

Some Dynamics of Language Attitudes and Motivation: Results of a Longitudinal Nationwide Survey

¹ZOLTÁN DÖRNYEI and ²KATA CSIZÉR

¹University of Nottingham and ²Eötvös University, Budapest

The purpose of this study is to examine how the significant sociocultural changes that took place in Hungary in the 1990s affected school children's language-related attitudes and language learning motivation concerning five target languages, English, German, French, Italian, and Russian. The analyses are based on survey data collected from 8,593 13/14-year-old pupils on two occasions, in 1993 and 1999. Besides investigating and comparing a number of motivational aspects with regard to the learning of the five target languages, the repeated measure design also allowed us to explore the changes that characterized the learners' motivation between the two phases of the survey. An unexpected but potentially important finding was that during the examined period the learners' general language learning commitment showed a significant decline, with only English maintaining its position. This can be seen as a reflection of a more general 'language globalization' process, whereby the study of the world language (i.e. English) and that of other foreign languages show an increasingly deviating motivational pattern.

INTRODUCTION

The collapse of Communist rule in Hungary in 1989 initiated unprecedented changes in the history of the country. After the first free elections for some 40 years in 1990, the closed, post-communist society was radically transformed into an open, market-oriented democracy. By the end of the decade the process had been completed: the privatization of the economy had been finalized, resulting in a proportion of private enterprise comparable to the situation in Western Europe, and Hungary had also been accepted as a full member of NATO.

Such a huge transformation had considerable language-related consequences, particularly in view of three highly influential changes that took place:

- 1 Russian, the compulsory first foreign language (L2) taught at every level of the Hungarian educational system before 1990, was replaced by a variety of western languages for schools to choose from;
- 2 foreign television channels (mainly German-speaking but also some in English), videos, and films became widespread within a few years after the changes;

- 3 the country opened up its borders and there was a dramatic increase in foreign (mainly West European) influence both in terms of two-way tourism and economic relationships; the latter is indicated by the fact that, in the 1990s, many job advertisements in Hungarian papers were published in English or German because the multinational companies which had moved into the country wanted to screen out applicants who had insufficient foreign language proficiency.

Each of these three processes would have been expected to make a considerable impact by itself, but the fact that they occurred in concert created a particularly intensive course of transformation. We became aware of the special nature of this situation immediately after the changes, but it was not until the beginning of 1993 that we managed to obtain sufficient resources to initiate a large-scale data-gathering process. This constituted the first phase of our project, and it was followed by a second phase when the survey was repeated during the very last months of the decade. Although the target of these investigations was a small European country, Hungary, we believe that the results obtained are not confined to this specific context but have wider implications. Hungary can be seen as a laboratory in which, for various political/historical reasons, certain processes took place with unusual intensity and speed, completing a transformation much faster than in other contexts. Therefore, observing the L2-specific consequences of this process can shed light on broader and longer-term trends worldwide.

The two large-scale surveys that were part of our project ($N = 8,593$) resulted in a wealth of data. Some of the results from the first phase have already been published (e.g. Dörnyei and Clément 2001), but this paper provides the first account of the second phase of the survey and a comparison of the results obtained on the two occasions. Our main emphasis will be on describing the motivational characteristics of the Hungarian L2 learning situation in a dynamic manner, highlighting changes and tendencies. For each set of analyses we will first provide a brief summary of what we found in 1993, and then compare these results with the 1999 ones.

THE HUNGARIAN CONTEXT

Hungary is a relatively small country, with the greatest internal distance not exceeding 320 miles. It is located in a special position in central Europe, along the latent borderline separating Eastern and Western Europe. This borderline has been in evidence for the past 2000 years, with the Roman Empire having its eastern border, the Turkish Empire its western border, the Habsburg Empire its eastern border, and recently the Soviet Union its western border (the 'Iron Curtain') in Hungary. The country also lies at the dividing line between Western Christianity and Eastern (Orthodox) Christianity, which reflects the country's position halfway between Rome and Byzantium

(Istanbul), the two religious centres that determined Christian orientation in the Middle Ages.

Hungary's location on the latent geopolitical/cultural border between Eastern and Western Europe is reflected in the different characteristics of the eastern and western parts of the country, separated by the River Danube. While the east of the country has more rural, traditional, and relatively poor areas, the west of the country (adjacent to Austria) is more developed and westernized. The capital of Hungary, Budapest, situated along the Danube in the centre of the country, is a modern metropolis, forming a 'country within the country' with a quarter of the total population (over two million people) living there. It is by far the most developed area in the country, constituting the undisputed economic and cultural centre.

As Hungary is almost exclusively populated by Hungarians, the country is one of the rather rare examples of a national context in which there are no significant ethnolinguistic minorities: according to the official figures of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (Központi Statisztikai Hivatal 1992), in 1990 97.8 per cent of the population were ethnic Hungarians and the proportion with Hungarian as their mother tongue was even higher (98.5 per cent). Accordingly, people do not speak languages other than Hungarian unless they learn them at school. From 1949 to 1989, for obvious political reasons, Russian had to be taught at all levels of the school system; as a result, by the time they graduated from university, students had studied Russian for a minimum of 10 years. However, the learning of Russian in Hungary was a perfect illustration of Gardner's (2001) claim that language learning without sufficiently positive language attitudes to support it is a futile attempt: Hungarians were very reluctant to learn Russian because it represented the oppressive power, and, consequently, in the years 1979–82, not more than 2.9 per cent of the Hungarian adult population spoke Russian, a number which had decreased by 1994 by almost another full percentage point (Terestényi 1996).

From the 1970s onwards, certain modern Western languages, primarily English and German, started to reappear in the national curriculum, although in a rather limited way. Their significance at the primary level remained minimal: for example, in the school year of 1988/89 nearly 100 per cent of primary pupils learnt only Russian. The picture was more positive at the secondary level: by the end of the 1980s, more than half of the country's secondary school students were offered a second foreign language besides Russian (Enyedi and Medgyes 1998).

Due to the sweeping changes taking place in the country, the reform of state education began in earnest at the very end of the 1980s and one of the first and most important components of this modernization process was the abolition of the compulsory status of Russian in the national curriculum. The gap was filled with a variety of western languages, primarily with English and German, for schools to choose from, but the transition was gradual (due, largely, to the unavailability of enough trained English and German teachers):

according to our data, in 1993 over 50 per cent of the final-year primary school population (i.e. the target age group of our study) still learnt Russian, while by the end of the 1990s Russian had completely disappeared from the primary school system. The disappearance of Russian at secondary level was quicker (Vágó 2000).

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Human motivation to learn is a complex phenomenon involving a number of diverse sources and conditions. Some of the motivational sources are situation-specific, that is, they are rooted in the student's immediate learning environment, whereas others appear to be more stable and generalized, stemming from a succession of the student's past experiences in the social world (for recent overviews, see Clément and Gardner 2001; Dörnyei 2001). Until the 1990s the emphasis in L2 motivation research had been on the latter, generalized disposition towards learning the L2 because it allowed researchers to characterize the motivational pattern of whole learning communities and then to draw inferences about intercultural communication and affiliation. However, the 1990s saw a shift in emphasis towards a more situated approach, with an increasing number of studies investigating how student motivation was reflected in concrete classroom events and processes (e.g. Crookes and Schmidt 1991; Dörnyei 1994; Julkunen 1989, 2001; Oxford and Shearin 1994; Williams and Burden 1997). If we look at the field of educational psychology, we can observe a similar tendency in the 1990s to conceive student motivation in a situated manner (e.g. Hickey 1997; Stipek 1996; Wentzel 1999).

The situated approach to motivation research soon drew attention to another, rather neglected, aspect of motivation: its dynamic character and temporal variation. As Berliner (1989) highlighted over a decade ago, when motivation is examined in its relationship to specific learner behaviours and classroom processes, there is a need to adopt a more process-oriented framework that can account for the 'ebbs and flows' of the motivation to learn:

The emphasis by school people, focused as one might expect on daily life in classrooms and schools, almost always leads to an emphasis on the process of motivation and not on motivation as a product. The daily ebb and flow of motivation, while of crucial significance to the classroom teacher, charged as they are with the need to maintain a heterogeneous group's interest in learning, is of only mild interest to the parents, school researcher, and society at large. Teachers and school administrators focus on motivation as process, because they have to; the rest of us more often focus on motivation as product. (Berliner 1989: 326)

In agreement with Berliner's (1989) conclusion, Dörnyei (2000) proposed a process-oriented approach to the understanding of student motivation. This

broke down the motivational process into several discrete temporal segments organized along the progression that describes how initial wishes and desires are first transformed into goals and then into operationalized intentions, and how these intentions are enacted, leading (hopefully) to the accomplishment of the goal and concluded by the final evaluation of the process. The current investigation has been initiated in the same spirit, that is, in an attempt to explore motivational processes over time. However, instead of taking a micro-perspective, we have focused on broad societal macro-processes, adopting the social psychological paradigm that was introduced and elaborated on by Robert Gardner and his Canadian associates (e.g. Clément and Gardner 2001; Gardner 1985; Gardner and MacIntyre 1993).

LANGUAGE FOCUS

Our project involved the examination of Hungarian school children's disposition towards five target languages: English, German, French, Italian, and Russian. These were selected partly because they had a salient presence in the Hungarian context and partly because they varied significantly in terms of their relative status in Hungary. Although English is the indisputable world language, Central Europe, of which Hungary is a part, has traditionally been dominated by German as the regional *lingua franca*. Russian was imposed on the communist 'Eastern Block' as a compulsory first foreign language for forty years (1949–89) but never became popular or widely used. French is not only an important world language but it used to be—besides German—the language of the Hungarian aristocracy, and it has been one of the additional foreign languages offered in many Hungarian secondary schools. The fifth language in our survey, Italian, was included as a control for the other four socioculturally 'important' languages: Although usually associated with happy memories of summer holidays and a rich culture, it is by no means viewed as a 'world' or 'international' language by Hungarians.

The selection of these five languages allowed potentially important comparisons about how the different status positions of the five languages influenced the learners' attitudes and preferences towards them, and how these preferences changed over the years. This line of investigation has a lot in common with a vigorous line of research in the fields of communication studies, cultural studies, and applied linguistics focusing on the interrelationship of international communication and 'globalization'. *Globalization* refers to the 'way in which, under contemporary conditions especially, relations of power and communication are stretched across the globe, involving compressions of time and space and a recomposition of social relationships' (Mohammadi 1997: 1). Although this process is strongly linked to economic factors such as the increasingly global reach of multinational corporations and the growing interrelatedness of local economies, it also has a significant cultural and linguistic dimension. Applied linguists in the past have focused on how globalization is carried out through a small number of dominating

languages, particularly English (e.g. Seidlhofer 2001; Widdowson 1994, 1997). As Phillipson (2001: 187) has summarized in a recent paper, 'English is integral to the globalisation processes that characterise the contemporary post-cold-war phase of aggressive casino capitalism, economic restructuring, McDonaldisation and militarism on all continents'.

A central tenet in the study of language globalization is that the promotion of English as a global language occurs at the expense of other languages by gradually eliminating linguistic and cultural diversity. Skutnabb-Kangas (2001) goes so far as to talk of this in terms of the threat of a 'linguistic genocide', and this view has been expressed—although perhaps less starkly—by a number of other researchers during the past decade (e.g. Crystal 1997; Fishman 1992; Graddol and Meinhof 1999; Kachru 1992; Pennycook 1994; Phillipson 1992). As Crystal (1997: 22) has summarized, 'all the evidence suggests that the position of English as a global language is going to become stronger', and Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1999) used the expressive term 'Englishisation' to refer to the ongoing language globalization process. They also urged scholars to 'assess in what ways the "triumph" of English and other major dominant languages is linked to the predicted demise of, or threat towards, 90 per cent of the world's languages within a century' (Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas 1999: 20). A study of the attitudes and motivation for the learning of foreign languages at a national level gains particular significance in light of this background.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND FOCUS AREAS

Our study is an example of a *repeated cross-sectional design*, consisting of two surveys, one conducted at the beginning of 1993, and the other taking place during the last few months of the decade. Because the target population in both phases was exactly the same (and the sampling of the participating schools was also almost identical—see below), the project can be considered *longitudinal* in nature (cf. Keeves 1994; Menard 1991), thereby allowing us to compare the results and analyse the changes that took place during the six-and-a-half-year interval between the two phases. Of the wealth of data obtained, we will specifically target the following main issues:

- 1 *A comparison of the five target languages* in terms of (a) *learner preferences* for them and the changes of these preferences during the 1990s; (b) the *internal structure* of the learners' attitudinal/motivational disposition toward the languages; (c) the *predictive value* of the motivational dimensions identified with regard to two criterion measures, the learners' *language choice* (i.e. the selection of certain L2s that the participants wished to study in the future) and *intended effort* (i.e. the amount of effort that the participants were planning to exert in their future language studies). Although comparative studies are not uncommon in the L2 motivation literature, most of these involve the study of different L2s in *different*

learning communities (e.g. comparing Finns and Russians learning English, Julkunen and Borzova 1997). Hardly any research has focused on the motivational dispositions related to learning various L2s within the *same* community (for exceptions, see Clément and Kruidenier 1983; Schmidt and Watanabe 2001), even though it is only through such investigations that the learning population can be held constant and thus L2-related variation in the motivation construct can be reliably identified.

- 2 The *dynamics of attitudinal/motivational changes* between 1993 and the end of the decade. Besides looking at the overall changes that took place, we were also interested in examining whether these changes displayed different patterns in various sub-populations. In particular, we analysed the *effects of language instruction* on the continuing motivation to study the particular target languages. A central principle of motivational dynamics is that the motivational basis of deciding to pursue a task (i.e. '*choice motivation*') and of actually carrying out the task (i.e. '*executive motivation*') is characterized by different motives (Dörnyei 2000; Gollwitzer 1990; Heckhausen 1991; Kuhl and Beckmann 1994). This would suggest that the affective disposition towards an L2 was likely to differ in children who were engaged in the learning of the particular L2 at the time of the survey from those who were not.
- 3 *Gender-based variation* associated with the five target languages. Although recording gender differences in language attitudinal/motivational data has got a long history and studies have again and again evidenced that male and female learners show systematic difference in their disposition toward language studies (e.g. Baker and MacIntyre 2000; Burstall *et al.* 1974; Clark and Trafford 1995; Djigunoviç 1993; Julkunen 1994; Ludwig 1983), the amount of systematic gender-specific research has been meagre relative to the potential importance of the issue. This is partly due to the fact that sample sizes often did not allow for confident gender-based generalizations; because our sample is representative of a total cohort within the Hungarian population, it is ideal for the purpose of examining the motivational characteristics of *the* boys and *the* girls, and the multi-language design also allows us to investigate any gender-based biases toward particular target languages.
- 4 *Geographical variation* in the learners' language attitudes/motivation and language choice. The relationship between the social milieu and language attitudes has been a traditional research topic of motivational studies (cf. Clément and Gardner 2001; Gardner 2001), but few studies have compared the motivational impact of the geographical location within a relatively homogeneous language community. We were particularly interested whether the three distinct regions of Hungary (east, west, and the central capital—see above) were characterized by different attitudinal/motivational patterns, and we also looked at the variation across types of settlement (i.e. village, town, or city).

METHOD

Participants

The participants of the survey were 4,765 pupils (2,377 males; 2,305 females; 83 with missing gender data) in 1993 and 3,828 pupils (1,847 males; 1,907 females; 74 with missing gender data) in 1999. They were all aged 13/14 and attended the final, eighth, grade of the primary school system (see Table 1). We selected this population in 1993 because at that time this was the most mature age group in the Hungarian educational system which studied within a more or less homogenous curricular and organizational framework (i.e. the national primary school system)—after the age of 14, pupils were offered a range of different secondary educational paths, some of which concluded when the students reached 16, the upper age limit of compulsory education. Therefore, by sampling students from this cohort, we did not need to be concerned with the modifying influences of various specialized secondary school types. At the same time, these learners were in the final year of their primary school studies and were just about to decide which type of secondary education to choose for their further studies and which foreign language to study. This lent particular relevance and validity to our question concerning language choice.

In selecting locations for the survey, we followed a stratified sampling approach, trying to sample students evenly from each main region and type of settlement, while also including a balanced mixture of areas with high and low levels of tourists. In order to ensure the compatibility of the samples in the two surveys, almost all the 1999 locations coincided with the 1993 ones. The decrease of the size of the sample in 1999 is largely due to demographic decline in Hungary. Data from the Hungarian Central Statistical Office confirm that the cohort under investigation decreased during the period by around 20 per cent (Demographics Yearbook 1993, 1998).

Instrument

In order to make the comparison of the obtained variables possible, the same instrument was used in both phases of the project. When designing the questionnaire we had to achieve a trade-off: on the one hand, L2 motivation is a complex, multi-dimensional construct, and therefore in order to obtain a comprehensive motivation measure one needs to administer a rather elaborate (and therefore long) instrument with every variable assessed by multi-item scales. On the other hand, the practical constraints inherent in the survey (namely that in order to get permission to administer the questionnaire in hundreds of classes across the country we had to make sure that we disrupted the course of teaching as little as possible) imposed a significant limitation on the length of time we could have access to the students. Rather than narrowing the scope of the instrument, we decided to cut down on the number of items focusing on each variable. In order to ensure that the

Table 1: The sample investigated in the survey

	Schools		Classes		Pupils ^a					
					Total		Boys		Girls	
	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999
Whole country	77	82	212	188	4765	3828	2377	1847	2305	1907
Budapest	15	13	38	32	792	685	406	346	372	325
City	14	17	48	44	1165	943	584	438	550	499
Town	32	33	94	77	2112	1581	1033	753	1051	796
Village	16	19	32	35	696	619	354	310	332	287

^a Some questionnaires had missing gender data

instrument had appropriate psychometric properties, the items we used were adopted from established motivation questionnaires (some of which had been specifically developed for use in Hungary), with sufficient validity and reliability coefficients (e.g. Clément *et al.* 1994; Dörnyei 1990; Gardner 1985).

The final version of the questionnaire used in the survey (for the complete questionnaire, see the Appendix of Dörnyei and Clément 2001) consisted of 37 items, assessing various student attitudes toward five target languages (English, German, French, Italian, and Russian) and toward six L2 communities (the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, and Russia), also asking about various aspects of the students' language learning environment and background. Because 21 of the 37 items focused on more than one L2 or L2 community (in a grid format), even this relatively short instrument yielded a total of 139 variables.

The main variable groups in the questionnaire were as follows (with the total number of items given in brackets):

Items concerning the five target languages (five-point rating scales):

- *Orientations*—the students' various reasons for learning a given language (5 items).
- *Attitudes* toward the L2 (2 items).
- *Intended effort*—the amount of effort the student was willing to put into learning the given language (1 item).
- *Parents' language proficiency* (2 items).

Items concerning the six target language communities (five-point rating scales):

- *Attitudes* toward the L2 community—the extent to which students felt positively toward the particular countries and its citizens (2 items), and the international importance they attached to these communities (2 items). Britain and the USA were mentioned separately to explore differences in the evaluations of the two communities, in spite of their common language (referred to in this study where relevant as English/UK and English/US).
- *Contact* with the L2 and its speakers, referring both to the quantity (2 items) and to the quality (5 items) of the contact (e.g. watching L2 TV programmes, meeting tourists).

Non-language-specific Likert scales (five-point scales):

- *Attitudes* toward L2 learning at school (1 item).
- *Contact* with foreign languages through watching satellite TV (1 item).
- *Fear of assimilation*—the extent to which students believed that learning and using the foreign language might lead to the loss of native language and culture (1 item).
- *Self-confidence* in L2 learning and use (3 items).
- *Language learning milieu*—the extent of the parents' support (1 item) and the friends' attitudes toward L2 learning (1 item).

Background questions (open-ended and multiple-choice items):

- *Language choice*—students were asked to name three languages they were

intending to learn in the next school year (1 item); this constituted a 'wish list' because at that stage they did not know about the realities of what they would actually be offered in their new schools.

- *Personal variables*, such as the student's sex and language learning background (7 items).

Data collection and analysis

Data collection was conducted in a similar way in 1993 and 1999. On both occasions, we first approached the selected schools by an official letter from Eötvös University, Budapest (which hosted the project), providing information about the purpose of the survey and details of the actual administration of the questionnaires. Once permission was granted by the principal of a school, we contacted the form-masters of the selected classes individually, asking for their co-operation. The questionnaires were filled in during class time; a representative of the university was always present at the administration, providing the introduction and overseeing the procedure. Answering the questions took the students approximately 20 minutes on average.

The data obtained were computer-coded and negatively worded items were recoded positively. Following Gardner's (1985: 78–9) recommendation, in order to form unitary groups from heterogeneous sources (as was the case in our study with students sampled from different schools and classes), before conducting any correlation-based analyses we computed standard scores within each class and used these rather than the raw scores in the computations (however, for the purpose of comparing subsample means—through ANOVA—we used the raw scores). Where the classes were not large enough (i.e. did not have more than 20 students), pooled data within the particular school with more parallel classes were standardized.

RESULTS

Main attitudinal/motivational dimensions

In order to identify broader dimensions underlying the attitudinal/motivational variables measured by the questionnaire, we submitted the attitude items concerning the L2s and L2 communities to factor analysis (conducting separate analyses for each language). Using a maximum likelihood extraction method with subsequent oblimin rotation,¹ the 1993 data could be adequately described by a five-factor solution for each of the target languages. The emerging factors in the different solutions were similar enough for Dörnyei and Clément (2001) to conclude that Hungarian teenage language learners appraised different target languages through roughly the same mental framework or schema, in terms of five broad and interrelated dimensions:

- 1 *Integrativeness*, which—similarly to Gardner's (1985) category—reflects a general positive outlook on the L2 and its culture, to the extent that learners scoring high on this factor would like to become similar to the L2 speakers.
- 2 *Instrumentality*, which refers to the perceived pragmatic benefits of L2 proficiency, corresponding to Gardner's (1985) category.
- 3 *Direct contact with L2 speakers*, which concerns attitudes towards actually meeting L2 speakers and travelling to their country.
- 4 *Cultural interest* (or 'indirect contact') which reflects the appreciation of cultural products associated with the particular L2 and conveyed by the media (e.g. films, TV programmes, magazines, and pop music).
- 5 *Vitality of L2 community*, which concerns the perceived importance and wealth of the L2 communities in question.

The 1999 data produced the same factor structure as was obtained in 1993. To save space, instead of providing a detailed analysis of this, we will only illustrate it by including the factor matrix obtained for English/US in Appendix A (for a more detailed account of how the various factors were obtained and labelled, see Dörnyei and Clément 2001). We should point out that the boundaries between these dimensions are not rigid and the factors show strong intercorrelation, attesting to a fairly homogeneous disposition (for illustration, Appendix B contains the intercorrelation tables concerning English/US in 1993 and 1999).

The questionnaire also contained eight items that concerned the learners' perceptions about their milieu and linguistic self-confidence that were not linked to particular languages or L2 communities. The factor analysis of these items again showed an almost identical pattern for both the 1993 and 1999 datasets, with two factors emerging:

- 1 *Milieu*, which relates to the general perception of the importance of foreign languages in the learners' immediate environment (e.g. in the school context and in friends' and parents' views).
- 2 *Linguistic self-confidence*, which reflects a confident, anxiety-free belief that the mastery of an L2 is well within the learner's means.

Comparative analysis of the motivational scales

In order to reduce the variables in the questionnaire, we computed seven multi-item scales by summing up the item scores related to each attitudinal/motivational dimension reported above. Table 2 presents descriptive statistics describing the seven scales in both phases of the survey, the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients of the scales, and the comparison of the boys' and the girls' scores. The mean reliability coefficient of the scales was .67 in 1993 and .71 in 1999, which is acceptable for such short scales.

As can be seen, all the variables show a very consistent rank order across the various languages in both years, with English obtaining the top and

Table 2: Descriptive information about the seven main motivational dimensions, and t-test statistics comparing the 1993 vs. 1999 results as well as the boys' and girls' scores

		M	SD	t-value	Cr.	M		t-value		
						Boys	Girls	Boys 93/99	Girls 93/99	Boys/Girls
<i>Integrativeness</i>										
English	1993	4.20	.80	-.68	.66	4.07	4.33	.12	-1.31	-11.32***
	1999	4.21	.85		.72	4.07	4.36			-10.76***
German	1993	3.67	.94	7.78***	.72	3.66	3.70	8.83***	2.09*	-1.52
	1999	3.51	1.05		.78	3.38	3.64			-7.45***
French	1993	3.39	.93	7.12***	.70	3.12	3.67	8.26***	2.56*	-21.16***
	1999	3.23	1.05		.77	2.87	3.59			-22.52***
Italian	1993	3.32	1.00	8.13***	.73	3.06	3.58	6.07***	6.01***	-18.18***
	1999	3.13	1.11		.79	2.87	3.39			-14.65***
Russian	1993	2.04	.86	5.84***	.66	1.98	2.10	2.86**	5.53***	-4.79***
	1999	1.93	.88		.70	1.90	1.95			-1.70
<i>Instrumentality</i>										
English	1993	4.65	.55	-8.74***	.73	4.61	4.70	-4.94***	-8.16***	-6.27***
	1999	4.75	.52		.80	4.69	4.82			-7.73***
German	1993	4.41	.63	1.76	.75	4.37	4.46	2.44*	-.17	-4.96***
	1999	4.39	.67		.78	4.32	4.47			-6.77***

Table 2: cont.

		M	SD	t-value	Cr.	M		t-value		
						Boys	Girls	Boys 93/99	Girls 93/99	Boys/Girls
French	1993	3.58	.77	8.49***	.73	3.48	3.68	7.24***	4.51***	-8.76***
	1999	3.43	.84		.76	3.30	3.57			-10.25***
Italian	1993	3.19	.86	6.55***	.77	3.07	3.31	4.49***	4.89***	-9.47***
	1999	3.07	.89		.78	2.95	3.18			-8.00***
Russian	1993	2.52	1.00	12.88***	.81	2.46	2.58	7.53***	10.58***	-4.12***
	1999	2.26	0.90		.78	2.24	2.27			-1.09
<i>Direct contact with L2 speakers</i>										
English (US)	1993	4.49	.67	6.18***	.67	4.42	4.56	5.35***	3.64***	-7.33***
	1999	4.39	.78		.71	4.29	4.49			-7.75***
English (UK)	1993	4.20	.76	6.07***	.70	4.10	4.31	5.35***	3.18***	-9.69***
	1999	4.09	.88		.74	3.96	4.24			-9.84***
German	1993	3.97	.86	8.01***	.74	3.96	4.00	8.83***	2.59**	-1.5
	1999	3.81	1.01		.77	3.70	3.92			-6.93***
French	1993	3.97	.85	7.53***	.72	3.77	4.17	7.40***	3.45***	-16.64**
	1999	3.82	.98		.77	3.55	4.09			-17.34***
Italian	1993	4.01	.85	7.48***	.73	3.83	4.19	5.95***	4.99***	-14.74**
	1999	3.86	.99		.77	3.65	4.06			-12.76***
Russian	1993	2.42	1.02	2.53*	.77	2.34	2.50	1.84	2.10*	-5.48***
	1999	2.36	1.02		.75	2.28	2.43			-4.72***

Vitality of L2 community

English (US)	1993	4.84	.40	-.82	.56	4.86	4.83	1.75	-2.79**	3.09**
	1999	4.85	.41		.62	4.84	4.86			-1.58
English (UK)	1993	4.28	.62	-1.27	.59	4.28	4.29	.25	-2.07*	-.73
	1999	4.30	.68		.66	4.27	4.33			-2.69**
German	1993	4.19	.62	-3.24**	.60	4.20	4.18	-1.45	-3.44***	1.00
	1999	4.24	.66		.62	4.23	4.25			-.90
French	1993	3.95	.62	-.20	.54	3.90	4.00	.14	-.18	-5.13***
	1999	3.95	.73		.65	3.90	4.00			-4.18***
Italian	1993	3.49	.74	-5.29***	.61	3.41	3.57	-4.50***	-2.82**	-8.09***
	1999	3.57	.70		.63	3.51	3.63			-5.05***
Russian	1993	2.81	.85	-6.28***	.41	2.87	2.76	-3.13**	-6.67***	4.49***
	1999	2.94	.91		.55	2.96	2.93			.78

Cultural interest (indirect contact with L2)

English (US)	1993	4.56	.59	9.9***	.66	4.52	4.61	8.29***	5.52***	-5.43***
	1999	4.42	.71		.67	4.34	4.50			-7.05***
English (UK)	1993	3.90	.79	14.63***	.70	3.79	4.02	13.21***	7.72***	-9.93***
	1999	3.62	.95		.76	3.42	3.82			-13.03***
German	1993	3.74	.79	10.44***	.67	3.72	3.77	10.86***	3.52***	-2.03*
	1999	3.55	.92		.71	3.42	3.68			-8.39***
French	1993	3.42	.90	14.39***	.68	3.28	3.57	12.36***	8.45***	-10.89***
	1999	3.12	1.03		.75	2.90	3.33			-12.44***
Italian	1993	3.44	.93	15.14***	.71	3.30	3.58	12.19***	9.46***	-10.24***
	1999	3.10	1.04		.77	2.92	3.29			-10.67***

Table 2: cont.

		M	SD	t-value	Cr.	M		t-value		
						Boys	Girls	Boys 93/99	Girls 93/99	Boys/Girls
				1993/99	α^a					
Russian	1993	1.74	.79	-6.14***	.78	1.70	1.77	-4.42***	-4.20***	-2.80**
	1999	1.86	.91		.77	1.83	1.89			-2.07*
<i>Milieu and linguistic self-confidence</i>										
Milieu	1993	4.43	.70	-3.17**	.61	4.31	4.56	-1.01	-3.55***	-12.24***
	1999	4.47	.65		.61	4.34	4.62			-13.71***
Self-confidence	1993	3.32	.75	1.26	.41	3.28	3.36	-.57	2.49*	-3.83***
	1999	3.30	.75		.48	3.29	3.31			-.52

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001^a$ Cr. α = Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient

Russian the bottom scores. The figures indicate that English is indeed a very popular language in Hungary, with every aspect of it highly appraised. Interestingly, even though the dominant English variety taught in Hungarian schools has traditionally been British English, in the items where the UK and the USA were separated, US-based attitudes are always more positive. In other words, according to the Hungarian learners' perceptions, English as a world language—or 'World English' (Crystal 1997)—is more closely associated with the USA than the UK.

German appears to still be widely endorsed among Hungarian teenagers although the ratings here show an imbalance towards the instrumental aspects, reflecting the importance of German economic influence in the region. With respect to French, the third ranked language, the figures reveal that it is not considered to be in the same 'class' as English and German by the respondents: It is rated considerably lower than German, and the appraisal of Italian—which has been included in the survey as a non-world language control—not only approaches the average French ratings, but in two scales (*Cultural interest 1993* and *Direct contact with L2 speakers 1993 and 1999*) actually exceeds them. Finally, the ratings of Russian are very low; even the strongest aspect, its vitality, failed to reach the mid-point of '3', on a five-point scale, and the average rating across the dimensions reflects a general dislike.

Although the rank order of the five languages appears to be very stable across variables and over time, we find some important changes in the magnitudes of the 1999 scores relative to the 1993 ones. First of all, all the *Integrativeness* scores, except for the results for English, decreased significantly. A similar tendency can be observed with respect to *Instrumentality*, although the decrease in German did not reach significance and—what is noteworthy—the English score actually increased. All the scores on the *Direct contact with L2 speakers* and the *Cultural interest* scales display a significant decline over the examined period; the only exception is the interest in Russian cultural products, which showed a slight but significant increase, perhaps as a first step of rediscovering that the Russian culture is not confined to ideologically selected (and very frequently inferior) works but actually contains products whose quality can be measured on an international scale. The assessment of the *Vitality of L2 community* did not alter in the case of English but actually increased in relation to German, Italian, and Russian. Finally, the *Milieu* score increased and the *Linguistic self-confidence* score did not change significantly.

These results suggest two consistent patterns. First of all, although the increased contact with foreigners and foreign cultural products that characterized the Hungarian situation in the 1990s might be expected to result in more positive perceptions of the quality of this contact, in fact perceptions became more negative. Second, the five languages examined can be divided into two distinct groups with regard to their overall endorsement: *world language* (or 'World English') and *other foreign languages*. Our results point to the conclusion that the declining interest in foreign languages only applies to non-world languages, whereas world language learning has maintained its

high popularity. It is also clear from the table that for Hungarian learners there is only one world language, English: the vitality of the USA is rated as high as 4.85 on a five-point scale, and its pragmatic benefits, which were already very highly rated in 1993 (4.65) further increased to 4.75 in 1999. These figures are so massively high that they suggest almost unanimous and unqualified endorsement. Thus, these findings appear to provide strong support for the 'Englishisation' process described by Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1999), reviewed in the 'Language focus' section above.

The decreasing tendency characterizing non-world languages even affected to some extent the regionally dominant language, German. Although its vitality index did increase a little and its instrumental rating managed to hold its ground, appraisals of German declined in all other aspects and the gap between English and German became wider (even in the instrumentality dimension). Finally, it is interesting to see that—as attested to by the increased *Milieu* scores—the degree of perceived environmental support for language learning actually grew during the examined period; however, our results show that this general contextual encouragement concerning language learning was not reflected in the endorsement of the non-world languages.

Analysis of the two criterion measures

Let us now examine whether the above trend also characterizes the ratings of the two language behavioural measures assessed in the study, *Language choice* and *Intended effort to learn the L2*. Tables 3 and 4 present descriptive statistics of the two variables, with gender and time comparisons.

The figures in Table 3 describe the popularity of all the languages listed by the students in the questionnaire as one of the three L2s that they would like to study in the future. The preference indices were obtained in the following way: if a language was marked as the student's first choice, it was assigned 3 points, if it was the second choice, 2 points, and if it was the third choice, 1 point. Non-ranked languages received a score of 0. The table confirms the rank order of the five target languages that we found in Table 2. English is indisputably the most popular foreign language among Hungarian primary school pupils, with its preference unchanged between 1993 and 1999. The endorsement of the second most preferred language, German, is still considerable, but it is noteworthy that it decreased during the examined period. We find that French did not have much general appeal in Hungary either in 1993 or in 1999; although it is the third most popular language, it is basically in the same preference range as Italian (which was included as a control for the 'important' L2s). Given that very few students are likely to learn more than two L2s, the moderate figures for French and Italian indicate that these languages play only a rather marginal role in the Hungarian language learning setup. Finally, Russian made further declines from its (already low) popularity and, indeed, Spanish managed to overtake Russian by the end of the 1990s.

Table 3: The learners' language choice preferences and gender/time comparisons

	Score ^a		M		t-value	t-value	t-value
	1993	1999 ^b	1993	1999	1993/ 1999	boys/girls 1993	boys/girls 1999
English	11,352	11,306	2.38	2.37	.51	.15	3.68***
			<i>Boys:</i> 2.39	2.44	-1.58		
			<i>Girls:</i> 2.38	2.33	2.24*		
German	8,466	8,012	1.78	1.68	4.11***	10.49***	4.72***
			<i>Boys:</i> 1.94	1.77	5.64***		
			<i>Girls:</i> 1.62	1.60	.55		
French	3,921	4,056	.82	.85	-1.49	-10.93***	-10.79***
			<i>Boys:</i> .70	.70	-.14		
			<i>Girls:</i> .97	1.01	-1.29		
Italian	2,485	2,613	.52	.55	-1.48	-9.33***	-2.50*
			<i>Boys:</i> .41	.51	-4.10***		
			<i>Girls:</i> .64	.58	2.02*		
Russian	684		.14	.10	5.16***	2.85**	4.38***
			<i>Boys:</i> .16	.12	2.72**		
			<i>Girls:</i> .12	.07	4.67		
Spanish	369	608					
Latin	229	295					
Japanese	94	108					
Chinese	49	56					
Portuguese	21	26					
Dutch	17	20					
Greek	15	42					
Arabic	9	17					
Romanian	9	15					
Slovakian	0	16					
Romany	0	12					
Croatian	0	12					

^a Only languages with a score greater than 5 are listed.

^b Because of the different sample sizes, the raw scores obtained from the two phases of the survey are not directly comparable; therefore the 1999 scores have been adjusted to present the score that would have been obtained if the sample sizes had been equal.

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$

Looking at the learners' *Intended effort* indices in Table 4, we find the same pattern as in the previous two tables but in a more pronounced manner. While English maintained its high position, the figures for all the other languages show a significant decline. This decrease provides strong support for the hypothesis we arrived at on the basis of the results in Table 2, namely that non-world language learning in Hungary is on the decline, in contrast to World English learning, which is generally and highly endorsed. Furthermore, even the regionally dominant language, German, appears to 'behave' as a non-world language in terms of the declining pattern observed in the scores related to it.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics of intended effort with gender/time comparisons

		M		t-value	t-value	
		1993	1999	1993/1999	boys/girls 1993	boys/girls 1999
English		4.25	4.25	.25		
	<i>Boys:</i>	4.11	4.10	.28	-10.63***	-9.83***
	<i>Girls:</i>	4.41	4.42	-.23		
German		3.75	3.57	6.90***		
	<i>Boys:</i>	3.70	3.41	7.95***	-3.52***	-8.55***
	<i>Girls:</i>	3.81	3.74	1.99*		
French		3.31	3.16	5.67***		
	<i>Boys:</i>	2.97	2.78	5.37***	-21.08***	-19.78***
	<i>Girls:</i>	3.66	3.54	3.32***		
Italian			3.22	3.01	7.78***	
	<i>Boys:</i>	2.90	2.72	4.52***	-19.69***	-13.94***
	<i>Girls:</i>	3.57	3.30	7.21***		
Russian		2.01	1.88	5.85***		
	<i>Boys:</i>	1.90	1.83	2.06*	-7.15***	-2.60**
	<i>Girls:</i>	2.12	1.92	6.12***		

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$

The relationship between the motivational scales and the criterion measures

A further important question is to determine the relative potency of the obtained motivational factors with regard to actual language learning. This can be achieved by examining their correlations with the criterion measures, as—in the spirit of the saying, 'The proof of the pudding is in the eating'—the significance of a motivational dimension lies in the extent to which it

encourages the choice and then the effortful learning of an L2. Table 5 presents correlations between the seven motivational scales and the language choice measures for each language. The results are noteworthy for several reasons.

First, there is one variable that clearly stands out in terms of its predictive capacity across the board: *Integrativeness*—which is, of course, the linchpin of Robert Gardner's (1985, 2001) classic L2 motivation theory. It is quite remarkable that the correlations of *Language choice* with *Integrativeness* across the five target languages are only marginally lower than the multiple-correlations of all the motivational factors together. Regression analyses of the 1993 data computed by Dörnyei and Clément (2001) confirmed the dominance of *Integrativeness* in explaining the students' language choice, and the figures in Table 5 indicate that the situation remained virtually unchanged during the examined period.² Thus, *Integrativeness* subsumes or mediates the other motivational factors measured in the surveys in a stable manner.

Besides *Integrativeness* we find two more factors that explain substantial variance in *Language choice*: *Instrumentality* and *Direct contact with L2 speakers*. Regression analyses of the 1993 data, however, indicated that of the two only *Instrumentality* explained sufficient unique variance, whereas *Direct contact with L2 speakers* lost its contributory capacity when *Integrativeness* was also entered into the equation (Dörnyei and Clément 2001). We find exactly the same situation in the 1999 data (cf. note 2).

The biggest difference between the 1993 and 1999 results is that *Integrativeness* displays a substantial decrease in its correlation with the *Language choice for English* (from .43 to .33). Interestingly, this does not necessarily contradict the 'Englishisation' process observed above. When people learn a subject because its knowledge is seen as a basic educational requirement, then the choice of the subject will become less a function of the students' personal attractions and preferences: they will take up the subject because it seems a prerequisite to everyday functioning, just like reading, writing, and arithmetic. In this case, however, the correlations between the learners' subject-related attitudes/motivation and the choice of the subject become depressed, which is exactly what we find in our data. This hypothesis is consistent with the observation that while the correlation between *Integrativeness* and *Language choice* for English decreased between 1993 and 1999, the actual level of *Integrativeness* remained high and unchanged (cf. Table 2): that is, an integrative orientation to learn English remained powerful but by 1999 it became less of a determinant of actual language choice than it was at the beginning of the decade. We should note, however, that this is largely speculative reasoning and warrants further future analysis of the cases where the level of the observed motivation and the actual language choice are not in accordance.

Let us now have a look at the relationship between the attitudinal/motivational factors and the other criterion measure, *Intended effort*. Table 6

Table 5: Correlations between the attitudinal/motivational scales and language choice

	English/UK		English/US		German		French		Italian		Russian	
	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999
<i>Integrativeness</i>	.43*	.33*	.43*	.33*	.47*	.43*	.42*	.44*	.43*	.43*	.25*	.32*
<i>Instrumentality</i>	.28*	.25*	.28*	.25*	.30*	.30*	.27*	.30*	.29*	.31*	.20*	.21*
<i>Direct contact with L2 speakers</i>	.23*	.16*	.17*	.16*	.33*	.30*	.31*	.33*	.32*	.31*	.12*	.21*
<i>Vitality of the community</i>	.12*	.09*	.12*	.09*	.11*	.12*	.13*	.16*	.16*	.18*	.07*	.10*
<i>Cultural interest</i>	.14*	.09*	.12*	.10*	.20*	.17*	.20*	.21*	.26*	.23*	.12*	.17*
<i>Milieu</i>	.12*	.12*	.12*	.12*	.01	-.00	.03	.04	.01	-.00	-.05*	-.10*
<i>Linguistic self-confidence</i>	.07*	.06*	.07*	.06*	-.00	.01	.03	-.02	-.01	-.02	-.02	-.04
<i>Multiple correlations</i>	.44*	.34*	.44*	.34*	.49*	.45*	.44*	.46*	.45*	.45*	.27*	.34*

* $p < .001$

Table 6: Correlations between the attitudinal/motivational scales and intended effort

	English/UK		English/US		German		French		Italian		Russian	
	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999
<i>Integrativeness</i>	.63*	.67*	.63*	.67*	.66*	.72*	.70*	.74*	.71*	.75*	.64*	.65*
<i>Instrumentality</i>	.50*	.49*	.50*	.49*	.49*	.51*	.51*	.56*	.54*	.59*	.57*	.56*
<i>Direct contact with L2 speakers</i>	.38*	.38*	.30*	.28*	.46*	.49*	.50*	.54*	.51*	.56*	.45*	.47*
<i>Vitality of L2 community</i>	.23*	.22*	.23*	.21*	.22*	.22*	.25*	.27*	.27*	.31*	.24*	.24*
<i>Cultural interest</i>	.26*	.27*	.25*	.22*	.31*	.34*	.32*	.36*	.35*	.40*	.30*	.34*
<i>Milieu</i>	.29*	.31*	.29*	.31*	.18*	.23*	.17*	.20*	.13*	.16*	.07*	-.02
<i>Linguistic self-confidence</i>	.26*	.28*	.26*	.28*	.19*	.21*	.17*	.14*	.14*	.12*	.08*	.03
<i>Multiple correlations</i>	.68*	.70*	.68*	.70*	.69*	.74*	.72*	.76*	.73*	.77*	.68*	.68*

* $p < .001$

presents its correlations with the seven motivational scales. The coefficients in the table are considerably higher than the ones in Table 5—which is partly due to the fact that *Intended effort* was assessed in the same format as the independent variables—but the pattern of the results is exactly the same as before: *Integrativeness* explains nearly as much variance as the multiple correlation coefficients, and regression analyses reveal again (cf. Dörnyei and Clément 2001; note 2) that the only other variable that explains substantial unique variance is *Instrumentality*. These findings unambiguously confirm Gardner's (1985, 2001) repeated claim that *Integrativeness* plays a key role in shaping L2 motivation. Furthermore and rather ironically, the fact that *Instrumentality* emerged as the second major factor appears to support the importance attached to the integrative/instrumental dichotomy in the L2 field—something which Gardner and others have often tried to dispel as being far too simplistic (e.g. Dörnyei 2001; Gardner and Tremblay 1994). Although our data indicate that Hungarian school children's general perception of foreign languages is strongly determined by an affective/interpersonal quality (integrativeness) and a practical quality (instrumentality), we need to raise two issues at this point:

- 1 In any empirical study the breadth of coverage of the measuring instrument determines the range of possible results. The questionnaire applied in our study was originally developed in 1992 and was to some extent rooted in the Gardnerian research paradigm. Although the results presented here are robust, other factors that were not included in the study could also have had a similar (or even bigger) impact on language choice.
- 2 The observed significance of 'integrativeness' warrants a closer look at what exactly this factor covers and whether the term 'integrativeness' adequately reflects this content. We will come back to this question in a separate section below.

The effects of language instruction

Table 7 presents the mean scores of the motivational measures and the language choice index related to the three main L2s that the students were actively studying at the time of the two surveys. Separate mean scores are provided for the students who were engaged in learning the particular L2 and for those who were not, and *t*-test statistics have been computed to assess engagement and time effects. Note that for Russian we only have scores from 1993 because no students in our survey studied it in 1999.

The results display a very straightforward pattern: In 1999, students who were actively engaged in the learning of English or German had higher scores on every motivational variable related to the particular L2 they were studying than students who were not engaged in the study of the particular language. The 'active learners' also had significantly higher *Language choice* indexes for

the language they were studying than the 'non-learners'. The 1993 scores show virtually the same pattern for English and German, and here we also find the same differences in the *Integrativeness*, *Instrumentality* and *Language choice* scores for the otherwise rather dispreferred Russian.

This consistent pattern can be explained in two ways: The scores of active learners of a language were higher than non-learners' either (a) because their *engagement with the L2* resulted in some improvement, or (b) because they constituted a *pre-selected sample* in the sense that they had chosen to study the particular L2; in this latter case the observed attitudinal/motivational differences either merely reflected their original motivation or the students scored higher on the items connected to their chosen language to justify their selection.

Although our data do not allow us to make an unambiguous choice between the two possible causes, there are strong indications that it is the first one which can be seen as primary. First of all, in the case of Russian in 1993 it was unlikely that anybody would have chosen to learn it voluntarily and yet, the two most important motivational scales, integrativeness and instrumentality, as well as the language choice index, show a significant difference in favour of the active learners. Second, in 1993 the study of English and German was not only, or even predominantly, the function of the students' personal choice as it hugely depended on whether a particular school could find any trained teachers of western languages to replace the Russian classes (and our figures show that about half of the student cohort had to carry on learning Russian in 1993 for the lack of an alternative L2 course being offered). In addition, even if a student was able to replace Russian with a Western language, it was not necessarily the language of first choice. Thus, in 1993 many learners could not be considered 'pre-selected' in the personal choice sense, and yet the pattern we find in their cases is identical to the one obtained in 1999. This points to the conclusion that the higher scores observed with the active L2 learners are due to their active engagement with the L2.

Further interesting insights can be obtained if we compare the changes between 1993 and 1999 across the two subgroups (i.e. active learners and non-learners). Although there is an overall decrease in most scores, this drop appears to be smaller amongst active learners: in their subsample the average scores across all the English-related variables dropped by a total of .46, whereas the same decrease is more than twice, .95, amongst non-learners. The difference is even more dramatic with German. Here the average scores dropped by a total of .39 amongst the active learners, and by exactly three times as much (1.17) amongst the non-learners. Thus, the general decrease of the attitudinal/motivational scores observed between 1993 and 1999 is less pronounced amongst active learners of an L2, which again supports the thesis that, at a national level, active engagement in the study of an L2 exerts a positive effect on the learners' attitudes and motivation.

Thus, as hypothesized in the introductory section of the paper, even when

Table 7: Mean scores of the motivational scales and language choice for learners who were (a) engaged and (b) not engaged in studying the particular L2 at the time of the surveys

		M		t-values		
		Learns the L2	Does not learn the L2	learns/does not learn	learns: 1993/1999	does not learn: 1993/1999
<i>English</i>						
Integrativeness	1993	4.32	4.15	-6.90***	-1.41	4.41***
	1999	4.36	4.04	-11.71***		
Instrumentality	1993	4.83	4.59	-17.56***	-1.65	-2.79**
	1999	4.85	4.64	-12.88***		
Direct contact with L2 speakers: US	1993	4.53	4.47	-2.51*	3.22**	6.78***
	1999	4.45	4.32	-5.05***		
Direct contact with L2 speakers: UK	1993	4.38	4.13	-10.77***	5.95***	7.83***
	1999	4.23	3.94	-10.27***		
Vitality of L2 community: US	1993	4.88	4.83	-4.77***	.48	.74
	1999	4.87	4.82	-4.31***		
Vitality of L2 community: UK	1993	4.36	4.25	-5.84***	.92	.15
	1999	4.34	4.25	-4.22***		
Cultural interest: USA	1993	4.56	4.56	.11	4.47***	9.31***
	1999	4.46	4.37	-3.67***		
Cultural interest: UK	1993	3.96	3.88	-3.01**	8.86***	12.91***
	1999	3.70	3.53	-5.35***		
Language choice: English ^a	1993	2.66	2.28	-14.37***	4.63***	3.13**
	1999	2.52	2.20	-10.74***		

<i>German</i>						
Integrativeness	1993	3.95	3.59	-12.23***	2.94**	14.95***
	1999	3.85	3.16	-21.64***		
Instrumentality	1993	4.62	4.35	-15.31***	3.54***	6.18***
	1999	4.56	4.23	-15.91***		
Direct contact with L2 speakers	1993	4.16	3.92	-8.60***	3.27**	12.49***
	1999	4.05	3.57	-15.19***		
Vitality of L2 community	1993	4.25	4.17	-3.43**	-1.04	-1.59
	1999	4.27	4.20	-3.09**		
Cultural interest	1993	3.81	3.72	-3.32**	4.70***	11.57***
	1999	3.67	3.42	-8.22***		
Language choice: German ^a	1993	2.13	1.66	-14.06***	1.76	12.37***
	1999	2.07	1.30	-23.51***		
<i>Russian</i>						
Integrativeness	1993	2.14	1.94	-8.17***		
Instrumentality	1993	2.60	2.44	-5.52***		
Direct contact with L2 speakers	1993	2.42	2.41	-.22		
Vitality of L2 community	1993	2.82	2.80	-.75		
Cultural interest	1993	1.75	1.73	-.81		
Language choice: Russian	1993	0.21	0.07	-9.94***		

^a On a four-point scale ranging from 0 to 3.

*** $p < .000$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$

we consider national learner cohorts rather than individual learners, we can separate 'choice motivation' and 'executive motivation'. In spite of the fact that our study did not specifically examine executive motives (i.e. motives related to the immediate learning situation), the consistent difference between active learners and non-learners in terms of their attitudinal/motivational disposition evidences the operation of an executive motivational system. It is noteworthy that in the examined population this subsystem appeared to have a positive effect regardless of the time of the survey or the nature of the target language.

Gender differences

Tables 2–4 contain data concerning how boys and girls scored on the various variables separately. The results confirm the frequent observation in the motivation literature that there is a tendency for girls' scores to be significantly higher than boys'. Out of the 30 variables included in the table (measured twice, in 1993 and 1999), this tendency is true for 21 in both surveys, with the mean differences sometimes exceeding .50. In 1999 there were no variables where the boys' scores exceeded the girls', and there were only six non-significant results (four of which concerned Russian). This pattern is virtually the same as the one in 1993, even though in 1993 there were two variables (the vitality of the USA and Russia) in which boys scored higher than girls.

Looking at the language choice measures in Table 3, we find significant gender-preferences. In 1999, English, German and Russian were endorsed more by boys than girls, whereas French and Italian could be seen as more 'feminine' languages. This pattern, again, coincides with that obtained in 1993, except for one important difference: the emerging male preference for English in 1999, which was not there earlier. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this preference might be due to the widespread use of computer games and the internet, which in Hungary usually come in English. There is one more change worth highlighting in Table 3, the significant decrease in boys' choice of German, which largely contributed to the decline of the overall choice measure for the language. Although German is still a 'masculine' language, by the end of the 1990s it seems to have lost a great deal of its unique male support base. It is to be seen whether this tendency further continues.

With regard to the reported measures of *Intended effort* (Table 4), the picture is very straightforward: all the girls' scores are higher than the boys', and all the figures, except the ones concerning English, decreased between the two phases of the survey. Thus, we can conclude that while language choice shows a certain amount of gender variation, once the choice has been made, girls show more commitment than boys regardless of what the actual L2 is. These robust results warrant further focused research into what factors are responsible for the observed male/female differences.

Geographical variation in language attitudes and preferences

In a detailed geographical analysis of the 1993 results, Dörnyei and Clément (2001) concluded that even in a small country such as Hungary, macro-contextual, geopolitical factors actively shape language attitudes and language learning motivation. There was a marked preference for German in the west of the country, which is clearly related to the fact that Hungary's western neighbour is German-speaking Austria and that the number of German visitors in this part of the country is particularly high: attracted by the cheaper prices, Austrians often come over to Western Hungary to do their shopping or even to go to the dentist. On the other hand, Russian was preferred (or rather, less disliked) in the east of the country, which is in accordance with the fact that Hungary's eastern neighbour used to be the Soviet Union and is currently the Ukraine. Thus, Hungary's traditional position somewhere in between Eastern and Western Europe, at the dividing line of German and Russian dominance was clearly reflected in the learners' language preferences.

Tables 8 and 9 present the 1993 and 1999 scores on *Integrativeness* and *Language choice*, broken down by regions and types of settlement. The most important changes that occurred between the two phases of the survey concern the role of German. Already in 1993, Budapest, the cosmopolitan capital of the country, showed a lower level of attraction towards German than the rest of the country (with a mean score of 3.46 on *Integrativeness*, compared to the mean score of 3.73 for the other regions together, and a mean score of 1.55 on *Language choice* compared to the mean score of 1.86 for the other regions together). The 1999 results revealed that these rather low scores were not accidental but were part of a larger process, and by the end of the decade the gap between Budapest and the rest of the country in the evaluation of German further increased (*Integrativeness*: 3.19 vs 3.60; *Language choice*: 1.20 vs 1.90, respectively). Furthermore, even within the rest of the country, an increasing division emerged with German gradually losing ground in the east (3.55 → 3.43) while still holding its traditional position in the west (3.80 → 3.77). This trend is in accordance with the 'Englishisation' process observed in other contexts earlier, and so is the fact that even in the west of Hungary, the traditional stronghold of German, English was gaining popularity in towns (4.15 → 4.22 on *Integrativeness* and 2.27 → 2.38 on *Language choice*), while staying constant in villages. Thus, our data point to the conclusion that the integration into an urbanized, modern world appears to increase the gap between World English learning and non-world language learning, even when World English is compared with a traditionally dominant regional *lingua franca*.

How is the 'Englishisation' process reflected in the preferences for the other languages examined? We find no surprises there. With regard to Russian, by 1999 its popularity had reached a record low (e.g. the mean score for *Integrativeness* slumped below 2 on a five-point scale, indicating an explicit rejection), with the eastern parts still exceeding the west somewhat (*Language*

Table 8. Analysis of variance of integrativeness across regions and types of settlement in 1993 and 1999

	English		German		French		Italian		Russian	
	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999
1 Capital	4.22	ns 4.26	3.46	> 3.19	3.29	ns 3.25	3.49	ns 3.40	2.14	> 1.94
2 Western town	4.15	< 4.22	3.81	ns 3.77	3.34	> 3.20	3.27	> 3.07	1.86	ns 1.87
3 Western village	4.11	ns 4.02	3.78	ns 3.77	3.35	> 3.15	3.19	> 2.83	1.98	ns 1.92
4 Eastern town	4.24	ns 4.24	3.65	> 3.45	3.47	> 3.29	3.31	> 3.16	2.11	> 1.98
5 Eastern village	4.19	ns 4.10	3.73	> 3.41	3.43	> 3.06	3.19	> 2.88	2.12	> 1.87
<i>F</i>	3.7657	6.4191	18.95	39.182	6.2140	4.3239	8.7757	21.55	20.888	2.4839
<i>p</i>	.0047	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0001	.0017	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0419
Post-hoc comparison ^a :	4,1,5		2,3,5		5,4,3,2		1		5,1,	
LSD (Least Significant Difference) 1993	1,5,2		5,4		1		2,4,5,3		1,4	
	5,2,3		1						3	
									2	
Post-hoc comparison ^a :	1,4,2		2,3		4,1		1		4	
LSD (Least Significant Difference) 1999	5,3		4,5		1,2,3		4,2		1,3,2,5	
			1		3,5		5,3			

^a Numbers refer to the settlement types; numbers in the same line indicate non-significant mean differences.

Table 9: Analysis of variance of language choice across regions and types of settlement in 1993 and 1999

	English		German		French		Italian		Russian	
	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999	1993	1999
1 Capital	2.51	> 2.40	1.55	> 1.20	.65	< .81	.67	< .79	.14	> .09
2 Western town	2.27	< 2.38	2.06	> 1.97	.73	ns .79	.53	ns .47	.10	> .07
3 Western village	2.23	ns 2.21	1.97	< 2.20	.84	ns .80	.44	> .33	.11	ns .09
4 Eastern town	2.43	ns 2.38	1.66	> 1.59	.92	ns .93	.48	< .55	.18	> .11
5 Eastern Village	2.38	ns 2.42	1.74	ns 1.84	1.01	> .77	.47	ns .45	.15	ns .13
<i>F</i>	13.911	2.735	42.712	78.733	21.312	5.6325	9.2136	22.791	5.6325	2.0812
<i>p</i>	.0000	.0275	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0002	.0000	.0000	.0002	.0808
Post-hoc comparison ^a :	1,4,5		2,3		5		1		5,4,1	
LSD (Least Significant Difference) 1993	2,3		4,5		4,3		2		1,3,2	
			5,1		2		4,3,5			
					1					
Post-hoc comparison ^a :	5,1,2,4		3		4		1		5,4,3,1	
LSD (Least Significant Difference) 1999	3		2,5		1,3,2,5		4		3,1,2	
			4				2,5			
			1				5,3			

^a Numbers refer to the settlement types; numbers in the same line indicate non-significant mean differences.

choice: 0.08 vs 0.12). French and Italian, as we have seen in Table 2, showed a significant overall decline in terms of their appeal to school children, and the breakdown of the results reveals that this trend is true across all regions and settlement types. The only exception to this diminishing tendency is the capital where the decrease did not reach significance and, in fact, with regard to *Language choice*, both French and Italian had gained some popularity. Although the resulting choice indices still only reflect a rather marginal position (0.81 and 0.79 for French and Italian vs 2.40 and 1.20 for English and German, respectively), the actual growth observed is a positive sign that indicates that in cosmopolitan areas there may remain a certain amount of (limited) interest in languages which are taught less often. Furthermore, there are some indications that the trend observed in Budapest might be followed by the rest of the country: A closer look at Table 9 reveals that the *Language choice* measures for French and Italian only decreased in villages rather than towns—French in the east and Italian in the west of the country—and in eastern towns the choice for Italian actually increased.

What is integrativeness?

The term ‘integrative’ has been used in the L2 motivational literature in three different forms/phrases: ‘integrative orientation’, ‘integrativeness’, and ‘integrative motivation’ (the latter corresponding to a fourth variation, the ‘integrative motive’). It was originally introduced within the phrase ‘integrative orientation’ by Gardner and Lambert in 1959, referring to the ‘willingness to be like valued members of the language community’ (Gardner and Lambert 1959: 271). As Gardner (2001) summarizes, since then the term has been used frequently in the literature, though ‘close inspection will reveal that it has slightly different meanings to many individuals’ (Gardner 2001: 1).

‘Integrativeness’ according to Gardner reflects:

a general interest in learning the second language in order to come closer to the other language community. At one level, this implies an openness to, and respect for other cultural groups and ways of life. In the extreme, this might involve complete identification with the community (and possibly even withdrawal from one’s original group), but more commonly it might well involve integration within both communities. Since Integrativeness involves emotional identification with another cultural group, the socio-educational model posits that it will be reflected in an integrative orientation toward learning the second language, a favourable attitude toward the language community, and an openness to other groups in general (i.e., an absence of ethnocentrism) (Gardner 2001: 5).

‘Integrativeness’ is thus more than a mere reason or goal for studying the L2—the goal aspect is covered by its subcomponent, ‘Integrative orientation’—and it is less than ‘integrative motivation’, since the latter concept also subsumes,

besides 'integrativeness', two other components: 'attitudes toward the learning situation' and 'motivation' (Gardner 2001).

The core aspect of all three levels of the integrative disposition is some sort of a psychological and emotional '*identification*'. According to Gardner (2001), this identification concerns the L2 community (i.e. identifying with the L2 speakers) but Dörnyei (1990) argued that in the absence of a salient L2 group in the learners' environment (as is often the case in foreign language learning contexts in which the L2 is primarily learnt as a school subject) the identification can be generalized to the cultural and intellectual values associated with the language, as well as to the actual L2 itself. Indeed, the three questionnaire items in our survey that make up the '*Integrativeness*' scale illustrate this multifaceted character well in that they concern the attraction towards the L2, the L2 culture, and the L2 speakers, respectively.

Gardner's (1985; Gardner and MacIntyre 1993) and Dörnyei's (1998, 2001) reviews of the literature provide ample evidence of the fact that some sort of 'integrativeness'-related factor typically emerges in empirical studies on L2 motivation, regardless of the characteristics of the learners and the learning situations examined. Furthermore, in many studies—including the current one—this integrative factor has been more than just one of several motivational components as it stood out in terms of its overall significance and salient impact on the criterion measures. In our national survey, for example, *Integrativeness* explained almost as much of the variance of the criterion measures as all the motivation components together. Given this general importance, we believe that it may be timely to reexamine the term 'integrativeness' and its standard definition. We suspect that the motivation dimension captured by the term is not so much related to any actual, or metaphorical, *integration* into an L2 community as to some more basic *identification process* within the individual's *self-concept*. As described above, such a conception would not conflict with the original Gardnerian notion and would at the same time provide a broader frame of reference: it could explain the motivational setup within diverse learning contexts even if they offer little or no contact with L2 speakers, and it would also be suitable for the study of the motivational basis of language globalization: World English is turning into an increasingly international language and it is therefore rapidly losing its national cultural base while becoming associated with a global culture (cf. Seidlhofer 2001; Widdowson 1994, 1997). This undermines the traditional definition of integrativeness as it is not clear any more who the 'L2 speakers' or the members of the 'L2 community' are.

The reconceptualization of 'integrativeness' reaches beyond the scope of the current paper. We are at the moment in the process of conducting further, more focused research using structural equation modelling to determine the exact nature of the identification process that underlies L2 motivation (Csizér and Dörnyei in preparation). In interpreting our findings we intend to refer to an important line of research in social psychology that highlights 'possible' and 'ideal' selves (e.g. Higgins 1987; Markus and

Nurius 1986). 'Possible selves' represent 'individuals' ideas of what they might become, what they would like to become, and what they are afraid of becoming, and thus provide a conceptual link between cognition and motivation' (Markus and Nurius 1986: 954). A further distinction has been made between the 'ideal self', which represents the attributes that a person would like to possess (e.g. hopes, aspirations, desires) and the 'ought self', which represents the attributes people believe that they ought to possess (e.g. sense of duty, obligations, responsibilities) (Higgins 1987). Within this framework, therefore, integrativeness and instrumentality would be associated with different self domains, and motivation to learn an L2 would be related to achieving possible selves and to resolving self-discrepancies between actual and ideal selves.

CONCLUSION

The two phases of the nationwide attitude/motivation survey described in this paper have produced a wealth of data. Although this paper did not cover all the aspects focused on in the investigation, the results reported above reveal some important general patterns and trends.

- 1 It was reassuring to find that the construct identified in 1993 to describe Hungarian school children's general L2 motivational disposition—comprising five broad dimensions: *Integrativeness*, *Instrumentality*, *Direct contact with L2 speakers*, *Cultural interest* (or 'indirect contact'), and *Vitality of L2 community*—remained virtually unchanged during the examined, and rather turbulent, period. Although with certain languages some of the identified components merged together into a broader disposition or split up into sub-dimensions, the five-factor structure seems to provide an adequate description in all cases. We should also note that the emerging factors are strongly intercorrelated, indicating that Hungarian school children's disposition towards a particular L2 and L2 community is fairly homogeneous (i.e. consistent across the subdimensions).
- 2 With respect to the changes observed between the two phases of the survey, the most important finding is the documentation of a 'language globalization' process as reflected through its impact on L2 motivation. The main characteristic of this process involves the emergence of an increasingly deviating trend in World English learning and non-world language learning: while World English learning appears to be maintaining its high educational profile, our results indicate that the study of non-world languages is becoming an increasingly marginal field of specialization. Even the traditional regional *lingua franca* in Hungary, German, was found to have embarked on a declining course, moving towards the 'non-world-language' category.

The language globalization process documented in Hungary in the 1990s is in accordance with observations in other parts of the world

reviewed briefly in the introduction. The threat that the learning of languages other than World English is impeded by the global 'Englishisation' is real, and we may speculate that this phenomenon may also explain, for example, why language learning as a school subject is rather unsuccessful in English-speaking countries such as the USA and the UK: because the population there speaks the world language as their mother tongue, in these contexts only non-world language learning can take place, and at the time of accelerating globalization this appears to be, motivationally speaking, a losing battle. The distinction between world language learning and non-world language learning, on the other hand, helps to question the common claim that the British and the Americans are worse language learners than people in other countries. This comparison contrasts non-world language learning with World English learning, which is simply not fair. Our results show that when it comes to non-world language learning, Hungarians—whom we believe are rather typical European foreign language learners—do not excel either. We suspect that if we compared the learning of French in the UK to that in Hungary, the picture we would find would not be at all dissimilar.

The obtained data highlighting the globalization process are robust, yet they do not foreshadow the extreme scenario whereby L2 learning gradually becomes equal to World English learning. Although the popularity of French and Italian decreased during the decade nationwide, it is noteworthy that the opposite trend was true for the most developed part of the country, Budapest: here not only did the two languages not lose any further ground but actually showed a small but significant increase in terms of learner preference. It remains to be seen whether this is a sign of a steady and sustained interest.

- 3 A third important set of results concerns the dynamics of motivational evolution at a national level. First, we have found—somewhat unexpectedly—that the increased contact with foreigners and foreign cultural products, brought about by the liberalization of Hungarian politics and economy in the 1990s, did not result in the improvement of the perceived quality of this crosscultural contact. Instead, the perceptions of the quality of contact became more negative during the examined period. This raises the broader question of how language contact in general affects interethnic relationships. The 'Contact Hypothesis' has been a much researched area in social psychology (cf. Pettigrew's 1998 review of the literature), and we are going to examine its relevance to L2 learning in more detail when fine-tuning our data analysis.

Secondly, our results displayed a robust 'school effect' in the learners' L2 disposition: It was found that at a national level, an active engagement in the study of an L2 exerts a positive influence on the learners' L2 attitudes and motivation. An important theoretical implication of this finding is that even when we speak of L2 learning communities rather than individual learners, it is possible to separate the two key components

of a process-oriented conception of L2 motivation: 'choice motivation' and 'executive motivation'.

- 4 Another significant finding of our study is the confirmation that Robert Gardner's (1985; 2001) construct of 'integrativeness' plays a key role in shaping L2 motivation. In our study, the scale labelled 'integrativeness' clearly stood out in terms of its impact on the criterion measures. Given this salience and the fact that similar findings have emerged worldwide, we have speculated that the term may not so much be related to any actual, or metaphorical, *integration* into an L2 community as to some more basic *identification process* within the individual's *self-concept*. Although further research is needed to justify any alternative interpretation, we believe that rather than viewing 'integrativeness' as a classic and therefore 'untouchable' concept, scholars need to seek potential new conceptualizations and interpretations that extend or elaborate on the meaning of the term without contradicting the large body of relevant empirical data accumulated during the past four decades.
- 5 With respect to the gender comparisons, our results confirm that there are indeed male/female preferences in considering certain languages. German and Russian were seen by our participants as more 'masculine' languages, whereas French and Italian were more 'feminine'; interestingly, this gender-bias is in accordance with Ludwig's (1983) findings in a markedly different language learning context, among college students of French and German in the USA. In the 1999 survey, English, which had been gender-neutral earlier, displayed a male preference, which we tentatively explained with its association with information technology. We should note, however, that while language choice was found to show a certain amount of gender variation, once the choice had been made, girls demonstrated more commitment than boys regardless of what the actual L2 was.
- 6 Finally, a comparison of the data gathered in different regions of the country and in different settlement types provided evidence that geographical variation in L2 attitudes and motivation, caused by geopolitical reasons, may occur even in a relatively small and homogeneous community such as Hungary. Although the perception of English was superior to the other target languages in every part of the country, we also found a marked preference for German in the west of the country (nearest to the Austrian border), whereas the generally unpopular Russian language was more endorsed in the east (nearest to the ex-Soviet border). It was interesting to see that Budapest, the cosmopolitan economic and cultural centre of Hungary appeared to be one 'step ahead' of the rest of the country in terms of the learners' language disposition. The decreasing status of German was clearly observable in the Budapest scores even in 1993, and there are some indications that the observed increasing trend of French and Italian in Budapest (mentioned above) might be followed by the rest of the country.

In conclusion, the results of our survey confirmed a number of assumptions and theories about L2 motivation and also revealed some important patterns and trends. Given the extensive size of our sample, these findings can be seen as fairly robust. We should note, however, that our results describe only one particular age group, 13/14-year-old teenagers, and younger or older learners might display different motivational characteristics. Furthermore, our sample only included language learners who studied in an environment in which L2s were primarily school subjects, without much extracurricular contact with the L2 (i.e. a 'foreign language learning' context). In environments which offer frequent opportunities for direct contact with L2s (i.e. 'second language acquisition' contexts), the motivation construct that best describes the learners' disposition may have a different structure, with some of the main motives assuming a different level of importance.

(Final version received December 2001)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Such a large-scale project required the cooperation of several researchers. In 1993 the research team included Richard Clément and Zoltán Dörnyei as principal investigators and Krisztina Kertész and Emese Nyilasi as research assistants; in 1999 the team consisted of Zoltán Dörnyei, Kata Csizér and Nóra Németh. We are grateful to all our friends for their contributions. We would also like to thank the editors and the reviewers for their particularly thorough comments and suggestions.

APPENDIX A

Table A1: Factor analysis of the attitudinal items concerning English/US: Maximum likelihood extraction, oblique rotation, pattern matrix (loadings under .30 not included)

	Factor				
	1	2	3	4	5
How much do you like the people who live in these countries?	.66				
How much do you like meeting foreigners from these countries?	.64				
How much would you like to travel to these countries?	.57				
How important do you think these languages are in the world these days?		.72			
How much would these languages help you to become more knowledgeable?		.66			
How much would these languages help you when travelling abroad in the future?		.55			
How much would knowing these languages help your future career?		.50			
How important a role do you think these countries play in the world?			.69		
How rich and developed do you think these countries are?			.57		
How much do you like the TV programmes made in these countries?				.81	
How much do you like the films made in these countries?				.37	
How much do you like the magazines made in these countries?				.33	
How much do you like the pop music of these countries?				.31	
How important do you think learning these languages is in order to learn more about the culture and art of its speakers?					.68
How much do you like these languages?					.59
How much would you like to become similar to the people who speak these languages?					.57

APPENDIX B

Table B1: Intercorrelations of the factors in the factor analysis of English/US in 1993

	Vitality of community	Integrativeness	Instrumentality	Cultural interest	Direct contact with L2 speakers
Vitality of the community	—				
Integrativeness	.07	—			
Instrumentality	.30	.55	—		
Cultural interest	.36	.34	.35	—	
Direct contact with L2 speakers	.34	.46	.29	.67	—

Table B2: Intercorrelations of the factors in the factor analysis of English/US in 1999

	Direct contact with L2 speakers	Instrumentality	Vitality of community	Cultural interest	Integrativeness
Direct contact with L2 speakers	—				
Instrumentality	.29	—			
Vitality of the community	.50	.41	—		
Cultural interest	.68	.26	.47	—	
Integrativeness	.47	.66	.28	.32	—

NOTES

- 1 We applied oblique rotation because the emerging factors were expected to be inter-correlated. The number of factors to be extracted was arrived at after applying Cattell's (1966) scree test and making sure that the factor matrix had a 'simple structure', that is, each variable had salient loadings only on one factor without any cross-loadings.
- 2 To save space, we do not include the 1999 regression tables, which replicate the 1993 findings.

REFERENCES

- Baker, S. C. and P. D. MacIntyre. 2000. 'The role of gender and immersion in communication and second language orientations.' *Language Learning* 50: 311–41.
- Berliner, D. C. 1989. 'Furthering our understanding of motivation and environments' in C. Ames and R. Ames (eds): *Research on Motivation in Education, Vol. 3: Goals and cognitions*. New York: Academic Press. pp. 317–43.
- Burstall, C., M. Jamieson, S. Cohen, and M. Hargreaves. 1974. *Primary French in the Balance*. Windsor: NFER.
- Cattell, R. B. 1966. 'The scree test for the number of factors.' *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1: 245–76.
- Clark, A. and J. Trafford. 1995. 'Boys into modern languages: An investigation of the discrepancy in attitudes and performance between boys and girls in modern languages.' *Gender and Education* 7: 315–25.
- Clément, R. and R. C. Gardner. 2001. 'Second language mastery' in H. Giles and W. P. Robinson (eds): *The New Handbook of Language and Social Psychology*. London: Wiley.
- Clément, R. and B. Kruidenier. 1983. 'Orientations on second language acquisition: 1. The effects of ethnicity, milieu and their target language on their emergence.' *Language Learning* 33: 273–91.
- Clément, R., Z. Dörnyei, and K. Noels. 1994. 'Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom.' *Language Learning* 44: 417–48.
- Crookes, G. and R. Schmidt. 1991. 'Motivation: Reopening the research agenda.' *Language Learning* 41: 469–512.
- Crystal, D. 1997. *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Csizér, K. and Z. Dörnyei. In preparation. 'The internal construct of language learning motivation: Results of structural equation modelling'.
- Demographics Yearbook. 1993. Budapest: Central Statistical Office.
- Demographics Yearbook. 1998. Budapest: Central Statistical Office.
- Djigunoviç, M. J. 1993. 'Effects of gender on some learner-dependent variables in foreign language learning.' *Studia Romanica et Anglicae Zagrabiensia* 38: 169–80.
- Dörnyei, Z. 1990. 'Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning.' *Language Learning* 40: 46–78.
- Dörnyei, Z. 1994. 'Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom.' *Modern Language Journal* 78: 273–84.
- Dörnyei, Z. 1998. 'Motivation in second and foreign language learning.' *Language Teaching* 31: 117–35.
- Dörnyei, Z. 2000. 'Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualisation of student motivation.' *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 70: 519–38.
- Dörnyei, Z. 2001. *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. Harlow: Longman/Pearson Education.
- Dörnyei, Z. and R. Clément. 2001. 'Motivational characteristics of learning different target languages: Results of a nationwide survey' in Z. Dörnyei and R. Schmidt (eds.): *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*. (Technical Report 23). Honolulu, HI: The University of Hawai'i, Second Language & Curriculum Center. pp. 391–424.
- Enyedi, Á. and P. Medgyes. 1998. 'ELT in Central and Eastern Europe.' *Language Teaching* 31: 1–12.
- Fishman, J. A. 1992. 'Sociology of English as an additional language' in B. B. Kachru (ed.): *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*.

- Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press. pp. 19–26.
- Gardner, R. C.** 1985. *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C.** 2001. 'Integrative motivation and second language acquisition' in Z. Dörnyei and R. Schmidt (eds): *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (Technical Report 23). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center. pp. 1–19.
- Gardner, R. C.** and **W. E. Lambert.** 1959. 'Motivational variables in second language acquisition'. *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 13: 266–72.
- Gardner, R. C.** and **P. D. MacIntyre.** 1993. 'A student's contribution to second language learning. Part II: Affective variables.' *Language Teaching* 26: 1–11.
- Gardner, R. C.** and **P. F. Tremblay.** 1994. 'On motivation, research agendas and theoretical frameworks.' *Modern Language Journal* 78: 359–68.
- Gollwitzer, P. M.** 1990. 'Action phases and mind-sets' in E. T. Higgins and R. M. Sorrentino (eds): *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behaviour* (Vol. 2). New York: Guilford Press. pp. 53–92.
- Graddol, D.** and **U. H. Meinhof.** (eds) 1999. *English in a Changing World*. Special Issue, *AILA Review* 13.
- Heckhausen, H.** 1991. *Motivation and Action*. New York: Springer.
- Hickey, D. T.** 1997. 'Motivation and contemporary socio-constructivist instructional perspectives.' *Educational Psychologist* 32: 175–93.
- Higgins, E. T.** 1987. 'Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect.' *Psychological Review* 94: 319–40.
- Julkunen, K.** 1989. *Situation- and Task-specific Motivation in Foreign-Language Learning And Teaching*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
- Julkunen, K.** 1994. 'Gender differences in students' situation- and task-specific foreign language learning motivation' in S. Tella (ed.): *Näytön paikka. Opetuksen kulttuurin arviointi*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Teacher Education Department. pp. 171–80.
- Julkunen, K.** 2001. 'Situation- and task-specific motivation in foreign-language learning' in Z. Dörnyei and R. Schmidt (eds.): *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (Technical Report 23). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center. 29–41.
- Julkunen, K.** and **H. Borzova.** 1997. *English Language Learning Motivation in Joensuu and Petrozavodsk*. University of Joensuu, Joensuu.
- Kachru, B. B.** 1992. 'Introduction: The other side of English and the 1990s' in B. B. Kachru (ed.): *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press. pp. 1–15.
- Keeves, J. P.** 1994. 'Longitudinal research methods' in T. Husén and T. N. Postlethwaite (eds.): *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Vol. 7. 2nd edn. Oxford: Pergamon. pp. 3512–24.
- Központi Statisztikai Hivatal** [Central Statistical Office] 1992. *Az 1990. évi népszámlálás; 3. kötet; összefoglaló adatok* [The 1990 census: Vol. 3. Summary data]. Budapest: Author.
- Kuhl, J.** and **J. Beckmann, J.** (eds) 1994. *Volition and Personality: Action versus State orientation*. Seattle, WA: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Ludwig, J.** 1983. 'Attitudes and expectations: A profile of female and male students of college French, German and Spanish.' *Modern Language Journal* 67: 216–27.
- Markus, H.** and **P. Nurius.** 1986. 'Possible selves.' *American Psychologist* 41: 954–69.
- Menard, S.** 1991. *Longitudinal Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mohammadi, A.** 1997. 'Introduction: A critical reader in international communication and globalisation in a postmodern world' in A. Mohammadi (ed.): *International Communication and Globalisation*. London: Sage. pp. 1–6.
- Oxford, R.** and **J. Shearin.** 1994. 'Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework.' *Modern Language Journal* 78: 12–28.
- Pennycook, A.** 1994. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Pettigrew, T. F.** 1998. 'Intergroup contact theory.' *Annual Reviews Psychology* 49: 65–85.
- Phillipson, R.** 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R.** 2001. 'English for globalisation or for the world's people?' *International Review of Education* 47: 185–200.
- Phillipson, R.** and **T. Skutnabb-Kangas** 1999.

- 'Englishisation: One dimension of globalisation'. *AILA Review* 13: 19–36.
- Schmidt, R.** and **Y. Watanabe.** 2001. 'Motivation, strategy use, and pedagogical preferences in foreign language learning' in Z. Dörnyei and R. Schmidt (eds.): *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (Technical Report 23). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center. 313–59.
- Seidlhofer, B.** 2001. 'Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca.' *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11: 133–57.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T.** 2001. 'The globalisation of (educational) language rights.' *International Review of Education* 47: 201–19.
- Stipek, D. J.** 1996. 'Motivation and instruction' in D. C. Berliner and R. C. Calfee (eds): *Handbook of Educational Psychology*. New York: Macmillan. pp. 85–113.
- Terestyéni, T.** 1996. 'Vizsgálat az idegennyelv-tudásról [Investigating the knowledge of foreign languages].' *Modern Nyelvoktatás* 3: 3–16.
- Vágó, I.** 2000. 'Az oktatás tartalma [The content of education].' In: G. Halász and J. Lannert (eds): *Jelentés a magyar közoktatásról 2000* [Report on the education in Hungary 2000]. Budapest: Országos Közoktatási Intézet.
- Wentzel, K. R.** 1999. 'Socio-motivational processes and interpersonal relationships: Implications for understanding motivation at school.' *Journal of Educational Psychology* 91: 76–97.
- Widdowson, H. G.** 1994. 'The ownership of English.' *TESOL Quarterly* 28: 377–89.
- Widdowson, H. G.** 1997. 'EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests.' *World Englishes* 16: 135–46.
- Williams, M.** and **R. Burden.** 1997. *Psychology for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.