

Motivation of Thai University Students from Two Disciplinary Backgrounds Using a Hybrid Questionnaire

Budsaba Kanoksilapatham^{a,*},
Attapol Khamkhien^b,
Pensinee Kitkha^c,
Angsu-orn Na Nongkhai^d

^a kanoksib@hotmail.com, Silpakorn University, Thailand

^b faasapk@ku.ac.th, Kasetsart University, Thailand

^c faaspnk@ku.ac.th, Kasetsart University, Thailand

^d angna@kku.ac.th, Khon Khen University, Thailand

* Corresponding author, kanoksib@hotmail.com

APA Citation:

Kanoksilapatham, B., Khamkhien, A., Kitkha, P., & Na Nongkhai, A. (2021). Motivation of Thai university students from two disciplinary backgrounds using a hybrid questionnaire. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 14(1), 455–491.

Received 09/08/2020	Abstract The increasing global and local demands to improve citizens' English proficiency have augmented the significance of English education across the entire paradigm. Meanwhile, motivation has been endorsed as one of the pivotal driving forces that propels the success of language learning. This study represents a large-scale motivational study, exploring the role of motivation in learning English among Thai undergraduate students, studying in the disciplines of the sciences and humanities at eight public universities across Thailand. Based on the frameworks by Gardner (1985; 2004) and Dörnyei (2010) and a number of modifications made on their corresponding questionnaires, a hybrid questionnaire eliciting quantitative data was specifically developed to
Received in revised form 25/11/2020	
Accepted 16/12/2020	
Keywords English, humanities, motivation, sciences, Thai university students	

accommodate the context of English language teaching and learning in Thailand. Additionally, a semi-structured interview form was devised to collect qualitative data, complementing the quantitative data. Quantitative data analysis revealed that these two cohorts of students were significantly different as far as the nature of their motivation is concerned. Scrutiny of the interview data demonstrates that both the sciences and humanities students had a common utilitarian goal of employment and professional advancement. However, the humanities students interestingly expressed their aspirations to extend the use of English as a tool to enlarge their cultural repertoire. In light of these results, a number of generalizations could be made, including practical implications for teaching and managing English classrooms of Thai undergraduate students from diverse disciplinary background.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the fields of education and psychology, motivation is one of the factors that moves learners to a particular action. It also refers to the choices that learners make as regards to what experiences or goals they approach or try to achieve, and the degree of effort they exert in that respect. In the realm of language learning, it has been widely recognized that motivation is a vital factor which individual language learners use as a driving force to propel them to attain higher long-term learning goals, and also to successfully learn a target language (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995).

As a seminal work on motivation, Gardner and Lambert (1972) proposed a motivation framework commonly known as the socio-educational model, highlighting the two central notions of “integrative” and “instrumental” orientations. Gardner and Lambert’s 1972 framework has been used to initially explain why a person is engaged in second language learning (L2), and subsequently gained substantial popularity among scholars interested in motivation and L2 acquisition (e.g., Dörnyei; 1998; 2005; 2010; 2018; 2019; Fontecha, 2014; Gardner, 1985; Gardner et al., 2001; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Lamb & Arisandy, 2019; Ushioda, 2013).

However, Gardner and Lambert's motivational framework has not been without criticism (Chen et al., 2015; Dörnyei & Clement, 2001; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009; Kaneko, 2012; Ushioda, 2011). One of the major criticisms lies in the fact that contexts of learning a target language can vary a great deal. For example, the opportunity for language learners to communicate and interact with members of the target language community can be vastly different. Particularly in the context in which English is taught as a foreign language (FL); the learners' contact with, and exposure to, the target language is quite limited and the source of the target language input is limited to language classrooms. Consequently, Gardner and Lambert's 1972 frameworks might not be adequate to capture these language learning and teaching situations.

In addition to different contexts that might exert influence on learner motivation in language learning, motivation might be impacted by the demands imposed by a changing globalized society. In this regard, a number of scholars interested in motivation (Dörnyei, 2005; 2009; Dörnyei & Clement, 2001; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009) decided to focus on learner characteristics in various contexts instead. Based on this notion, Dörnyei's (2005) motivation framework was developed and widely adopted as a device to explain the complex concept of language learning motivation (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Dörnyei et al., 2006; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009; 2011; MacIntyre et al., 2009; Ushioda, 2011).

The presence of the two different motivation frameworks developed by Gardner and Dörnyei (as presented above) suggests that motivation in language learning can be conceptualized by a number of constructs. Moreover, it also indicates that language learners' motivation is determined, to a certain extent, by individual contexts in which language learning is taking place. For example, the types and degrees of motivation can depend on their exposure to the target language or their opportunities to interact with native speakers of the target language. Consequently, it is not surprising that a large number of studies have focused on the roles of motivation and its impacts on a wide variety of L2 and FL contexts. These studies include Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei et al., 2006; Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011; Gardner, 1985; Gardner et al., 2001; Masgoret and Gardner, 2003; and Lamb and Arisandy, 2019. The findings generated from these studies have provided us with a better understanding of how motivation works in language learning.

A number of researchers interested in motivation have moved to another level, investigating the relationship between motivation and other variables related to learners and learning contexts: teachers (Ushioda, 2013; Dörnyei, 2001a), teaching styles (Dörnyei, 2001a), parents (Gardner, 1985), learning contexts (Dörnyei, 2001a; Dörnyei, 2001b), learning styles and strategies (Cohen & Dörnyei, 2002), learner gender differences (Dörnyei et al., 2006), and teaching and learning in a disciplinary context (Neuman et al., 2002). However, to our knowledge, very few motivational studies have examined the relationship between language learner motivation and disciplinary backgrounds (i.e., Breen & Lindsay, 2002 in biology, history, computing, anthropology, geology, food science and nutrition, and education; Strombach et al., 2016 in biology, psychology, and economics). These studies have revealed relationships between learning disciplines and motivation types.

Given the prevailing trend of globalization that augments the demands of English competence and the specific features of English teaching/learning contexts that potentially determine the degree and type of motivation, this article aims to scrutinize Thai learners' motivation in learning English at the university level. At this juncture, based on Gardner's and Dörnyei's prominent motivational frameworks and the two corresponding sets of questionnaires, each with its own merits, a hybrid motivation questionnaire was developed for this study. The hybrid questionnaire integrates both Gardner's and Dörnyei's motivation constructs; however, repetitive features across these two sets of questionnaires were eliminated or collapsed to yield a more thorough and accurate picture of Thai learners' motivation. Since previous studies have shown that discipline tends to have an impact on motivation, this study aims to investigate the degree of English language learning motivation between two principal groups of Thai undergraduate students: sciences and humanities. The findings will bear a number of pedagogical implications, including providing clearer and more explicit guidelines, especially regarding whether language classroom management and instruction offered to these two groups of students should be distinctive. It is also anticipated that the findings of this study will enable policy makers and language educators to appropriately devise curricula, empower language instructors to better manage English language classrooms, and subsequently allow students to achieve their language learning goals.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Due to the pivotal role of motivation in language education, an extensive number of studies have been conducted (e.g., Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, Day & MacIntyre, 1992; Dörnyei, 2001a; 2005; Ushioda, 2006; 2011). To better understand and appreciate the contribution of these scholars and their studies, this section exclusively reviews the accounts relevant to the two most influential motivational frameworks: Gardner's and Dörnyei's. Additionally, this section describes a number of motivational studies conducted specifically in the context of Thailand, followed by the presentation of the relevant questionnaires in detail.

2.1 Gardner's motivation frameworks

Spearheading the work on motivation research in social psychological frameworks, Gardner and Lambert (1972) proposed the theory of motivation known as the "socio-educational model," which is essentially related to "integrative" and "instrumental" motivation. The former refers to the desire to interact and assimilate with the target language, speakers, and learners' attitudinal disposition toward the language learning situation. Meanwhile, the latter refers to a utility-driven orientation in which the learner learns the language for the sake of achieving rewards or getting a job (Gardner, 1985).

As an extension of Gardner and Lambert's work in 1972, Gardner (1985) redefined the socio-educational model and proposed the two variables, "integrativeness" and "attitudes toward the learning situation", as the central elements of his motivation framework. That is, integrative motivation refers to the learners' desires to become members of the other cultural community, whereas attitudes towards the learning situation include elements such as teachers, instructions, curricula, and evaluation processes.

In alignment with Gardner's 1985 socio-educational model, the AMTB (Attitude/Motivation Test Battery) questionnaire was first developed in 1985 as an instrument to measure the effects of attitudes and motivation in L2 learning contexts of English-speaking Canadians learning French in elementary and secondary schools. However, subsequently, this original AMTB questionnaire has been widely modified

and expanded by adding new components such as the relationship between anxiety and motivation (Gardner et al., 1992), and learner motivation in diverse academic contexts and settings (e.g., Baker & Macintyre, 2000; Gardner, 2010; Gardner et al., 1992; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). To elaborate, for instance, Gardner et al. (2001) focused on attitudes and motivation inside and outside formal classrooms in Spain, whereas the emphasis of Noels et al. (2001) was French learners of English in Canada. Tremblay and Gardner (1995) investigated English learners' motivation for reading in a Pakistani context, and Masgoret and Gardner (2003) on language learner motivation in multicultural classrooms. Despite the variety of learning contexts of these studies, the findings are relatively congruent, demonstrating that integrative motivation exerts a stronger impact on behavior and achievement than instrumental motivation.

Due to the application of AMTB to address various contexts of L2 motivation, the original 1985 AMTB version was substantially revised in 2004. This version has been quite popular, being applied to investigate learner motivation in various contexts. To illustrate, for example, Taguchi et al. (2009) focused on English language learners from Japan, China and Iran, whereas Sayadian and Lashkarian (2010) investigated the attitudes and motivation of Iranian EFL learners. In 2012, Gardner specifically explored the roles of integrative motivation in the prediction of student achievement in Polish schools. These studies provide insights into the roles and effects of motivation on language learning from different language learning scenarios.

In addition to the revision of AMTB, Gardner's socio-educational model was also expanded in 2005. In this 2005 motivational framework, Gardner further emphasized that "instrumentality," which refers to the extent to which the learner strives to achieve a particular goal such as passing exams, financial rewards, furthering a career or getting a promotion, is another variable influencing language achievement. In short, Gardner's 2005 motivational framework based on the socio-educational model highlights the importance and correlation of the three constructs: integrativeness, instrumentality, and attitudes in language learning.

2.2 Dörnyei's motivation framework

Although Gardner's (1985) framework has made a huge contribution to this area of investigation, the motivation framework was criticized by several researchers, such as Dörnyei (2005), Dörnyei and Clement (2001), Dörnyei et al. (2006), Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009). To elaborate, particularly, Ushioda and Dörnyei (2012) questioned Gardner's 1985 dichotomy of integrative vs. instrumental motivation. According to Ushioda and Dörnyei (2012), motivation is too complex a notion to be captured by only this simple dichotomy. This criticism was supported by other scholars including Chen et al. (2015) and Kaneko (2012), who remarked that learner motivation is partly determined by different contexts in which the learning is taking place. In short, the distinction between integrative and instrumental might not be sensitive enough to capture other pertinent features of motivation in language learning taking place in diverse contexts.

Dörnyei (2006) and Kaneko (2012) noticed that it is also possible for learners to have both types of motivations (integrative and instrumental) concurrently in the process of language learning. Furthermore, due to the changing global scenario and multicultural communities, the interest in and learning of English may result from the learners' desire "to be identified with more educated or cosmopolitan members of one's own group" (Lamb, 2013, p. 1000). Therefore, integrativeness which has often been understood as a central notion of Gardner's socio-educational model, might not represent a valid reason for learning the English language. These criticisms have resulted in a reinterpretation of integrative motivation within a broader perspective.

In response to these criticisms, Dörnyei (1994b) proposed a distinct framework of motivation consisting of three levels: the language, the learner, and the learning situation. This newly created motivational framework is based on the theories of "possible selves" proposed by Markus and Nurius (1986) and "self-discrepancy" by Higgins (1987). According to Markus and Nurius (1986), "possible selves" include three types of individuals' ideas regarding 1) what they might become, 2) what they would very much like to become, and 3) what they are afraid of becoming. This concept of "possible selves" provides a conceptual link between cognitive components (hopes, fears, goals, and threats) and

motivation. Similarly, Higgins' 1987 notion of "self-discrepancy" comprises two aspects: "ideal self" and "ought-to self". "Ideal self" refers to what people hope or wish to become, whereas "ought-to self" refers to the attributes that a person believes he or she ought to possess according to a general sense of obligations and responsibilities which can be from one's desires and aspirations (Dörnyei, 2009).

Applying these two psychological theories of "self" to the motivation framework, Dörnyei's 1994a motivation framework includes the following elements: instinct, drive, arousal, need, and personality traits such as anxiety, need for achievement, cognitive appraisals of success and failure, ability, and self-esteem. Later, based on Csizér and Dörnyei's empirical study in 2005, Dörnyei (2005) elaborated on his motivation framework, including motivation as a part of the learners' system of "possible selves", which can "give form, meaning, structure, and direction to one's hopes and threats, thereby inciting and directing possible behavior" (p. 100).

Dörnyei's latest motivation framework (2005) was referred to as the "L2 Motivational Self System" or L2MSS. In a nutshell, L2MSS incorporates three elements: 1) the "ideal L2 self," 2) the "ought-to L2 self," and 3) the "L2 learning experience" (to be presented in detail in 2.4). According to Dörnyei, "the ideal L2 self" is an individual's powerful force or goal to learn and ideally possess the target language. Meanwhile, "the ought-to L2 self" refers to an individual who believes that he or she ought to possess the target language in order to avoid possible negative outcomes (this definition is in alignment with Gardner's notion of instrumentality). Finally, "the L2 learning experience" can be termed as situation-specific motives that are related to the immediate learning environment and experience. In short, in Dörnyei's motivation framework, learners' future "possible selves" are supposed to be the primary motivational force because learners may have a desire to bridge the gap between their actual selves and their ideal selves (Dörnyei, 2005; 2009).

A number of scholars in this area are advocates of Dörnyei's L2MSS (e.g., Dörnyei, 2010; Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011; Lamb, 2012; 2013; Papi, 2010; Taguchi et al., 2009). For instance, according to

Dörnyei and Ushioda, (2011), L2MSS seems to be an effective tool to demystify language learner motivation because it connects the learning of a foreign language to the individual learners' identity. Moreover, based on L2MSS, diverse motivational types can be identified, yielding informed decisions regarding the design of language instruction in a manner that best accommodates the motivation of learners. Finally, L2MSS can also provide insight into the relationship among learners' attitudes towards learning English, learning experience, and language learning environments in the globalized world (Dörnyei, 2010).

2.3 Previous motivation studies in the Thai context

As discussed in the previous section, the frameworks of Gardner and Dörnyei have served as tools enabling researchers to delve into the topic of motivation in various contexts, including Thailand – the focus of this section. As motivation is generally viewed as one of the most important elements in the process of language learning, many Thai researchers, with the hope to help enhance students' English proficiency and develop their English communication abilities, conducted research on motivation in a Thai context. Based on Gardner's (1985; 2005) frameworks, with certain modifications, Thai students, in general and as found in a number of studies, congruently express high motivation for learning English (Assavanadda & Tangkiengsirisin, 2018; Choomthong & Chaichompo, 2015; Choosri & Intharaksa, 2011; Santikarn, 2015; Wimolmas, 2013). In a similar vein, certain studies found that Thai students have a relatively higher degree of instrumental motivation than integrative motivation (Assavanadda & Tangkiengsirisin, 2018; Choosri & Intharaksa, 2011; Santikarn, 2015; Wimolmas, 2013). Interestingly, Kitjaroonchai (2013) and Oranpattanachai (2013) found that motivation level correlates with learning achievement. These studies repeatedly highlight the fact that Gardner's questionnaires have been quite popular in Thailand. To the best of our knowledge, only one motivational study in Thailand was on Thai learners from various academic disciplines or subject areas. Hengsadekul et al. (2014) investigated how Thai learners from different academic disciplines (i.e., information technology, engineering, nursing, business, education, law, English, international business) used their

motivation in learning English and how teachers motivated them to learn English.

In contrast to the substantial interest of Thai scholars in adapting Gardner's 1985 and 2005 frameworks or AMTB for motivational studies, for some reason, Dörnyei's L2MSS seems to have received much less attention. To our knowledge, only three studies by Darling and Chanyoo (2018), Na Nongkhai (2018), and Rattanaphumma (2016) were based on Dörnyei's L2MSS framework. Rattanaphumma (2016) focused on 28 undergraduate students from an international university in Thailand. The two major findings include that 1) the students saw themselves as users of English in their work and daily life in the future, and 2) they ought to learn English in order to meet social and family expectations. A more recent study by Na Nongkhai (2018) on the motivation of 16 Thai university students to learn English revealed that while the students' sense of "ideal L2 self" was strongly influenced by their future careers and education overseas, their sense of "ought-to L2 self" was associated with a fear of being unemployed. Finally, Darling and Chanyoo (2018) who examined 330 Thai students from one public university found that in terms of the power to conceptualize motivation, "ideal L2 self" was the strongest of the L2MSS components, followed by "L2 learning experience" and "ought-to L2 self". These three L2MSS-based studies have contributed to shedding light on the motivation of Thai learners for learning English, particularly in tertiary education. Meanwhile, these studies illustrate that the L2MSS framework can provide different perspectives regarding how to conceptualize motivation.

2.4 Scrutiny of AMTB and L2MSS

Due to the plethora of motivational studies, be they based on Gardner's AMTB (1985, 2004) or Dörnyei's L2MSS (2010), it is clear that these questionnaires play a vital role as a tool to demystify motivation. Therefore, this section scrutinizes and subsequently compares the details of the two sets of questionnaires: AMTB and L2MSS.

As presented in 2.2 and 2.3, due to the changes taking place in a globalized world and the diversity of learning contexts, Gardner's AMTB (1985, 2004) and Dörnyei's L2MSS (2005; 2010) have been revised and refined to accommodate specific contexts and purposes of individual

studies (e.g., Hengsadeeikul et al., 2014; Taguchi et al., 2009). In this regard, based on our preliminary exploration, Gardner’s AMTB revised in 2004 and Dörnyei’s L2MSS questionnaires developed in 2010 seem to have gained popularity in measuring motivation levels of students from different contexts (Lamb, 2012). Therefore, this section aims to highlight and compare the details of these two questionnaires in detail. It is expected that based on the comparison, a number of conclusions can be drawn to form a basis of developing a hybrid questionnaire that would effectively address Thai learners in the context of Thailand and accommodate the motivation conceptualization of Thai learners.

The two questionnaires developed by Gardner (2004) and Dörnyei (2010) are presented side by side in Table 1. Both of them have a considerable number of items: AMTB contains 104 items, whereas L2MSS has 140 items.

Table 1

AMTB (Gardner, 2004) and L2MSS (Dörnyei, 2010)

Category	AMTB questionnaire (104 items)	L2MSS questionnaire (140 items)
1	Motivational Intensity (10 items)	Criterion Measures-Intended Learning Effort (10 items)
2	Desire to Learn the Language (10 items)	Ideal L2 Self (10 items)
3	Attitudes toward Learning the Language (10 items)	Ought-to L2 Self (10 items)
4	Integrative Orientation (4 items)	Parental Encouragement (11 items)
5	Interest in Foreign Languages (10 items)	Instrumentality-Promotion (14 items)
6	Attitudes toward the Target Language Community (8 items)	Instrumentality-Prevention (11 items)
7	Language Teacher Evaluation (10 items)	Linguistic Self-Confidence (4 items)
8	Language Course Evaluation (10 items)	Attitudes toward Learning English (10 items)
9	Language Class Anxiety (10 items)	Travel Orientation (3 items)
10	Language Use Anxiety (10 items)	Fear of Assimilation (15 items)
11	Instrumental Orientation (4 items)	Ethnocentrism (17 items)
12	Parental Encouragement (8 items)	Interest in the English Language

Category	AMTB questionnaire (104 items)	L2MSS questionnaire (140 items)
		(4 items)
13		English Anxiety (10 items)
14		Integrativeness (3 items)
15		Cultural Interest (4 items)
16		Attitudes toward L2 Community (4 items)

As shown, these questionnaire items are grouped into categories: 12 categories for AMTB and 16 for L2MSS. As mentioned earlier, revisions and expansion of items were made to AMTB to accommodate a variety of learning contexts in which it was implemented. Correspondingly, the original three constructs were expanded, including additional variables related to motivation such as language anxiety, the influence of family pressure, and cultural context, which are likely to affect language learning behavior and motivation (Taguchi et al, 2009). Each category of AMTB consists of a number of questionnaire items, leading to the combined total of 104. To illustrate, for instance, Category 4: Integrative Orientation has four items: 1) *Studying English is important because it will allow me to be more at ease with people who speak English;* 2) *Studying English is important because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people;* 3) *Studying English is important because it will enable me to better understand and appreciate the English way of life;* and 4) *Studying English is important because I will be able to interact more easily with speakers of English.*

Meanwhile, based on three constructs of “ideal L2 self”, “ought-to L2 self”, and “L2 learning experience”, L2MSS consists of 140 items, classified into 16 categories. Similarly, each category is represented by a number of questionnaire items, yielding a total of 140. An examination of the 140 items in L2MSS reveals that some of the items overlap to a certain extent. *“Studying English can be important for me because I think I’ll need it for further studies on my major.”* and *“Studying English can be important to me because I think I’ll need it for further studies.”* are two items in Category 5: Instrumentality-Promotion that highlight this. Dörnyei (2010) explained that existence of these overlapping items

serves the function as a means to cross-check the consistency of the responses elicited.

The examination of both AMTB and L2MSS also elucidates a certain amount of overlap between the two sets of the questionnaires. For example, one item in Category 2 of AMTB, Desire to Learn the Language (*If it were up to me, I would spend all of my time learning English.*) overlaps with an item in Category 1 of L2MSS: Criterion Measures (*I would like to spend lots of time studying English.*). Another overlap or, actually, resemblance is in Category 6 of AMTB and Category 8 of L2MSS: Attitudes toward Learning English, which share the same verbatim (*I really enjoy learning English.*). Finally, concededly, Dörnyei (2009) remarked that Category 4 of AMTB: Integrative Orientation and Category 2 of L2MSS: Ideal L2 Self are complementary forms of identification, with minor difference in the central point with which it is associated.

The scrutiny of both AMTB and L2MSS is quite revealing. First, the number of the items included in each of the two questionnaires is considerable, possibly hampering the feasibility of the study. That is, the length of the questionnaires can be intimidating, posing some constraints in implementing and completing the questionnaires. The students might not be able to hold their attention to stay focused throughout the questionnaire completion task. Furthermore, as demonstrated above, some items both within and across the two questionnaires, overlap to a certain extent. Based on these two observations and taking into consideration the merits pertaining to the two sets of the questionnaires, hybridization of AMTB and L2MSS would substantially contribute to the enhanced power of the instrument and feasibility of the study. Precisely, in this hybridization process, while adhering to the frameworks' constructs, certain overlapping features are eliminated or collapsed. Furthermore, by using a hybrid questionnaire, it is expected that the findings obtained will be more robust and more thorough, facilitating the accurate conceptualization of Thai learners' motivation.

3. THIS STUDY

This study has a general objective of exploring the role of motivation in learning English among Thai undergraduate students in the disciplines of

sciences and humanities. Specific objectives of this study include determining the degree of learning motivation of science and humanities undergraduate students, and to compare and contrast their motivation levels across the two groups.

3.1 Participants

This study focuses on Thai learners of English in tertiary education. The population of this study was approximately 397,359 university students based on the statistics released in the 2018 academic year by Higher Education (<http://www.mua.go.th/assets/img/pdf/stat.pdf>). To make sure that this study represents a national picture of Thai learners' motivation of learning English, the participants of this study comprises 2,641 first-year Thai university students from eight medium-sized public universities in four different regions of Thailand¹. Two universities were selected to represent each region of Thailand (namely, the northern, southern, northeastern, and central regions). For ease of reference in the subsequent parts of this article, the acronyms of the eight universities (*MFU, PYU, SU, KU, UBU, MSU, TSU* and *WLU*) participating in this project were used.

The students were purposively sampled from the two broad disciplines of sciences and humanities. Out of the total 2,641 participants, 976 were science students (*Sci*), majoring in chemistry, physics, biology, biochemistry, and microbiology. The other group of participants were 1,665 humanities students (*Arts*), majoring in English. It is true that in the present study, science students were from various majors offered in the faculty of sciences of each university studied. However, it should be noted that these students were in the discipline collectively known as '*pure science*' (e.g, physics, chemistry, biology) as opposed to '*applied science*' (e.g., medicine, environment science, engineering). Consequently, although these science students are literally from different academic disciplines, it can be justifiably claimed that the

¹ These eight universities were selected to be research sites because they are identified as mid-size public universities based on the budget allocated to finance the universities by the government, and the number of students. With these reasons, they are very likely to represent the general scenario pertaining to individual regions of Thailand.

science participants are homogenous to a certain extent, representing those in pure sciences only. Similarly, as far as the English major students are concerned, even though humanities are a huge academic branch encompassing a large number of subjects (e.g., history, literature, philosophy), to address the research objectives of this study, English major students were the focus.

To estimate the ideal sample size of the participants of this study, substituting the numbers into the Yamane's formula with an error 5% and with a confidence coefficient of 95% (Yamane, 1973) revealed that the number of appropriate sample was expected to be approximately 400 students. Therefore, it can be assumed that 976 science students and 1,665 humanity students were a good representative of the population. At the time of the study, all participants were enrolled in an English foundation course as required by their respective universities.

3.2 Instruments

To address the objectives of this study, two instruments were developed: a hybrid questionnaire based on Gardner's AMTB (2004) and Dörnyei's L2MSS (2010) to collect quantitative data, in addition to a set of interview questions to collect qualitative data.

3.2.1 Hybrid questionnaire

To elicit language learning motivation data, Gardner's AMTB (2004) and Dörnyei's L2MSS (2010) provide impetus for the need to develop a hybrid questionnaire for this research. In fact, the questionnaires are recognized to possess essential constructs and contain predictive validity in the field of motivational studies covering crucial elements involved in a language learning situation (Tort Calvo, 2015; Dörnyei, 2001b, p. 189). Therefore, it is not surprising that these questionnaires have been recognized to be the most influential, being adapted and adopted by a large number of motivation studies in diverse contexts (e.g., Assavanadda & Tangkiengsirisin, 2018; Cheng & Dörnyei, 2007; Dörnyei, 2005; 2010; Gardner et al., 2001; Hengsadeekul et al., 2014; Kitjaroonchai, 2013; Wimolmas, 2013).

However, with respect to the context of English teaching in Thailand and a number of overlapping and complementing items across

the two questionnaires in 2.4, a hybrid questionnaire specifically developed for this study was deemed more valuable. To achieve this target, overlapping items of the two questionnaires were collapsed and regrouped. The hybrid questionnaire developed and employed in this study thus comprises 26 motivation items divided into five categories, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Hybrid Questionnaire of Five Constructs with 26 Items

Category	Label	Definition	Items
1	Ideal L2 self	students' views of themselves as successful and/or proficient English speakers	1-4
2	Ought-to-L2 self	students' views of themselves what is expected of them and the students' perception of parental interest and encouragement to learn English	5-6
3	Instrumentality-Promotion and Prevention	students' desire and interest in learning English for practical reasons	7-12
4	Ethnocentrism and Integrativeness	students' reactions toward, and interest in interacting with, the communities speaking English	13-18
5	Attitudes toward learning English	students' more or less positive opinions about learning English and English skills	19-26

This hybrid questionnaire, preceded by a set of questions eliciting the participants' personal information including background, year of study and gender, was subsequently validated by five experts in the field of English language teaching and education. Specifically, two international experts are renowned scholars in the area of motivation, and three experienced Thai researchers are familiar with the context and with language learning in a Thai university setting. The hybrid questionnaire was assessed for both content validity and reliability. That is, for content validity, the questionnaire items were evaluated by five experts. Index of item-objective congruence (IOC) value for each item was assessed by individual experts and subsequently calculated. It was found that all of the items received an IOC value of .60 or more which is

considered satisfactory. In short, the hybrid questionnaire items were satisfactory as far as the content is concerned. Moreover, based on the comments and feedback from the five experts, the hybrid questionnaire items were revised and finalized.

In order to ascertain the hybrid questionnaire's reliability, feasibility, credibility, content validity, and comprehensibility, the revised hybrid questionnaire was trialed. In order to make sure that the questionnaire items were transparent to the Thai participants and their comprehension of the questions was facilitated, the questionnaire was presented to the participants in the Thai language. Regarding the reliability of the hybrid questionnaire, the finalized questionnaire was then administered to a convenient sample of 45 second year students majoring in education at one of the eight participating universities of this study. The reasons for asking this particular group of students to take part in this reliability assessment are twofold. First, these students were English majors, and thus they seemed to share commonality with the target participant of the study. Second, they were one-year senior to the target participants, and thus discrepancy between this group and our target group was kept to the minimal particularly as far as language input was concerned. In so doing, we managed to keep our target participants intact.

To empirically ensure there was internal consistency within the items, the reliability value was calculated by using Cronbach's alpha. The internal consistency of the questionnaire was found to be 0.923 for Cronbach's Alpha, and thus the hybrid questionnaire was proved to be an appropriate tool to collect motivation data in the main study. The entire hybrid questionnaire can be viewed in the results section.

3.2.2 Interview questions

Even though the hybrid questionnaire devised for this study was validated by the experts regarding coverage and reliability, it is insightful for students' perspectives to be elicited by means of a qualitative approach (Sakeda & Kurata, 2016). Therefore, to obtain additional in-depth information relevant to the questionnaire responses, semi-structured interviews were conducted. The appendix illustrates the set of interview questions developed for this study.

3.3 Data collection and analysis

To collect data, permission from the deans of the Faculty of Sciences and the deans of the Faculty of Arts or Humanities of the eight universities was obtained. Subsequently, assistance from a course coordinator of individual universities and English instructors was sought in order to facilitate the task of data collection. As previously described, the data collected from the questionnaire and the interviews were quantitative and qualitative in nature, respectively. Due to the speculation that most of the students might prefer to complete the questionnaires using their mobile phones, the hybrid questionnaire was converted into a Google form to facilitate accessibility for the participants. At this data collection stage, several course coordinators expressed their preference with regard to the employment of the Google form. However, one of the eight course coordinators from the central region clearly requested for the use of hard copies of the questionnaire because she felt more at ease with this format of data collection. Prior to the administration of the questionnaire, the participants were given a brief description of the aims of the study, the question format, and the instruction regarding how to complete the questionnaire.

Upon completion of the data collection, the quantitative data were coded by the researchers and subsequently analyzed using descriptive statistics. In addition, *t*-tests were performed to determine whether there was a significant difference in the role of motivation in English learning between the two student cohorts. The interpretation of the degree of motivation was based on the following criteria: 1.00–1.80 = very low degree of motivation, 1.81–2.60 = slightly low degree of motivation, 2.61–3.40 = moderate degree of motivation, 3.41–4.20 = slightly high degree of motivation, and 4.21–5.00 = very high degree of motivation.

The qualitative data were obtained from the 80 sessions of interviews conducted individually and in the Thai language. To maintain even distribution of interviewees across the eight universities, five students were randomly selected from each discipline and from each university, yielding a total number of 10 students from each university, totaling 80 interview sessions. Each interview session lasted approximately 30 minutes, be it by phone or face-to-face, depending on the interviewees' preference. All of the interview sessions were transcribed, coded, and analyzed using content analysis. All of the codes

from the content analysis were collapsed based on the five motivation categories identified in the hybrid questionnaire.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Questionnaire results

Based on the analysis of the questionnaire data, the results revealed different patterns regarding the degree of motivation reported by the students from two different disciplines. These are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics and Interpretation Regarding Motivation (n = 2,641)

No.	Items	Sciences (n = 976)		Motivation Level	Humanities (n = 1,665)		Motivatio n Level
		\bar{X}	S.D.		\bar{x}	S.D.	
1. Ideal L2 Self: I can imagine myself							
1	using English when I think of my future career	4.37	0.74	Very High	4.46	0.79	Very High
2	using English effectively in general communication	3.85	1.05	Slightly High	4.20	1.01	Slightly High
3	attaining and understanding all aspects of English	3.56	1.02	Slightly High	3.85	1.08	Slightly High
4	using English fluently in communicating with foreign friends	3.59	1.16	Slightly High	4.05	1.11	Slightly High
Mean		3.84	0.99	Slightly High	4.14	1.00	Slightly High
2. Ought-to L2 Self: English is important to me because							
5	people surrounding me (parents and family members) expect me to study English	3.71	0.97	Slightly High	3.64	1.08	Slightly High
6	it will help me gain acceptance among people surrounding me (family members, teachers and friends)	3.60	0.92	Slightly High	3.59	1.01	Slightly High
Mean		3.66	0.95	Slightly High	3.62	1.05	Slightly High
3. Instrumentality – Promotion and Prevention: I study English because							
7	English is necessary for my career (in getting a good job, incentives, promotions)	4.42	0.78	Very High	4.43	0.82	Very High

No.	Items	Sciences (n = 976)		Motivation Level	Humanities (n = 1,665)		Motivatio n Level
		\bar{X}	S.D.		\bar{x}	S.D.	
8	English is necessary for my further studies	4.44	0.83	Very High	4.50	0.80	Very High
9	I want to study or work abroad	4.06	1.00	Slightly High	4.36	0.91	Very High
10	the things I want to do in the future require me to use English	4.21	0.84	Very High	4.37	0.85	Very High
11	English is a compulsory subject	4.16	0.90	Slightly High	4.14	1.03	Slightly High
12	I would like to travel internationally	4.06	0.99	Slightly High	4.30	0.95	Very High
	Mean	4.23	0.89	Very High	4.35	0.89	Very High
4. Ethnocentrism and Integrativeness: English is important to me because ...							
13	it will help me understand the values and customs of other cultures	3.87	0.84	Slightly High	3.96	0.90	Slightly High
14	it will allow me to meet and get to know foreigners	3.68	0.98	Slightly High	3.94	0.98	Slightly High
15	I like English songs	3.94	0.99	Slightly High	4.17	0.99	Slightly High
16	I like English movies and TV programs	3.82	1.04	Slightly High	4.09	1.01	Slightly High
17	I like English books, journals, and magazines	3.07	1.12	Moderate	3.37	1.10	Moderate
18	I like to use social media for updates and to read news in English	3.48	1.11	Slightly High	3.73	1.07	Slightly High
	Mean	3.64	1.01	Slightly High	3.88	1.01	Slightly High
5. Attitudes towards Learning English							
19	In general I like studying English.	3.61	0.92	Slightly High	3.89	1.00	Slightly High
20	I like the atmosphere of my English classes.	3.69	0.92	Slightly High	3.73	0.98	Slightly High
21	I like my English teachers (their teaching methods, answering their questions, etc.).	3.91	0.96	Slightly High	3.83	0.97	Slightly High
22	I like the content and instructional material used in my English classes.	3.71	0.82	Slightly High	3.68	0.94	Slightly High
23	I like the activities in my English classes.	3.51	0.86	Slightly High	3.56	0.95	Very High
24	If possible, I would like to study English more.	4.13	0.83	Slightly High	4.23	0.89	Slightly High
25	I still want to learn English	3.98	0.93	Slightly High	4.14	0.95	Slightly High

No.	Items	Sciences (n = 976)		Motivation Level	Humanities (n = 1,665)		Motivatio n Level
		\bar{X}	S.D.		\bar{x}	S.D.	
26	even though it is not necessary. I really pay attention to learning English.	3.63	0.88	Slightly High	3.84	0.90	Slightly High
	Mean	3.77	0.89	Slightly High	3.86	0.95	Slightly High

Based on the data gathered through the questionnaires, the majority of the students in the two groups reported having a slightly high level of motivation, ranging from slightly high to very high. In general, the students from the humanities discipline ascribed a greater role of motivation in English learning than their science counterparts in almost all aspects and motivation categories. For instance, with regard to the influence of promotion and prevention or instrumentality, or Category 3 (Items 7 to 12), the humanities students strongly desired to use English for studying, working, and travelling abroad (Items 8 and 9, respectively). Interestingly, both groups of students expressed their high motivation in learning English as they considered that English is important for their future jobs (Items 1 and 7), further studies (Item 8), and their future in general (Item 10).

As for attitudes towards learning English (Category 5), the majority of the humanities students reported that they would like to study English more if possible (4.23, whereas 4.13 for the science students, as shown in Item 24). In addition, it can be seen that in Category 3: Instrumentality-Promotion and Prevention, both science and humanities students expressed their highest degree of motivation (Items 7 to 12), suggesting that they would like to study English because it is indispensable for their further studies (4.44 and 4.50 for science and humanities students, respectively). The students also reported a slightly high degree of motivation for studying English because it is compulsory (Item 11, 4.16 and 4.14 for science students and humanities counterparts, respectively).

At this juncture, it should be noted that the only area that the humanities students seemed to be slightly less motivated than the science counterparts is Category 2: Ought-to L2 self, with the mean value of 3.62 (as opposed to 3.66 of the science students). In this regard, according to Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010), "Ought-to L2 self" motivation is

triggered externally or from outside of individuals. The “Ought-to L2 self” is more oriented towards the opinions and expectations of parents, friends and work colleagues. Possibly, science students might perceive themselves more obliged to study English than their humanities counterparts in order to avoid “possible negative outcomes” (Dörnyei, 2005, p. 106), such as getting bad grades in English. It is also possible that they are pressured by their families to continue studying the English language so that they can obtain high status, and thus higher paid jobs. Additionally, due to the increasing need for English communication or competence in the national and international context, students are expected to learn to speak and write English proficiently in order to achieve both academic and social goals.

Subsequent to descriptive statistics conducted on the questionnaire data, independent sample *t*-test analyses were performed to determine whether the differences between the two groups of students were significantly different. The results of the *t*-test analyses are presented in the following table.

Table 4

Results of Independent Sample T-tests

Motivation Categories	<i>F</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>p-value</i>
1. Ideal L2 Self	7.03	2133.07	.000*
2. Ought-to L2 Self	15.17	2228.36	.305
3. Instrumentality-Promotion and Prevention	.04	2639	.000*
4. Ethnocentrism and Integrativeness	.74	2639	.000*
5. Attitudes toward Learning English	17.22	2257.17	.001*

**p* < 0.05

Table 4 reveals that there was indeed a significant difference between the mean motivation scores in all categories, except for Category 2 “Ought-to L2 self”. This shows that the students in this study have a strong motivation level in the five categories identified from the hybrid questionnaire, even though the “Ought-to L2 self” category presents a relatively lower effect on learning English compared to the other categories. The analysis also confirms that motivation has a strong influence on Thai students learning English, be they from science or

humanities disciplines.

4.2 Interview results

The responses obtained from the interviews were analyzed qualitatively. The goal of this analysis was to confirm or complement the survey results, elaborating the extent to how the two groups of the students actually use their language motivation and what they think about learning English. The interview responses also reflect the effectiveness and importance of each of the five motivation categories (Ideal L2 Self, Ought-to-L2 Self, Instrumentality-Promotion and Prevention, Ethnocentrism and Integrativeness, and Attitudes toward Learning English) covered in the hybrid questionnaire and employed in the survey. The following excerpts represent some of the interview extracts originally in the Thai language and translated into English for enhanced clarity and comprehension. Each excerpt is accompanied by the identity of the interviewee. The keywords emerged in the interviews were underlined to show the connection between the motivation categories and the interview contents.

Ideal L2 Self

I want to learn English because if I understand and communicate in English, I think I will get a good job and have a bright future.

(MU-Arts 2)

My motivation in learning English is to work abroad after graduation. I think English can widen my world views and perspectives, including having more opportunities in the future.

(KU-Arts 2)

Ought-to L2 Self

I like studying English because I think it is essential for my future, and I think my mom would be proud of me if I could speak English fluently.

(MFU-Sci 3)

My inspiration for studying English is my English teachers. If they make the lessons fun and interesting, I will concentrate

on my studies even more, and I think I will get a good grade at the end of the course.

(KU-Sci 1)

Instrumentality – Promotion and Prevention

I want to be able to communicate with foreigners effectively because when I was younger, a foreigner came to talk to me, but I could not speak with him.

(KU-Arts 1)

I want to travel abroad, especially to English-speaking countries. If I have a chance to work there, I would have a better understanding of what foreigners say without any help from an interpreter.

(MFU-Sci 4)

Ethnocentrism and Integrativeness

In my view, knowing English is important and advantageous. Some of my friends are good at English and I want to be good at it just like them. I also want to study abroad so that I can learn about their culture.

(WU-Arts 4)

I want to speak English like an MC on a TV program that I watched. She is my role model and I want to use English for my job.

(TSU-Sci 1)

Attitudes toward Learning English

English is crucial because it is the language that everyone has to use. Even though I do not use it in my everyday life, it is essential for learning every subject at my university.

(WU-Arts 3)

I think English is very important for communication. No matter where we go in this world, we can use English to communicate with foreigners. English is very useful for daily life, jobs and online work. It will be advantageous if we are proficient in English nowadays.

(UBU-Arts 4)

As shown, the interview data presented above seem to support the quantitative data highlighting the effectiveness of the hybrid questionnaire in capturing the five categories of motivation expressed by

the two groups of students. It can be concluded that the science and humanities students seemed to be aware of the importance of motivation, and thus they employed a certain level of motivation in their English learning. In particular, the interview data also demonstrated that both science and humanities students clearly had the common utilitarian goal of employment and professional advancement.

Interestingly, regarding the Ethnocentrism and Integrativeness category, two humanities students expressed their aspiration to extend the use of English as a tool to enlarge their cultural knowledge.

I want to study English more and more so that I can share my English knowledge with other people. I want to see them use English for communication, too. I will feel more than happy if they are good at English and use it effectively.

(SU-Arts 4)

I want to employ my English language skills as a tool to understand other people's culture. I enjoy reading novels and stories written in English and I learn so much from reading. At the same time, I can use my English knowledge to disseminate my Thai culture to the world. Moreover, I wish to improve my English so that I can use English to help other people who are in need of help, especially those who are stressed and sad. They need someone to share how they feel or what they are going through. Being proficient in English, I can contribute so much to the world and help alleviate the pain of other people.

(SU-Arts 2)

The two excerpts above reflect certain motivation characteristics of the humanities students as well as their attitudes toward learning English. Given the fact that English is their major subject, their English ability was somewhat above average compared to the science student-counterparts. Similarly, they are likely to have very strong motivation to learn English. Additionally, the motivation of these humanities students does not seem to be limited by their personal pursuits but extended for the benefits of other people. That is, to them, as a long-term goal, they would like to improve their English so that they could use English to help other people who might be in some kind of need. Moreover, they would

like to make use of English as a tool, not only to communicate with the world or work internationally, but also to extend and enlarge their cultural knowledge.

The findings presented above can be quite intriguing. That is, English motivation as reflected in the interview goes beyond the classroom. Pedagogically and practically, English teachers might want to encourage English students, particularly those in humanities and those who are ready for challenges, to interact with people through social media platforms. Of course, the goal of this pursuit is not only to improve their English but also to better understand and appreciate other cultures, perspectives, and worldviews through English. At this juncture, these students will then be cognizant of the world and sharpen their intercultural sensitivity. In short, all of these challenges cannot be accomplished without the use of the English language.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has the objective of investigating the role of motivation in learning English among undergraduate students in science and humanities disciplines at eight public universities located in four different regions of Thailand. A hybrid questionnaire developed and employed in this study was based on Gardner's (1985, 2004) and Dörnyei's (2010) motivation questionnaires, which have been recognized to be effective in exploring language learner motivation. The results gained from the quantitative data revealed a significant difference between the two cohorts of students in all motivation aspects, except for "Ought-to L2 self".

When quantitative findings are taken into consideration, it is observed that the humanities students generally had less parental pressure to learn English than their science counterparts. It is possible that in the case of the humanities students, most preferred to study English and wanted to study the language regardless, which is why they chose to study in the humanities field, rather than sciences. In contrast, the parents of the science students may expect them to be fluent in the target language so that they can complete their education and get a good job to support their families financially. In short, the science students are studying English so that they can use it in their future jobs.

At this juncture, the findings generated from this study provide a

number of pedagogical implications. First, the students' motivation in learning English should be considered when designing curriculums, managing language classrooms, and teaching English, particularly to these two groups of students from different disciplines. For example, as suggested by Dornyei (2018; 2019), teachers need to be aware and conscious that language learners are likely to differ in their ambitions, outlook, and motivation. Therefore, language instructors need to be adaptable and flexible with the learning environment, the content, and classroom management which would in turn serve the aim of improving student motivation.

Pedagogically, since the analysis of this study showed that teaching and learning activities have an influence on motivating students from the two disciplines to learn English, teachers should make efforts to support students in maintaining their motivational intensity such as establishing a close and reliable relationship with the students, providing positive feedback to improve students' English ability, and encouraging students to set achievable goals. Ushioda (2008) also suggests that in order to promote healthy interaction between social and individual processes of motivation, it might be best to incorporate classroom activities where students work together in pairs or small groups to achieve their learning goals, which can help foster cognitive and motivational interdependence among students. Students, meanwhile, should be aware of the importance and effects of autonomous learning, which can, to a certain extent, extend and expand their skills for their future career and development, allowing them to take full advantage of the benefits of using English to achieve the goal of professional advancement.

According to quantitative and qualitative findings of this study, both groups of the students expressed their motivation in learning English. They also firmly believe that English competence and knowledge is essential for their future. It is acknowledged that motivational orientations and engagement are crucial in developing students' linguistic, socio-cultural, and psychological wealth (Noels et al., 2019). In terms of pedagogy, teachers should encourage and reinforce the expected and desirable forms of behavior in the language teaching process by fostering and stimulating curiosity and inquisitiveness about the English language (Cook, 2000), and by providing authentic tasks and stimulating students to engage in classroom activities (Lamb & Arisandy,

2018), making full use of the English language. It should be noted that these actions should be made to fit the precise contexts and should be appropriate to the local educational culture, meet curriculum goals, and match the interests of students' needs wherever possible. In this regard, as far as the science students are concerned, raising their awareness of the importance of English language skills for communicative functions and motivating them to use English as much as possible should be emphasized so that they can maintain their language learning motivation and engagement (Chaffee et al., 2014).

The present study, which focused on first year Thai undergraduate students, is relatively large scale in terms of the scope and the sample size. It is expected that the findings can, to an extent, thus be generalized, elucidating how Thai students' motivation in English language learning can be enhanced. However, given the fact that the degree of motivation can change over time, longitudinal studies are needed so that more in-depth information and more details of Thai students' motivation patterns in relation to learning English can be obtained. Finally, given the focus of this study on motivation in learning English between the learners from two disciplinary fields, future studies could integrate other factors or variables, which may yield insightful results related to motivation and provide more concrete (and perhaps more refined) motivation frameworks, contributing to a more comprehensive picture of the role of motivation in language learning.

Despite a clearer picture of Thai learners' motivation in learning English revealed by this research, this study suffers from some limitations. First, it should be noted that the participants were drawn from eight different universities; therefore, it is very likely that the participants' English educational backgrounds or current English learning exposure are different. Without control of the participants' educational backgrounds, it is thus highly possible that the accounts related to their motivation in learning English as reported here might manifest the influence of previous English education. Second, the eight universities represented by the participants of this study cannot be treated as a homogeneous group of participants either. That is, the quality and quantity of English education provided by individual universities were not taken into consideration. For instance, one university might encourage the integration of technology in teaching and learning of the English

language, whereas the others might adopt a face to face traditional classroom strategy. Additionally, the choice of textbooks selected for English courses and the teaching approaches adopted by the teachers at these eight universities could be vastly distinct. Not to mention the emphasis of the English instruction that can vary substantially both across the two major disciplines within a single university or across the eight universities. Based on these shortcomings, the results presented in this paper remain inconclusive and thus need to be validated by subsequent studies to elucidate the role of motivation among Thai learners.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article is an output of the research project supported by the Thailand Science, Research, and Innovation Fund (Grant No. RDG61H0029). We are grateful to all the participants, and to the universities where the research was successfully conducted.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Budsaba Kanoksilapatham: a Professor of English at the Faculty of Management Science, Silpakorn University, Thailand. She received her PhD in Linguistics (Concentration of Applied Linguistics) from Georgetown University, Washington DC, USA.

Attapol Khamkhien: an Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Science, Kasetsart University, Thailand. He received his PhD in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics from the University of Warwick, UK.

Pensinee Kitkha: a lecturer at the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Science, Kasetsart University, Thailand. She received her PhD in Curriculum and Instruction from Chulalongkorn University, Thailand.

Angsu-orn Na Nongkhai: a lecturer in English language teaching at Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, Khon Kaen University, Nong Khai, Thailand. She completed her PhD in Education from the University of Sheffield, UK.

REFERENCES

- Assavanadda, A., & Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2018). Motivation towards learning English of Thai political science undergraduate students: A survey study. *The New English Teacher*, 12(2), 76-90.
- Baker, S. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (2000). The role of gender and immersion in communication and second language orientations. *Language Learning*, 50(2), 311-341. <https://doi.org/10.1.1.583.352>
- Breen, R., & Lindsay, R. (2002). Different disciplines require different motivations for student success. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(6), 693-725. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020940615784>
- Chaffee, K.E., Noels, K.A., & Sugita McEown, M.S. (2014). Learning from authoritarian teachers: Controlling the situation or controlling yourself can sustain motivation. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(2), 355–387. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssl.2014.4.2.9>
- Chen, Y., Jiang, Y., & Mu, Z. (2015). A survey study: The correlation between introversion/extroversion and oral English learning outcome. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(3), 581-587. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0603.14>
- Cheng H. F., & Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 153-174. <https://doi.org/10.2167/illt048.0>
- Choomthong, D., & Chaichoompoo, C. (2015). English language learning motivation of Thai undergraduate students in the globalized era. *Suranaree Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(2), 23-45.
- Choosri, C., & Intharaksa, U. (2011). *Relationship between motivation and students' English learning achievement: A study of the second – year vocational certificate level Hatyai technical college students*. Paper presented at The 3rd International Conference on Humanities and Social Sciences, 1-15.
- Cohen, A.D. & Dörnyei, Z. (2002). Focus on the language learning: Motivation, styles, and strategies. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 170-190). Arnold.
- Cook, V. (2000). Linguistics and second language acquisition: One person with two languages. In M. Aronoff & J. Rees-Miller (Eds.), *The*

Blackwell handbook of linguistics (pp. 488-511). Oxford: Blackwell.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756409>

- Darling, W. E., & Chanyoo, N. (2018). Relationships of L2 motivational self-system components and willingness to communicate in English among Thai undergraduate students. *NIDA Journal of Language and Communication*, 23(33), 1-22.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Clement, R. (2001). Motivational characteristics of learning different target languages: Results of a nationwide survey. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 391-424). Honolulu, HI: The University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994a). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge! *Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 515-23. <https://doi.org/10.2307/328590>
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994b). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 273-284.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/330107>
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31, 117-135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480001315X>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). New themes and approaches in L2 motivation research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 43-59.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2006). Individual differences in second language acquisition. *AILA Review*, 19, 42-68. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.19.05dor>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda, (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9-42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Routledge.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2018). Motivating students and teachers. In J. I. Lontos (Ed.), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 4293-4299). Wiley.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2019). Towards a better understanding of the L2 learning experience, the Cinderella of the L2 Motivational Self System. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(1), 19-30. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.1.2>
- Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., & Németh, N. (2006). *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation: A Hungarian perspective*. Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2009). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Pearson.
- Fontecha, A. F. (2014). Receptive vocabulary knowledge and motivation in CLIL and EFL. *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas*, 9, 23-32. <https://doi.org/10.4995/rlyla.2014.2077>
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (2004). *Attitude motivation test battery: International AMTB project*.
- Gardner, R. C. (2012). Integrative motivation and global language (English) acquisition in Poland. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 2(2), 215-226. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2012.2.2.5>
- Gardner, R. C., Day, J. B., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1992). Integrative motivation, induced anxiety, and language learning in a controlled environment. *Studies in Second Language Learning*, 14, 197-214. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100010822>
- Gardner, R. C., Masgoret, A.M., & Bernaus, M. (2001). Examining the role of attitudes and motivation outside of the formal classroom: A test of the mini-AMTB for children. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 281-195). Honolulu, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

- Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Newbury House.
- Hengsadeekul, C., Koul, R., & Kaewkuekool. (2014). Motivational orientation and preference for English-medium programs in Thailand. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 66(1), 35-44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2014.02.001>
- Higgins, T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94(3), 319-340.
- Kaneko, M. (2012). On the motivation of science majors learning English as a Foreign Language: A case study from Japan. *OnCUE Journal*, 6(2), 3-26.
- Kitjaroonchai, N. (2013). Motivation toward English language learning of students in secondary and high schools in education service area office 4, Saraburi, Thailand. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 1(1), 22-33. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20130101.14>
- Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System*, 32, 3-19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2003.04.002>
- Lamb, M. (2012). A self system perspective on young adolescents' motivation to learn English in urban and rural settings. *Language Learning*, 62(4), 997-1023. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00719.x>
- Lamb, M. (2013) "Your mum and dad can't teach you!": Constraints on agency among rural learners of English in Indonesia'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34. 14–29
- Lamb, M., & Arisandy, F. E. (2019). The impact of online use of English on motivation to learn. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1545670>
- MacLynre, P., Mackinnon, S., & Clement, R. (2009). From integrative motivation to possible selves: The baby, the bathwater and the future of language learning motivation research. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 43-65). Multilingual Matters.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41, 954-969. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954>
- Masgoret, A. M., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivations, and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language Learning*, 53(1), 123-163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00212>

- Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation. (2018). *Higher education statistics: Academic year 2018*. Retrieved from: <http://www.mua.go.th/assets/img/pdf/stat.pdf>
- Na Nongkhai, A. (2018). *An investigation into English language motivation of Thai university students: Understanding students' motivation over time and their visions of future L2 selves through narrative inquiry*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Sheffield, UK.
- Neumann, R., Rarry, S., & Becher, T. (2002). Teaching and learning in the disciplinary context: A conceptual analysis. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(4), 405 – 417.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0307507022000011525>
- Noels, K.A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, A.G. (2001). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French Canadian learners of English. *Canadian Language Review*, 57, 424-442.
<https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.424>
- Noels, K. A., Adrian-Taylor, S. M., Saumure, K.D., & Katz, J. W. (2019). Motivation and the support of significant others across language learning contexts. *Journal for the Psychology of Language Learning*, 1, 106-114. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X8600500403>
- Oranpattanachai, P. (2013). Motivation and English language achievement of Thai undergraduate students. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 6(1), 15-26.
- Oxford, R.L. (1994). Where are we regarding language learning motivation? *Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 512-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02069.x>
- Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self-system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System*, 38, 467-479. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.06.011>
- Rattanaphumma, P. (2016). *Ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self: A study in the Thai context*. Paper presented at The European Conference on Language Learning 2016. United Kingdom.
- Sakeda, M., & Kurata, N. (2016). Motivation and L2 selves: A study of learners of Japanese at an Australian university. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 13(1), 49-67.
- Santikarn, B. (2015). Attitude, motivation, and parental encouragement toward learning English of English of undergraduate students. *Research and Development Journal Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University*, 7(3), 144-160.

- Sayadian, S., & Lashkarian, A. (2010). Investigating attitude and motivation of Iranian University learners toward English as a foreign language. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 3(1), 137-148. <https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v3i1.170>
- Strombach, T., Strang, S., Park, S., & Kenning, P. (2016). Common and distinctive approaches to motivation in different disciplines. *Progress in Brain Research Journal*, 229, 3-23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pbr.2016.06.007>
- Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self-system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian Learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 66-97). Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-005>
- Tort Calvo, E. (2015). *Language learning motivation: The L2 motivational self system and its relationship with learning achievement*. Master's Dissertation, Universitat Autònoma Barcelona.
- Tremblay, P. F., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 7, 505-518. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1995.tb05451.x>
- Ushioda, E. (2006). Language motivation in a reconfigured Europe: Access, identity, autonomy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(2), 148-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630608668545>
- Ushioda, E. (2008). Motivation and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp. 19-34). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2010.502804>
- Ushioda, E. (2011). Language learning motivation, self and identity: Current theoretical perspective. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(3), 199-210. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2010.538701>
- Ushioda, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2012). Motivation. In S. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 396-409). Routledge.
- Wimolmas, R. (2013). *A survey study of motivation in English language learning of first year undergraduate students at Sirindhorn International Institute of Technology (SIIT), Thammasat University*. Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Foreign

APPENDIX

Interview Questions

1. In the 21st century, how is English important to you?

ในศตวรรษที่ 21 คุณคิดว่าภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญต่อคุณอย่างไร

.....
.....

2. In the 21st century, which English skill, e.g. listening, speaking, reading and writing, do you think is the most important? Why? Which skills do you want to improve most?

ในศตวรรษที่ 21 คุณคิดว่าทักษะภาษาอังกฤษด้านใดสำคัญมากที่สุด เพราะอะไร และคุณต้องการพัฒนาทักษะใดมากที่สุด

.....
.....

3. What is the most important factor for increasing your motivation of learning English?

คุณคิดว่าอะไรเป็นปัจจัยที่สำคัญที่สุดสำหรับการสร้างแรงจูงใจในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของคุณ

.....
.....

4. In your opinion, which English classroom management style would you prefer: e.g., classrooms managed solely by instructors, online lessons and materials, or classrooms managed by instructors and supplemented with online lessons and materials?

ในความคิดเห็นของคุณ คุณต้องการให้มีการจัดการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษแบบใด เช่น ห้องเรียนที่ดำเนินการสอนโดยอาจารย์ บทเรียนภาษาอังกฤษออนไลน์

ห้องเรียนที่ดำเนินการสอนโดยอาจารย์และใช้บทเรียนภาษาอังกฤษออนไลน์
ประกอบ

.....
.....

5. As a first-year student, do you have any suggestions or recommendations for the university on improving your English skills continuously?

เนื่องจากคุณเป็นนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 คุณมีวิธีหรือข้อเสนอแนะอะไรที่มหาวิทยาลัยจะ
ช่วยคุณให้พัฒนาทักษะภาษาอังกฤษได้อย่างต่อเนื่อง

.....
.....

6. If you could choose, would you like your English instructor to use technology such as computers or the Internet, to teach English? How?

ถ้าคุณสามารถเลือกได้ คุณต้องการให้ครูผู้สอนใช้เทคโนโลยี (เช่น คอมพิวเตอร์
อินเทอร์เน็ต) ในการสอนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษหรือไม่และอย่างไร

.....
.....