L2 MOTIVATION: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PAST ATTRIBUTIONS, THE L2MSS, AND INTENDED EFFORT

1 INTRODUCTION

English language learning has become widespread due to globalization, which has made English an international language. Many countries have thus implemented English in their educational programmes and extended its inclusion from elementary school to tertiary levels. Learning a second language (L2) is a long process, and many factors can contribute to successful acquisition. Individual differences have been studied a great deal in second language acquisition (SLA) research and have been found to significantly affect L2 learning success. In particular, L2 motivation has been shown to be an important factor in L2 learning (Dörnyei 2005; Dörnyei and Ryan 2015). The temporal aspect of L2 learning motivation has been considered in the Process Model of L2 Motivation (Dörnyei and Otto 1998) which identifies several phases of motivational behaviour in the L2 learning process. The L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) proposed by Dörnyei (2005; 2009), which is based on future self-guides, can be regarded as an influence in the preactional phase of learners’ journey to learn an L2, while causal attributions of past L2 learning success can be considered as an influence in the post-actional phase of learning. The major aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between learners’ past learning experiences, their current motivational disposition and future intended effort in learning English among university students. The paper focuses on one aspect of a larger study (Martinović 2014) which explored several factors related to L2 learner motivation, including differences in motivation (e.g. associated with gender, area of study, length of studying English, grade levels), as well as predictors of intended effort.
2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 The Process Model of L2 Motivation

L2 learning is a process that takes a great deal of time, and the degree of motivation can change depending on various personal and contextual factors. Dörnyei and Ottó’s (1998) Process Model of L2 Motivation attempts to explain various phases that reflect learners’ changing motivated behaviour during the course of L2 learning. Each of the phases involve numerous motivational influences which affect typical actions that learners take. In the preactional phase, when learners are about to embark on a new stage in their L2 learning, the emphasis is on various motivational influences which will affect how learners set their goals, form intentions, and initiate action. In the actional phase the focus is on motivational behaviour that aids in achieving and sustaining these goals. Moreover, the post-actional phase reflects learners’ motivation in terms of an evaluation of the learning process in the previous phase, which in turn will affect future plans. From the perspective of various frameworks, future self-guides that form the basis of the L2MSS can be regarded as part of the preactional phase of L2 motivation, while the formation of causal attributions can be considered part of the post-actional phase of L2 learning.

2.2 The L2MSS

One of the most influential models in L2 motivation research is Gardner’s (1985; 2010) socio-educational model, which is based on the concept of integrativeness. Gardner has suggested that positive attitudes towards the L2 language, L2 community, and the learning situation will result in higher L2 motivation. However, this model has been criticized with regard to its use in foreign language learning contexts (Coetzee-Van Rooy 2006; Dörnyei et al. 2006). In an effort to re-define integrativeness within the context of today’s globalized world, Dörnyei (2005) introduced the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS). The L2MSS is founded on a ‘self’ framework and the situational context of language learning. This framework encompasses the concept of possible selves as proposed by Markus and Nurius (1986) which can act as motivators when individuals attempt to reduce the disparity between their current state and future desired end-states. Another influence involves Higgins’ (1987; 1996) self-discrepancy theory, which suggests two types of possible selves, including an ideal self and an ought self.

According to Dörnyei (2005), the L2MSS is comprised of three parts: Ideal L2 Self, Ought-to L2 Self, and L2 Learning Experience. Ideal L2 self can be regarded as an individual’s image of oneself as a proficient L2 speaker which he or she would like to become. The ought-to L2 self consists of motives that involve the expectations of significant others, as well as fear of negative outcomes. L2 learning experience includes motives related to the influence of classroom experiences, including the teacher, curriculum,
learner group, or experience of success in the classroom. It is suggested that the interaction of these three elements will affect students’ effort in learning the L2. In addition to these three main elements, the L2MSS also consists of pragmatic motives, which are especially relevant to English language learning (Csizér and Dörnyei 2005; Dörnyei et al. 2006). In Higgins’ (1987; 1998) theory, ideal self-guides have a desired end-state that entail a promotion focus, while ought self-guides are based on the avoidance of a feared end-state, and thus have a prevention focus. Dörnyei (2005) uses the term instrumentality to describe pragmatic motives and divides these according to the degree of internalization of external motives. Namely, instrumental motives that have a promotion focus (instrumentality-promotion), such as learning English for job success, are more internalized and are related to the ideal L2 self. On the other hand, instrumental motives that have a prevention focus (instrumentality-prevention) are less internalized, for example, fear of obtaining negative grades, and are thus considered to be associated with the ought-to L2 self. In brief, both instrumentality-promotion and instrumentality-prevention are important elements of the L2MSS since they focus on the utilitarian aspect of L2 learning.

2.3 Factors Affecting L2 Motivation

Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) suggested that current L2 motivation research should be founded on a complex dynamic system approach which takes into consideration various influential elements. Future self-guides may be considered a dynamic system on their own since they entail motivational, cognitive, and affective features. In educational psychology, interest is seen as having a key influence on motivation (Schunk et al. 2010). The concept of interest has also been recognized in several early L2 motivation frameworks, which included interest in foreign languages in their models (Gardner 1985; 2010; William and Burden 1997). Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) suggested that interest can be considered a motivational conglomerate within current socio-dynamic approaches in L2 research. Interest consists of cognitive elements, including curiosity and engagement in a particular realm, as well as affective features such as joy in engaging in an activity. As such, it can be considered an important influence on L2 motivation.

In addition to interest, another factor that may influence L2 motivation includes L2 anxiety. L2 anxiety is a widely studied affective factor which can affect SLA (Horwitz 2001; MacIntyre 1999; Oxford 1999). L2 anxiety can be characterized as the “the worry and negative emotional reaction aroused when learning or using a second language” (MacIntyre 1999: 27). Researchers (Horwitz et al. 1986) have shown that foreign language anxiety is a particular situation-specific anxiety concept that is different from general types of anxiety. Early studies in language learning (Clément 1980) suggest that there is a complex relationship between language anxiety, motivation, self-perceptions of L2 proficiency, and L2 self-confidence. Moreover, research studies have indicated a
connection between L2 performance and language anxiety (Horwitz 2001; MacIntyre 1999; Oxford 1999). In the Croatian context, Mihaljević Djigunović (2000) found that L2 anxiety was negatively related to higher L2 grades, higher levels of self-concept and motivation among high school students. Other research focused on personality traits and L2 anxiety, for instance, Dewaele (2002) showed that individuals who were extraverts had lower levels of communicative anxiety in English L3 usage. In a study focusing on L2 anxiety and multilinguals, Dewaele (2010) found that individuals experienced more L2 anxiety among languages learned later in life, while less L2 anxiety was found among individuals who began learning languages earlier in life. Few studies have focused on the relationship between the L2MSS and L2 anxiety. Papi’s (2010) study based on an Iranian context found a negative relationship between L2 anxiety and a strong ideal L2 self. Moreover, research carried out by Shih and Chang (2018) in the Taiwanese context showed that the ought-to L2 self was positively related to L2 anxiety, while the ideal L2 self and positive learning experiences were negatively correlated with L2 anxiety.

2.4 Learner Attributions

Individuals’ beliefs and assessment about their abilities to successfully accomplish a task, as well as their beliefs regarding the reasons for doing a task, are key elements of expectancy-value theories in educational motivation psychology. According to Schunk et al. (2010: 44), “both expectancies and values are important for predicting students’ future choice behavior, engagement, persistence, and actual achievement.” Within this framework, Weiner’s (1992) attribution theory has been an influential approach in attempting to explain students’ motivation to learn.

Attribution theory (Weiner 1992) proposes that a person’s perceived causes of outcomes, either success or failure, and the reasons attributed to those outcomes will affect one’s emotional reactions and behaviour in the future. The assumption is that individuals strive to understand the causes of their successes or failures. Individuals may attribute their success or failure to many possible causes; however, Weiner has suggested four potential causes, including aptitude, effort (long-term and short-term), task difficulty and luck. In order to study how attributions can affect beliefs, emotions, and motivated behaviour, Weiner proposed that they be classified according to dimensions such as stability, locus, and control. The locus dimension deals with whether a cause is perceived to be internal or external. For example, if a learner blames the teacher for a bad grade then this is considered external to the individual. The stability dimension is concerned with whether a cause is perceived as stable or unstable over time, that is, whether it is changeable or unchangeable. The controllability dimension involves the perception of how controllable or uncontrollable a cause is perceived to be. For instance, effort can be considered a controllable cause which the learner can control, whereas task difficulty is not within
their control. Another dimension which needs to be mentioned is globality, which refers to whether a cause is perceived to be global or specific; in other words, whether the cause is attributed to all academic subjects or to a single subject such as English. Each of these dimensions, that is, how individuals perceive the reasons for their successes and failures, have ramifications with regard to the individuals’ motivation and expectations for success in the future.

Causal attributions have been recognized as important aspects of L2 learning motivation and were included in several L2 motivation frameworks (Dörnyei 1994; Williams and Burden 1997). However, research in L2 motivation which includes causal attributions has been scarce. Several small-scale qualitative studies (Ushioda 1996; 1998; Williams and Burden 1999) have shown important results related to the causal attributional processes of L2 learners. Nonetheless, more research is needed as causal attributions may help explain how past learning experiences affect L2 learner motivation.

3 AIM AND METHOD

3.1 Aim

The major aim of this paper was to study how learners perceived attributions of past English language learning success, as measured by final grades, are related to motivational variables in language learning. The criterion measure for the study included intended effort.

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. It is expected that the L2MSS, including the ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, instrumentality-promotion, and instrumentality-prevention, as well as L2 interest and L2 anxiety play a mediating role between students’ causal attributions of high school English achievement and intended effort in learning English at university.

2. It is expected that there is a relationship between elements of the L2MSS and other motivational variables, such as causal attributions, L2 interest, L2 anxiety, and students’ intended effort to learn English at university.

3.2 Method

3.2.1 Sample

The sample included 543 first year students from the University of Zadar who were non-English majors. This included a total of 204 males (37.6% of the total sample) and 339 females (62.4% of the total sample). Students were enrolled in various areas of study from the following fields: Biomedical and Health Sciences (6.8%), Biotechnical Sciences...
(5.9%), Humanities (23%), Social Sciences (46.2%), and Technical Sciences (17.9%). All the students were taking an English language course in the first semester of their studies. Students were asked if they perceived their final English high school grade to be a success or not. The majority considered their final English high school grade a success (70.5%), while close to one third (29.3%) did not.

All the students in the sample studied English before they enrolled in their university studies, in high school and/or elementary school. The number of years of studying English ranged from 4 to 16. The average number of years of studying English was 10.3 (SD= 2.22). The average final grade in English in high school was 3.7 (SD= 0.93), on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest grade.

3.2.2 Instruments and Procedures

Data was gathered by means of a three-part questionnaire. The first part presented the purpose of the study and basic instructions, and elicited the following background information: gender, field of study, years of studying English, final English grade in high school, and perceptions of success of final high school English grades. The second part of the questionnaire included The Causal Attribution Scale II (CAS-II) (Sorić 2002) which evaluated students’ causal attributions of their past English language achievement. The ratings on each subscale were based on a 5-point Likert scale which identified the extent to which students' perceived cause showed these causal dimensions, with 1 being the lowest degree of agreement and 5 the highest. Each causal dimension was measured by a four-item subscale. Factor analysis was applied to the CAS-II scale. The extraction method used was the principal component analysis extraction method, while the rotation method that was utilized was varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization. The factors were identified using the Kaiser criteria, as well as Cattell’s scree test criteria. The results showed an acceptable one-factor solution for the CAS-II subscales, which implied that all the items used in each subscale were homogeneous. All the items tested had salient loadings, that is, factor loadings above 0.30. The scales displayed good internal consistency with the following Cronbach’s alpha (α) scores: Stability (α= .77), Controllability (α= .84), Locus (internality) (α= .82), and Globality (α= .68). Each of the scales contained items related to the dimensions in Weiner’s (1992) attribution theory.

The third part of the questionnaire measured the motivational components of the L2MSS, as well as other motivational factors (L2 interest and L2 anxiety). It consisted of seven scales adapted from the motivation questionnaire developed by Taguchi et al. (2009): Intended effort, Ideal L2 Self, Ought-to L2 Self, Instrumentality-promotion, Instrumentality-prevention, L2 Interest, and L2 Anxiety. The multi-item scales, which included all three versions of the original questionnaire (Japanese, Chinese and Iranian), were previously piloted on a Croatian sample (Martinović 2013) and showed good internal consistency. Factor analysis was applied to all the scales using the same method.
as noted above. Upon examining the scree plot, it was evident that a one-factor solution would be possible for these scales. The results showed an acceptable one-factor solution with item loadings above 0.30 in each of the scales. The results showed good internal consistency with the following Cronbach’s alpha (α) scores: 1) Intended effort - Criterion measure (α= .83); 2) Variables of the L2MSS - Ideal L2 Self (α= .92), Ought-to L2 Self (α.87), Instrumentality-promotion (α= .82), Instrumentality-prevention (α= .80); 3) L2 interest (α= .74); and 4) L2 Anxiety (α= .95). All these scales had statement-type items and were based on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). L2 Anxiety had two sub-scales: one scale had statement-type items similar to the scales above, while the other scale had question-type items which were also based on a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 6 (very much). As a result, these scales were given separately to students in this study. However, both were combined in the factor analysis since they measured the same variable. The results of the factor analysis showed that this was an appropriate decision due to the fact that a one factor solution was found for the combined items in this scale. The total number of items in the third part of the questionnaire was 66.

The questionnaire was administered to students at the beginning of their first year of university studies during their regular English class. Students were informed about the aim of the study; in addition, they were told that their participation was voluntary and that their responses were anonymous. Participants also signed a consent form before completing the questionnaire.

3.2.3 Data Analysis

Path analysis was used to examine the mediating role of the L2MSS in the relationship between final grades, causal attributions and intended effort in learning English, as well as the relationships among these variables. In the model final grades were considered as an independent or exogenous variable and only had outcoming arrows in the model. Causal attributions, the L2MSS, as well as L2 Interest and L2 Anxiety, were considered mediating variables or intervening endogenous variables since they had both incoming and outgoing arrows within the model. Intended effort was considered the dependent or endogenous variable as it only had incoming arrows. The model hypothesized that elements of the L2MSS (Instrumentality-promotion, Instrumentality-prevention), as well as L2 Interest, and L2 Anxiety, through other aspects of the L2MSS (Ideal L2 Self and Ought-to L2 Self) mediated between causal attributions and intended effort.

Analyses were conducted using the Mplus 5.21 statistical program (Muthén and Muthén 2009). The evaluation of the parameters in the model was made using the maximum likelihood algorithm. Full information maximum likelihood procedures were employed to compensate for missing data. The matrix of raw data was the basis for the input matrix. Model fit indicators included the following measures: Chi-square test, CFI
RESULTS

In step one, a full mediation model was tested using path analysis whereby the L2MSS variables (and L2 anxiety and L2 interest) fully mediated between causal attributions and intended effort. The direction paths of the relationships were as follows: Final English high school grades → Causal attributions → Instrumentality-promotion, Instrumentality-prevention, L2 Interest, L2 Anxiety → Ideal L2 Self, Ought-to L2 Self → Effort. Based on the obtained fit statistics, the results showed a poor model fit: $\chi^2 = 1044.62$, df = 36, $p < .01$, CFI = 0.57, TLI = 0.22, RMSEA = 0.23 (C.I. 0.22 – 0.24) and SRMR = 0.16.

In the second step, a partial mediation model was assumed whereby, along with the relationships proposed in step one, an additional direct path was proposed between causal attributions and intended effort. Thus the direction paths of the relationships were the same as in step one, but also included the following direct path: Causal attributions → Intended effort. Unfortunately, the results showed an even poorer model fit for this model: $\chi^2 = 1042.09$, df = 32, $p < .01$, CFI = 0.57, TLI = 0.12, RMSEA = 0.24 (C.I. 0.23 – 0.25) and SRMR = 0.16.

In the third and final step all the paths in the model that were statistically non-significant were omitted. Non-significant paths were fixed to zero and new paths were introduced, and thus paths with the greatest modification indices were released. The final modified model resulted in a good model fit with the given data: $\chi^2 = 95.15$, df = 34, $p < .01$, CFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.06 (C.I. 0.04 – 0.07) and SRMR = 0.04. The results are shown in Figure 1.

Examination of the standardized path coefficients (the STDYX standardization method was applied to obtain the model coefficients) showed that effects ranged from small to large. The criteria for these results was based on the following ranges: standardized path coefficients with absolute values less than 0.10 indicated a small effect, values around 0.30 a medium effect, while values greater than 0.50 a large effect (Suhr 2012). In the model, final English grades explained variability in each dimension of causal attributions in the following way: Stability (26%), Controllability (2%), Internality (5%), and Globality (8%). Furthermore, final English grades explained 8% of the variance of
L2 Anxiety. In addition, final English grades, as well as Instrumentality-promotion, Instrumentality-prevention, L2 Interest, and L2 Anxiety accounted for 64% of the variance of the Ideal L2 Self. Instrumentality-promotion and Instrumentality-prevention explained 52% of the variance of Ought-to L2 Self. Finally, the Ideal L2 Self, Ought-to L2 Self, as well as L2 Interest explained 40% of the variance of intended effort.

The largest positive effect was found between final grades and Stability (β = .51) followed by Globality (β = .29), Internality ((β = .23), and Controllability ((β = .14). However, contrary to expectations, direct or indirect effect of causal attributions on the L2MSS was not found, nor was there a direct or indirect effect of causal attributions on intended effort. This finding seems to suggest that students' causal interpretations of high school English achievement were unrelated to their future intentions and motivation in learning English at university.

The path coefficients representing the effect of final English grades on the Ideal L2 Self showed a direct, positive association (β = .16), while a direct effect between grades and Anxiety was negative (β = -.29). Instrumentality-promotion had a direct, positive effect on Ideal L2 Self (β = .50), which could be considered large, and a direct, positive, medium effect on Ought-to L2 Self (β = .22). Furthermore, Instrumentality-prevention had a direct, large, positive effect on Ought-to L2 Self (β = .59); on the other hand, it had a negative effect on Ideal L2 Self (β = -.16). Moreover, L2 Interest had a direct positive effect on the Ideal L2 Self (β = .20), as well as a direct, positive effect on Intended effort (β = .40). In addition, L2 Anxiety had a direct negative effect on Ideal L2 Self (β = -.40). The path coefficients showing the influence of Ideal L2 Self and Intended effort were positive (β = .30) as were those for Ought-to L2 Self and Intended effort (β = .14). It appears that Instrumentality-promotion, Instrumentality-prevention, and L2 Anxiety indirectly affected intended effort via Ideal L2 Self and Ought-to L2 Self. The only exception was L2 Interest which had both a direct and indirect effect on intended effort.

The results of the final model also showed correlation among all the causal attribution scales (double-headed arrows) indicating that all the scales were related to one another. Meanwhile, correlation also existed between Instrumentality-promotion and Instrumentality-prevention implying a relationship among these components. Furthermore, it appears that L2 Anxiety was related to Instrumentality-prevention.

In sum, it could be stated that the results of the path analysis partially confirm the hypothesis in this study. Namely, it appears that causal attributions were unrelated to the L2MSS and the criterion variable (intended effort). In other words, it appears that students' causal interpretation of high school English achievement was not related to their future ‘English self’ or to the amount of effort they intended to exert in their English courses. However, intended effort was related to the L2MSS, as well as L2 Interest and L2 Anxiety, at least at the beginning of students’ first academic year at university. More comments with regard to these results are given in the discussion section.
5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Causal Attributions and the Mediating Role of the L2MSS with Intended Effort

A theoretical model was proposed in order to investigate the relationship between students’ past English language learning experiences and L2 motivation at university. The results of the path analysis partially confirmed the hypothesis. The final model showed that causal attributions had no effect on either the L2MSS variables, nor the criterion variable (intended effort). It seems that students’ attributions of past English outcomes were not related to their L2 self-concept or future intentions. The results indicated, nevertheless, that the L2MSS directly affected intended effort. According to Ushioda (2001), L2 motivation has traditionally been perceived as a cause or product of learning success, including positive learning experiences and achievement outcomes. However, the results of Ushioda’s research suggested that learners’ L2 motivation can be characterized as either causal, in other words, procuring from the continuum of past L2 learning and L2 related experience, or teleological, that is, aimed at short-term or long-term goals and future perspectives. Moreover, Ushioda found that these two motivation dimensions are in a complimentary relationship which varies from individual to individual. Dörnyei (2005) suggested that these findings imply that language learners’ L2 motivation may derive from two directions, both of which may influence successful motivation; for example, one that is generated by positive learning experiences, the other which is fuelled by learners’ visions for the future. The results of Ushioda’s investigations (1998; 2001) indicated that with regard to L2 language majors, the motivation of successful language
learners was stimulated by positive L2 learning experiences, while the motivation of less successful students was focused on future goals. The results of this study have shown that the L2MSS is an important predictor of intended effort, implying that the L2 motivation of non-language students is based on future selves, or future goals, as opposed to past learning experiences. In other words, it is teleological in nature. Conceivably, this result could also have been influenced by the timing of the investigation. Namely, students were tested during the first few weeks of their first year of university. It is possible that as students were entering a new phase in their academic life they were not focusing on the past, but rather on the future. A follow-up investigation focusing on motivation changes in English language learning at the end of the academic year, or in the latter years, could provide more insightful answers.

An alternative explanation for the lack of direct relationship between causal attributions and intended effort may be illustrated from an educational psychological perspective. Psychologists have argued that cognitive effort is a relevant measure of motivation with regard to skill learning (Corno and Mandinach 1983). Moreover, motivated students will be inclined to exert more mental effort during instruction, and will likely utilize cognitive strategies that promote learning (Peterson et al. 1982; Pintrich and De Groot 1990). However, Pintrich and Schunk (1996) proposed that the usefulness of effort as a measure of motivation is curbed by ability, such that as ability increases, less effort is required to perform better. Consequently, it is possible that students’ past successes in English language learning have given them a positive L2 self-concept, or a positive perception of L2 ability, which has led them to believe that future language learning will not require a great deal of effort. Clearly, more analysis is needed to verify this suggestion.

5.2 The Relationship between the L2MSS and Intended Effort

Although there were no apparent associations between causal attributions and intended effort, the results nevertheless showed that the L2MSS, as well as final English high school grades, and L2 interest played a significant role in L2 motivation, accounting for 40% of the variance of the criterion variable. Specifically, ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and L2 interest had a direct positive effect on intended effort. The model showed that interest in English was an important factor in students’ L2 motivation. Moreover, the model revealed that the ideal L2 self dimension played a more significant role in L2 motivation compared to the ought-to L2 self dimension, in accordance with the results of other studies. For example, ideal L2 self had a stronger effect on the criterion measure than ought-to L2 self in Japanese, Chinese, and Iranian contexts (Taguchi et al. 2009), as well as in the Hungarian context (Csizér and Kormos 2009).

Researchers have suggested that the ideal L2 self can be characterized as an identification process of L2 proficiency within an individual’s self-concept (Csizér and
Dörnyei 2005). From the expectancy-value perspective, Wigfield and Eccles’s (1992) social cognitive expectancy-value model proposes that self-concept belief, which personifies a learner’s self-perceived confidence in various domains, is an indispensable element of learner achievement motivation. Therefore, if the ideal L2 self could be considered as an essential part (or representation) of self concept, then it could be concluded that a strong L2 self concept expressed through a strong ideal L2 self is a significant indicator of motivated L2 behaviour.

Furthermore, it was found that instrumentality-promotion, L2 interest, and final English grades had a positive direct effect on the ideal L2 self. In particular, instrumentality-promotion appears to have had the strongest positive influence on the ideal L2 self. This result suggests that Croatian students’ ideal L2 self is closely related to job and career success. Taguchi et al. (2009) also found that instrumentality-promotion had a fairly strong positive effect on Chinese and Iranian students’ ideal L2 self. These results appear to substantiate the specific role of English as a global language. Accordingly, many cultures have associated knowledge of English with professional success. In Croatia, the importance of learning English is viewed by many as a way to connect with Europe and the world at large. It seems that Croatian students have internalized this value and closely associate professional advancement with their personal L2 self-concept.

A somewhat smaller positive effect on ideal L2 self was found with the interest variable. This indicates that interest toward English, which entails positive cognitive and affective components, was also part of the ideal L2 self dimension. It is interesting to note that Gardner (1985) included interest in foreign languages as a component of integrativeness in his model. However, Gardner (2010: 174) argued that “the concept of L2 self is a cognition-based construct”, and as such it cannot be equated with the concept of integrativeness, which is an affect-based construct. However, the connection with interest indicates that ideal L2 self is associated with both cognitive and affective components of L2 motivation. In addition, the results showed that final English high school grades were directly related to the ideal L2 self in a positive manner. These findings indicate that final grades played a role in the formation of students’ ideal L2 self, suggesting that more successful learners were motivated to learn English based on an integrative or intrinsic L2 self-concept.

Conversely, L2 anxiety displayed a moderate negative effect on ideal L2 self, indicating that students who had a strong ideal L2 self were confident with regard to their English language abilities and would not be affected by this variable. Another possible explanation of this result is that a strong ideal L2 self may have acted as a ‘buffer’ against L2 anxiety. Moreover, a small negative effect was found between instrumentality-prevention and ideal L2 self. This relationship suggests that motives related to avoidance of negative consequences are not related to learners ideal L2 self concept.

With regard to the ought-to L2 self variable, the results showed that it was directly and positively influenced by instrumentality-prevention and instrumentality-promotion. It appears that both types of instrumentality were related to externally generated motivation,
in other words, the ought-to L2 self. However, the fact that instrumentality-prevention had a much larger effect on ought-to self, whereas instrumentality-promotion had a larger effect on ideal L2 self, validates Dörnyei’s (2005; Dörnyei and Ushioda 2011) contention that integrative and internalized instrumental motives are associated with ideal L2 self, while more extrinsic types of instrumental motives are related to ought-to L2 self.

6 CONCLUSION

Contrary to expectations, this study did not find that the L2MSS played a mediating role between students’ causal attributions of past English achievement outcomes and intended effort. The results of the path analyses showed that students’ causal attributions of English high school grades were not related to students’ L2 self-concept or future intentions. However, these results support Ushioda’s (2001) research findings which suggest that L2 motivation can be described as either causal or teleological. The results of this investigation have shown that the L2 motivational disposition of first year Croatian non-language university students was teleological in nature – that is, it was generated by their visions for the future.

This argument is supported by the results of the path analyses which have shown that the L2MSS is an important component of future intended effort in learning English. In particular, the ideal L2 self had a stronger effect on the criterion measure in comparison to the ought-to L2 self, which supports research findings in other L2 contexts (Csizér and Kormos 2009; Taguchi et al. 2009). Moreover, the direct influences on the ideal L2 self, including instrumentality-promotion, interest, and final English high school grades, showed important elements of the L2 motivational character of Croatian students. Firstly, Croatian students’ ideal L2 self is closely linked to job and career success, which is similar to findings found among Chinese and Iranian students (Taguchi et al. 2009). Secondly, the fact that interest in English directly affects ideal L2 self suggests that the latter is an important motivational factor in the motivational process of learners, as it contains a combination of motivational, cognitive, and affective elements. Thirdly, it has been shown that ideal L2 self is affected by successful past achievement, which implies a reciprocal relationship between learning achievement and an integrative L2 self-concept. Finally, the results have shown that L2 anxiety was negatively related to ideal L2 self, suggesting that lack of anxiety is a component of ideal L2 self.

The findings of this study have contributed to a better understanding of the motivational profile of Croatian non-language university students with regard to English language learning. The limitations of the study can be viewed from the perspective of the concept of motivation itself, which is both dynamic and volatile, as well as subject to many internal and external factors. Suggestions for further studies include a wider sample and the use of qualitative measures in order to obtain richer and more comprehensive data.
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POVZETEK

MOTIVACIJA ZA UČENJE DRUGEGA JEZIKA: VPLIV PRETEKLEGA UČNEGA USPEHA, SISTEMA MOTIVACIJSKEGA JAZA IN NAČRTOVANE VLOŽKE V UČENJE


Ključne besede: motivacija za učenje drugega jezika, samoocena preteklega učnega uspeha, teorija sistema motivacijskega jaza pri učenju drugega jezika, načrtovani vložek v učenje, nejezikovne študijske smeri

ABSTRACT


Globalization has led to the spread of English, which has become the world’s international language. As a result of its importance in social, economic, and political spheres, many countries have introduced English language learning in their school curricula. However, despite its importance, many learners still seem to struggle with English second language (L2) motivation, which is an
important element of L2 learning success. The aim of this study was to analyse the relationship between several phases of learners’ motivation, including learners’ attributions of past English L2 learning success, current motivational characteristics, and motivation to learn English in the future. Using the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) as a framework, it was found that past learning experiences did not have a significant effect on current learner motivational dispositions. However, elements of the L2MSS had an effect on learners’ intentions to exert effort into future English language learning. In other words, Croatian university students’ L2 motivation was based on their visions for the future rather than on past learning experiences. Moreover, it appears that the ideal L2 self plays a much stronger role in learners’ motivation compared to the ought-to L2 self, and this motivation is tied to utilitarian motives for learning English. In addition, the results showed that other motivational components, such as interest, as well as L2 anxiety, are important elements of learners’ motivation, suggesting cognitive as well as affective aspects in this motivational profile. The complexity of motivation as shown in this study suggests the need for further investigations in various contexts.

**Keywords:** L2 motivation, past attributions, the L2MSS, intended effort, non-language university majors