UKRAINIAN AND ENGLISH MOTIVATIONAL SELF SYSTEM OF MINORITY LEARNERS IN TRANSCARPATHIA

Beatrix Henkel

Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine
henkel.betty82@gmail.com

Abstract: The investigation reported in the present article discusses the differences between the motivational disposition of ethnic minority learners to studying a state language as compared to their motivation to studying a foreign language. Dörnyei's (2005) L2[*] Motivational Self System Theory serves as the dominant theoretical framework of the current research. Altogether 147 questionnaires were collected from Hungarian minority secondary school learners in Ukraine studying in the tenth and eleventh forms. The results confirm the presence of each of the three key dimensions in Dörnyei's theory, namely, the Ideal L2 Self, the Ought-to L2 Self, and Learning Experience in the English motivational self system of the learners. However, only one of the named key dimensions was incorporated in the learners' Ukrainian motivational self system and it was supplemented by attitudes learners have towards learning the language of the linguistic majority of Ukraine, i.e., Ukrainian. The findings of the study confirm that the dimensions of the L2 Motivational Self System adequately explain the language learning motivation construct of minority learners of English; however, to examine its feasibility to describe the Ukrainian language motivation of learners further research is needed.

Keywords: L2 motivation, self, attitude, ethnic minority, Hungarians, Transcarpathia, Ukraine, questionnaire.

1 Introduction

In L2 motivation research, several studies have dealt with English language learning motivation (Dörnyei, 1990, 1998; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009a; Gardner, 1985, 2006; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Sjöholm, 2004) in foreign as well as second language learning contexts. Some of the L2 motivation studies investigated motivation to study languages other than English, for instance German (Kormos & Csizér, 2007; Macaro & Wingate, 2004; Nikolov & Józsa, 2006), French (Gardner & McIntyre, 1993; Gardner, Masgoret, & Tremblay, 1999; McIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2002; Noels, Clément, & Pelletier, 1999; Williams, Burden, & Lanvers, 2002; Wright, 1999), Italian (DePonte, 2004), Arabic (Donitsa-Schmidt, Inbar, & Shohamy, 2004), and Chinese (Humphreys & Spratt, 2008; Rueda & Chen, 2005).

Less widespread languages, however, have not been researched adequately. Therefore, there seems to be a need to carry out research exploring motivation in languages that have local relevance only and are not as widely used languages as the above-mentioned ones. A good example of such a language is Ukrainian, which serves as the official language in only one country, in Ukraine. The present study intends to contribute to this field of research by investigating the issue of motivation to learn Ukrainian. To my knowledge no study has dealt with this topic before.

The aim of this investigation was not only to describe minority language learners' motivation to study Ukrainian, but also to compare it with their motivation to learn English. Obviously, Ukrainian and English are languages of completely different status. In order to create an appropriate research design, it was necessary to select a theoretical framework

---

[*] L2 refers to second language.

sensitive to this issue. Dörnyei's (2005) L2 Motivational Self System Theory was found to be the most suitable framework, as this theory provides a sharp focus on the language learners' selves and can enhance the understanding of the learners' language learning environment. Dörnyei describes the motivational self system of a language learner as a construct that can be grasped through three core dimensions: the *Ideal L2 Self*, the *Ought-to L2 Self* and *Learning Experience*. Since its publication, the Motivational Self System Theory has proved to be a popular motivation theory, and it has been applied in quite a few empirical studies that were collected and published in a volume edited by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009a).

In the last chapter of the volume, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009b) suggest some possible future research directions in relation to the Motivational Self System Theory. Two of the research directions they propose coincide with the focus of the present research. One of their suggestions is to explore whether there are a number of possible selves, or only one possible self with several facets. Another is the question of cross-cultural variation of the language learners' self and/or self-system. Exploring and analyzing self structures in an ethnic minority context evidently builds on the two research directions mentioned.

Keeping in mind the above research directions, the context of the study and the chosen theoretical framework, the following research questions have been formulated:
1. To what extent are the dimensions of the L2 Motivational Self System Theory present in the Ukrainian language learning motivational set-up of the minority learners?
2. To what extent are the dimensions of the L2 Motivational Self System Theory present in the English language learning motivational set-up of the minority learners?
3. What are the commonalities and differences between the Ukrainian and English language motivational self systems?

2 The language learning context of the participants

The Transcarpathian region is situated in the Western part of Ukraine. Up to 96.8% of Hungarians in Ukraine live in this region (Molnár & Molnár, 2005). The majority of Hungarian learners in Transcarpathia use Ukrainian and English only in the language classes at school. Therefore, becoming familiar with the instructional context where these two languages are taught will help us understand and interpret the findings of the present research.

2.1 The status and role of the Ukrainian language among ethnic Hungarian minority learners

The teaching of Ukrainian as a compulsory subject in educational establishments was introduced in the 1990-91 school year (Csernicskó, 1998). This did not happen by chance, as 1991 was the year when Ukraine became an independent country after several decades of being a member state of the Soviet Union. As soon as the autonomy of Ukraine was declared, Ukrainian became a compulsory subject throughout the school years in all state-supported schools, regardless of whether the medium of instruction was Ukrainian, Russian, Hungarian or any other language that was and still is in use in the territory of Ukraine.

In schools where Hungarian is the medium of instruction, the Ukrainian lessons are divided into language and literature classes. The number of classes per week ranges from four to nine in the different academic years. Despite the growing number of classes in Ukrainian

language and literature, there appears to be no improvement in the learners' perceived self-proficiency ratings. Beregszászi and Csernicskó (2003) confirm this claim on the basis of the results of two surveys they conducted and report in their book about Hungarians' language use in Transcarpathia. One of the two investigations involved a representative sample of adults from the Carpathian basin, selected on the basis of their age, sex, educational background, and the type of settlement they live in. There were altogether 846 respondents from the Carpathian basin, 144 of which were from Transcarpathia. The other survey project, named Agent 2000, asked 595 teenagers studying in the tenth form both in secondary schools where Hungarian is the medium of instruction and in those schools where there are a large number of Hungarian students but Hungarian is not the medium of instruction. On the basis of the results of both projects, Beregszászi and Csernicskó (2003) conclude that the majority of the respondents hardly know the state language.

2.2 The status and role of the English language among ethnic Hungarian minority learners

Although English is the most widespread foreign language in Transcarpathia, less than one percent of the population of Transcarpathia claims to speak this language (Molnár & Molnár, 2005). It must also be pointed out that foreign languages in the region are only taught and learnt within the framework of instructional settings, and direct contact with the language is rarely available outside the language classes (Csernicskó, 1998). This situation obviously influences the context of teaching and learning foreign languages.

Similarly to Ukrainian, English is introduced early in primary schools and is taught throughout the school years. The number of English classes per week changes from one academic year to another, which means it ranges from two to four classes per week. Unlike the situation with Ukrainian, there are no classes offered for studying English literature. Interestingly, there are fewer English language classes in the upper forms of secondary schools than in the lower forms.

On the basis of interview data with language teachers, Huszti (2005) concludes that teachers think it is the lack of proper educational supplies that hinders the successful acquisition of English in Transcarpathian minority schools. She admits that teachers miss methodologically well-constructed coursebooks containing interesting topics and challenging exercises, accompanied by listening materials and teachers' books. The lack of a methodologically well-developed framework for English language teaching and the low number of language classes obviously contribute to the fact that only one percent of the Hungarians in Transcarpathia claim to speak a foreign language (Molnár & Molnár, 2005).

In summary, it can be concluded that there are several difficulties present in both Ukrainian and English language teaching. It can also be assumed that neither language is being taught effectively enough, as language learners claim to have a low proficiency despite having studied the languages for several years (Beregszászi & Csernicskó, 2003). As the respondents of the current study come from this background, understanding their language learning context will obviously add to our understanding of the results of the investigation.

3 Theoretical background of the research

Dörnyei's (2005) Motivational Self System Theory is the major underlying framework of the present research. This theory focuses upon the L2 selves of language learners. Since it was published, several studies have found empirical evidence supporting the feasibility of the Motivational Self System Theory in various language learning contexts. The theory has been tried out in many foreign language learning contexts, for example, in Hungary (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005b; Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Kormos & Csizér, 2008), in Japan (Ryan, 2009), and among Japanese, Chinese, Iranian (Taguchi et al., 2009) and Korean (Kim, 2009) foreign language learners.

Dörnyei's theory (2005) is a synthesis of two main theoretical models in the field of L2 motivation. One of the theoretical constructs is that of the possible selves theory developed by Markus and Nurius (1986). They claim possible selves to be "a type of self-knowledge [that] pertains to how individuals think about their potential and about their future. Possible selves are the ideal selves that we would very much like to become" (p. 954). Markus and Nurius (1986) describe two basic functions of possible selves to highlight the relevance of the notion. First, they claim that possible selves might serve as personalized visions of one's hopes and fears. Second, possible selves might provide a continuous feedback on the current behaviour of the individual.

This second function of possible selves can serve as a link to the next theoretical model incorporated in the Motivational Self System Theory, namely, the self-discrepancy theory. The self-discrepancy theory introduced by Higgins (1987) states that there is a discrepancy between the actual self or selves of the individual and his/her possible selves. Interpreting events happening in the individual's environment through the lens of possible selves adds certain meanings and reflections to the current self and behaviour. Similarly to Markus and Nurius (1986), Higgins also presupposes a continuous relationship between the actual and possible selves. Higgins (1987) claims that motivation is the effort made to reduce the discrepancy between the actual and possible selves. Higgins's interpretation of motivation allows us to imagine motivation as a bridge that links actual and possible selves and transfers continuous feedback from possible selves to fuel the actual self of the individual so as to reduce the discrepancy.

Dörnyei (2005) adjusted the concepts of possible selves and self-discrepancy to the self of the second language learner. He developed three dimensions in his Motivational Self System Theory through which the second language motivational disposition of language learners can be explained. The three key components of the Motivational Self System are: the *Ideal L2 Self*, the *Ought-to L2 Self* and *Learning Experience*.

Dörnyei (2005) states that the *Ideal L2 Self* is the embodied vision the language learner has of him/herself as a future user of the target language, who possesses all the attributes that s/he would ideally like to possess. Ryan (2009) says that it is the *Ideal L2 Self* of the learner that serves as "the essential regulatory mechanism at the heart of an individual's interaction with an imaginary language community" (p.41). In their nationwide survey, Csizér and Dörnyei (2005b) found that the *Ideal L2 Self* was made up of two complementary aspects: one, the interest and positive attitude towards the L2 and the L2 culture, the other the achievement-oriented side of the ideal self.

The presence and dominant nature of the *Ideal L2 Self* were verified in many studies (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005a, 2005b; Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Dörnyei, Csizér, & Németh, 2006; Kormos & Csizér, 2008; Ryan, 2006, 2009). In addition, several motivational variables were found to contribute to the *Ideal L2 Self*, which finding asserts the key role the *Ideal L2 Self* plays in motivational self constructs. Kormos and Csizér (2008) found the attitude of secondary school learners and university students towards language learning contributed to the *Ideal L2 Self*. Furthermore, they confirmed that the way the milieu establishes the relevance of learning a second or foreign language is also related to the *Ideal L2 Self*.

The other core dimension in Dörnyei's Motivational Self System Theory, the *Ought-to L2 Self*, cannot be confirmed to the same extent by research data as the *Ideal L2 Self* can be. Dörnyei (2005) explains that the *Ought-to L2 Self* refers "to the attributes that one believes one ought-to possess (i.e. various duties, obligations, or responsibilities) in order to avoid possible negative outcomes" (p.106). Kormos and Csizér (2008) in their Hungarian sample including three different population cohorts could not ascertain the presence of the *Ought-to L2 Self*. One year later Csizér and Kormos (2009), when discussing the results of another surveyof 202 Hungarian learners of English, found that this dimension did not play a significant role in language motivation. In addition, in their sample of secondary school learners they found that the *Ought-to L2 Self* correlated significantly only with parental support. They interpreted this finding to indicate that the *Ought-to L2 Self* seems to be socially constructed and learners' motivation to learn English is mainly influenced by the attitude towards language learning present in their immediate language learning environment. Therefore, it can be concluded that the exploration of the construct of the *Ought-to L2 Self* seems to be challenging and needs further research.

The above mentioned studies reported on the presence of the two dimensions separately, but there have also been attempts to examine how the two dimensions are related to each other. Kim (2009), for instance, explored the socio-cultural interface between the above named two selves in her interview study involving two Korean learners of English. She concluded that the *Ideal L2 Self* and the *Ought-to L2 Self* "are not entirely antithetical positions. What can be regarded as the typical instantiation of the *Ideal L2 Self* can sometimes be understood as that of the *Ought-to L2 Self*, or vice versa" (p.289). Dörnyei et al. (2006) confirm this finding by asserting that it depends on the degree of internalization of instrumentality that defines whether a variable will form part of the *Ideal L2 Self* or the *Ought-to L2 Self*.

The third dimension of the Motivational Self System Theory is situated on a different level to the *Ideal* and the *Ought-to L2 Selves* (Dörnyei, 2005). *Learning Experience* is the dimension that provides the opportunity for all "situation-specific motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience" to take place in the motivational self system of the language learner (Dörnyei, 2005, p.106). The scope of this dimension can be broadened to involve several variables that can influence motivation (e.g., family, friends, language learning curriculum and/or policy) or can be narrowed down to examine the effect of one variable only (e.g., language classes). The present study applies the latter, narrow scope.

The three dimensions of the Motivational Self System Theory, as Csizér and Kormos (2009) conclude on the basis of their research results, are not related to each other and can be considered as independent motivational variables. Therefore, the theoretical framework proposed by Dörnyei (2005) serves as a valid tool for exploring language learning motivation. Besides the validity of its constituents, the L2 Motivational Self System Theory has two more

advantages. First, it fits in with L2 motivation research tradition by including the social dimension. Second, the theory opens up new routes for researching the agenda by placing the self of the language learner in focus. Combining two trends of language motivation research may well uncover promising new perspectives into second and third language learning motivation.

4 Methods

The main instrument of the current research was Ryan's (2005) motivation questionnaire. Before it was given to the target population, items inquiring about language contact were added to the core pool of items. Afterwards, think-aloud interviews helped to improve the layout and wording of the motivation questionnaire. The improved questionnaire was piloted on 102 learners from the target population. Altogether, there were 147 respondents taking part in the final version of the current research. Before explaining the analysis of the data, the development and validation of the questionnaire will be described in detail.

4.1 Instrument

This study is based on a motivation questionnaire collecting quantitative data. The items of the instrument were compiled on the basis of two already existing and validated questionnaires. The majority of the items were taken from Ryan's (2005) motivation questionnaire. Altogether, fourteen items inquiring about language contact were adopted from Kormos and Csizér (2008). Another fourteen items inquired about the language learning history of the learners, including some items referring to bio data. All the items are in line with the self approach of language learning motivation, i.e., Dörnyei's Motivational Self System Theory, which offers a vision of possible future language learning selves.

As part of the validation procedure, the first step was to ask two experts to comment on the instrument. They recommended merging items referring to the US and those referring to Great Britain, and only then were the items reworded to refer to both Ukrainian and English.

The second step was to alter the layout of the questionnaire so that adequate space could be created for answers referring to the two languages. Therefore, next to each item (except the ones referring to bio data and language learning history) two separate columns were created, one for English and one for Ukrainian.

The third step taken, after the first compilation of the questionnaire, was to give the instrument to three learners from the target population, i.e., tenth-form pupils, and to ask them to think aloud while completing it. Owing to the think-aloud interviews, some further alterations were implemented in the instrument. These included wording, spelling mistakes, and repetition of item numbers or items.

After the above-described validation process, the instrument was piloted on 102 secondary school learners studying in the tenth and eleventh forms. The pilot project was followed by data analysis, which resulted in the reduction of some items, the merging of scales, and the creation of new items and new scales. The improved questionnaire ended up with 11 scales and 64 items. The pre-designed scales were adopted from Kormos and Csizér

(2008). The scales included items inquiring about written and oral language use, learners' contact with the two languages, the role parents play in their language learning, the learners' attitude towards language learning, the experience of language classes, perceived class and language use anxiety, the perceived importance of Ukrainian and English languages respectively and last but not least the three dimensions of the L2 Motivational Self System Theory, i.e., the *Ideal L2 Self*, the *Ought-to L2 Self*, and *Learning Experience*.

All the items were composed in the form of questions or statements. The participants were asked to place their responses on a five point Likert scale. The final form of the questionnaire given to the participants from the target population contained 78 items including 14 items inquiring about the bio data of the respondents. (See the Appendix for an English translation of the questionnaire.)

4.2 Participants

The validated questionnaire was given to 147 secondary school learners living in different parts of Transcarpathia. They were all native speakers of Hungarian. The learners studied in either the tenth or in the eleventh forms of secondary schools and were aged between 16 and 18 at the time of filling in the questionnaire. Most had been studying Ukrainian for about ten years, and English for about six to nine years. However, some learners had been studying English only for two years. The length of their English studies depended largely on their previous education. When English was introduced as a compulsory subject in Ukraine, it had to be taught beginning with the second form in elementary school (Bekh, 2001). However, only some of the schools complied with this regulation due to the lack of English teachers at the time. That is why some of the learners started to learn English only in the fifth form. There were a few learners who finished junior high school in their village and started the tenth form in another village or in a nearby town where there was a secondary school. In the secondary school English was (in most of the cases) the only foreign language to be studied; therefore, these students had to stop studying their first foreign language (in most of the cases German or French) and needed to start another foreign language in the tenth form. This educational variation is an obstacle that cannot be overcome, as it arises in all Hungarian secondary schools in Transcarpathia. The learners' perceived level of their own proficiency ranged between elementary to proficient in the case of Ukrainian, and between elementary and intermediate in the case of English.

Five Hungarian secondary schools were selected and visited. They were chosen using a criterion-sampling procedure. The criterion was the proportion of Hungarians living in the given area. Molnár and Molnár (2005) in their report of the All-Ukrainian census of 2001 identified four different regions in the territory of Transcarpathia. The first region comprises districts where the proportion of Hungarians is between 1-10% of the population. The second and third regions encompass territories where Hungarians form 10-25% and 25-50% of the population, respectively. Finally, the fourth group is made up of those areas where Hungarians form the majority of the population. With this criterion as a selection measure, the hypotheses tested included not only differences in the language use and language contact indices of the learners living in each of the four regions, but also differences in their motivational set-up concerning the Ukrainian language.

One of the five selected schools belongs to the first group, one school represents the second and third groups, and three schools represent the fourth group, respectively.

Unfortunately, the distribution of the respondents among the four groups is not ideal, due to two problems. First, there are fewer Hungarian respondents in the first, second and third regions, simply because there are fewer Hungarians in these regions. Second, at the time of the survey, some of the schools still had German or French as their foreign language and not English, and this excluded them from the list of schools appropriate for the research. Still, due to the advances in statistical analysis, namely, in non-parametric inferential statistics, the above mentioned problem could be solved, and differences among learners belonging to different groups were detected, as will be described in the Conclusions section of the study.

4.3 Procedures

First, the headmaster of each school was asked to allow the investigation to take place. Second, an appointment was arranged with a teacher of the tenth or eleventh forms to distribute the questionnaires. In all cases, the questionnaires were distributed during class time. It took 15 to 20 minutes on average for the learners to fill in the questionnaire.

4.4 Data analysis

The data was computed and analysed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 13.0. First, the descriptive statistics were calculated to establish the mean and standard deviation figures for each scale. Second, internal reliability coefficients were established to identify the strength of the links among the items within each scale. Third, correlations were computed to find significant relationships among the scales. Fourth, a regression analysis was performed to identify the underlying components of the motivational dispositions of learners towards Ukrainian and English.

5 Results and discussion

5.1 Reliability coefficients and descriptive statistics of the scales

First, the consistency of the scales was investigated for the three constituents making up Dörnyei's Motivational Self System Theory (See Table 1 for the descriptive statistics and internal reliability indices). Table 1 shows that the Ukrainian *Ideal Self* (.69) has a lower reliability coefficient than that of the English *Ideal Self* (.79). The Ukrainian *Ideal L2 Self* scale has the third highest mean (4.10) among all the scales, while the second highest mean with a rather low standard deviation is attributed to the English *Ought-to L2 Self* scale (4.28; .75). Both the English *Ideal L2 Self* and *Ought-to L2 Self* have quite a high reliability coefficient of .79 and .82, respectively. The third dimension of the Motivational Self System, i.e., *Learning Experience*, has reliability indices of .83 for Ukrainian and .84 for English. This means that the items belonging to the scale adequately tap into the learning experience of the learners. However, the mean and standard deviation figures of the scales (Ukrainian: 2.75; 1.14; English: 3.04; 1.10) show that in general, the learners do not really enjoy Ukrainian or English language classes, but there are considerable variations among them as demonstrated by the standard deviation figures in Table 1.

Scales	Ukrainian			English		
	Mean	St. dev.	Cronbach's alpha	Mean	St. dev.	Cronbach's alpha
Ideal L2 Self	4.10	.90	.69	3.74	1.11	.79
Ought-to L2 Self	3.80	.73	.70	4.28	.75	.82
Motivated Language Learning Behaviour	3.51	.94	.80	3.23	1.09	.88
Direct Contact with L2 Speakers	2.54	1.03	.68	1.78	.79	.70
Written Language Use	1.59	.95	.72	1.41	.71	.75
Language Contact	2.57	.97	.83	2.12	.86	.79
Parental Encouragement	4.23	.86	.81	3.77	1.10	.85
Attitude towards Learning Ukrainian	3.15	1.03	.86	3.30	1.14	.89
Class Anxiety	2.66	1.13	.75	2.72	.98	.68
Language Use Anxiety	2.72	1.11	.70	3.14	1.08	.67
Learning Experience	2.75	1.14	.83	3.04	1.10	.84

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and internal reliability indices of the scales included in the questionnaire

Three scales in the research instrument investigated the actual frequency of contact opportunities exploited by the participants. These are the scales exploring how often the learners used the languages examined for speaking, reading and writing purposes and how frequently they met speakers of the two languages. The scales and their values are as follows: *Direct Contact with Ukrainian/English Speakers* (.68; .70), *Written Language Use* (.72; .75), and *Language Contact* (.83; .79). The comparatively low Cronbach α-s of the scale examining direct contact opportunities can be attributed to the difference among events, opportunities and occasions when learners can and do meet speakers of Ukrainian and English. Apart from the direct contact scale, the other two scales have fairly high reliability coefficients indicating that the items involved in the scales covered the written language use and language contact domains successfully.

Descriptive statistic figures of the *Written Language Use* scale show that Hungarian minority learners claim that they seldom use Ukrainian (1.59; .95) or English (1.41; .71) for writing. They very rarely use either of the languages for communicating with native speakers. In the case of English, this may be due to the fact that they do not travel abroad, especially not to English-speaking countries where they could meet English speakers. In the case of Ukrainian, the situation is somewhat different. The learners live in the country where Ukrainian is the only state language. Yet, most of the learners live in an environment where only Hungarian is used on a daily basis. As the Hungarian ethnic group in Transcarpathia forms a cohesive unit geographically, learners are exposed to Ukrainian only when they leave the imaginary borderline that defines their neighbourhood (Molnár & Molnár, 2005).

The other two contact scales add emphasis to the above-described findings. The low mean value of 1.78 for the *Direct Contact with L2 Speakers* scale for English indicates the participants are not characterized by using English with native speakers. The *Direct Contact*

with L2 Speakers scale for Ukrainian has a higher mean value (2.54; 1.03) but still does not reach the mean of three points in the five-point Likert-scale, and remains at the 'not really true of me' level. Beregszászi, et al. (2001), also confirm that Hungarian learners rarely have direct contact with Ukrainian native speakers. They quote the results of surveys conducted by specialists of the Ukrainian Pedagogical Academy to state that only 35.5% of Hungarian learners have access to Ukrainian speakers. The actual mean values of the *Language Contact* scale for both Ukrainian (2.57; .97) and English (2.12; .86) confirm that Hungarian learners rarely read books/websites/magazines in either Ukrainian or English. This finding might be related to their lack of interest in getting familiar with the cultural products in the two target languages.

The *Parental Encouragement* scale shows consistently high reliability indices for both Ukrainian (.81) and English (.85). The support of parents is confirmed by the high mean values as well (4.23; 3.77). This seems to confirm the results of earlier research on the influence and support of parents in language motivation (Bartram, 2006; Gonzalez-DeHass, Willems, & Doan Holbein, 2005). Another consistent and reliable scale in several L2 motivation studies is the attitudinal scale (Gardner, Masgoret, & Tremblay, 1999; Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005a, 2005b). In this study the mean values of the *Attitude towards L2 Speakers* scale reveals that participants display a relatively positive attitude towards learning both Ukrainian (3.15; 1.03) and English (3.30; 1.14).

As claimed earlier in the present study, language use for most of the Hungarian learners is restricted to language classes, which they do not like very much as is shown by the mean values of the *Learning Experience* scale for Ukrainian (2.75; 1.14) and for English (3.04; 1.10), respectively. The mean values of the *Learning Experience* scale show that learners perceive English language classes as being more interesting than Ukrainian ones. Still, there are huge variations from the mean value (three on the five-point Likert scale), which indicates that the learners' opinions about their English language classes range from the category of 'do not really like' to 'enjoy'.

5.2 Correlations among the scales

In the present study, all variables are measured against the criterion of *Motivated Language Learning Behaviour*. First, the scales correlating with motivated language learning behaviour in the case of the Ukrainian language are discussed, and this is followed by the discussion of motivational scales showing significant relationships with motivated language learning behaviour in the case of English.

As demonstrated in Table 2, the Ukrainian *Motivated Language Learning Behaviour* scale correlates significantly with the Ukrainian *Ideal L2 Self* (.670) and the *Attitude towards Learning Ukrainian* (.699). The Ukrainian *Ideal L2 Self* also correlates with the *Attitude towards Learning Ukrainian* (.529). This relationship is confirmed by Kormos and Csizér (2008), too, although in reference to English language motivation. *Parental Encouragement* (.520) and the *Learning Experience* scales (.523) are associated to a lesser extent with motivation, but relate significantly to other scales, for example, the Ukrainian *Ideal L2 Self*. *Parental Encouragement* is associated with learners' visions of their ideal selves significantly (.616), while *Learning Experience* shows a relatively close association with *Attitude towards Learning Ukrainian* (.690). Regular contact with speakers of Ukrainian (.403) or just contact with the language itself (through watching films, reading books or visiting websites in that

language) (.484) seems to stand only in a weak relationship with the learners' motivational efforts to learn the state language. The low correlation between the language contact scales and Ukrainian language motivation might suggest that learners are neither interested in reading or speaking in Ukrainian, nor do they favour getting acquainted with Ukrainian cultural products. On the other hand, this finding might also suggest that it is this very lack of contact that contributes to the learners' not perceiving contact with the Ukrainian language as a link to their motivation to learn Ukrainian.

Scales	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.
1. Ideal L2 Self	-										
2. Ought-to L2 Self	.522	-									
3. Motivated Language Learning Behaviour	.670	.522	-								
4. Direct Contact with L2 Speakers		.215	.403	-							
5. Written Language Use			.227	.508	-						
6. Language Contact	.315		.484	.692	.635	-					
7. Parental Encouragement	.616	.400	.520				-				
8. Attitude Towards Learning Ukrainian	.529	.475	.699	.462	.408	.590	.331	-			
9. Class Anxiety			-.234	-.242	-.220	-.271		-.275	-		
10. Language Use Anxiety			-.166	-.341	-.406	-.434		-.313	.665	-	
11. Learning Experience	.323	.339	.523	.350	.376	.396		.690	-.268	-.279	-

Table 2. Significant correlations (p<.001) among the scales referring to the Ukrainian language in the questionnaire

One of the most significant relationships was found between *Direct Contact with Speakers of Ukrainian* and *Language Contact* (.692). There is also a significant relationship between the *Written Language Use* of Ukrainian and Ukrainian *Language Contact* with cultural products (.635). These two pairs of associations can be explained as the result of the fact that all the three scales share the common feature of language contact. The *Written Language Use* and *Language Contact* scales correlated negatively though with *Language Use Anxiety*, showing a moderately strong relationship of -.406 and -.434. Clément and Kruidenier (1983) support this finding by claiming that pleasant contact experiences lead to increased self-confidence, and consequently to a lower level of anxiety. The present study shows a similar finding: learners who have contact with Ukrainian have lower levels of language class and language use anxiety.

Scales	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.
1. Ideal L2 Self	-										
2. Ought-to L2 Self	.540	-									
3. Motivated Language Learning Behaviour	.749	.630	-								
4. Direct Contact with L2 Speakers	.310		.420	-							
5. Written Language Use	.202		.298	.535	-						
6. Language Contact	.395	.248	.451	.487	.530	-					
7. Parental Encouragement	.677	.588	.712	.217		.352	-				
8. Attitude Towards Learning English								-			
9. Class Anxiety			-.273		-.213	-.271			-		
10. Language Use Anxiety					-.258				.539	-	
11. Learning Experience	.513		.628	.331	.230	.387	.442		-.292	-.279	-

Table 3. Significant correlations (p<.001) among the scales referring to English in the questionnaire

As can be seen in Table 3, English *Motivated Language Learning Behaviour* was associated with all three elements of Dörnyei's theory (2005). It stands in close relationship with the *Ideal L2 Self* (.749) and forms weaker but still significant relationships with the *Ought-to L2 Self* (.630) and with *Learning Experience* (.628). Furthermore, the *Ought-to L2 Self* correlates with parental support as well (.588). This finding is interesting because Csizér and Kormos (2009) found the *Ought-to L2 Self* to correlate significantly only with parents, while in the present study it was associated with language motivation as well. Both the *Ought-to L2 Self* and the English *Ideal L2 Self* of the participants maintain close associations with *Parental Encouragement* (.677).

5.3 Results of the regression analysis

Conducting regression analysis for the Ukrainian variables resulted in the exploration of four scales that contribute to the motivation of Hungarian learners to learn the state language, as displayed in Table 4. The most dominant scale out of the four is *Attitude towards Language Learning* (.41), the importance of which has already been confirmed in L2 motivation studies (Dörnyei & Clément, 2001; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003). The second significant scale in the Ukrainian language motivation model was the *Ideal L2 Self* (.32). This result can also be found in several motivation studies experimenting with the L2 Motivational Self System (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005a, 2005b; Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Dörnyei, Csizér, & Németh, 2006; Kormos & Csizér, 2008; Ryan, 2006, 2009). *Parental Encouragement* and

Direct Contact with Ukrainian Speakers were also involved in the model but are not as significant as the *Ideal L2 Self* and *Attitude towards Language Learning*. Altogether the above named four scales explain 65% of the variance.

Variable	B	SE B	β
Attitude towards Learning Ukrainian	.37	.06	.41**
Ideal L2 Self	.34	.07	.32**
Parental Encouragement	.18	.06	.16*
Direct Contact with L2 Speakers	.12	.05	.13*
R^2		.65	
F for change in R^2		64.46**	

Note. B stands for regression coefficient.
*p<.05; **p<.001.

Table 4. Results of the regression analysis regarding Ukrainian

When comparing the results of regression and correlation analyses, a strong relationship between the *Ukrainian Ideal L2 Self, the Attitude towards Learning Ukrainian and Ukrainian Motivated Language Learning Behaviour* can be noticed. Furthermore, a link between the *Ukrainian Ideal L2 Self* and *Parental Encouragement*, and another association between *Learning Experience* and *Attitude towards Language Learning* can also be identified. One way of interpreting these findings is to assume that parents influence how learners imagine their future career. Consequently, parents enhance the learners' Ukrainian ideal self by suggesting directly or indirectly that learning and knowing Ukrainian is inevitably important in Ukraine. Another part of the Ukrainian motivational self system is influenced by the attitude formed as a result of the learners' experiences during Ukrainian language classes. One possible conclusion drawn from the mean value of the *Learning Experience* scale (2.75) is that learners do not really like Ukrainian classes. This in turn might make the explanation of the construct of Ukrainian language learning motivation confusing. Still, one way of interpreting these findings is as follows: the learners are not really motivated to learn Ukrainian because of the deficiencies present in the Ukrainian language learning situation (Csernicskó, 1998; Huszti, 2005). Despite the low level of interest to learn the state language, they have an ideal self, and a relatively positive attitude towards learning the state language. This ideal self foreshadows the benefits that go together with knowing Ukrainian in Ukraine, and is affected by the opinion and attitude of their parents.

The English language motivational disposition is a more composite self-construct than its Ukrainian counterpart, as can be seen in Table 5. In the established model six scales play significant roles in shaping the learners' L2 motivation. The vision learners have of their *Ideal L2 Self* ranks first in the current model (.32). This scale is followed by *Learning Experience* (.19), the inclusion of which scale into the motivational system is not by chance, as learners who live in a foreign language learning environment do not have regular access to L2 speakers and their language-related experiences come mainly from the language classes (Dörnyei, 1990). *Parental Encouragement* (.24) can be found in the English model too, as well as the scale of *Direct Contact with English speakers* (.16). Surprisingly, the *Ought-to L2 Self* (.18) was included in the model. Even if the *Ought-to L2 Self* was part of the theoretical model, on the basis of the findings reported by Csizér and Kormos (2009) it was not expected

to be part of the motivational self system. This finding in the present study may indicate that learning English is influenced and/or enhanced by the learners' environment and is perceived to some extent as a duty or obligation. This perception can partly be explained by the fact that English is a compulsory subject and no other foreign language classes are offered at the majority of Hungarian secondary schools. *Language Class Anxiety* is the sixth element in the suggested model (-.09), which reveals that the lack of contact learners have with English speakers and English cultural products makes class anxiety a part of the English language motivational set-up of the learners. The model explains 75% of the variance in the English language motivational self system of the learners.

Variable	B	SE B	B
Ideal L2 Self	.32	.06	.32**
Learning Experience	.19	.05	.19**
Parental Encouragement	.24	.06	.24**
Direct Contact with L2 Speakers	.22	.06	.16*
Ought-to L2 Self	.26	.07	.18*
Class Anxiety	-.10	.05	-.09*
R^2	.75		
F for change in R^2	69.66**		

Note. B stands for regression coefficient.
$*p<.05; **p<.001.$

Table 5. Results of the regression analysis regarding English

In the English language motivation construct, the English *Ideal L2 Self* (.74) has moderately strong relationships with the *Ought-to L2 Self* (.63), with *Learning Experience* (.62) and *Parental Encouragement* (.67), and low but still significant associations with *Class Anxiety* (-.23), and *Direct Contact with English Speakers* (.420). Both the English ideal and ought-to selves are affected by motivation to learn English, and, in addition, the two elements of the Motivational Self System Theory also have a common relationship with parental support. This finding harmonizes with Csizér and Kormos's (2008) claim that the relationship between parental encouragement and the ought-to self is very strong; furthermore, they refer to the Ought-to L2 Self as being entirely socially constructed. This might mean that parents encourage their children to learn English, as they believe not only in the utilitarian values associated with the knowledge of English, but also in the international opportunities that might be within reach if the child acquires the language. Parental support appears in the outcome of the analysis as both a direct and an indirect factor influencing language motivation. The *Parental Encouragement* scale has a direct relationship with motivation and indirect and strong associations with two elements of the English motivational self system (i.e. the *Ideal L2 Self* and the *Ought-to L2 Self*), and a moderately low but significant association with the third element of the Self System, i.e., *Learning Experience*. This outcome allows us to conclude that even if learners are not really fond of language classes, in their milieu they receive considerable support and encouragement to learn the language.

The English language motivational disposition includes two more scales, namely, the *Direct Contact with L2 Speakers* and the *Class Anxiety* scales. It is interesting that, while both

Direct Contact with English Speakers and *Class Anxiety* influence English language motivation, there is no statistically significant relationship between the two scales, but *Class Anxiety* has significant associations with the two other scales investigating language contact (*Written Language Use*, and *Language Contact*). This outcome again can be explained by the language context the learners live in. They do not have much opportunity to talk to native speakers of English, and they use cultural products and written language (in the form of online chats and e-mail writing) as mediators to get familiar with the language. Furthermore, the learners' anxiety in English classes may be related to the methodological design of English language teaching in Transcarpathia. Current English language teaching does not focus on communication but instead promotes vocabulary building and translation activities (Huszti, Fábián, & BáránYné, 2007). Bekh (2001) claims that the curriculum corresponds to the requirements of the Common European Framework, but in fact English language teaching in Transcarpathian Hungarian schools still applies the grammar translation method and pays less attention to communicative and audio-lingual features, which might explain why learners' perceived class anxiety forms part of the English language motivational self system.

6 Conclusions

Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System Theory (2005) found firm support in the English motivational self system of Hungarian learners in Transcarpathia. All three dimensions of the theory were included in the construct of English language motivation. The results also provide evidence that the language learning environment of the learners does shape their motivation to study English, and in this environment both the parents and the availability of English speakers are important factors. The inclusion of English language class anxiety might point forward to the need for future research since the complex notion of anxiety and its presence in the language motivation construct might be attributed to various external and internal conditions existing in and around the learner.

Out of the three dimensions of Dörnyei's theory, only the *Ideal L2 Self* was included in the proposed Ukrainian language motivation model, but it was complemented by the attitude secondary school learners have towards learning Ukrainian. This finding indicates the presence of a strong vision the learners have of themselves as successful users of Ukrainian, fuelled by their attitude towards learning the language. Csizér and Dörnyei (2005b) arrive at a similar conclusion when claiming that the ideal self is composed of two complementary aspects. One of these is associated with holding a positive attitude towards the L2 community, while the other aspect is related to the professionally successful possible self. Besides the *Ideal L2 Self*, the role parental support plays and the perceived importance of language contact are present in both constructs, highlighting the importance these factors have in the learners' environment.

Despite the commonalities that Hungarian ethnic minority learners' Ukrainian and English motivational dispositions have, the key elements in the examined two motivational self systems show sharp differences. This was predicted at the outset of the study. As demonstrated by the findings of the regression analysis, the influence and/or encouragement of parents, and the presence of a vivid image of one's future self as a successful user of the language are dominant elements in both motivational self systems. By examining the means of the scales included in the Ukrainian and English language motivational self systems, one can conclude that the low number of contact opportunities with the language and the language users, and the resulting language class anxiety, characterise English language motivation only,

while language learning attitude and the absence of remarkably pleasant experiences of language classes are representative of the Ukrainian motivational self system of the secondary school learner population which was examined.

A further outcome of the present study is that there are differences among the schools in terms of language use and language contact, as well. This is reasonable given the chosen criterion was the proportion of Hungarians in a given area. Consequently, the frequency of being exposed to Ukrainian is inversely related to the proportion of Hungarians. Where Hungarians form a majority, learners do not use Ukrainian as often as learners living in areas where Hungarians represent less than ten percent of the population. No differences were identified among learners studying in different schools in terms of their level of motivation to learn Ukrainian or English.

In sum, it can be concluded that the interpretation of the findings obviously deepens our understanding of motivational self systems but leaves some questions unanswered. Due to advances in statistical analyses (e.g., correlation and regression analysis) assumptions emerged, but they remained unexplored because of the limitations statistical analyses have. To be able to understand the present findings in more detail, further research is needed. The outcomes of the statistical analysis have to be triangulated, that is, compared with outcomes from other sources. Thus, the findings of the questionnaire study introduced in the present report could become more valid if they were interpreted within the design of, for example, an interview study. The reflections of the respondents (either students or adults) on the assumptions that were raised earlier in the present piece of research would contribute to our understanding of the underlying reasons behind language learning motivation.

This line of research definitely seems to be a promising area in the field of second and third language motivation. The results of the current investigation also point towards the need for further research on minority groups living in other territories and facing similar challenges. It is well known that, besides Ukraine, there are substantial Hungarian ethnic minorities in Slovakia, Serbia, Romania, and Austria. Carrying out investigations exploring Hungarian learners' attitudes and motivation towards English and the state language of the country where they live might uncover important facets of foreign language learning and could have important implications in the field of minority language education and policy, as well.

Proofread for the use of English by: Frank Prescott, Department of English Applied Linguistics, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest.

References

Bartram, B. (2006). An examination of perceptions of parental influence on attitudes to language learning. *Educational Research, 48*(2), 211-221. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131880600732298

Beregszászi, A., Csernicskó, I., & Orosz, I. (2001). *Nyelv, oktatás, politika* [Language, education, politics]. Ungvár: Poliprint.

Beregszászi, A., & Csernicskó, I. (2003). A kétnyelvűség (bilingvizmus) fogalma [The notion of bilingualism]. In I. Csernicskó (Ed.), *A mi szavunk járása. Bevezetés a kárpátaljai magyar nyelvhasználatba* (pp.28-31) [Our manner of speaking. Introduction to the

Transcarpathian Hungarian language use]. Beregszász: Kárpátaljai Magyar Tanárképző Főiskola.

Bekh, P. (Бех, П.). (Ed.) (2001). *Програми для загальноосвітніх навчальних закладів. Англійська мова (2-12 класи) Міністерство освіти і науки України* [Curricula for secondary schools. English language (Forms 2-12). Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine]. Kyiv: Shkilyniy Svit.

Clément, R.L., & Kruidenier, B.G. (1983). Orientations in second language acquisition: The effects of ethnicity, milieu, and target language on their emergence. *Language Learning, 33,* 273-291. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1983.tb00542.x

Council of Europe (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Csernicskó, I. (1998). Az ukrán nyelv Kárpátalján [The Ukrainian language in Transcarpathia]. *Regio, 9*(1), 5-48.

Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005a). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. *Modern Language Journal, 89,* 19-36. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2005.00263.x

Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005b). Language learners' motivational profiles and their motivated learning behaviour. *Language Learning, 55*(4), 613-659. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0023-8333.2005.00319.x

Csizér, K., & Kormos, J. (2009). Learning experiences, selves and motivated learning behaviour: A comparative analysis of structural models for Hungarian secondary and university learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp.98-119). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

DePonte, A. (2004). Linking motivation to personality: Causality orientations, motives and self-descriptions. *European Journal of Personality, 18,* 31-44. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.503

Donitsa-Schmidt, S., Inbar, O., & Shohamy, E. (2004). The effects of teaching spoken Arabic on students' attitudes and motivation in Israel. *Modern Language Journal, 88,* 217-228.

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning, 40*(1), 45-78. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1990.tb00954.x

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Understanding L2 Motivation. On with the challenge! *Modern Language Journal, 78,* 515-523. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02071.x

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching, 31,* 117-135. https://doi.org/10.1017/s026144480001315x

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp.9-43). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Clément, 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.399-432). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i.

Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., & Németh, N. (2006). *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation: A Hungarian perspective.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2009a). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2009b). Motivation, Language Identities and the L2 Self: Future Research Directions. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 350-356). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation.* London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. (2006). The socio-educational model of second language acquisition. A research paradigm. *EUROSLA Yearbook, 6,* 237-260. https://doi.org/10.1075/eurosla.6.14gar

Gardner, R. C., Masgoret, A., & Tremblay, P. F. (1999). Home background characteristics and second language learning. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18*(4), 419-437. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X99018004004

Gardner, R.C., & McIntyre, P. D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning, 43*(2), 157-194. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1992.tb00714.x

Gonzalez-DeHass, A.R., Willems, P.P., & Doan Holbein, M.F. (2005). Examining the relationship between parental involvement and student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review, 17*(2), 99-123. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-005-3949-7

Higgins, E.T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review, 94,* 319-340. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.319

Higgins, E.T. (1996). The 'self-digest': Self-knowledge serving self-regulatory functions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(6), 1062-1083. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.71.6.1062

Humphreys, G., & Spratt, M. (2008). Many languages, many motivations: A study of Hong Kong students' motivation to learn different target languages. *System, 36,* 313-335. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.09.010

Huszti, I. (2005). English language teaching in the upper primary classes of Transcarpathian Hungarian schools. Problems and solutions. In I. Huszti & N. Kolyadzhyn (Eds.), *Nyelv és oktatás a 21. század elején* [Language and education at the beginning of the 21st century]. Proceedings of the International conference 'Language and education at the beginning of the 21st century' held at the Transcarpathian Hungarian College named after Ferenc Rákóczi, II., in Beregszász (pp.182-186). Ungvár: Poliprint.

Huszti, I., Fábián, M., & Bárányné, K.E. (2007). English language teaching and teaching the Ukrainian language in Form 3 of the Beregszász Hungarian schools in Transcarpathia, Ukraine. *Melting Pot, 1,* 2-13.

Kim, T. (2009). The sociocultural interface between ideal self and ought-to self: A case study of two Korean students' ESL motivation. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 274-294)*.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2007). An interview study of intercultural contact and its role in language learning in a foreign language environment. *System, 35,* 241-258. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.10.010

Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2008). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behaviour. *Language Learning, 58*(2), 327-355. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00443.x

Macaro, E., & Wingate, U. (2004). From sixth form to university: Motivation and transition among high achieving state-school language students. *Oxford Review of Education, 30*(4), 467-488. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305498042000303964

Makus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist, 41,* 954-969.

Masgoret, A.M., & Gardner, R.C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation 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

McIntyre, P.D., Baker, S.C., Clément, R., & Donovan, L.A. (2002). Sex and age effects on willingness to communicate, anxiety, perceived competence, and L2 motivation among

junior high school and French immersion students. *Language Learning, 52*(3), 537-564. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00226

Molnár, J., & Molnár, D.I. (2005). *Kárpátalja népessége és magyarsága a népszámlálás és népmozgalmi adatok tükrében* [The population and the Hungarian people in Transcarpathia in the light of census and immigration data]. Poliprint: Ungvár.

Nikolov, M., & Józsa, K. (2006). Relationships between language achievements in English and German and classroom-related variables. In M. Nikolov & J. Horváth (Eds.), *UPRT 2006: Empirical studies in English applied linguistics* (pp.197-224). Pécs: Lingua Franca Csoport.

Noels, K. A., Clément, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modern Language Journal, 83,* 23-34. https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00003

Rueda, R., & Chen, C.B. (2005). Assessing motivational factors in foreign language learning: Cultural variation in key constructs. *Educational Assessment, 10*(3), 209-229. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326977ea1003_4

Ryan, S. (2005). *Motivational factors questionnaire.* Nottingham: School of English Studies, University of Nottingham.

Ryan, S. (2006). Language learning motivation within the context of globalization: An L2 self within an imagined global community. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal, 3*(1), 23-45. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427595cils0301_2

Ryan, S. (2009). Self and identity in L2 motivation in Japan: The ideal L2 self and Japanese learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei, & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 120-143). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sjöholm, K. (2004). The complexity of the learning and teaching of EFL among Swedish minority students in bilingual Finland. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36*(6), 685-696. https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027041000229387

SPSS Inc. (2004). Statistical Package for Social Sciences (Version 13.0) [Computer software]. Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.

Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 otivational 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. 66-98). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Williams, M., Burden, L. R., & Lanvers, U. (2002). 'French is the language of love and stuff': Students' perceptions of issues related to motivation in learning a foreign language. *British Educational Research Journal, 28,* 503-528. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/0141192022000005805

Wright, M. (1999). Influences on learner attitude towards foreign language and culture. *Educational Research, 41*(2), 197-208. https://doi.org/10.1080/0013188990410207

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *Modern Language Journal, 86,* 54-66. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00136

Appendix A

THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE MOTIVATION QUESTIONNAIRE

I would like to ask you to help me by answering the following questions concerning foreign language learning. This is not a test so there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers, and you don't even have to give your name. We are interested in your personal opinion. Please give your answers sincerely, as only this will guarantee the success of the investigation.
Thank you very much for your help!

Beatrix Henkel
Transcarpathian Hungarian College named after Ferenc Rákóczi, II.

I. In the following section please answer some questions by simply giving marks from 1 to 5.
5 = very much, 4 = quite a lot, 3 = so-so, 2 = not really, 1 = not at all.

For example, if you like 'hamburgers' very much, 'bean soup' not very much, and 'spinach' not at all, write this.

	hamburgers	bean soup	Spinach
How much do you like this food?	5	2	1

Please put one (and only one) whole number in each box and don't leave out any of them. Thanks.

5=very much, 4=quite a lot, 3=so-so, 2=not really, 1=not at all	Ukrainian	English
1. How much do you think knowing this language would help your future career?		
2. How much do you think knowing this language would help you if you travelled abroad in the future?		
3. How important do you think this language is in the world these days?		
4. How much do you think knowing English would help you to become a more knowledgeable person?		
5. How much do you think the Ukrainian/English classes have a pleasant atmosphere?		
6. How much do you like TV programmes in this language?		
7. How much do you like Ukrainian/English films?		
8. How much do you like Ukrainian/English pop music?		
9. How much do you like Ukrainian/English magazines?		
10. How important do you think learning Ukrainian/English is in order to learn more about the culture and art of its speakers?		
11. How often do you use Ukrainian/English while abroad? (Write 9 if you haven't been abroad yet.)		
12. How often do you use Ukrainian/English with your neighbours?		
13. How often do you use Ukrainian/English with your foreign friends/acquaintances?		
14. How often do you use Ukrainian/English during your holidays in Ukraine?		
15. How often do you use Ukrainian/English with foreign adults or children visiting your school?		
16. How often do you chat in this language on the Internet?		
17. How often do you write ordinary letters to your foreign acquaintances in this language?		
18. How often do you write e-mails in this language?		
19. How often do you watch films in this language?		
20. How often do you read books in this language?		
21. How often do you check websites in Ukrainian/English?		
22. How often do you watch TV in this language? (e.g. BBC, CNN, RTL, YT-1, YT-2, 1+1).		
23. How often do you read newspapers, magazines in this language?		

II. Some people agree with the following statements and some don't. I would like to know to what extent they describe your feelings or situation. Please write marks from 1 to 5 in the boxes representing the two languages to expresses how true the statement is about your feelings or situation. For example, if you like sleeping very much, put a '5' in the box.

I like sleeping very much.	5

There are no right or wrong answers. I am interested in your personal opinion.

5=absolutely true   4=mostly true   3=partly true, partly untrue   2=not really true   1=not true at all

	Ukrainian	English
24. I like this language very much.		
25. I would feel uneasy speaking Ukrainian/English with a native speaker.		
26. People around me tend to think that it is a good thing to know this language.		
27. My parents encourage me to study Ukrainian/English.		
28. Learning Ukrainian/English is really great.		
29. My future plans require me to speak Ukrainian/English.		
30. I should be able to speak Ukrainian/English in order to be an educated person.		
31. I am willing to work hard to learn Ukrainian/English.		
32. If I could speak Ukrainian/English well, I could get to know people from other countries.		
33. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in our Ukrainian/English class.		
34. I would get tense if a foreigner asked me for directions in Ukrainian/English.		
35. My friends think that this language is an important school subject.		
36. I always feel that the other students speak Ukrainian/English better than I do.		
37. My parents consider Ukrainian/English important school subjects.		
38. I enjoy learning Ukrainian/English.		
39. Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself being able to use Ukrainian/English.		
40. Nobody really cares whether I learn Ukrainian/English or not.		
41. It is very important for me to learn Ukrainian/English.		
42. Studying Ukrainian/English will help me to understand people from all over the world.		
43. If there was an opportunity to meet a(n) Ukrainian/English speaker, I would feel nervous.		
44. I get nervous when speaking in my Ukrainian/English class.		
45. My parents have stressed the importance of Ukrainian/English for my future.		
46. I find learning Ukrainian/English interesting.		
47. I like to think of myself in the future as someone who can speak Ukrainian/English.		
48. The knowledge of Ukrainian/English would make me a better educated person.		
49. I would like to be able to use Ukrainian/English to communicate with people from other countries.		
50. I worry that the other students will laugh at me when I speak Ukrainian/English.		
51. My parents feel that I should do everything to learn Ukrainian/English really well.		
52. For people in the area where I live learning Ukrainian/English is not really important.		
53. In the future, I imagine myself working with people from other countries using this language.		
54. If I fail to learn Ukrainian/English, I'll disappoint other people.		
55. Learning Ukrainian/English is necessary because it is an international language.		
56. I can honestly say that I am really doing my best to learn Ukrainian/English.		
57. When I think about my future, it is important that I use Ukrainian/English.		
58. I am determined to learn Ukrainian/English.		
59. Learning Ukrainian/English is one of the most important aspects of my life.		
60. I like Ukrainian/English language classes.		
61. I am never bored at the Ukrainian/English language classes.		
62. One of my favourite subjects is Ukrainian/English.		
63. I like the things we do at the Ukrainian/English language classes.		
64. It is important to know Ukrainian/English because while travelling abroad, I could really make use of the knowledge of Ukrainian/English.		

Have you answered all the questions? Thank you!

III. Finally, please answer these few personal questions.

65. Your gender? (Please underline): male   female

66. How old are you? _____

67. Circle the level that you think describes your proficiency in Ukrainian/English

ENGLISH   beginner   intermediate   proficient (native-speaker)

UKRAINIAN   beginner   intermediate   proficient (native-speaker)

68. What foreign languages are you learning besides Ukrainian and English?

....……………
69. What foreign languages did you learn earlier?

………………………………………………………...........
70. Did you study or are you studying any other foreign languages outside school?

....…………..
71. If yes, which language(s)?

………...…………………...
72. Are you learning Ukrainian with a private teacher or in a language course?

………...…………………...
73. Are you learning English with a private teacher or in a language course?

………...…………………...
74. How old were you when you started learning Ukrainian?

....………..
75. How old were you when you started learning English?

....………..
76. When you started learning English at school, did you want to learn it?

....………..
77. When you started learning Ukrainian at school, did you want to learn it?

....………..
78. If not, what languages would you have wanted to study?

....………..

Thank you for your help!