

## **The impacts of school on English learners' motivation in Indonesian Islamic schools**

**Ahmad Farid<sup>\*1</sup>, Reza Anggriyashati Adara<sup>2</sup>, Salim Ashar<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Pesantren Tinggi Darul Ulum, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Islam 45 Bekasi, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Institut Agama Islam (IAI) Bani Fattah Jombang, Indonesia

Manuscript received August 4, 2022, revised March 23, 2023, accepted April 8, 2023, and published online May 7, 2023.

### **Recommended APA Citation**

Farid, A., Adara, R. A., & Ashar, S. (2023). The impacts of school on English learners' motivation in Indonesian Islamic schools. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 10(2), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v10i2.14656>

### **ABSTRACT**

Among the teaching practitioners in Indonesia, there is a general belief that some learners of English in some Indonesian pesantren (Islamic boarding schools) have a negative view on English, which consequently affects their motivation. However, it remains unclear what has affected the trend. The current study investigates this issue in three pesantren schools in Indonesia affiliated with different Islamic groups. Using the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) model proposed by Dörnyei (2009) as an analytical lens, a survey instrument was designed to describe and compare students' motivation to learn English (n = 376). A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was run to describe and compare the students' motivation, and a stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed to discover which motivational factors made the most significant contribution to motivation by predicting reported learning effort in English. In addition, a thorough document analysis was performed to obtain background information regarding the teaching of English in the three institutions. It was found that institutional factors do play a role in influencing the learners' motivation, in that in the most religiously conservative context, the school policy does shape the learners' ideal L2 self. As the learners' ideal L2 self was weak, it leads to weak motivational power as well. The paper concludes by emphasizing the crucial role of educational contexts in shaping students' ideal selves and in providing favourable learning experience, which are key elements in motivating learners to learn English.

---

*\*Corresponding Author:*

Ahmad Farid  
Universitas Pesantren Tinggi Darul Ulum  
Jln KH As'ad Umar No.1 Kampus Unipdu, Kabupaten Jombang, Jawa Timur 61481, Indonesia  
Email: achmadfarid@fbs.unipdu.ac.id

**Keywords:** *L2 motivation; L2 motivational self system; Institutional impact; Pesantren*

## **1. Introduction**

There is a general belief among some English teachers that students are classified into two different categories in terms of their willingness to learn – motivated and unmotivated learners. These teachers hold that a motivated learner would make an effort to learn a foreign language, and an unmotivated learner would not. This categorisation might sound plausible, but stereotyping learners would possibly result in a serious problem, assuming that learners' effort to learn a foreign language is determined by the levels of their internal motivation only. Furthermore, this categorisation somehow disregards the importance of the role of external factors such as school support, class atmosphere, and teachers' role in motivating learners (Lamb, 2007). That is, with motivated and unmotivated labeling, a pleasant or unpleasant learning environment in class has no effect on learners' levels of motivation.

In fact, favourable learning experience would encourage students to learn a foreign language independently (Henry & Thorsen 2020; Lamb & Wedell, 2014). Pintrich and Schunk (2007) have suggested that learners' motivation can be hugely affected by external factors like institutional context, such as: learning facilities, peers' interactions, and classroom atmospheres. According to the dominant L2 motivation theory – the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009) – the institutional impacts are more associated with the third facet of the model, the 'L2 learning experience'. Nevertheless, the construct of the 'L2 learning experience' is significantly correlated with the first aspect of the model – the 'Ideal L2 self', which indicates that institutional factors might also help direct learners' future aspirations, which further impact their motivation for learning a foreign language (Taguchi et al., 2009).

Previous studies conducted in Indonesia as well as in other global contexts suggest that socio-economic factors also do play a role in shaping learners' motivation. For instance, there were significant differences in English learning motivation between learners from schools in urban areas and those from schools in rural areas (Lamb, 2012; Muslim et al., 2020). Lamb's (2012) study suggests that students in rural areas who typically are from lower social backgrounds tend to find it more difficult to envision themselves as future users of English, which further affects their effort to learn the language. Another study conducted by Farid and Lamb (2020), also suggests that some students related their motivation to their religious self, using English for proselytizing their religious belief.

The current study is situated in three Indonesian pesantren schools. Pesantren is an Islamic boarding school, where Islamic teachings are more intensively inculcated. Many pesantren schools allocate more hours to religious subjects at the cost of secular subjects such as mathematics, English and sciences, though the pupils are still expected to study those subjects. The pesantren institutions' policy on prioritising religious subjects may become a source of influence for the learners on how they envision themselves in

the future, which further affects their willingness to learn or not to learn something at the moment. As Lamb (2013) argues, '[c]ultural norms and values infuse institutions, social activity and individuals' beliefs and behaviour' (p.17). The current study investigates the role that pesantren play in shaping their pupils' ideal selves and in providing language learning experience for the students, and the implications that these factors might have on their motivation to learn English. Specifically, the research questions are formulated as follows:

1. In general, how motivated are pesantren students to learn English?
2. How do L2 motivational factors vary among students from different pesantrens?
3. How, if at all, do pesantren as religious institutions affect learners' L2 motivation?

## **2. Literature review**

### *2.1. L2 motivation theory development*

L2 Motivation has been viewed differently by different L2 researchers, and these different perspectives on L2 motivation can be divided into three different phases: the 'social psychological' period, the 'cognitive period', and the 'L2 motivational Self System' model. The social psychological period was marked primarily by the work on the L2 motivation theories proposed by Gardner and his colleagues from the late 50s onwards (e.g. Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Gardner, 1979; Gardner, 1985). Their context of study was in the bilingual social context of Canada, in which there are two language users – Anglophone and Francophone groups. The main element of the theory is the notion of integrativeness, that is, a second language is viewed as facilitating instruments between different ethnolinguistic groups. Integrating with the target community, which is referred to as an 'integrative motive', is seen as the key factor that motivates an L2 learner to learn a second language.

However, in spite of its huge influence on L2 motivation research, the integrative motivation theory explanatory power started to wane as many arguments against it emerged from the cognitive-situated studies. The cognitive-situated period was marked by the work of Crooks and Schmidt (1991), which suggests that the integrative motivation is not suitable with the educational context. Lamb (2004) argues that the integrative model is not compatible with the current age of globalization as 'English is no longer associated just with Anglophone countries' (p.14). In addition to their criticism of social-psychological models, Crooks and Schmidt (1991) also proposed a new perspective on defining motivation as well as the pedagogical implications that motivation may pose. The key factor of motivation is no longer the willingness to integrate with a certain community, but the outcomes. Therefore, the cognitive theory of motivation also takes classroom factors into account. This model holds that language teachers, classroom activities and teaching methods, as well as learning materials have an important role in determining learners L2 motivation.

After a long continuous debate in the past decades, a new model for L2 learning motivation was introduced by Zoltán Dörnyei, called 'the L2 motivational self-system'

(Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). Dörnyei's model is a re-conceptualisation of the existing theory with regard to the concept of self and identity. This theory is elaborated in the following section.

## *2.2. The L2 motivational self system*

Dörnyei's (2005) L2 Motivational Self System is currently a major theoretical framework employed by L2 motivation researchers and has now been used in more than 40 L2 motivation studies. This model has been utilised in various contexts involving participants from diverse social backgrounds (e.g. Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Ryan, 2009; Lamb, 2012), is compatible with the contemporary conceptualisation of identity (Chowdhury, 2022; Dörnyei & Ushioda 2021;; Farid & Lamb, 2020; Islam et al., 2013, Lamb, 2009; Yashima, 2009), and accords with the widely recognised frameworks in general motivational psychology, especially Higgins' (1987) theory of self-discrepancy and Markus and Nurius' (1986) possible selves concept. In this study, the L2 Motivational Self System is considered as an appropriate theoretical foundation because it has been recognised as an effective tool to examine many L2 motivations in different contexts in many parts of the world, and it provides a well-established methodological instrument to collect data from a large population.

The L2 Motivational Self System consists of three elements: 'the ideal L2 self', 'the ought-to L2 Self', and 'the L2 learning experience'. The ideal L2 self is defined as 'the L2-specific facet of one's 'ideal self'' (p.105). It is a representation of an L2 speaker that a learner would like to become in the future. The Ought-to L2 Self represents a more externalised source of motivation, that is, motivation triggered by an outer source, such as the demands of parents and teachers. The third element of the L2 Motivational Self System is 'the L2 learning experience', which explains immediate learning constituents in the classroom such as teacher, teaching strategies, teaching materials, and other factors that can affect learners' motivation. This aspect is the causal dimension of the L2 motivational self system which is concerned with 'situation-specific motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience' (Dörnyei, 2005, p.106).

## *2.3. Contextual differences*

A wide range of studies have been conducted in different contexts to assess the usefulness of Dörnyei's L2 Motivation Self System for studying L2 learners' motivation, such as the ones in Indonesia (Lamb, 2007, 2009, 2012), Pakistan (Islam et al., 2013), Chile (Kormos et al., 2011), Japan (Ryan, 2009; Taguchi et al., 2009), and Hungary (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Dörnyei et. al., 2006). In general, the findings in those studies provide support for the L2 Motivational Self System as the three components seem to have an impact on learners' motivation and envisage their motivated learning behaviour, although the findings from different studies show variance of the effect of each component on learners' motivation. Dörnyei et al. (2006) investigated the appraisal of five target languages in Hungary by involving over 13.000 year 8 students, and they found

that the ideal L2 self becomes the most crucial component of the L2 Motivational Self System. This was confirmed in a later study in the same country by Csizér and Kormos (2009), who involved secondary and university student participants. They found that the ideal L2 self and L2 learning experiences result in the participants' intended learning effort. This is also the case in Asian contexts, such as in Pakistan, Japan, and Saudi (see Islam et. al. 2013; Taguchi, Magid, & Papi, 2009; Ryan, 2009; Al-Shehri, 2009). In the Indonesia context, Lamb (2012) also used the L2 Motivational Self System to investigate junior high school students' motivation to learn English. He found that L2 learning experience is the dominant factor, and the ideal L2 self does not play a significant role in motivating the learners to learn English.

Lamb suggests that the status of English as a compulsory subject with a predetermined schedule explains this finding as the pupils' motivation in learning English is more likely linked with immediate English language learning setting than with their future language selves. In addition, because Lamb's participants were young teenagers (12–14 years of age), they seemed to have unrealistic ideal selves. Another Lamb's (2007) research in Indonesia also provides valuable insight into Indonesian L2 learners' motivation in relation to Dörnyei's L2 motivational self-system. Lamb reported that learners' motivation during the first 20 months period was maintained, although their attitude toward classroom learning was likely to decline. Lamb's findings support Dörnyei's differentiation of L2 motivation inspired by L2 future self and motivation generated by L2 learning involvement in the classroom setting, but he also suggests that further research needs to be conducted to examine the validity of the distinction.

Regarding the ought-to L2 self, a number of studies have shown that it only has little or no importance in motivating learners (e.g. Dörnyei, 2019; Dörnyei et. al., 2006; Taguchi et al., 2009; Lamb, 2012; Dörnyei & Chan, 2013). In Csizér and Kormos' (2009) study, involving 202 secondary school pupils, it was found that the ought-to L2 self has very little importance in enhancing learners' investment in L2 learning, and with the sample of college student participants the correlation was even extremely weak. With regard to learners' language anxiety, it was found that the ought-to L2 self significantly makes language learners anxious about language learning, while the ideal L2-self was found to be reducing language anxiety (Hiver & Papi, 2020; Papi, 2010).

To summarize, it becomes a consensus among the current L2 motivation researchers that Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) conceptualisation of L2 motivation – the L2 Motivational Self System – has been very useful to be employed to understand L2 learners' motivation. However, it is worth noting that the three components of the model do not always have a similar impact on motivation as previous studies employing the model in different contexts obtained different results. Hence, it seems that the context inevitably determines the significance of the correlation between the components and language learning motivation. Ushioda (2012) argued that 'people engaged in language learning are not only uniquely individual, but are also necessarily located in particular temporal, situational, and social contexts that contribute to shaping their motivation and

their developing self-system' (p. 65-6). Therefore, the reciprocal interaction between self and context changes over time, and this affects learners' learning motivation.

### **3. Method**

In this study, a mixed methods approach was adopted, combining qualitative and quantitative methods to make the most of both methods and avoid the weakness of each one. By combining the quantitative and qualitative methods, the researcher aims at investigating phenomena both at wide social levels and at individual levels. As Dörnyei (2007) puts it, 'in most cases a mixed methods approach can offer additional benefits for the understanding of the phenomenon in question' (p. 47).

#### *3.1. Sampling for the study*

The quantitative part of this research involved 376 participants (16-18 years old) from three institutions. The first school was in Pesantren 1 in East Java, which is noticeably affiliated with the Nahdlatul Ulama (NU), recognised as the most moderate Islamic group in Indonesia. The second school was in the Pesantren 2 in Central Java; this pesantren is affiliated with Muhammadiyah group, which is religiously more conservative than those of NU, but still relatively very moderate. The third one was in Pesantren 3 in East Java. Pesantren 3 is affiliated with Salafism, known as the most legal conservative Islamic group in Indonesia. Considering that in these institutions male and female classes are segregated, and involving female participants from a conservative Muslim group could raise ethical issues as well (e.g. restricted interaction between a male researcher and female participants), only male participants were recruited. Also, this would avoid variability of the results as previous studies have shown different performance and motivation between male and female students (Dörnyei et al., 2006).

In this study, the nature of participants' selection is both 'purposive' and 'random'. The sampling is purposive in that three pesantren schools were purposefully selected because 'are likely to produce the most valuable data' (Denscombe, 2007, p. 17) based on their religious affiliations. In selecting which groups/classes of students at each institution, random sampling was carried out, that is, randomly choosing three groups of students at each pesantren school, considering that they are 'likely to provide a representative cross-section of the whole' population (Denscombe, 2007, p. 17, original italic). Ideally, I would have chosen 1 group of students from each level (Year 10, 11, and 12), but Year 12 students were not available during the data collection period because they were occupied with the preparation of the school final examinations. Therefore, only Year 10 and 11 students were able to participate in the research.

#### *3.2. Instrument*

A survey instrument was designed to collect quantitative data. Bahasa Indonesia was used in the questionnaire as this would make the participants easier to complete it. There are six constructs containing 29 statements. The students were asked to express

their thoughts on a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), and strongly agree (4). The statements in the questionnaire were mainly adapted from previous studies that use L2 Motivational Self System as the theoretical framework (i.e. Dornyei et al., 2006; Ryan, 2009; and Lamb, 2012). The constructs and their items can be seen in the appendix.

### *3.3. Procedures for data collection and analysis*

To see how the questionnaire works, an initial pilot study was conducted, distributing the questionnaire to 32 students in Pesantren 1. The internal consistency of all scales was measured by running Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951), and it was found that most of the sub-scales had not met the acceptable alpha value according to the commonly accepted standards of social science (0.60, as suggested by Pallant, 2007). Several changes were made to improve the questionnaire in order to increase its reliability. For example, some items that were already available in the Indonesian language were used (those of Lamb, 2017). The Indonesian version of the questionnaire was then proofread by an Indonesian bilingual educationalist, which resulted in the rewording of some items, e.g. changing the phrase *dinilai baik* 'to gain the approval' into *dinilai cukup* (B6, B13, D6, D12), changing the word *menikmati* 'enjoy' into *menyukai* (B7, B24, D7, D21) and so on.

More items were also added into the scale 'Intended Learning Effort' that previously had a low Cronbach's alpha level. After those changes were made, the questionnaire was administered to 86 participants in Pesantren 1. Eighty two participants' responses were eligible for analysis as four participants were eliminated due to their incomplete responses. The reliability analysis indicates that all of the scales met the minimum Cronbach's alpha value, including the newly created scales. This implies that the questionnaire is ready to be used to collect data from a wider population.

After the data were collected from 376 participants, they were inputted into SPSS version 20 for Windows. The internal consistency of all scales was again measured to make sure that the questionnaire really measured what it was supposed to measure. Descriptive statistics and comparative analysis of motivational factors were presented to show how motivational factors vary among participants from different institutions. Finally, the regression models based on the Intended Learning Efforts as the criterion measure were presented.

Qualitative data in the form of the school documents (both printed and electronic) from the three institutions were also collected. Bowen (2009) noted that 'documents can provide data on the context within which research participants operate' (p.29). Therefore, the documents collected containing general school information, teacher information, curriculum, lesson schedules, and extra-curricular activities schedules were very important in order to understand the contexts being studied. A thorough document analysis was performed to obtain background information regarding the teaching of English in the three institutions.

## 4. Findings and discussion

### 4.1. Reliability analysis and descriptive statistics

Before participants' responses were inputted into SPSS, they were carefully examined for missing, incomplete and inappropriate responses. It was found that 365 participants' responses were eligible for analysis as they were able to provide meaningful responses, while 11 participants were eliminated due to their invalid responses. These were the participants who simply answered in a zig-zag or straight line across the page, and those who reflected no meaningful effort at all by providing random answer patterns. The internal consistency of all scales was measured by running Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951).

The reliability analysis indicates that all of the scales for English motivation obtained high alpha values (see Table 1). Three scales (Attitude towards English, Millieu, and Intended Learning Effort) have an alpha value of above .60. The scales of L2 Learning Experience and the Ought-to L2 Self have a higher alpha value of above .70. The highest alpha value was obtained for the scale Ideal L2 Self, which is over .80. The mean inter-item correlations were also computed with SPSS, and the results indicated that the values of all of the mean inter-item correlations of the scales ranged from .20 to .40, except for the Ideal L2 Self. This implies that each scale contains items that are similar, but they comprise adequately distinctive variance. Therefore, the items in the same scale are not similar to each other, but they are aimed to measure the same thing. Regarding the mean inter-item correlation of the scale of 'the Ideal L2 Self', the alpha value of above .50 may indicate that the items in the scale only reflect a small bandwidth of the construct captured (Piedmont, 2014). However, given that the alpha value of the scale is very high, it is reasonable to use it in the analysis.

**Table 1**

Reliability and comparative analysis of motivational scales.

No.	Scales	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha Value	Mean Inter-item correlation	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Ideal L2 Self	5	0.85	0.54	3.03	0.65
2	Ought-to L2 Self	5	0.77	0.40	2.64	0.61
3	L2 Learning Experience	4	0.72	0.40	2.60	0.60
4	Attitude towards English	5	0.68	0.35	2.66	0.62
5	Milieu	4	0.63	0.30	2.60	0.55

6	Intended Learning Effort	6	0.69	0.27	2.69	0.48
---	--------------------------	---	------	------	------	------

---

#### 4.2. Students motivation for learning English: Mean values and differences at the institutional levels

In order to identify how motivational dimensions vary among participants from the three different types of pesantren, the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted. Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels (Field, 2005: 373) was used to correct the  $\alpha$ -level for multiple comparisons, setting the level of significance at  $p < .008$ . The result shows that there was a significant effect of pesantren categories on the means of motivational aspects, Wilks' Lambda = 0.53,  $F(16, 710) = 16.716$ ,  $p = .000$ . It was found that in Pesantren 3, where more conservative Islamic values are more heavily inculcated, students showed significantly lower motivation to learn English compared to that of Pesantren 1 and 2. It is found that students in Pesantren 1 and 2 tend to have more positive attitudes to English, dedicate more effort to learn English, have stronger ideal L2 self and ought to L2 self, experience more positive learning, and have more supportive learning environment.

The above results suggest that in Pesantren 3, where more conservative Islamic values are more heavily inculcated, students showed significantly lower motivation to learn English compared to that of Pesantren 1 and 2. In addition, it is found that students in Pesantren 1 and 2 tend to have more positive attitudes to English, dedicate more effort to learn English, have stronger ideal L2 self and ought to L2 self, experience more positive learning, and have more supportive learning environment. It can be said that students from moderate learning pesantrens tend to show higher level of motivation than the conservative pesantren. To explain the low scores in all motivational factors in Pesantren 3, the next paragraph provides a further analysis on factors causing the low motivation in the most conservative context.

Despite the fact that participants from Pesantren 3 scored significantly lower than those from Pesantren 1 and 2, it is interesting that the effect size values measured with partial eta-squared ( $\eta^2$ ) are relatively small for all of the English motivational scales. Cohen (1992) suggested that .10 be considered a small effect size, .30 a medium effect size, and .50 a large effect size. In Table 2, it can be seen that the effect size values for the scales of the Ideal L2 Self, L2 Learning Experience, Attitudes towards English, Milieu, Intended Learning Effort only range from 0 to 0.2. Those small effect sizes indicate that only 50% to 58% (see Coe, 2002 for interpretations of effect sizes) in the variability in the participants' mean scores of motivational factors are accounted for by group membership, in this case the institutions to which the participants belong. Meanwhile, a higher effect size of 0.3 was obtained for the Ought to L2 Self, indicating that 62% of the variability in the participants' external motivation to learn English is accounted for by group membership. In this case, participants that belong to Pesantren 2

tend to have a stronger Ought to L2 Self, and on the contrary participants belonging to Pesantren 3 tend to have a weaker Ought to L2 Self.

In this context, one possible explanation for the low motivation of Pesantren 3 students seems to be the inequality of schooling system between the educational contexts of Pesantren 3 and Pesantren 1 and 2. The aforementioned point is deduced from the observation conducted by the researchers during data collection. In this regard, the role of educational context in motivation is prominent. Gardner (2007) highlighted some of the components of an educational context that may influence learners' motivation; they are i.e. 'the system, the quality of the program, the interest, enthusiasm, and skills of the teacher, the adequacy of the materials, the curriculum, [and] the class atmosphere' (p.14). He argued that these are crucial elements, which can affect learners' motivation. By looking at the school curriculum, Pesantren 3 allocates a much more limited amount of time for English subjects, as the pesantren's curriculum has been encumbered with elaborate religious subjects, English is taught only once a week in the afternoon for ideally 60 minutes. However, in practice, it was noticed that English classes only lasted for less than 60 minutes. As English is taught for a very limited amount of time, it may have consequently made students in Pesantren 3 not put a great deal of effort into learning English. Therefore, it comes as no surprise for them to score low for the construct of Intended Learning Effort. McIntyre et al. (2009) pointed out that 'language learning is integrated with all of the other activities in which a learner occupies his or her time' (p.52). Hence, it is the low exposure to English that has caused low learning effort, which further results in low motivation.

The results of document analysis suggest why Pesantren 3 students reported less favourable learning experience. The latter point can be inferred from document analysis on the educational background of one of the English teachers in Pesantren 3. As an English teacher, Mr. Pramono (pseudonym), is underqualified. He does not hold any English language teaching qualification. Therefore, it was reasonable that his English was very limited. The lesson plans suggest Mr. Pramono's classes were mostly teacher-centered with virtually no teacher-student or students-student communicative language use. Negative learning experience can be one of the factors that causes students' low motivation. As Lamb (2007) reported in his study with Indonesian pupils, some learners' motivation declined because they were not happy with their learning experience with their teacher in the formal setting. Even though Lamb's study was a longitudinal one, observing the same subjects for a longer period, it suggests the important role that learning experience plays in shaping the pupils' L2 motivation, especially in the Indonesian context. Lamb's finding is echoed in that of Muslim et al. (2020). They found that the student cohort they investigated did have integrative and instrumental motivation for learning English, but they did not put sufficient effort to learn in the class, and their English performance is poor. Muslim and his colleagues argue that this problem is a result of low teachers' professionalism. The problem with the teacher in Pesantren 3 is in agreement with Parker and Raihani (2011), who postulated that 'one of the key issues that

Islamic schools face is the number and quality of teaching staff, including teacher shortages, low teacher qualifications and teacher mismatch’.

Of course, the condition in Pesantren 3 is very different from that in Pesantren 1 and 2. The two pesantrens, adopting the curriculum from the Ministry of Education and Culture, oblige English to be taught for 90 minutes per week (45 minutes x 2) in both pesantren schools. In addition, Pesantren 1 and 2 have their own policies in terms of additional English lessons. In both pesantren schools, they added another 45 minutes x 2 English lesson. In Pesantren 2, the focus of the additional class is on reading and conversation materials, while in Pesantren School A the materials are similar to the ones from the government. Moreover, every morning prior to regular classes, Pesantren School 2 students spend 30 minutes attending a language enriching programme called ‘lughoh morning’ (lughoh means language in Arabic), which focuses on either English or Arabic. Meanwhile, in Pesantren School 1, every morning the students are obliged to memorise a list of vocabularies of three languages – English, Arabic, and Indonesian. Pesantren School 1 also offers an optional English extracurricular lesson along with other lessons once a week in the afternoon, so students can choose whether they want to join the English lesson or other extracurricular lesson such as Arabic language, geography, economics, football, basketball, volleyball, calligraphy art, Arabic music, and so on. Of course these are not offered in Pesantren 3. It seems that the differences in the educational context between Pesantren School 3 and Pesantren School 1 and 2 have affected the students’ attitude towards English, which further affected their effort in learning English. Pesantren School 1 and 2 have undoubtedly supported the teaching of English, while Pesantren School 3 seemed to put very little attention to English language teaching.

**Table 2**

Comparison of the English motivational scales for the three pesantren institutions (Pesantren 1, 2, and 3).

Variables	Pesantren Sample	Means	SD	F	Sequence	Effect size
Ideal L2 Self	A	3.22	0.52	54.08*	C<B,A	0.23
	B	3.32	0.57			
	C	2.64	0.60			
Ought to L2 Self	A	2.78	0.48	64.98*	C<B,A	0.26
	B	2.98	0.58			
	C	2.25	0.52			
L2 Learning Experience	A	2.93	0.47	32.25*	A<C,B	0.15
	B	2.57	0.59			
	C	2.37	0.58			

Attitude towards English	A	2.84	0.46	38.47*	C<B,A	0.18
	B	2.87	0.66			
	C	2.33	0.55			
Milieu	A	2.76	0.50	45.72*	C<B,A	A
	B	2.82	0.54			
	C	2.29	0.43			
Intended Learning Effort	A	2.82	0.37	31.04*	C<B,A	0.15
	B	2.83	0.47			
	C	2.45	0.46			

'<' indicates significant difference, ',' indicates non-significant difference.

\* The mean difference is significant at the .008 level.

#### 4.3. The regression model based on the intended learning efforts as the criterion measure for English learning motivation in the three institutions

The model summary presented in Table 3 reveals that out of five scales there was only one scale that significantly contributed to Pesantren 1 students' effort in learning English by predicting the criterion measure, namely the L2 Learning Experience. The correlation is significant at  $p < 0.008$ . The R<sup>2</sup> value was 0.45, which implies that the model explains 45 percent of the variation in the Intended Learning Effort. Similarly, in Pesantren 2, there was also only one scale that contributed significantly to the students' effort in learning English, namely the Ought to L2 Self, significant at  $p < 0.008$ . The R<sup>2</sup> value is 0.58, implying that the model explains 58 percent of the variation in the Intended Learning Effort. The finding in Pesantren 3 is similar to that in Pesantren 1, in that the L2 Learning Experience becomes the only significant predictor of the criterion measure. The R<sup>2</sup> value was 0.67, which implies that the model explains 67 percent of the variation in the Intended Learning Effort.

It is quite surprising, however, to find that only one component of the L2 Motivational Self System appears as a significant predictor of Intended Learning Effort in the regression model ( $p > 0.008$ ) in each Pesantren school. While in Pesantren 1 the construct of L2 Learning Experience explained 24 percent of the variation in the Intended Learning Effort, in Pesantren 3 it explained a much higher percentage of 48 percent of the variation in the criterion measure. Meanwhile, the Ought-to L2 Self explained 41 percent in the criterion measure in Pesantren 2. The L2 Learning Experience was not strong enough to predict the criterion measure in Pesantren 2, explaining only 11 percent of the variation in the Intended Learning Effort.

The Ideal L2 Self, which is one of the main components in the L2 Motivational Self System, did not significantly predict the Intended Learning Effort in the three institutions, while the Ought-to L2 Self had only a little contribution to Pesantren 3 students' motivation, explaining 10 percent of the variation in the criterion measure. The

other scales with the  $p$  value of  $> 0.01$ , which implies that they do not predict the criterion measure in the three Pesantren, can be seen in Table 4. 3.

It is interesting to see the ought-to L2 self so prominent in predicting reported learning effort in Pesantren 2, indicating that the most important factor that motivates the learners' motivation to learn English is the status of English as a compulsory subject in school. Therefore they need to gain approval of their teachers and people around them and also pass English periodical examinations. Meanwhile, the L2 Learning Experience becomes the second most influential factor to motivation to learn English in Pesantren 2, followed by the Ideal L2 Self. In Pesantren 3 the regression analysis revealed that there is one scale that significantly contributed to pesantren 3 students' effort in learning English by predicting their reported learning effort, namely the L2 Learning Experience with the  $R^2$  value of 32.31. The predictors explain 32.31 percent of the variation in the Intended Learning Effort. The first three predictors of the criterion measure in Pesantren 3 are the main components of the L2 Motivational Self System. Similar to the finding in Pesantren 1, the strongest predictor of the criterion measure in Pesantren 3 is the L2 Learning Experience, which is followed by the Ought to L2 Self. The Ideal L2 Self becomes the third predictor of the criterion measure, and this result resembles the finding in Pesantren 2.

**Table 3**

Regression model for the three pesantren students' motivation to learn English based on intended learning efforts as the criterion measure.

<b>Model Summary</b>					
<b>Scales</b>	<b><i>B</i></b>	<b><i>SE B</i></b>	<b><i>B</i></b>	<b><i>t</i></b>	<b><i>Sig.</i></b>
<b>Pesantren 1</b>					
L2 Learning Experience	0.23	0.07	0.29	3.39	0.00*
Ideal L2 Self	0.17	0.07	0.25	2.33	0.02
Attitude towards English	0.17	0.08	0.21	2.08	0.04
Milieu	-.03	.06	-.04	-.41	0.69
Ought to L2 Self	.02	.07	.03	0.28	0.78
$R^2$	0.45				
$F$ for change in $R^2$	12.00				
<b>Pesantren 2</b>					
Ought to L2 Self	0.24	0.07	0.30	3.37	0.00*
L2 Learning Experience	0.17	0.06	0.21	2.71	0.01
Ideal L2 Self	0.18	0.08	0.22	2.30	0.02

Attitude towards English	0.11	0.06	0.15	1.69	0.10
Milieu	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.53	0.60
R <sup>2</sup>	0.58				
F for change in R <sup>2</sup>	21.51				
<b>Pesantren 3</b>					
L2 Learning Experience	0.27	0.06	0.34	4.74	0.00*
Ought to L2 Self	0.15	0.06	0.17	2.40	0.02
Ideal L2 Self	0.13	0.06	0.17	2.05	0.04
Attitude towards English	0.14	0.07	0.17	2.04	0.04
Milieu	0.13	0.06	0.12	2.01	0.05
R <sup>2</sup>	0.67				
F for change in R <sup>2</sup>	32.31				

\*p < 0.01.

To interpret the finding, apart from the differences in the motivation level, it is interesting to find that it is the learning experience that plays the most important role in motivating learners in the three pesantrens, especially in Pesantren 1 and Pesantren 3. That is to say that it is learning enjoyment, the teacher's teaching methods and strategies, and the class favourable learning atmosphere that make them more likely to put effort in learning English. This finding is similar to the findings in some Asian contexts. Lamb's (2012) study with Indonesian lower secondary school pupils in the three different contexts – an Indonesian metropolitan city, a provincial town, and a rural district – found that it is the causal dimension – the L2 Learning Experience – that contributes to learners' reported learning effort. Similarly, in their comparative study in China, Japan and Iran, Taguchi et al. (2009) reported that it is attitude to L2 learning that contributes most to intended learning effort in Japan and Iran, but not in China. In China, the Ought-to L2 Self became the dominant factor that contributes to motivation.

The finding in the study of Taguchi et al. (2009) is mirrored in the current study in Pesantren 2. In terms of the factor that contributes most to Intended Learning Effort, Pesantren 2 students are slightly different from their two counterparts. The Ought-to L2 Self is the most powerful factor that affects learners' English language learning motivation in Pesantren 2, explaining 41% of the variance in the criterion measure. The finding in Pesantren 2 is, again, similar to that in China in Chen et al's (2005) study. They postulated that Chinese learners tend to have the notion of obliged motivation, which undermines the role of learning experience in the classroom. This finding suggests that although Dörnyei et al. (2006) did not find Ought-to Self as a major motivational factor in their Hungarian study, nor did Kormos and Csizér (2008) with older learners of in the same country, it does not necessarily mean that the construct is not important in other

contexts. Pesantren 2 does not only emphasise English learning at school, but also in the student dormitories (pondok). Apart from the English subject minimum passing grade of 80.00 at school (higher than that of Ministry of Education standard), Pesantren 2 students are obliged to attend various English and Arabic language enrichment programme at their dormitories, such as muhadharah (public speaking), muhadathah (conversation), and tazwid al-mufradat (vocabulary enrichment) programmes both in English and Arabic. Perhaps, the enforced nature of English subjects both at school and dormitory has made the Pesantren 2 students feel the need to gain the approval of their teachers and people around them.

The discrepancy of findings in the three pesantren is interesting in itself; for even though the study was conducted in the same country, different results were obtained. This study partly supports Kormos et al.'s (2011) proposal that the Ought-to L2 Self may have some importance in the Asian context. We would say partly because findings in Pesantren 1 and 3 suggest that it is attitude to learning experience that matters, as it does in Lamb's (2012) study in Indonesia, Islam's (2013) study in Pakistan, and Taguchi et al.'s (2009) in Iran and Japan. Therefore, the researcher argues that it is the individual context that inevitably determines students' motivation for learning English, and further determines the motivational factor that best contributes to the learners' motivation. In this study, it is argued that support provided by each institution to English learning, the teachers' teaching skills, the learning environment, and many contextual factors are crucial elements that help shape students' attitudes to language being learned, and these factors are also crucial in shaping their ideal L2 selves.

## **5. Conclusion**

The present study aimed to analyze the impacts of schools on students' motivation. The present study analyzed three pesantren schools in Indonesia in order to compare students' motivation as well as their motivational factors. The present study applied a mixed method approach. Based on the research questions outlined in section 2.3, this study has shown that pesantren students' motivation are varied according to institutions they belong to. The variations can be ascribed to the educational contexts as they provided different support to English learning. It can be argued that this different support to English learning leads students to have different learning experiences and Ideal L2 Self. In Pesantren 1 and 2, where support is provided, the students enjoyed learning English and had a positive learning experience. In Pesantren 2 where students were demanded to gain approval of their teachers both at school and dormitory, the Ought-to L2 self becomes the most significant contributor to learning effort. Hence, in both institutions it is easier for the students to find the motives why they should learn English, which further affects their motivation. Meanwhile, in Pesantren 3, due to the lack of support for English learning, it was difficult for the students to have a positive learning experience.

It was also difficult for them to envision themselves as a future user of English, which consequently makes their motivation low. Therefore, we argue that it is the individual educational context that plays an essential role in shaping students' motivation. However, the researcher does not claim that the institutions being studied here are representing their affiliations. More schools with the same affiliations need to be involved in the study. A different result could be obtained from a Salafi pesantren school that provides better support to English learning. Finally, the findings in this study offers pedagogical implications that students cannot be merely labelled motivated or unmotivated to learn English because students' motivation in learning fluctuates depending on how positive their learning experience is and how much they can imagine themselves as future users of the language. If the school can facilitate a favourable learning experience and awaken students' vision as future English speakers, this would certainly boost their learning effort.

This research also offers an insight into further research, that is, researching the influence of students' religious identity on their motivation to learn a foreign language. This can be done, for example, by including constructs related to their religious identity, such as a construct measuring how they perceive English as a threat to their religious identity or a construct measuring how they view English as a medium of da'wah (Islamic propagation).

## References

- Anderman, E. M., & Maehr, M. L. (1994). Motivation and schooling. *Review of Educational Research*, 64, 287-309.
- Bowen, G.A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), p.27-40.
- Chen, J. F., Warden, C. A., & Chang, H.-T. (2005). Motivators that do not motivate: The case of Chinese EFL learners and the influence of culture on motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 609–633.
- Chowdhury, Q. H. (2022). English and development: Voices from a rural Bangladeshi Madrasa. *Applied Linguistics*, 43(3), 413-432.
- Coe, R. (2002). It's the effect size, stupid 1, what effect size is and why it is important. In: *the British Educational Research Association annual conference, 1214 September, 2002, Exeter*. [Online]. [Accessed 06 May 2019]. Available from: <https://www.cem.org/attachments/ebe/ESguide.pdf>
- Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*. 16(3), 297-334.
- Crookes, G. and Schmidt, R.W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512.
- Csizér, K. & Kormos, J. (2009). Learning experiences, selves and motivated learning behaviour: A comparative analysis of structural models for Hungarian secondary and university learners of English. *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self. Bristol: Multilingual Matters*, 98-119.

- Denscombe, M. (2007). *Good research guide: for small-scale social research*. New York: Open University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In motivation, language identity and the L2 Self, ed. Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 9-42. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2019). Towards a better understanding of the L2 learning experience, the Cinderella of the L2 Motivational Self System. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(1), 19-30.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Chan, L.J.L. (2013). Motivation and vision: An analysis of future L2 self images, sensory styles, and imagery capacity across two target languages. 63(3), 437-462.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E., (2021). *Teaching and researching motivation* Third Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., & Németh, N. (2006). *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation: A Hungarian perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Farid, A., & Lamb, M. (2020). English for *Da'wah*? L2 motivation in Indonesian pesantren schools. *System*, 94, 1-13.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: the role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (2007). Motivation and second language acquisition. *Porta Linguarum*, 8, 9-20.
- Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie*, 13(4), 266.-272.
- Gardner, R.C., Smythe, P.C., & Clément, R. (1979). Intensive second language study in a bicultural milieu: An Investigation Of Attitudes, Motivation And Language Proficiency. *Language Learning*, 29(2), 305-320.
- Henry, A., & Thorsen, C. (2020). Disaffection and agentic engagement: 'Redesigning' activities to enable authentic self-expression. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(4), 456-475.
- Higgins, E.T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*. 94(3), 319-340.
- Hiver, P., & Papi, M. (2020). Complexity and L2 Motivation. In Lamb, M., Csizer, K., Henry, A., & Ryan, S. Eds. *Palgrave Macmillan Handbook of Motivation for Language Learning*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 117-138
- Islam, M., Lamb, M., & Chambers, G. (2013). The L2 motivational self system and national interest: A Pakistani perspective. *System*, 41(2), 231-244.

- Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2008). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behavior. *Language Learning*, 58(2), 327-355.
- Kormos, J., Kiddle, T., & Csizér, K. (2011). Systems of goals, attitudes, and self-related beliefs in second-language-learning motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(5), 495-516.
- Lamb, M. (2007). The impact of school on EFL learning motivation: An Indonesian case study. *Tesol Quarterly*. 41(4), 757-780.
- Lamb, M. (2009). Situating the L2 self: Two Indonesian school learners of English. In Dörnyei Z. and Ushioda E. eds. *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 229-247.
- Lamb, M. (2012). A self system perspective on young adolescents' motivation to learn English in urban and rural settings. *Language Learning*. 62(4), 997-1023.
- Lamb, M. (2017). Young adult Indonesians' use of English outside of class vs their motivation to learn English in class. Unpublished research.
- Lamb, M., & Wedell, M. (2014). Cultural contrasts and commonalities in inspiring language teaching. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(2), 207–224.
- Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System*, 32(1), 3-19.
- Macintyre, P. D., Mackinnon, S. P., & Clément, R. J. M. (2009). The baby, the bathwater, and the future of language learning motivation research. In: Dörnyei Z. and Ushioda E. eds, *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 43-65.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*. 41(9), 954-969.
- Martin, L. (2013) 'Your mum and dad can't teach you!': constraints on agency among rural learners of English in the developing world, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(1), 14-29.
- Muslim, A. B., Hamied, F. A., & Sukyadi, D. (2020). Integrative and instrumental but low investment: The English learning motivation of Indonesian senior secondary school students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 493-507
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using SPSS*. 3rd edition. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System*. 38(3), 467-479.
- Parker, L. & Raihani, R. (2011). Democratizing Indonesia through education? Community participation in Islamic schooling. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 39(6), 712-732.
- Piedmont, R. L. (2014). Inter-item Correlations. In: A. C. Michalos, ed. *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 3303-3304.
- Pintrich, P.R., & D.H. Schunk. (2007). *Motivation in education: Theory, research and applications*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

- Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Dörnyei Z. and Ushioda E. eds. *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 66-97.
- Ushioda E. (2012) Motivation: L2 Learning as a Special Case?. In: Mercer S., Ryan S., Williams M. (eds) *Psychology for Language Learning*. Palgrave Macmillan, London
- Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the ideal L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. In Dörnyei Z. and Ushioda E. eds. *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 144-163.