previous research that career related and communication related goals can coexist among the individuals who value the importance of communicating in the target language while using it for a career too (Kim, 2009; MacIntyre, et al., 2009a). The effects of religion, society and family were also examined in relation to the participants’ self guides. In contradiction to the initial prediction, neither the religious nor the collectivist nature of Saudi Arabia reflected on the participants’ ideal and ought-to selves, notwithstanding that they were mentioned by some participants as having affected their decision to learn English.

The majority reported awareness of the importance of English as lingua franca to all people regardless to their religious or ethnic background. It was interesting, nevertheless, that the Saudi learners’ view of English being the common ground for people from different linguistic backgrounds was not completely compatible with Yashima’s (2002, 2009) description of the concept of international posture. For Saudis, English was almost always reported to be connected to the main English speaking countries, e.g. America, Britain and Australia, and the people living there. One other
unexpected finding was the denial of most of the participants that their families including their parents had any direct role in their choice of learning English. However, they acknowledged their families’ crucial role in encouraging them and supporting them to learn English.

The second part of the chapter looked into the nature of the participants’ imagined future selves and how these imaginations develop in the minds of these participants. Most of the participants affirmed having imaginations about how they see themselves in the future. While the majority of these participants described using English for communicative purposes in these imagined situations, other participants had imaginations that were associated with their future dream careers. This section also answered the second main question in this study about the formation and development of the future self images in the minds of the learners. The findings of this study confirm Dörnyei’s (2009) assumption about the crucial impact played by role models and the views held by significant others in the process of building the learners’ future selves.

Although all the participants in the current study disputed the suggestion that their future selves could have been influenced by how they were viewed by friends and family members, almost half the participants related their future desired selves to role models within their immediate social environment, which in this case were mostly their competent English teachers and competent English speaking family members. This is consistent with previous findings that emphasized the importance of having competent role models in the learners’ close social environment. The existence of these competent role models, who are most likely non-native speakers of the target language, in the learners’ immediate learning environment can present a reasonable target proficiency level to be achieved by the L2 learners which is a more realistic goal than aiming for native like proficiency (see Lyons, 2009; Yashima, 2009). The second source for the future selves that was discussed by the remaining participants was distant role models. These role models ranged from famous English novelists and men of literature to actors and politicians that the participants see in the media, which highlights the importance of the L2 media in the development of the learners’ future selves.

One other main finding reported in the second section of the qualitative analysis was linked to the presence or lack thereof of actual action plans and fear of future failure that can help the L2 learners reduce the incongruity between their present L2 proficiency
and that of their future desired selves (Dörnyei, 2009, pp. 21-22). Only one third of the respondents, the majority of whom were upper-proficiency participants, reported having future action plans that are expected to help them actualize their future desired selves. However, most of the respondents admitted their lack of clearly formulated present or future plans that will help them turn their hopes into realities even though most of them reported certain attempts of putting more time and effort into their L2 learning. On the other hand, most of the lower-proficiency participants reported their dissatisfaction with their L2 progress and their fear of future failure that is associated with it. Dörnyei (2009, p. 22) argued that future selves have their optimum effectiveness when the learners’ hopes for success are counterbalanced by their fears of possible future failures accompanying L2 incompetence. However, the fear of the negative outcomes reported by the lower-proficiency participants in this study when not coupled with action plans was not enough for their future selves to translate into positive behavioural consequences leading to better overall L2 proficiency.

The third section of the chapter discussed the learners’ levels of satisfaction with the L2 learning experience. Dörnyei proposed that the learners’ evaluation of their success as well as the different components of their classroom learning would have a direct impact on their motivation; and in turn their L2 achievement levels (Dörnyei, et al., 2006; Dörnyei, 2009). Although the majority of the participants in the current study reported they were not generally satisfied with their overall L2 progress, most of them described their English learning experience as “fun” and “interesting”. However, when the different components of the L2 learning process were evaluated individually, the levels of the satisfaction varied between the respondents. Generally, despite the fact that most of these participants were happy with the L2 language skills textbooks, general L2 learning setting and facilities provided as well as their general appraisal of the positive impact of the supportive peer group inside the L2 classroom, the majority of these respondents reported they were not specifically pleased with their teachers, some courses’ textbooks, or the teaching methods that were used for L2 learning. This variation in attitudes towards the different variables affecting the L2 learning experience underlies the complexity of researching such an issue. Our findings demonstrate the importance of being cautious about analysing general evaluative statements that learners report about the L2 learning environment as a whole, since these general statements do
not necessarily reflect the learners’ genuine attitudes towards the different integral parts that comprise their L2 learning experience.
Chapter 6

Conclusions, Contributions, Limitations and Recommendations

6.1 Overview

This chapter brings this study to its conclusion. The chapter begins by briefly describing the L2 Motivational Self System, and provides a general review of the study. It then summarises the study’s major quantitative and qualitative findings, as well as the contributions its empirical findings make to the current L2 Motivational Self System theoretical framework. It then outlines the various limitations that came into play at different stages of the study. The chapter concludes by offering some recommendations to improve EFL teaching/learning motivational research, and finally identifies some directions for future research within the L2 Motivational Self System.

6.2 General Review

The key objective in this study was to test empirically a recently developed theory of motivational SLA, the L2 Motivational Self System theory, within the context of English as a foreign language in Saudi Arabia. The L2 Motivational Self System theory introduced by Dörnyei in 2005 and 2006, and discussed in more detail in Dörnyei and Ushioda’s ‘Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self’ book in 2009 was a ground-breaking theory explaining the relationship between motivation and L2 learning through three components: ideal self, ought-to self, and L2 learning experience. Dörnyei proposed that these three factors correlate with the self-reported intended learning efforts of the learners, which he viewed as predictive of the learners’ L2 proficiency levels. However, the effect of these three factors had not been previously assessed against the learners’ actual L2 proficiency, either by Dörnyei or other advocates of his theory.
This study was cross-sectional correlational by design and used a mixed methods approach. A survey containing statements representing the three theorized components was administered to collect data from 360 male and female participants. The age range of participants was between 19 and 31. These respondents were English major students at either King Abdulaziz University or Taif University in Saudi Arabia.

At the second stage, 21 participants (5.83%) of the larger sample self-selected to take part in semi-structured interviews. Each participant was interviewed individually for 30 minutes and was asked questions related to the different components of the L2 Motivational Self System. The interviews were conducted in English and they were recorded using a digital voice recorder. Then, they were transcribed and categorized into different themes in preparation for analysis.

The study has yielded some interesting findings in both its stages: Quantitative and Qualitative data analyses. First, the findings of the Quantitative data analysis will be summarised, then, this will be followed by the most important findings of the qualitative data analysis stage.

6.3 Summary of the Quantitative and Qualitative Data Analyses

6.3.1 Summary of the Quantitative Data Analyses

As it was a key objective of this study to establish whether the two self-guides that Dörnyei (2005, 2006, 2009) conceptualized in his L2 Motivational Self System are actually two separate selves or are simply two facets of one broad self, the self-guide scales were subjected to exploratory factor analysis. The factor analysis revealed that two selves exist within the Saudi learners, which is in line with Dörnyei’s theory. This separation was further confirmed by the fact that the two indices computed for the self-guides correlated with different variables and each predicted proficiency uniquely. Additional factor analyses conducted on the remaining constructs within the theory revealed that two subscales exist within the L2 learning experience scale and the intended learning efforts scale, as well.

Another main finding from the quantitative data analysis was the relationships uncovered between the age and gender of the learners and the level of English of their
parents on one side, and the two self-guides and intended learning efforts on the other side. There was a positive correlation between parental influence and the two self-guides which is consistent with previous research that underlined the significance of parental influence in the development of the learners’ future selves (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Dörnyei, 2009; Higgins, 1987). The statistically significant correlation between the participants’ ideal selves and the level of English of their fathers while another significant correlation existed between the participants’ ought-to selves and the level of English of their mothers supports the idea that the self is not a monolithic construct, but rather of a dual nature. Moreover, parental influence was found to positively impact the intended learning efforts, which indicated that the parents play a significant role in their children’s motivated L2 behaviour.

This analysis has also established that males were generally more affected by the positive L2 learning experience, and less affected by the negative L2 learning experience than their female counter-parts. These different levels of satisfaction with the L2 learning experience were reflected in variation from participants belonging to different campuses, as well. Nevertheless, the effect of age on the different constructs within the theory was one of the most notable findings to emerge from the quantitative data analysis. The normal university age group appeared to always have better correlation levels with the different variables within the theory than those participants belonging to the older age group. This finding is unique to our study and is difficult to explain in relation with previous research which always compared between university and pre-university L2 learners and established that the L2 Motivational Self System exerts its full potential among university level L2 learners (see Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Dörnyei, 2009; Dunkel, Kelts & Coon, 2006; Ryan, 2009; Zentner & Renaud, 2007).

By far the most noteworthy finding of this project was the counter-intuitive direction in the relationship between the two self-guides and the participants’ L2 proficiency. The ideal self, L2 learning experience, and ought-to self emerged as reliable predictors of the participants’ intended learning efforts. This result was predicted in the light of previously conducted research within the L2 Motivational Self System literature (see Al-Shehri, 2009; Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Ryan, 2008; Taguchi et al., 2009). However, when further correlation and regression analyses were performed on the previous constructs and the IELTS scores of the participants, rather unexpected results were
discovered. The self-guides were found to be weak to moderate, although statistically significant, predictors of proficiency; the L2 Motivational Self System predicted 9% and 16% of the participants’ reading and writing IELTS scores, respectively. More importantly, this causality was found to go in the opposite direction: stronger self-guides were linked to low proficiency.

One explanation may lie in the fact that L2 achievement is not always a consequential outcome of having high levels of motivation. This was suggested in previous research (see MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991; Ushioda, 1996). Most importantly, self-reported motivated language behaviour is not necessarily reflected in the learners’ L2 proficiency (Ryan, 2008). This is particularly expected when intended learning efforts are not coupled with action plans that can help transform these hopes and intentions into actual L2 learning plans (Oyserman, 2008). Oyserman et al. (2004, pp. 133-134) specified that “general possible selves lacking behavioral strategies cannot function to guide self-regulation because they neither provide a specific picture of one’s goals nor a roadmap of how to reduce discrepancies between the present and one’s future possible selves.”

6.3.2 Summary of the Qualitative Analysis

Although originally designed as a complementary and somewhat subsidiary component to the current study, some of the most important findings emerged from the qualitative data analyses. One of the principal findings was the importance attributed to learning English by Saudis for both communication and career related goals, which in turn influences the formation of these learners’ future selves. This was in line with the quantitative data which revealed that the majority of the participants had moderate ideal and ought-to selves. The co-existence of both ideal and ought-to selves within the same learners was also reported in previous studies that specified that individuals who value the importance of communication in the target language as well as using that target language for career purposes are very likely to have goals belonging to the communication and career related domain at the same time (Kim, 2009; MacIntyre et al., 2009a).

Another major but rather unexpected finding was the lack of correlation between the participants’ religious background, collectivist culture and close family relations on the
one side, and the participants’ self guides on the other. It was expected that the religious and collectivist nature of the Saudi culture strongly influence the formation of the Saudi learners’ future selves. The findings of the study revealed this not to be the case. Most of the participants, however, highlighted the role their families played not so much in influencing their sons’ and daughters’ decisions of what they should become in the future, but rather in encouraging them and supporting them indirectly to reach their own goals. Religion and culture were not found to be very influential factors to the participants’ decision to learn English either. The majority reported the importance of English as lingua franca to all people regardless of their religious beliefs or ethnicities. The Saudis’ views about English being the common ground for people who speak different languages was not completely well-matched with Yashima’s (2002, 2009) description of the concept of international posture, which entails the disassociation of English with specific countries and cultures. The participants in the current study always linked English to people living in America, Britain and Australia.

One of the most important findings of the qualitative data analysis, however, was the confirmation of the role of imagination in L2 learning and the formation process of the learners’ future selves (Dörnyei, 2009). Most of the participants in this study affirmed having imaginations about their future L2 speaking selves. These imaginations were most readily associated with the use of English for communicative purposes. Alternatively, future imagined situations were reported to be linked to future careers. The findings of this study affirmed one of Dörnyei’s (2009) assumptions about the formation of the future selves. Dörnyei proposed that the formation process of the L2 learners’ future selves involve either being influenced by role models or by the views held about this L2 learner by significant others. All the participants in the current study disputed the proposition that their future selves were influenced by how they were viewed by friends and family members; almost half the participants associated their future desired selves with role models within their immediate social environment, e.g. their competent English teachers and family members. This is in accord with previous findings that emphasized the importance of having competent role models in the learners’ close social environment as these close role models tend to possess a more likely-to-attain proficiency level in the L2 than an actual L2 native speaker (see Lyons, 2009; Yashima, 2009). The second source for the future selves that was discussed by the remaining participants was linked to distant role models. These role models ranged
from famous English literature writers to actors and politicians that the participants only see on TV, which highlights the important role played by the target language media in the development of the learners’ future selves.

One other main finding from the qualitative analysis was linked to the presence or lack thereof of actual action plans and fear of future failure that can help the L2 learners reduce the incongruity between their present L2 proficiency and that of their future desired selves (Dörnyei, 2009, pp. 21-22). Only one third of the respondents, the majority of whom were upper-proficiency participants, reported having future action plans that are likely to help them actualize their future desired selves. However, the rest of the respondents admitted their lack of present or future procedural strategies that can help them turn their hopes into realities even though most of them reported having unplanned extra-curricular activities that allow them to have more exposure the L2 to help them improve their L2. Most of the lower-proficiency participants reported their dissatisfaction with their L2 progress and the fear of future failure associated with it, but did not mention any strategies or study plans they were using to improve their L2 proficiency. Dörnyei (2009, p. 22) argued that the future selves will have their optimum effectiveness when the learners’ hopes for success are counterbalanced by their fears of possible future failures accompanying L2 incompetence. However, the fear of the negative outcomes reported by the lower-proficiency participants in this study, when not coupled with the action plans needed to realize their hopes and avoid their failures, was not enough to actualize their future selves.

Other findings of the qualitative data analysis shed more light on Dörnyei’s third and usually under-researched component, the learners’ levels of satisfaction with their L2 learning experience. Dörnyei proposed that the learners’ evaluation of their success as well as the different components of their classroom learning is anticipated to have a direct impact on their motivation; and in turn their L2 proficiency (Dörnyei, et al., 2006; Dörnyei, 2009). Although the majority of the participants in the current study reported they were not generally satisfied with their current L2 proficiency, they still reported that they are enjoying their L2 learning experience. However, when the different components in the L2 learning process were evaluated separately, the levels of satisfaction with these isolated components were varied between the respondents. Generally, the participants were happy with the English language skills textbooks, the
general L2 learning setting in the English department and the facilities they were provided with. They also reported a generally positive experience of their classroom learning and of the other learners inside the L2 classroom. Nonetheless, the majority of these respondents reported several problems with their teachers, literature and linguistics textbooks, and the teaching methods used for L2 learning. This variation in attitudes towards the different components in the L2 learning experience by different participants underlies the complexity of researching such a topic. It also makes it very difficult to generalize the findings on the whole population as these findings made it even clearer that L2 learning is an individual experience that is different from one learner to the other. This should also turn our attention to the importance of being cautious about handling general evaluative statements that learners use when describing the L2 learning environment as a whole. The findings of this study proved that these general statements do not necessarily reflect the learners’ genuine attitudes towards the different integral parts that comprise the L2 learning experience when viewed individually and more specifically.

6.4 Contributions of the Study

The most important contribution of this study was in the novel approach of researching the relationship between the L2 Motivational Self System and L2 learning which was adopted in this study. This approach not only utilized a mixed method for collecting the data to ensure more triangulation and better understanding of the issue under investigation, but also extended the already existing self framework by adding English language proficiency scores (obtained via a dedicated language test) as the criterion variable in the self model of L2 motivation. Most of the quantitative investigations within the L2 Motivational Self System realm have used ‘the intended efforts in learning the target language’ as the criterion measure. The use of this scale as the only indicative variable of the participants’ level of proficiency in the target language puts the validity of the findings of these studies under question as to whether the criterion measure used in these studies accurately reflected the proficiency levels of the participants or not.

The findings of this study proved that motivated language behaviour, i.e., intended learning efforts, does not necessarily have actual behavioural consequences. Although
most of the previous studies which used the intended learning efforts scale as the criterion measure confirmed the fruitfulness of using Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System in examining the relationship between motivation and language learning (see Ryan, 2008; Taguchi et al., 2009), in the current study the tripartite system was not found to be successful in predicting actual L2 proficiency. With the exception of a weak positive correlation between the ought-to self and the writing scores, the self-guides correlated weakly and negatively with the proficiency measures used in this study, i.e., reading and writing scores.

6.5 Limitations and Recommendations of the Study

This study has tried to address some of the key issues and limitations that befell the previous studies, but it had some limitations of its own. One of the limitations linked to this project was related to the proficiency test used to assess the participants’ levels of proficiency in English. It was anticipated that the inclusion of a language test in the current study would add more validity to the other criterion measure in this study, i.e., the intended learning efforts, and thus yield better overall results. Nonetheless, for time and monetary considerations related to administering as well as scoring the standard IELTS exam, it was deemed appropriate to include only parts of the reading and writing tasks of the IELTS to assess the participants’ language skills. It was proposed that the reading tasks would be appropriate for assessing the participants’ receptive skills while the writing tasks would be sufficient to assess the productive skills. However, the connection between these two skills and career related goals, i.e., the ought-to self, could have contributed to the unpredictable direction of the correlations between the self-guides and the reading and writing scores of the participants. Thus, the use of a test for both career related, i.e., reading and writing, as well as communicative purposes, i.e., listening and speaking, is recommended in future studies.

Another shortcoming with the research design in this study was related to matching the participants’ responses in the quantitative part and proficiency test with those of the qualitative part. The main purpose for conducting the interviews was to answer the second research question concerning the formation process of the self-guides. Accordingly, for purposes related to protecting the privacy and the anonymity of the participants, no linkage was made between the interviewed participants and their
questionnaires. As a result, the interviewed participants’ L2 proficiency was only assessed through their speaking performance in the interviews, using the IELTS speaking band descriptors. The use of the reading and writing scores of the interviewees could also have been utilized in assessing their L2 proficiency had a link between the quantitative part and the qualitative part been made. This did not only restrict the assessment criteria of the interviewed participants’ L2 proficiency, but also restricted the potential of utilizing the qualitative data collected in the interviews to explain in more detail the results of the quantitative data for these particular interviewed participants. Thus, using a coding system in future research can help in making important links between the quantitative data and the qualitative data that could enrich the findings of the research as a whole.

One other limitation linked to the administration of the research was the exclusion of the female participants in the second stage of the data collection. Genders are segregated in the educational system in Saudi Arabia. Thus, although it was possible for the questionnaire surveys to be administered on the female population, it was culturally inappropriate and nearly impossible for the male researcher to conduct interviews with female respondents. Therefore, more research that includes both genders is recommended for a better understanding of the issue under investigation and more generalizable results.

It is also important to note that the scope of this research only focused on assessing the L2 Motivational Self System and language learning from the learners’ perspective. Another major component in the L2 learning experience is the L2 teachers. It is essential to investigate this issue from the teachers’ perspective, to shed more light on the direct role of the L2 teachers in the formation process of their students’ future selves in its different development stages. Future longitudinal studies investigating the topic from various perspectives will help to better understand the complex relationships between motivation and the L2 learning and teaching process. In addition, it is important to remember that motivation is only one of several factors that have been recognized in the SLA literature to have a bearing on L2 learning; thus it is appropriate for the role of motivation to be investigated among the other dynamics that take place in the very complex process of L2 learning.
Finally, it is important to note that it would be inappropriate to generalize the findings of this study to all Saudi learners of English at this stage, let alone on other English learners from other contexts since the participants in the current study only represent a small sample of Saudi learners of English at only two Saudi universities. More investigations between the L2 Motivational Self System and measurable L2 outcomes need to be conducted in different contexts to provide a sufficient basis for generalizations. Nonetheless, the findings in this study gave a very good idea about the Saudi students’ motivation and L2 learning from the point of view of the L2 Motivational Self System theory, and suggested areas that need further and deeper investigation.

6.6 Implications of the Study

This study was focused on testing the theoretical framework of the L2 Motivational Self System which has been researched in different contexts globally, but insufficiently within the Saudi Arabian context. A number of implications to the EFL teachers and academics, learners, parents, and curriculum designers in Saudi Arabia, as well as internationally, can be suggested from the findings of this study.

According to Lee and Oyserman (2009, p. 5):

Perhaps the most important message that educators can take from the research on possible selves is that possible selves are malleable and can be influenced by intervention to enhance the content of possible selves. Changing possible selves through intervention can lead to positive changes in academic behavior, in better academic performance and lower risk of depression.

One of the most important implications of the current study is drawn from the qualitative data analysis section and is related to the process of formation and development of the future selves. The qualitative analysis revealed that the most important source of future selves was found to be associated with role models. These role models were found to range from teachers and close family members to distant role models who were only read about in books or watched on TV. This underlines the impact that the parents and other family members can have on the L2 learners and how
it can be utilized in developing the learners’ future selves and as well as their L2 learning outcomes, accordingly. The parents’ and other family members’ behaviour patterns can be directed in positive and constructive ways which can help these learners reach their full L2 potentials. This can include, but is not limited to, promoting positive attitudes by the parents towards their children’s L2 learning experience. It also includes encouraging the parents and other family members, i.e., role models, to communicate with the learners in L2, since the present research concurred with other researchers’ assertions about the role played by close family members and L2 teachers’ proficiency as a more realistic target for the learners to attain than that of the native speakers (see Lyons, 2009; Yashima, 2009). Not only that, but family members can also be encouraged to share their L2 learning experiences with younger learners which can, in turn, inspire the development of similar L2 learning experiences in the minds of the learners themselves.

More importantly, this finding highlights the crucial role played by L2 instructors in the success or lack thereof of their students. This finding was consistent with Sampson’s (2012, p. 332) contention that “initially consulting with learners about their self-images might help to empower the course-planner to create motivating lessons through activities enhancing the self-images of learners.” This underlines the importance of having highly qualified teachers who not only have an excellent command of the L2, teaching qualifications and competencies, but also have the personal characteristics and qualities required to make them good and approachable teachers. It is always important for teachers to recognize, pay attention to and respect their students’ idiosyncrasies and views about their own learning and address them appropriately. Moreover, teachers can be more strongly encouraged to limit their use of Arabic with their students, and to provide those students whose English is lacking with a rich linguistic environment and a good English speaking model while communicating with these students in English inside and outside the classroom.

It also emphasizes the important role of the teachers as facilitators and directors of their students’ future imaginations. Teachers should be made aware of the crucial role of imagination about future success in the L2 learning process. They should help in playing the role of the initiators and the architects of their students’ possible future selves at the future selves building stage. Then, play the role of the supporters,
maintainers and evaluators of these self-guides at later stages in order to help their students trigger these future imaginations regularly and to keep these future selves alive throughout their L2 learning process. One way for L2 teachers to achieve this would be by surveying their students’ main hobbies and interests and identifying their role models and heroes, then, bringing them into the classroom and incorporating them in their students L2 learning experience even if not in person, but through TV and the other media sources.

The qualitative data analysis and more specifically the L2 learning experience section has also revealed a general dissatisfaction from the participants towards the literature and linguistics textbooks, the teachers and the teaching methods adopted inside the L2 classrooms. Satisfaction with the L2 learning experience is reported to have a crucial effect on the overall L2 learning (Dörnyei, 2009). Teachers should demonstrate a genuine interest in their students’ progress and do their best to reduce the anxiety barriers between the students and teachers and between students amongst themselves. Moreover, teachers should promote cooperative learning between their students and incorporate various teaching methods and styles inside their classrooms. Furthermore, teachers should make use of modern technology as well as the facilities provided to arrange for some activities to be executed outside the classroom, which was one of the most fundamental demands of the participants in the current study. They urged teachers to utilize mobile phones and the internet, and incorporate the use of the listening labs and the libraries in their teaching more frequently.

This leads to a final recommendation which is of substantial magnitude regarding enhancing the L2 learning experience. In order to make really effective educational reforms, it is vitally important for decisions to be informed by the learners’ views and recommendations. Therefore, it is important for teachers and curriculum designers to regularly survey the students’ levels of satisfaction with the different components of the L2 learning environment, e.g., preferred teaching styles and teaching materials, hopes, goals, fears, etc. Then, take these views and opinions into consideration in hopes of improving the L2 learning experience for these learners, and improving their L2 learning outcomes accordingly.
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Appendix A

Questionnaire: The L2 Motivational Self System Scales

- *The Ideal L2 Self (10 items):*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- I can imagine myself living abroad and having a conversation in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- I can imagine myself as someone who is able to speak English as if I were a native speaker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- I can imagine myself studying in a university where all my courses are taught in English (maybe abroad in the future).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- I can imagine myself living abroad and using English effectively for communicating with the locals and international people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24- I can imagine myself writing English e-mails fluently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31- The things I want to do in the future require me to use English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35- I can imagine myself having a lot of English speaking friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40- If my dreams come true, I will use English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effectively in the future.

45- I can imagine myself using English fluently like my favorite (teacher/sheikh or religious scholar/sport player/actor/singer).

**The Ought-to L2 Self (15 items):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2- Learning English is necessary because people around me expect me to do so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Without learning English it will be difficult to travel to English speaking countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- It will have a negative impact on my life if I don’t learn English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Studying English is important to me because other people will respect me more if I have knowledge of English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- I have to study English because I don’t want to get bad marks in it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- I am Studying English because I don’t like to be considered a weak student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23- Studying English is important for me because without it I will have a low-paying job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28- Some important people in my life feel that it is very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
important for me to learn English.

29- Without learning English it will be very difficult for me to use computers effectively.

34- Being able to speak English will add to my social status.

37- Saudi society expects me to learn English so that I can explain my culture to others.

38- Without learning English it will be very difficult for me to use the internet effectively.

42- I am expected to learn English so that I can invite people who don’t speak Arabic to Islam.

46- Every Muslim should be able to speak English.

48- Without learning English it will be difficult to find an excellent job in the future.

• **L2 Learning Experience (15 items):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3- I like the overall atmosphere of my English classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- My English teachers are better than my other subjects’ teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- I really enjoy learning English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-</td>
<td>I think my English class is boring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-</td>
<td>I would rather spend more time in my English classes and less in other classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-</td>
<td>I enjoy the activities of our English class much more than those of my other classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-</td>
<td>My English teachers have interesting teaching styles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-</td>
<td>To be honest, I really have little interest in my English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-</td>
<td>I find the English books that we are studying really useful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-</td>
<td>I’m losing any desire I ever had to know English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-</td>
<td>I find the other students at my English classes really friendly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-</td>
<td>I am sometimes worried that the other students in class will laugh at me when I speak English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-</td>
<td>My English teacher doesn’t teach in an interesting way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-</td>
<td>The English books that we use are really boring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-</td>
<td>It worries me that other students in my class seem to speak English better than I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**The Intended Learning Efforts (8):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5- I am working hard at learning English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- It is extremely important for me to learn English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- If an English course was offered at university or somewhere else in the future, I would like to take it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22- I think that I am doing my best to learn English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26- I would like to spend lots of time learning English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33- I would like to study English even if I were not required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39- If I could have access to English-speaking TV stations, I would try to watch them often.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47- I am the kind of person who makes great efforts to learn English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from (Taguchi, et al., 2009), (Ryan, 2008) & (Gardner, 2004)
Appendix B

Information Statement for the Head of Department:

The L2 Motivational Self System among Saudi Learners of English

Document Version 1; dated 1/3/11

You are invited to allow students in your Department to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Mr Turki Assulaimani as part of his PhD research in Linguistics at the University of Newcastle, under the supervision of Dr Jean Harkins and Dr Christo Moskovsky from the School of Humanities and Social Science at the University of Newcastle. This research is sponsored by the Ministry of Higher Education in Saudi Arabia, King Abdulaziz University.

Why is the research being done?

This study aims to test a recently developed theory of motivation in foreign language learning, the L2 Motivational Self System theory. We want to know more about what kinds of things motivate Saudi learners to learn English, and how their levels of motivation affect their proficiency in the target language.

Who can participate in the research?

We are seeking at least 100 male Saudi students, aged 19-24, who are currently enrolled in an English major in your Department at King Abdulaziz University, and who have completed at least one year of study for their degree, to participate in this study.

What choice do participants have?

Participation in this research is entirely by choice. Only those people who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not a student decides to participate, this decision will not disadvantage them, and will in no way affect their grade. They can stop participating at any time without giving a reason, and withdraw any data that could identify them.

What would you be asked to do?

- If you agree to allow your students to participate, you are asked to sign the attached letter granting permission for the researcher to administer the attached questionnaire and English reading and writing tasks to students studying English in the European Languages Department; and indicate if you are willing to be the local contact in the case of any complaints about the research.
- Students will also be asked if they are willing for the researcher to interview them about their experiences, thoughts and feelings when learning English. From those who volunteer, ten students will be randomly selected to be interviewed at an agreed time during this week. The interviews will be audio recorded, and interviewees will have the opportunity to review their recording and have any part of it erased if they wish.
**How much time will it take?**

- The questionnaire, reading and writing task will take approximately 60 minutes to complete.
- The interview is expected to take no more than 30 minutes. Interviewees can choose how much or how little they want to say during the interview.

**What are the risks and benefits of participating?**

We cannot promise you any benefit from participating in this research, but you will be helping to increase our knowledge about the learning of English by Saudis. The reading and writing tasks give your students the opportunity to test their English language proficiency without the stress of a grade, and they can say if they want to know their score. Participants in this study can also choose to go into a draw for an iPhone4. Students might feel some stress when doing the reading and writing tasks, or reflecting on learning experiences in the questionnaire or interview. They are reminded that they can stop at any time. If they feel anxious about participating, they are asked to choose not to participate.

**How will participants’ privacy be protected?**

No names or other identifying information will be collected unless the participant chooses to give their name to receive their score or go into the iPhone draw. All information will remain confidential to the researchers, and no participant will be identifiable in any reports of the research. Data collected during the research will be kept securely and only accessed by the researcher and his supervisors, and will be stored for at least 5 years at the University of Newcastle.

**How will the information collected be used?**

The results will be reported in Turki’s PhD thesis, and may be presented at conferences and in professional journals. A summary of the findings will be sent to you in appreciation of your permission to conduct the study. Participants can request a summary of the findings by emailing the researcher.

**What do you need to do to participate?**

Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you give your consent. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher or his supervisors. If you choose to allow your students to participate, please sign the attached letter granting your permission, and return it to the researcher.

**Further information**

If you would like further information please contact Turki Assulaimani by email: Turki.Assulaimani@uon.edu.au, or Dr Jean Harkins, whose address and contact details are shown above.

Thank you for considering this invitation.

Your participation would be greatly valued.
Appendix C

Information Statement for the Research Project:

The L2 Motivational Self System among Saudi Learners of English

Document Version 1; dated 1/3/11

Dear respondent:

You are invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Mr Turki Assulaimani as part of his PhD research in Linguistics at the University of Newcastle, under the supervision of Dr Jean Harkins and Dr Christo Moskovsky from the School of Humanities and Social Science at the University of Newcastle. This research is sponsored by the Ministry of Higher Education in Saudi Arabia, King Abdulaziz University.

Why is the research being done?

This study aims to test a recently developed theory of motivation in foreign language learning, the L2 Motivational Self System theory. We want to know more about what kinds of things motivate Saudi learners to learn English, and how their levels of motivation affect their proficiency in the target language.

Who can participate in the research?

We are seeking at least 100 male Saudi students, aged 19-24, who are currently enrolled in an English major at King Abdulaziz University, and who have completed at least one year of study for their degree, to participate in this study.

What choice do you have?

Participation in this research is entirely your choice. Only those people who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to participate, this decision will not disadvantage you, and will in no way affect your grade. You can stop participating at any time without giving a reason, and withdraw any data that could identify you.

What would you be asked to do?

- If you agree to participate, you are asked to fill in the attached questionnaire about your thoughts and feelings toward learning English.
- After completing the questionnaire, you are asked to complete the attached reading task and writing task, to measure the level of your proficiency in reading and writing English.
- You will also be asked if you are willing for the researcher to interview you about your experiences, thoughts and feelings when learning English. From those who volunteer, ten students will be randomly selected to be interviewed at an agreed time during this week. The interviews will be audio recorded, and interviewees will have the opportunity to review their recording and have any part of it erased if they wish.

How much time will it take?

- The questionnaire, reading and writing task will take approximately 60 minutes to complete.
• The interview is expected to take no more than 30 minutes. You can choose how much or how little you want to say during the interview.

What are the risks and benefits of participating?

We cannot promise you any benefit from participating in this research, but you will be helping to increase our knowledge about the learning of English by Saudis. The reading and writing tasks give you the opportunity to test your English language proficiency without the stress of a grade, and you can say if you want to know your score. Participants in this study can also choose to go into a draw for an iPhone4. You might feel some stress when doing the reading and writing tasks, or reflecting on your learning experiences in the questionnaire or interview. You are reminded that you can stop at any time. If you feel anxious about participating, please choose to stop or not to participate.

How will your privacy be protected?

No names or other identifying information will be collected unless you choose to give your name to receive your score or go into the iPhone4 draw. All information will remain confidential to the researchers, and no participant will be identifiable in any reports of the research. Data collected during the research will be kept securely and only accessed by the researcher and his supervisors, and will be stored for at least 5 years at the University of Newcastle.

How will the information collected be used?

The results will be reported in Turki’s PhD thesis, and may be presented at conferences and in professional journals. Participants can request a summary of the findings by emailing the researcher.

What do you need to do to participate?

Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher. If you choose to participate, please complete the questionnaire and the reading and writing tasks, and place them in the box provided for this purpose. Your return of a completed questionnaire will be taken as your consent to participate in this part of the research. If you volunteer and are selected for the interview, you will be asked to sign a consent form before the interview. If you choose not to participate, you are free to leave at any time, and take this information with you or place it in the box.

Further information

If you would like further information please contact Turki Assulaimani by email: Turki.Assulaimani@uon.edu.au, or Dr Jean Harkins, whose address and contact details are shown above.

Thank you for considering this invitation.

Your participation would be greatly valued.
**Questionnaire**

**The L2 Motivational Self System among Saudi Learners of English**

A. There are 48 statements in this section. Please respond to each statement by putting a cross (x) in the box with the answer that applies to you most. There are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers. The abbreviations mean the following:

- **SA** = Strongly Agree
- **A** = Agree
- **U** = Undecided
- **D** = Disagree
- **SD** = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- I can imagine myself living abroad and having a conversation in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Learning English is necessary because people around me expect me to do so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- I like the overall atmosphere of my English classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- My English teachers are better than my other subjects’ teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- I am working hard at learning English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Without learning English it will be difficult to travel to English speaking countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- I can imagine myself as someone who is able to speak English as if I were a native speaker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- I really enjoy learning English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- It is extremely important for me to learn English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- I think my English class is boring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- If an English course was offered at university or somewhere else in the future, I would like to take it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- It will have a negative impact on my life if I don’t learn English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Studying English is important to me because other people will respect me more if I have knowledge of English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- I can imagine myself studying in a university where all my courses are taught in English (maybe abroad in the future).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- I would rather spend more time in my English classes and less in other classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- I have to study English because I don’t want to get bad marks in it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- I can imagine myself living abroad and using English effectively for communicating with the locals and international people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19- I enjoy the activities of our English class much more than those of my other classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- I am Studying English because I don’t like to be considered a weak student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- My English teachers have interesting teaching styles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22- I think that I am doing my best to learn English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23- Studying English is important for me because without it I will have a low-paying job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24- I can imagine myself writing English e-mails fluently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25- To be honest, I really have little interest in my English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26- I would like to spend lots of time learning English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27- I find the English books that we are studying really useful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28- Some important people in my life feel that it is very important for me to learn English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29- Without learning English it will be very difficult for me to use computers effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30- I’m losing any desire I ever had to know English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31- The things I want to do in the future require me to use English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32- I find the other students at my English classes really friendly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33- I would like to study English even if I were not required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34- Being able to speak English will add to my social status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35- I can imagine myself having a lot of English speaking friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36- I am sometimes worried that the other students in class will laugh at me when I speak English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37- Saudi society expects me to learn English so that I can explain my culture to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38- Without learning English it will be very difficult for me to use the internet effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39- If I could have access to English-speaking TV stations, I would try to watch them often.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40- If my dreams come true, I will use English effectively in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41- My English teacher doesn’t teach in an interesting way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42- I am expected to learn English so that I can invite people who don’t speak Arabic to Islam.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43- The English books that we use are really boring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44- It worries me that other students in my class seem to speak English better than I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45- I can imagine myself using English fluently like my favorite (teacher/sheikh or religious scholar/sport player/actor/singer).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46- Every Muslim should be able to speak English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47- I am the kind of person who makes great efforts to learn English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48- Without learning English it will be difficult to find an excellent job in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. This section seeks some information about your background.

49- How old are you? ______

50- Which city are you originally from? ______________

51- What type of school have you attended during your school years? Public
Private

52- Have you ever lived in an English speaking country for over 3 months? Yes _ No

53- What are your parents’ occupations? Father___________ Mother___________

54- What is your parents’ level of education? Please circle the number that applies to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no schooling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>public school education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>public school education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>university education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>university education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>postgraduate education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>postgraduate education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55- What is the level of English of your parents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speaks English well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speaks English well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does not speak English well</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does not speak English well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does not speak English at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does not speak English at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now please proceed to the reading and writing tasks in part C ☺️
Part C: Reading

You should spend about 25 minutes on this task.

Spider silk cuts weight of bridges

A strong, light bio-material made by genes from spiders could transform construction and industry

(A) Scientists have succeeded in copying the silk-producing genes of the Golden Orb Weaver spider and are using them to create a synthetic material which they believe is the model for a new generation of advanced bio-materials. The new material, biosilk, which has been spun for the first time by researchers at DuPont, has an enormous range of potential uses in construction and manufacturing.

(B) The attention of the silk spun by the spider is a combination of great strength and enormous elasticity, which man-made fibers have been unable to replicate. On an equal-weight basis, spider silk is far stronger than steel and it is estimated that if a single strand could be made about 10m in diameter, it would be strong enough to stop a jumbo jet in flight. A third important factor is that it is extremely light. Army scientists are already looking at the possibilities of using it for lightweight, bullet-proof vests and parachutes.

(C) For some time, biochemists have been trying to synthesize the drag-line silk of the Golden Orb Weaver. The drag-line silk, which forms the radial arms of the web, is stronger than the other parts of the web and some biochemists believe a synthetic version could prove to be as important a material as nylon, which has been around for 50 years, since the discoveries of Wallace Carothers and his team ushered in the age of polymers.

(D) To recreate the material, scientists, including Randolph Lewis at the University of Wyoming, first examined the silk-producing gland of the spider. ‘‘We took out the glands that produce the silk and looked at the coding for the protein material they make, which is spun into a web. We then went looking for clones with the right DNA,’’ he says.

(E) At DuPont, researchers have used both yeast and bacteria as hosts to grow the raw material, which they have spun into fibers. Robert Dorsch, DuPont’s director of biochemical development, says the globules of protein, comparable with marbles in an egg, are harvested and processed. ‘‘We break open the bacteria, separate out the globules of protein and use them as the raw starting material. With yeast for better access,’’ he says.

(F) ‘‘The bacteria and yeast produce the same protein, equivalent to that which the spider uses in the drag lines of the web. The spider mixes the protein into water based solution and then spins it into a solid fiber in one go. Since we are not as clever as the spider and we are not using such sophisticated organisms, we substituted man-made approaches and dissolved the protein in chemical solvents, which are then spun to push the material through small holes to form the solid fiber.’’

(G) Researchers at DuPont say they envisage many possible uses for a new biosilk material. They say that earthquake-resistant suspension bridges hung from cables of synthetic spider silk fibers...
may become a reality. Stronger ropes, safer seat belts, shoe soles that do not wear out so quickly and tough new clothing are among the other applications. Biochemists such as Lewis see the potential range of uses of biosilk as almost limitless. “It is very strong and retains elasticity; there are no man made materials that can mimic both these properties. It is also a biological material with the advantages that has over petrochemicals,” he says.

(H) At DuPont’s laboratories, Dorsch is excited by the prospect of new super-strong materials but warns they are many years away. “We are at an early stage but theoretical predictions are that we will wind up with a very strong, tough material, with an ability to absorb shock, which is stronger and tougher than the man-made materials that are conventionally available to us,” he says.

(I) The spider is not the only creature that has aroused the interest of material scientists. They have also become envious of the natural adhesive secreted by the sea mussel. It produces a protein adhesive to attach itself to rocks. It is tedious and expensive to extract the protein from the mussel, so researchers have already produced a synthetic gene for the use in surrogate bacteria.

(Official IELTS Practice Materials, 2007)

**Question 1**

Complete the flow-chart below.

Choose NO MORE THAN THREE WORDS from the passage for each answer.

Write your answers in boxes 6-11 on your answer sheet.

Synthetic gene grown in (1)……………. Or (2) ……………………

globules of (3) ………………

dissolved in (4) ………………

passed through (5) ………………

to produce (6) ………………

(Official IELTS Practice Materials, 2007)
**Question 2**

Choose the correct letter A, B, C or D:

7- **The main idea discussed in the reading is**
   a- biosilk can revolutionize the construction and industry in the future
   b- biosilk can be recreated in laboratories
   c- research should look for stronger materials to replace nylon
   d- sea mussel protein adhesive can be recreated in laboratories

8- **What does “it” in line 28 refer to?**
   a- the water
   b- the solution
   c- the protein
   d- the bacteria

9- **The word “envisage” in line 32 means**
   a- report
   b- produce
   c- predict
   d- study

10- **In the last paragraph, find a word that means substitute (adj)**
    a- adhesive
    b- secreted
    c- tedious
    d- surrogate

**Question 3**

Which Paragraph contains the following information?

Write the letter of the corresponding paragraph A-I in the boxes 9-13.

11  Approaches of dissolving protein in laboratories
12  The attractive qualities of biosilk
13  Ongoing research into other man-made materials
14  The possible uses of biosilk in civil engineering
15  Predictions about the availability of biosilk
Writing

You should spend about 20 minutes on this task.

Present a written argument to an educated reader describing how the use of technology has enhanced or harmed peoples’ life using your own ideas and supporting your argument with relevant evidence.

Write at least 200 words
• I ask for a summary of the research findings to be sent to me: ☐ Yes ☐ No
• I would like to enter the draw for the iPhone 4: ☐ Yes ☐ No
  If yes, please write your name and email address:

  Name: ________________________ e-mail: ____________________________

Thank you again for helping me in this study.
# Appendix D

## Writing Band Descriptors for IELTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Task Achievement</th>
<th>Coherence and Cohesion</th>
<th>Lexical Resource</th>
<th>Grammatical Range and Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9    | • fully satisfies all the requirements of the task  
      • clearly presents a fully developed response | • uses cohesion in such a way that it attracts no attention  
      • skilfully manages paragraphing | uses a wide range of vocabulary with very natural and sophisticated control of lexical features; rare minor errors occur only as ‘slips’ | uses a wide range of structures with full flexibility and accuracy; rare minor errors occur only as ‘slips’ |
| 8    | • covers all requirements of the task sufficiently  
      • presents, highlights and illustrates key features / bullet points clearly and appropriately | • sequences information and ideas logically  
      • manages all aspects of cohesion well  
      • uses paragraphing sufficiently and appropriately | • uses a wide range of vocabulary fluently and flexibly to convey precise meanings  
      • skilfully uses uncommon lexical items but there may be occasional inaccuracies in word choice and collocation  
      • produces rare errors in spelling and/or word formation | • uses a wide range of structures  
      • the majority of sentences are error-free  
      • makes only very occasional errors or inappropriacies |
| 7    | • covers the requirements of the task  
      • (Academic) presents a clear overview of main trends, differences or stages  
      • (General Training) presents a clear purpose, | • logically organises information and ideas; there is clear progression throughout  
      • uses a range of cohesive devices appropriately | • uses a sufficient range of vocabulary to allow some flexibility and precision  
      • uses less common lexical items with some awareness of style and collocation | • uses a variety of complex structures  
      • produces frequent error-free sentences  
      • has good control of grammar and punctuation but may |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reading Level</th>
<th>Accuracy and Grammar</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Language and Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>with the tone consistent and appropriate</td>
<td>although there may be some under- /over-use</td>
<td>• clearly presents and highlights key features / bullet points but could be more fully extended</td>
<td>• may produce occasional errors in word choice, spelling and/or word formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>• addresses the requirements of the task</td>
<td>• arranges information and ideas coherently and there is a clear overall progression</td>
<td>• (Academic) presents an overview with information appropriately selected</td>
<td>• uses an adequate range of vocabulary for the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (General Training) presents a purpose that is generally clear; there may be inconsistencies in tone</td>
<td>• uses cohesive devices effectively, but cohesion within and/or between sentences may be faulty or mechanical</td>
<td>• presents and adequately highlights key features / bullet points but details may be irrelevant, inappropriate or inaccurate</td>
<td>• may not always use referencing clearly or appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>• generally addresses the task; the format may be inappropriate in places</td>
<td>• presents information with some organisation but there may be a lack of overall progression</td>
<td>• (Academic) recounts detail mechanically with no clear overview; there may be no data to support the description</td>
<td>• makes inadequate, inaccurate or over-use of cohesive devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (General Training) may present a purpose for the letter that is unclear at</td>
<td>• may be repetitive</td>
<td>• may make noticeable errors in spelling and/or word formation that may cause some difficulty for the reader</td>
<td>• attempts complex sentences but these tend to be less accurate than simple sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• may make frequent grammatical errors and punctuation may be faulty; errors can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>• attempts to address the task but does not cover all key features / bullet points; the format may be inappropriate&lt;br&gt;• (General Training) fails to clearly explain the purpose of the letter; the tone may be inappropriate&lt;br&gt;• may confuse key features / bullet points with detail; parts may be unclear, irrelevant, repetitive or inaccurate&lt;br&gt;• presents information and ideas but these are not arranged coherently and there is no clear progression in the response&lt;br&gt;• uses some basic cohesive devices but these may be inaccurate or repetitive&lt;br&gt;• uses only basic vocabulary which may be used repetitively or which may be inappropriate for the task&lt;br&gt;• has limited control of word formation and/or spelling; errors may cause strain for the reader&lt;br&gt;• uses only a very limited range of structures with only rare use of subordinate clauses&lt;br&gt;• some structures are accurate but errors predominate, and punctuation is often faulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• fails to address the task, which may have been completely misunderstood&lt;br&gt;• presents limited ideas which may be largely irrelevant/repetitive&lt;br&gt;• does not organise ideas logically&lt;br&gt;• may use a very limited range of cohesive devices, and those used may not indicate a logical relationship between ideas&lt;br&gt;• uses only a very limited range of words and expressions with very limited control of word formation and/or spelling&lt;br&gt;• errors may severely distort the message&lt;br&gt;• attempts sentence forms but errors in grammar and punctuation predominate and distort the meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>answer is barely related to the task&lt;br&gt;has very little control of&lt;br&gt;uses an extremely limited range of&lt;br&gt;cannot use sentence forms except in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organisational features</td>
<td>vocabulary; essentially no control of word formation and/or spelling</td>
<td>memorised phrases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>answer is completely unrelated to the task</td>
<td>fails to communicate any message</td>
<td>can only use a few isolated words</td>
<td>cannot use sentence forms at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E

Consent Form for the Research Project:

The L2 Motivational Self System among Saudi Learners of English

Document Version 1; dated 1/3/11

I agree to participate in the above research project and give my consent freely.

I understand that

- the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained
- I can withdraw from the project at any time and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing
- I can stop talking with the researcher at any time, or choose not to answer any question
- I can review the recording after the session to edit or erase my contribution
- my personal information will remain confidential to the researchers

I consent to

- talking with the researcher and having it recorded □ Yes □ No
- being quoted anonymously in reports of the research □ Yes □ No

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

Print Name: ______________________________________________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ______________________

I ask for a summary of the research findings to be sent to me: □ Yes □ No

If yes, please give your email address:

Email: ______________________________________________________________
Appendix F

Preliminary interview guide

Interview Guide

A LANGUAGE LEARNING EXPERIENCE

How long have you been learning English?
Would you say that you enjoy learning English?
  • Can you give reasons? (Why/ Why not?)
Do you think that you are a successful language learner?
  • Can you give reasons? (Why/ Why not?)
How would you evaluate you English language teachers?
  • Can you say why? (What do you like about him/ What do you not like about him?)
How would you evaluate your English textbooks?
  • Can you say why? (What do you like about them/ What do you not like about them?)
Do you like the overall atmosphere of your English study (classroom activities/other students/ facilities provided by the English Department)?

B GOALS AND ORIENTATIONS

Do you have clear learning goals?
  • Can you explain?
How would a command of English enrich your life?

C OBLIGATIONS AND NEED TO LEARN ENGLISH

Is it necessary for Muslims/Saudis to learn English?
  • Can you give reasons? (Why/ Why not?)
Is it necessary for YOU to learn English?
  • Can you give reasons? (Why/ Why not?)
If you think that it is necessary to learn English, when did you first think so?
  • Can you give reasons?
Have you ever felt any pressure to learn English?
What do other people think about your learning English?
What concerns you most about your English ability?
  • Can you explain?

D   IDEAL L2 SELF

Do you ever imagine yourself speaking English with English speakers (not necessarily native speakers)?
  • How frequently do you imagine yourself in these situations?
  • Who would you be speaking to?
  • Where would you be speaking?
  • What would you be using English for?
  • What would you say the source of these imagined situations is?
  • Would you say they stem from images others have of you? Or
  • Are these images associated with a role model you have? If yes who is s/he?
  • (If s/he not famous, what does s/he do?
  • Do you think it is really possible that you will be like that person?
  • Do you have an action plan to achieve this goal? Are you implementing it?
  • Do you ever consider failure in achieving this? What would failure in achieving this means?

Some interview questions were adapted from (Ryan, 2008)
## Appendix G

### Speaking Band Descriptors for IELTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Fluency and Coherence</th>
<th>Lexical Resource</th>
<th>Grammatical Range and Accuracy</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9    | • speaks fluently with only rare repetition or self-correction; any hesitation is content-related rather than to find words or grammar  
• speaks coherently with fully appropriate cohesive features  
• develops topics fully and appropriately | • uses vocabulary with full flexibility and precision in all topics  
• uses idiomatic language naturally and accurately | • uses a full range of structures naturally and appropriately  
• produces consistently accurate structures apart from ‘slips’ characteristic of native speaker speech | • uses a full range of pronunciation features with precision and subtlety  
• sustains flexible use of features throughout  
• is effortless to understand |
| 8    | • speaks fluently with only occasional repetition or self-correction; hesitation is usually content-related and only rarely to search for language  
• develops topics coherently and appropriately | • uses a wide vocabulary resource readily and flexibly to convey precise meaning  
• uses less common and idiomatic vocabulary skilfully, with occasional inaccuracies  
• uses paraphrase effectively as required | • uses a wide range of structures flexibly  
• produces a majority of error-free sentences with only very occasional inappropriacies or basic/non-systematic errors | • uses a wide range of pronunciation features  
• sustains flexible use of features, with only occasional lapses  
• is easy to understand throughout; L1 accent has minimal effect on intelligibility |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Textual Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>• speaks at length without noticeable effort or loss of coherence&lt;br&gt;• may demonstrate language-related hesitation at times, or some repetition and/or self-correction&lt;br&gt;• uses a range of connectives and discourse markers with some flexibility&lt;br&gt;• uses vocabulary resource flexibly to discuss a variety of topics&lt;br&gt;• uses some less common and idiomatic vocabulary and shows some awareness of style and collocation, with some inappropriate choices&lt;br&gt;• uses paraphrase effectively&lt;br&gt;• uses a range of complex structures with some flexibility&lt;br&gt;• frequently produces error-free sentences, though some grammatical mistakes persist&lt;br&gt;• shows all the positive features of Band 6 and some, but not all, of the positive features of Band 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>• is willing to speak at length, though may lose coherence at times due to occasional repetition, self-correction or hesitation&lt;br&gt;• uses a range of connectives and discourse markers but not always appropriately&lt;br&gt;• has a wide enough vocabulary to discuss topics at length and make meaning clear in spite of inappropriacies&lt;br&gt;• generally paraphrases successfully&lt;br&gt;• uses a mix of simple and complex structures, but with limited flexibility&lt;br&gt;• may make frequent mistakes with complex structures, though these rarely cause comprehension problems&lt;br&gt;• uses a range of pronunciation features with mixed control&lt;br&gt;• shows some effective use of features but this is not sustained&lt;br&gt;• can generally be understood throughout, though mispronunciation of individual words or sounds reduces clarity at times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>• usually maintains flow of speech but uses repetition, self-correction and/or slow speech to keep going&lt;br&gt;• manages to talk about familiar and unfamiliar topics but uses vocabulary with limited flexibility&lt;br&gt;• attempts to use&lt;br&gt;• produces basic sentence forms with reasonable accuracy&lt;br&gt;• uses a limited range of more complex structures, but these&lt;br&gt;• shows all the positive features of Band 4 and some, but not all, of the positive features of Band 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4    | • cannot respond without noticeable pauses and may speak slowly, with frequent repetition and self-correction  
• links basic sentences but with repetitious use of simple connectives and some breakdowns in coherence  
• is able to talk about familiar topics but can only convey basic meaning on unfamiliar topics and makes frequent errors in word choice  
• rarely attempts paraphrase  
• produces basic sentence forms and some correct simple sentences but subordinate structures are rare  
• errors are frequent and may lead to misunderstanding  |
| 3    | • speaks with long pauses  
• has limited ability to link simple sentences  
• gives only simple responses and is frequently unable to convey basic message  
• uses simple vocabulary to convey personal information  
• has insufficient vocabulary for less familiar topics  
• attempts basic sentence forms but with limited success, or relies on apparently memorised utterances  
• makes numerous errors except in memorised expressions  |
| 2    | • pauses lengthily before most words  
• little communication  
• only produces isolated words or memorised utterances  
• cannot produce basic sentence forms  |
| 1    | • may over-use certain connectives and discourse markers  
• produces simple speech fluently, but more complex communication causes fluency problems  
• produces basic sentence forms and some correct simple sentences but with limited success, or relies on apparently memorised utterances  
• makes numerous errors except in memorised expressions  
• uses a limited range of pronunciation features  
• attempts to control features but lapses are frequent  
• mispronunciations are frequent and cause some difficulty for the listener  |
| 0    | • pauses lengthily before most words  
• little communication  
• only produces isolated words or memorised utterances  
• cannot produce basic sentence forms  
• speech is often unintelligible |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>possible</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• no communication possible</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• no rateable language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix H

Consent from Head of Department:

The L2 Motivational Self System among Saudi Learners of English

Document Version 1; dated 1/3/11

As Head of the European Languages Department, King Abdulaziz University, I grant permission for the above research project to be conducted in the European Languages Department and give my consent freely.

I understand that

- the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained
- participants can withdraw from the project at any time and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing
- all participants’ personal information will remain confidential to the researchers, and all information will be securely stored so that participants’ privacy is protected
- the researcher will send me a summary of the findings within one year of completion of the research

I consent to

- allow the researcher to visit English classes in the European Languages Department for the purposes of the research
- allow the researcher to administer the attached questionnaire and English reading and writing tasks to students studying English in the European Languages Department
- allow the researcher to interview selected volunteers about their experiences, thoughts and feelings toward learning English
- allow my name and contact details to be given as a local contact for questions or complaints about the research, and to pass these on to the researcher or the University of Newcastle

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

Print Name: __________________________________________________________

Signature: ________________________________ Date: ____________________
Appendix I

Consent Form for Local Contact

The L2 Motivational Self System among Saudi Learners of English

I agree to serve as a local contact person for the above research project and give my consent freely.

I understand that

- the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have kept for my records
- I can withdraw from the project at any time and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing
- all participants’ personal information will remain confidential to the researcher, and all information will be securely stored so that participants’ privacy is protected

I agree to serve as a local contact for questions or complaints about the research, and to pass these on to the researcher or the University of Newcastle. ☐ Yes ☐ No

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

Print Name: __________________________ Position: __________________________
Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________
# Notification of Expedited Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Chief Investigator or Project Supervisor:</th>
<th>Doctor Jean Harkins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cc Co-investigators / Research Students:</td>
<td>Doctor Christo Moskovsky, Mr Turki Assulaimani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re Protocol:</td>
<td>The L2 Motivational Self System among Saudi Learners of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>14-Apr-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference No:</td>
<td>H-2011-0076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Initial Approval:</td>
<td>14-Apr-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your [Response to Conditional Approval (minor amendments)](mailto:response) submission to the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) seeking approval in relation to the above protocol.

Your submission was considered under **Expedited** review by the Ethics Administrator.

I am pleased to advise that the decision on your submission is **Approved** effective **14-Apr-2011**.

In approving this protocol, the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) is of the opinion that the project complies with the provisions contained in the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, 2007, and the requirements within this University relating to human research.

Approval will remain valid subject to the submission, and satisfactory assessment, of annual progress reports. **If the approval of an External HREC has been *noted* the approval period is as determined by that HREC.**

The full Committee will be asked to ratify this decision at its next scheduled meeting. A formal **Certificate of Approval** will be available upon request. Your approval number is **H-2011-0076**.

**If the research requires the use of an Information Statement, ensure this number is inserted at the relevant point in the Complaints paragraph prior to distribution to potential participants** You may then proceed with the research.

## Conditions of Approval

This approval has been granted subject to you complying with the requirements for
Monitoring of Progress, Reporting of Adverse Events, and Variations to the Approved Protocol as detailed below.

PLEASE NOTE:
In the case where the HREC has “noted” the approval of an External HREC, progress reports and reports of adverse events are to be submitted to the External HREC only. In the case of Variations to the approved protocol, or a Renewal of approval, you will apply to the External HREC for approval in the first instance and then Register that approval with the University’s HREC.

- **Monitoring of Progress**

Other than above, the University is obliged to monitor the progress of research projects involving human participants to ensure that they are conducted according to the protocol as approved by the HREC. A progress report is required on an annual basis. Continuation of your HREC approval for this project is conditional upon receipt, and satisfactory assessment, of annual progress reports. You will be advised when a report is due.

- **Reporting of Adverse Events**

1. It is the responsibility of the person first named on this Approval Advice to report adverse events.
2. Adverse events, however minor, must be recorded by the investigator as observed by the investigator or as volunteered by a participant in the research. Full details are to be documented, whether or not the investigator, or his/her deputies, consider the event to be related to the research substance or procedure.
3. Serious or unforeseen adverse events that occur during the research or within six (6) months of completion of the research, must be reported by the person first named on the Approval Advice to the (HREC) by way of the Adverse Event Report form within 72 hours of the occurrence of the event or the investigator receiving advice of the event.
4. Serious adverse events are defined as:
   - Causing death, life threatening or serious disability.
   - Causing or prolonging hospitalisation.
   - Overdoses, cancers, congenital abnormalities, tissue damage, whether or not they are judged to be caused by the investigational agent or procedure.
   - Causing psycho-social and/or financial harm. This covers everything from perceived invasion of privacy, breach of confidentiality, or the diminution of social reputation, to the creation of psychological fears and trauma.
   - Any other event which might affect the continued ethical acceptability of the project.

5. Reports of adverse events must include:
   - Participant's study identification number;
   - date of birth;
   - date of entry into the study;
   - treatment arm (if applicable);
   - date of event;
   - details of event;
   - the investigator's opinion as to whether the event is related to the research procedures; and
   - action taken in response to the event.
6. Adverse events which do not fall within the definition of serious or unexpected, including those reported from other sites involved in the research, are to be reported in detail at the time of the annual progress report to the HREC.

- **Variations to approved protocol**

If you wish to change, or deviate from, the approved protocol, you will need to submit an Application for Variation to Approved Human Research. Variations may include, but are not limited to, changes or additions to investigators, study design, study population, number of participants, methods of recruitment, or participant information/consent documentation. **Variations must be approved by the (HREC) before they are implemented** except when Registering an approval of a variation from an external HREC which has been designated the lead HREC, in which case you may proceed as soon as you receive an acknowledgement of your Registration.

**Linkage of ethics approval to a new Grant**

HREC approvals cannot be assigned to a new grant or award (i.e., those that were not identified on the application for ethics approval) without confirmation of the approval from the Human Research Ethics Officer on behalf of the HREC.

Best wishes for a successful project.

Professor Alison Ferguson
Chair, Human Research Ethics Committee

*For communications and enquiries:*

**Human Research Ethics Administration**

Research Services
Research Integrity Unit
HA148, Hunter Building
The University of Newcastle
Callaghan NSW 2308
T +61 2 492 18999
F +61 2 492 17164
Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au

**Linked University of Newcastle administered funding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding body</th>
<th>Funding project title</th>
<th>First named investigator</th>
<th>Grant Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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