

College EFL Learners' Speaking Motivation under English-medium Instruction Policy

Jeong-Yeon Kim

Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology, Korea

This study aims to examine how English-medium instruction policy in an EFL context is interrelated with L2 motivation and achievement of the students taking a college English speaking course. The data consisted of 88 Korean college students' questionnaire responses, final scores in an English speaking course, and qualitative interviews with 8 students. The findings indicated that the students had higher extrinsic motivation than intrinsic motivation. Participants' perception of contributions of foreign instructors and of the English-medium instruction has been examined as the two subscales of the learning context under English-medium instruction policy, which engendered high scores. Whereas these contextual factors had significant correlations with achievement in speaking, motivation was found to have no direct correlation with the achievement. The results corroborate the roles of the learning context in the learning process as motivational subscales affect achievement through their interplay with the context. The role of the English-medium instruction policy, therefore, is significant as a mediating factor, which influences students' motivation on the one hand and their speaking achievement on the other hand.

Keywords: English-medium instruction policy, L2 motivation, learning context, L2 speaking achievement

INTRODUCTION

Recently, Korean colleges and universities, as the centers of higher education, have struggled to cope with the challenge of establishing and improving global competitiveness. The challenge came mainly from outside the campuses such as more standardized evaluation of the colleges conducted by Korea's major journalism newspapers, e.g., *Chungang Daily* and *Chosun Daily*. Among their evaluation criteria, globalization has been received as a tremendous challenge, since it requires a change in education, academic exchanges, and administration. Many universities have attempted to reinforce foreign language programs and to recruit foreign students to be members of their student body. One of the strategies chosen by several universities is a policy change, which mandates English to be used as a medium of interaction in all the sectors of universities including administration, research, and education. The ramifications of this policy shift are especially apparent since it has forced many institutions to abandon Korean as a medium of instruction in favor of a shift to English, so called English-medium instruction (EMI).

EMI creates an unusual learning environment in Korea's English as a foreign language (EFL) context. According to Oxford and Shearin (1994), a foreign language is "one that is learned in a place where that language is not typically used as the medium of ordinary communication" (p. 14), such as the English language used in Korea. By contrast, a second language is "one that is learned in a location where that language is typically used as the main vehicle of everyday communication for most people" (Oxford & Shearin, 1994, p. 14). Students in the EFL context typically receive input from the target language only in a classroom setting and lack the opportunities that second language students would have to practice the target language on a daily basis. EMI, apparently, helps to create a second language environment in a foreign language context, at least in the physical boundary of classrooms. Students, while learning a subject course in English, have more contact with English, which may foster their learning process.

This study examines how EMI policy might correlate with English learners'

motivation to learn English speaking and their achievement in a Korean college context. Second language (L2) motivation has received attention from L2 researchers, as it is one of the nonlinguistic outcomes of L2 learning (Gardner, 1996) and affects the entire learning process as well (e.g., Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; Dörnyei, 2001; Kim, 2010; Kormos, Kiddle, & Csizér, 2011; Noels, Pelletier, & Vallerand, 2000; Vandergrift, 2005). However, little is known how EMI, practiced in an EFL country like Korea, is interrelated with students' motivation to learn specific linguistic skills and with their learning outcomes.

This study addresses the gap in research, the findings of which will help L2 educators understand better the effects of EMI policy on the learning process. In Korean society, in which English proficiency is a major factor for academic and occupational advance, this study will ultimately provide information on how to design a more effective L2 curriculum and globalization policy.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

L2 Motivation and Learner Autonomy

L2 motivation, a major learner factor, is strongly influenced by social and contextual factors (Kormos, Kiddle, & Csizér, 2011). Beginning in the 1990s, motivation has drawn attention from researchers who attempted to examine the dynamic workings of motivation in specific educational contexts of L2 learning (Dörnyei, 2001; Kim, 2010; Noels, Pelletier, & Vallerand, 2000; Vandergrift, 2005). In the self-determination theory proposed by Deci and Ryan (1985, 1995), learners' motivation can be classified into three different categories: amotivation, extrinsic motivation, and intrinsic motivation. Lying on a continuum, the three categories represent the extent to which a learner is autonomous while participating in specific learning activities (Noels et al., 2000; Vandergrift, 2005). For example, learners may see no relation between their actions and the consequences of those actions, i.e., the state of amotivation; as a result, they will be least autonomous in learning the target

language. When learners are motivated for the sake of certain rewards for their current actions, extrinsic motivation is manifested. This instrumental-goal oriented motivation can be divided into three subtypes, which again indicate the extent to which learners are autonomous or self-determined: external regulation (pursuit of an external reward, such as a good job), introjected regulation (a more internalized form of motivation, such as becoming a good citizen), and identified regulation (pursuit of a certain value placed on the outcome of language learning). On the other extreme of the continuum of motivation, a more intrinsic type of motivation is specified, which involves a drive for enjoyment and satisfaction. Vallerand and colleagues (Vallerand, 1997; Vallerand et al., 1992, 1993) have extended this dimension of self-determination theory further by dividing intrinsic motivation into three subtypes, each increasingly more self-determined: knowledge (motivation to perform an activity for the feelings associated with acquiring knowledge), accomplishment (sensations related to attempting to master a task or to achieve a goal), and stimulation (the most self-determined subtype of motivation which refers to sensations stimulated by performing a task, such as excitement). Autonomous learners tend to be highly intrinsically motivated, which will consequently promote achievement.

Several conflicting results have been found regarding the effects of intrinsic motivation on learning L2. Regarding personal choice in L2 motivation, Asian American children did not particularly favor freedom of choice (Iyengar & Lepper, 1999; Littlewood, 1999; Murray, 2007). They were more intrinsically motivated when choices were made for them by trusted authorities, such as their teachers. However, interestingly, some L2 motivation studies on Korean EFL learners revealed that intrinsic motivation has a stronger bearing on L2 achievement (Pae, 2007; Yang, 2009, 2011). For example, Yang (2011), in her study of motivation in a college listening class, showed that identified value regulation was highly interrelated with the students' language proficiency. She emphasized that motivational orientation should be firmly internalized in order to facilitate L2 listening proficiency.

Contributions of Learning Context to L2 Motivation and Outcome

The recent trend viewing motivation as a dynamic learner variable reflects the influence of a sociocultural perspective of learning on SLA research. Learning is largely a social process (Haijun & Gorke, 2008; Kim, 2010; Turuk, 2008; Wold, 2011), and, as Turuk (2008) notes, effective L2 learning can occur when L2 learners reflect on their new surroundings and change their beliefs based on these reflections. This process of reflective interaction influences the learners' current approaches to learning and transforms their social and cognitive developments (Nguyen, 2010; Phan, 2010). It is therefore important to understand how the learners perceive the learning itself as well as the surrounding context as these perceptions will be closely related with their learning outcomes.

In this learner-centered perspective of L2 learning, learners' own perception of the roles of English is closely related to their individual goals and to the society which the learners will belong to. Their needs for learning specific English skills, such as speaking and writing, may change across English courses, such as English for general purpose, for academic purpose, or for specific purposes (Liu, Chang, Yang, & Sun, 2011). Meanwhile, L2 learners' learning goals may depend on the status of English as a lingua franca as perceived by the learners (Kormos, Kiddle, & Csizér, 2011). What is highlighted in this study is the contribution of the systems of the social, cultural, and instructional settings in which the learners are situated, because these external conditions influence the learners' internal motivation. L2 proficiency levels, therefore, may also change depending upon L2 learners' individual differences, which are in close interaction with context variables (Kozaki & Ross, 2011).

Immersion environments have been considered learning contexts which provide extended opportunities to interact in a target language. Baker and MacIntyre (2003) examined the influences of an immersion environment on foreign language learners' willingness to communicate (WTC) in an L2 French classroom. The students in the immersion programs showed higher WTC and

lower communication anxiety. Dörnyei (1990) argued that integrative motivation, or a type of motivation to integrate into the target language group or culture, is often necessary to achieve a certain level of proficiency in the L2. Since EFL learners have limited access to the target language, their motivation to learn the language would be less integrative (Dörnyei, 1990). Providing an immersion environment for the EFL learners, then, may compensate for the lack of exposure to the target language, and as a result, the learners may tend to be more integratively, or intrinsically, motivated.

Given the crucial role of the context in the workings of motivation and L2 achievement, EMI, as a specific learning context, creates substantial challenges for learners and instructors alike. The next section addresses the challenges examined by the previous research on EMI in EFL countries.

Positive and Negative Perspectives of EMI

Recently, L2 researchers have investigated EMI practiced in many Asian countries, where English is a main factor for academic and social achievement. In a study of relationship between Turkish college students' motivation and EMI, Kirkgöz (2005) showed that most of the students were motivated towards EMI courses instrumentally rather than integratively. That is, they pursued better jobs by taking EMI courses. A positive effect was found in the students' confidence in reading and writing English, which improved significantly while taking EMI classes. The other, most frequently proposed positive effect of EMI has a great bearing on the globalization of the campus, as the universities have attracted more international students and globalized their campuses (Hou, Morse, Chiang, & Chen, 2013; Jensen & Johannesson, 1995; Manakul, 2007; Tsuneyoshi, 2005). For example, due to the governmental emphasis on globalization of higher education in Korea, the number of foreign students in Korean universities increased from 15,000 in 2005 to over 60,000 in 2010, or 400% growth (e-Narajipyo, 2013).

Negative aspects of English-medium instruction in Asian countries have mainly centered on ineffective delivery of course content and little evidence of

English improvement (e.g., Akar, 2010; Bang, 2007; Chang, 2010; Cho, 2012; Hou, 2011; Hou et al., 2013; Jensen & Johannesson, 1995; Kahng, 1999; Manakul, 2007; Manh, 2012; Oh & Lee, 2010; Tsuneyoshi, 2005). Manh (2012) examined difficulties that students and instructors experienced in an EMI classroom of a Vietnamese college. English use was limited to comprehension, as the lectures were offered in monologs in EMI classrooms. Given the socio-economic impacts of EMI, Manh highlighted the importance of the preparation stage before launching EMI, in which students' and instructors' perception of EMI should be identified. Similarly, Chang (2010) reported students' negative reaction to EMI courses of a Chinese university and emphasized the need of sufficient English proficiency of the students to take EMI courses.

Studies on EMI in the context of a Korean university have shown more specific consequences as a result of its implementation (e.g., Bang, 2007; Cho, 2012; Kang & Park, 2005; Kim, 2002). Students, taking EMI courses, were found to pay more attention to content than to language itself (Kim, 2002). Moreover, as Kang and Park (2005) highlighted, they hardly received feedback on language forms in oral and written activities and had few opportunities for linguistic development. Bang (2007) and Cho (2012) also reported that instructors and students of an engineering university perceived EMI negatively. In order to deal with difficulties of EMI, Cho (2012) suggested, universities should offer systematic services for the instructors along with a new English curriculum to improve the English proficiency of the engineering major students.

Research Questions

The studies on the effects of EMI of Asian countries have addressed various challenges for EMI policy of higher education, such as curriculum adjustment to multi-cultural classrooms, need of administrative assistance for faculty development, and national-level educational support. However, little is known regarding the roles of an English policy like EMI in the interplay between

motivation and learning English speaking. This study attempted to explore this topic with a case of a college English speaking course, and, thereby, to show the dynamic workings of L2 motivation under EMI policy in an EFL context. In order to understand the relationship between motivation, context, and L2 achievement, the following three research questions were developed:

- (1) What are the L2 motivational orientations of Korean EFL college students who have taken an English speaking course under EMI policy?
- (2) How are the motivational orientations and the perception of the learning context interrelated with each other?
- (3) In what ways do motivational orientations and the learning context affect the students' L2 achievement?

METHODS

The EMI Context and Participants

The study was conducted in a large research-oriented university located in a metropolitan city in South Korea. Since the year of 2009, the university had enforced English-medium instruction for all the credit courses including required and elective major subjects. That is, in subject courses other than English, all the class activities were administered through the medium of English. Students not only used class materials, including textbooks, written in English, but also took exams in English. However, outside the classrooms, instructors and students had no restrictions on the medium of communication, and spoke Korean or English during office hours.

A total of 88 college freshmen taking an English speaking course, 68 males, and 20 females, participated in this study. The course was offered to the students who had taken one general English course in the previous semester. Undecided on their specific majors, the participants' field of study was indicated either as business management or as engineering. Between speaking and writing, the participants in the study had chosen the speaking course in order to fulfill the English language requirement of the university.

The Organization of the Classes

The speaking classes were offered in two different settings, i.e., a larger overview component given by one foreign instructor (Chris) and a small discussion component given by the other instructor (Nicole), both being B. A. holders from Canada. Chris was in charge of giving an overview of the weekly topic and materials, and thus, met students in a class in which two smaller discussion groups are combined. Nicole handled six activity-focused weekly sessions. The sizes of her groups ranged from 14 to 23.

The learning materials included practices of English conversations and instructions of several basics of English grammar (e.g., 'I run' versus 'I am running'). Each unit consisted of a general explanation of a topic using audio/video material and subsequent quizzes. The students were expected to watch and/or listen to audio/video materials linked to the class website and to read/watch lesson materials before they participate in the class activities with the foreign instructors. The mid-term and final exams included completing a conversation on a written exam, and giving an oral presentation on a topic of their choice.

Procedure

The study used both quantitative and qualitative methods. A thirteen-item questionnaire was constructed based on the Language Learning Orientations Scale presented and used by many SLA researchers, including Noels et al. (2000) and Vandergrift (2005). The questionnaire consisted of two parts: items 1-9 on motivation and items 10-13 on the learning environment. Specifically, items on motivation represented three different types of motivation: extrinsic motivation (items 1-5), intrinsic motivation (items 6-8), and amotivation (item 9). Extrinsic motivation has been classified into three subscales: external regulation (items 1 and 2), introjected regulation (items 3 and 4) and identified regulation (item 5). For intrinsic motivation subscales, each of the three items (6, 7, and 8) represented knowledge, accomplishment, and stimulation,

respectively. The remaining item (item 9) represented amotivation. Thus, a total of 7 motivational orientations were examined in the descriptive analysis (See Appendix).

In order to identify EMI policy-related factors, the researcher recruited 11 freshmen and organized a focus group, who freely talked about what they thought significant in classrooms under EMI policy. Their responses showed that EMI policy had directly affected the participants in two specific areas: the English class taught by foreign instructors and all the other subject classes being taught in English. Accordingly, the contributions of foreign instructors, as perceived by the participants, were addressed in two items (items 10 and 11), and the participants' perception of EMI in other subject classes was also addressed in two items (item 12 and 13).

All the participants completed the questionnaire, written in Korean, between the tenth and the thirteenth week of the semester. Then, eight students were selected for an interview with the researcher. Asked by the instructors, students volunteered for the interview with the researcher according to their availability for the interview times. Among the selected students, four students' (ST01-ST04) final scores in the speaking course ranged from 82.6% to 87.4%, while the scores of the other four students (ST05-08) were between 88.5% and 93%. The interviews were conducted in Korean for 20-30 minutes with each student with questions drawn from the questionnaires. They also freely discussed and/or written about episodic experiences regarding EMI classes and foreign instructors.

Data Analysis

The 13 items in the questionnaire were presented in Likert scale (1-5) according to the responder's level of agreement to the given statement, 1 corresponding to 'strongly disagree' and 5 to 'strongly agree'. In addition to the responses, their final scores were coded for the examination of the relationship between the motivational/contextual constructs and the achievement in the speaking class. The SPSS statistical program was used to process the

quantitative data. The statistical analysis included descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients, which calculated the participants' motivational modality, their perception of the two contextual factors, the interrelationship between motivation and contextual factors, and its contribution to L2 speaking achievement. Cronbach's alpha was calculated to check the internal consistency and reliability of the questionnaire items on motivation. The reliability estimate was 0.792 in Cronbach's coefficient alpha value, which was considered acceptable for this study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Motivational Types in the Speaking Course

The first research question concerned the motivational dynamics which the participating students showed in three overarching types of motivation, i.e., extrinsic motivation (EM), intrinsic motivation (IM), and amotivation (AM). The EM and the IM were reclassified into 3 subscales respectively; external regulation, introjected regulation, and identified regulation under EM, knowledge, accomplishment and stimulation under IM.

As Table 1 shows, the students taking the English speaking course had low AM. That is, they were motivated to learn English speaking extrinsically and/or intrinsically, and their response scores marked higher than average, i.e., 3. Between EM and IM, their EM score was a little higher than their IM score, which explains that the students tended to be motivated to learn English more extrinsically than intrinsically. Specifically, they were found to relate English speaking to self-improvement (Identified EM) more than the other EM subscales, i.e., rewards in their majors or future jobs (External EM), display of ability to speak English to friends or teachers (Introjected EM). In other words, they pursued rather long-term rewards for learning English speaking.

Among the three IM subscales, stimulation scored highest. That is, the students were strongly motivated to learn speaking for enjoyment and

satisfaction from successful interactions with English native speakers in a daily conversation (IM Stimulation). They were less intrinsically motivated to learn English speaking to acquire knowledge of western ways of thinking (IM Knowledge) or to feel accomplishment (IM Accomplishment).

TABLE 1
Motivational Types

Motivational types (item number)	Mean	<i>SD</i>
EM (items 1-5)	4.50	.48
External EM (items 1 and 2)	4.55	.59
Introjected EM (items 3 and 4)	4.39	.56
Identified EM (item 5)	4.57	.56
IM (items 6-8)	3.76	.65
IM Knowledge (item 6)	3.84	.89
IM Accomplishment (item 7)	3.49	.91
IM Stimulation (item 8)	3.95	.95
AM (item 9)	1.88	.87

According to self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1995; Vallerand, 1997; Vallerand et al., 1992, 1993), IM-stimulation is the most self-determined subtype of motivation which was often associated with L2 achievement. The highest score among the three subscales of intrinsic motivation, then, is noteworthy, given the stronger tendency of extrinsic motivation in the participants' group. In other words, although a significant number of the students tended to be highly extrinsically oriented to learning English speaking, some participants were autonomous in learning speaking with the most internalized form of motivation. This extremity in motivation shows the opposite attitudes to English speaking that many Korean English learners have; while to some students, English speaking is only for certain external rewards, but to others, it is for their own enjoyment or satisfaction. The participants in the currently study showed extremes in their different average scores in EM and IM subscales. These extremes were also revealed in

interviews. The following interview scripts show the differences in motivation of the two students, one who was extrinsically (ST06) and the other intrinsically (ST07) motivated to learn English speaking.

Before college, speaking English was only one of the options to me. I thought that TOEIC score of 850 was enough for me. However for now, that score is not good enough for me. I feel like I need a good score on TOEIC speaking now. (ST06)

I was thrilled to take this course from foreign instructors, because most professors are Korean and I felt like it was relatively easy to understand their spoken English. I think I was more interested in communicating with them or experiencing their native English, not in the subject itself. (ST07)

Students' Perception of the Learning Context under EMI Policy

For the examination of how the students taking the English-speaking course would perceive the learning context, their responses to the questionnaire items on the two contextual factors, i.e., foreign instructors (FI) and English-medium instruction (EMI), were calculated in terms of the mean scores. Cronbach's coefficient alpha values or reliability estimates for these factors were 0.605 for FI and 0.737 for EMI, respectively, which were considered acceptable in this study.

The results, as presented in Table 2, indicated that the participants evaluated highly the effectiveness of the factors on learning English. EMI marked the higher score than FI, its mean being more than 4. The students felt driven to English speaking, situated in the environment under the university's strong EMI policy, taking other subject classes in English. They also felt comfortable with the class taught by the foreign instructors that they met on a weekly basis, and responded positively as to the foreign instructor's contribution to their learning.

TABLE 2
Perception of the EMI Context

Contextual factors (item numbers)	Mean	<i>SD</i>
FI (items 10 and 11)	3.85	.87
EMI (items 12 and 13)	4.27	.85

The following interview script shows specific areas of assistance which a student received from a foreign instructor. The foreign instructors' contribution is also related to the interviewee's affective problem.

I used to think I was not that good at speaking English. I was always anxious, speaking English. In the speaking course, however, the foreign instructors always tried to encourage all of us to express our individual ideas into real words. They listened to us carefully and patiently even when we made a mistake, and then gave a proper feedback. Their efforts were really helpful for me to gain confidence in speaking English. (ST04)

In the correlation analysis, FI was found to correlate significantly with EMI ($r = .340$) at the 0.01 level. This result corroborates that these two factors are not to be separated from each other. The participants of this study were conscious of the foreign instructors' contributions to taking EMI courses. During the qualitative interview, one of the participating students commented on the relationship between the policy and the class that she had been taking.

Before I entered this university, I thought this 100% English lecture was just a gesture to attract more students. So did my friends. But we are really doing it! It's difficult, but I think ultimately there's more gain than loss. At least, we have more opportunities to use English. We have foreign, native English-speaking instructors in this course, too. It's good to listen to real pronunciation. (ST01)

As revealed in the interview data, the participants related EMI policy to more significant roles of foreign instructors, and further, to English speaking proficiency rather than writing. Apparently, for the first-year college students,

these two contextual factors created challenges in English learning, but, at the same time, encouraged them to improve English.

These contextual factors correlated with most of motivational constructs (Table 3). Significant correlation between FI and motivational constructs is not surprising since the roles that foreign instructors play in the EMI classrooms are substantial in a speaking course. Therefore, although the students related contributions of instructors to their external rewards, they perceived, more strongly, the instructors to be helpful for learning English-speaking countries' culture (IM knowledge), successful communication (IM Stimulation), and especially, a feeling of accomplishment (IM Accomplishment). Meanwhile, the more the students appreciated the effect of EMI context on their learning, the more they tended to be extrinsically motivated to learn English speaking. That is, the context reinforced the students' orientation to external rewards, such as their future major or job (External EM), global citizenship/display of ability to speak English to friends and teachers (Introjected EM), or personal improvement (Identified EM). EMI also affected students' intrinsic orientation, specifically the feeling of accomplishment (IM Accomplishment). A strong negative correlation was found between the participants' perception of the context and amotivation; as long as they had a certain level of motivation to learn English speaking, they tended to evaluate positively the contribution of the university's EMI policy.

TABLE 3
Correlation Coefficients Between Motivation and Contextual Factors

Motivation/Contextual Factors	FI	EMI
EM in total	.292** (.006)	.382** (.000)
External EM	.327** (.002)	.449** (.000)
Introjected EM	.167 (.119)	.243* (.023)
Identified EM	.243* (.022)	.272* (.010)
IM in total	.462** (.000)	.233* (.029)
IM Knowledge	.347** (.001)	.065 (.550)
IM Accomplishment	.418** (.000)	.338** (.001)
IM Stimulation	.319** (.002)	.144 (.182)
AM	-.235* (.027)	-.496** (.000)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

The significant correlation between FI and intrinsic motivation indicates how an autonomous learner, possibly a high achiever, reacts to the context of the English speaking course. The more autonomous, intrinsically motivated the learners were, the more positive they tended to be concerning the foreign instructors in English speaking classrooms. In comparison, the other contextual variable, EMI, was moderately interrelated with learner autonomy, as this factor correlated more significantly with extrinsic motivation than with intrinsic motivation. An interviewee commented on how much she was driven to speaking English, extrinsically, because of class requirement, such as English presentation in a subject course.

EMI policy in our campus definitely motivated me to study English more. In high school, I just focused on studying English reading and listening passively. Here, every day I feel like I need to improve my speaking skill for class participation and presentation, which is required in most lectures like Introduction to Philosophy or Calculus. So I tried to improve speaking in various ways, like taking conversation course during vacation. I can say that I got more active and enthusiastic about studying English than I used to.(ST03)

Relationship Between Motivation, Contextual Factors and Speaking Achievement

The third research question concerned how the motivational and contextual constructs was interrelated with L2 speaking achievement. Their achievement scores were calculated based upon class participation, scores on the four assignments, two in-class exams on conversation, and one individual speaking project. The mean score of the participating students was 85.18 ($SD = 6.377$). In order to see if there was significant difference between the group of scores higher than the mean and the group of scores equal to or lower than the mean, the t-test was run, the result of which indicated a significant difference between the two groups (Table 4).

TABLE 4
T-Test Result Comparing Low and High Group in the Final Speaking Scores

Final Score	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Low	26	80.59	6.190	-11.401	86	.000
High	62	91.37	2.718			

The differences in achievement have then been cross-examined with the motivational and contextual constructs. First, in the examination of the relationship between motivational subscales and the students' final scores, neither EM nor IM correlated with achievement (Table 5). This finding is striking, as the statistical procedure indicated no significant association between the students' motivational disposition and their learning outcomes. Only amotivation was in significant interplay with the students' achievements as it correlated negatively with achievement ($p < .05$).

TABLE 5
Correlation Coefficients Between Motivational Subscales and Speaking Achievement

Motivational types	Achievement (<i>r</i>)	<i>p</i>
EM in total	.045	.679
External EM	.056	.602
Introjected EM	-.005	.963
Identified EM	.180	.094
IM in total	.012	.915
Knowledge	.043	.694
Stimulation	.129	.232
Accomplishment	-.052	.630
AM	-.243*	.023

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

Previous research on motivation has seldom reported a vigorous relationship between students' final scores and motivation (Noels, Clément, & Pelletier, 1999, 2001; Vandergrift, 2005). Noels and colleagues reported the significant correlation between IM and the final course grade was not high (Noels et al., 2001). Vandergrift (2005) pointed out the discrepancy between listening proficiency tasks, which were authentic and fast, and regular classroom

listening practices, which were teacher-centered, slow-paced, and contextualized. Likewise, in the current study, the grading criteria by which the students were evaluated included conventional exams, assignments and quizzes other than participation marks and one speaking project. Thus, the instructors emphasized the importance of improvement in speaking and the amount of effort made by the students, which was measured by students' observance of norms imposed on the different activities such as discussion board postings. The participants' final scores in the speaking course, then, represented not only their English speaking proficiency but also how sincere they were while participating in class activities.

Table 6 shows a positive correlation between FI and achievement. That is, the students who appreciated the contributions of the foreign instructors were likely to receive higher final scores. By contrast, the statistical analysis found no significant relationship between achievement scores and EMI. That is, the students' perception of effectiveness of EMI policy did not serve as a discriminatory factor which affects, or is affected by, the students' final achievement scores.

TABLE 6
Correlation Coefficients Between Contextual Factors and Speaking Achievement

Contextual factors	Achievement (<i>r</i>)	<i>p</i>
FI	.271*	.010
EMI	-.080	.461

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Considering the significant effect of FI on motivation, especially on intrinsic motivation and its subscales, motivation may influence L2 achievement, indirectly, through their perception of FI factor. Therefore, apparently, motivational subscales hardly affect L2 achievement in a direct manner. Instead, their impact is valid through the ways in which participants perceive the context. This three tier relationship can be represented as in the following (Figure 1).



FIGURE 1

The Mediating Function of Context between Motivation and Achievement

What is in the core of this relationship is that motivation is not a stable variable, but, it is subject to change according to the individual learner's perception of a learning context. In this case, the perception of foreign instructors contributed to being more intrinsically motivated to learn English speaking, which ultimately contributed to a better achievement in English speaking. However, EMI, which was highly correlated with motivation, was not directly relevant to the students' achievement. That is, the students' evaluation of EMI could improve with stronger motivation. The students who achieved better, however, were not necessarily the ones who highly appreciated EMI. One of the interviewees, who belonged to the top 3 % of the class, provides a comment that explains this intricate, dynamic interplay between motivation and contextual factors.

Sometimes, I think we would be better off in a normal campus (Korean-medium instruction) environment. I don't care whether it is English, Korean, or a mixture of the two. I will just do whatever I have to do in order to get good grades and to be successful. However, I have seen many of my friends frustrated because they cannot do as well as they have expected. They say that they like this EMI thing. But I don't know if it's really good for them. In order to be successful, we need to be proficient in English even before we start this university. (ST05)

CONCLUSION

Among language skills, speaking has been considered the most anxiety-provoking form of communication (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). This study examined L2 students' attitude towards learning English speaking in relation to an EMI context and their achievement in the speaking course. The number of EMI classes offered by some of the leading Korean universities gradually increased during the years 2008-2011, and, as of 2011, EMI classes take up 30 % of the classes offered in the universities (Aju University, 2011). Given the growing interest in and concerns about EMI context in higher education, the findings of this study have provided useful information on how EMI policy would interplay with English speaking motivation and achievement in the EFL context, as summarized below.

Firstly, the participants showed extremity in motivational orientations. Overall, EM score was higher than IM score. That is, they were driven to learn English speaking extrinsically than intrinsically. Interestingly, among IM subscales, IM-Stimulation, the most intrinsic and autonomous type of motivation, scored the highest. This result indicates there exists a significant divide in orientation towards learning English speaking that Korean learners of English bring to the learning context. Studies on learner variables have shown that speaking a foreign language has a great bearing on learners' affective reactions. On the one hand, as MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) highlight, it engenders a context in which a group of learners feel very anxious. For this group of learners, only external rewards would motivate them to participate in the learning context. On the other hand, for another group of learners, speaking and/or learning a foreign language is genuinely enjoyable. With their anxiety level being low, they seek their own enjoyment or satisfaction; they, thus, tend to be highly autonomous learning a foreign language.

Secondly, the participants' understanding of the immediate context, characterized by EMI policy revealed that the researched university's policy was perceived as crucial to their learning. They evaluated positively not only the classroom meeting with foreign instructors but also EMI in subject classes.

These two contextual factors were significantly correlated with each other, and, further, significantly interrelated with motivational subscales. Whereas the factor of EMI correlated more significantly with EM than with IM, FI factor was in close interaction with IM subscales. Their perception of EMI most significantly correlated with amotivation in a negative manner; as long as they had a certain level of motivation in learning English speaking, they tended to evaluate positively the effectiveness of EMI for learning English speaking.

The final research question concerned the differences in achievement in relation to the participants' motivational orientation and perception of the context. No significant correlations between achievement in speaking and motivation were found, with only amotivation determined to be most strongly interrelated with speaking achievement. Meanwhile, the analysis has found a more robust relationship between achievement and the context. There was a significant positive relationship between achievement and the perceived contributions of the foreign instructors.

The findings revealed not only who would be most successful in this speaking course, i.e., those who are genuinely interested in learning English and have a high appreciation of foreign instructors. But, the result also identified a group of learners who may not achieve as well as those who are highly autonomous in learning with greatly intrinsic motivation. One example of the latter case would be that the learners have extrinsic motivation and overestimate the contribution of the learning environment, i.e., taking classes in English-medium instruction, to enhancing motivation and ultimately L2 outcome. Meanwhile, an amotivated student tends to perceive negatively the role of a foreign instructor and EMI policy, which consequently has a negative effect on L2 achievement.

Given the results, this study corroborates the substantial effect of immediate, social context on L2 motivation, as proposed by SLA researchers (Guay & Vallerand, 1997; Kim, 2009; Kozaki & Ross, 2011; Larsen-Freeman, 2007; Macintyre & Legatto, 2011; Noels et al., 2000). The learning context is relevant in the manifestation of motivational subscales in L2 achievement. The two factors relevant to the environment, i.e., foreign instructor and English-

medium instruction policy, were found not only to correlate significantly with each other, but, more importantly, they were also in close interaction with motivational subscales. Consequently, influences of motivation on speaking achievement has only become valid through its interaction with the context.

The result may be applied to the new learning context under EMI policy in many Asian countries where English is used only in English classrooms, i.e., EFL contexts. EMI creates challenges, such as additional workload and problems related with understanding subject areas. Although learning other subjects, such as chemistry, physics, and history, in English could orient the students to learn English, the policy itself will not directly lead to better speaking achievement. The policy makers and L2 class curriculum designers need to provide more structured support. For example, given the high correlation between the context and intrinsic motivation, the campus, along with the enactment of the policy, needs to provide the students with more input regarding English culture not only in the English curriculum, but also in diverse campus-wide experiences, which will help to address the students' motivation to learn English speaking for their own enjoyment. Also, foreign instructors would be effective to enhancing motivation and learning outcome. The students with lower proficiency should receive special attention and support in EMI courses, so that their increased motivation in the context can sustain and entail successful L2 achievement.

Despite the contributions of the study to understanding motivation in relation to EMI, this study is not without limitations. First, the data of the present study are limited to a small number of the non-English major students of a university in Korea. Therefore, it is difficult to generalize the findings to other groups of students with different backgrounds and proficiency levels. Another participant-related limitation is the discrepancy in the number of male ($n=68$) and females ($n=20$). Although not considered as a major variable in this study, gender was not evenly distributed in the current dataset, thus, not controlled. Also, the findings only indicate the degree of influence of the examined factors and correlations among them, but not the causation. Therefore, they are to be cautiously interpreted, and further research may need to address the causation

in a systematic manner. Finally, since this study examined L2 achievement in terms of the final speaking score for a grading decision, it reflects neither the changes in motivation in its close relationship with contextual factors, nor the growth in speaking proficiency. The conjoint effect may be better explained through several rounds of surveys, such as pre- and post-instruction surveys.

THE AUTHOR

Jeong-Yeon Kim is a professor of Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology (UNIST) in Ulsan, South Korea. Her current research interests cover the effects of multimedia in L2 learning and relationship between L2 motivation and learning context. Her recent publications include *Relationships among motivation, contextual factors and achievement in on-offline blended English writing class* (2011) and *Learning Chinese as a foreign language in English immersion context* (2013).

Division of General Studies
Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology
50 UNIST-gil Eonyang-eup Ulju-gun
Ulsan, 689-798, Korea
Tel: (+82)-(52)-217-2013
Fax: (+82)-(52)-217-2009
Email: jkim@unist.ac.kr

REFERENCES

- Aju University.(2011). *The Ratio of English-medium instruction in selected Korean universities*. Unpublished Report of Aju University's Office of Academic Affairs.
- Akar, H. (2010). Globalization and its challenges for developing countries: the case of Turkish higher education. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 11, 447-457.

- Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2003). The role of gender and immersion in communication and second language orientations. *Language Learning, 53*(1), 65-96.
- Bang, H. (2007). *An analysis of university students' perception regarding English medium Instruction*. Unpublished MA thesis. Seoul: Korea.
- Chang, Y. (2010). English-medium instruction for subject courses in tertiary education: Reactions from Taiwanese undergraduate students. *Taiwan International ESP Journal, 2*(1), 55-84.
- Cho, D. (2012). English-medium Instruction in the university context of Korea: Tradeoff between teaching outcomes and media-initiated university ranking. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 9*(4), 135-163.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency and self-esteem* (pp. 31-49). New York: Plenum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualising motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning, 40*, 45-78.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). New themes and approaches in second language motivation research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 43-59.
- e-Narajipyo. (2013). *Study Abroad*. Retrieved August 20, 2013, from <http://www.index.go.kr>.
- Gardner, R. C. (1996). Motivation and second language acquisition: Perspectives. *Journal of the CAAL, 18*, 19-42.
- Guay, F., & Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Social context, student's motivation, and academic achievement: Toward a process model. *Social Psychology of Education, 1*, 35-58.
- Haijun, K. & Gorke, A. (2008). Rethinking distance learning activities: A comparison of transactional distance theory and activity theory. *Open Learning, 23*, 203-214.
- Hou, A. Y. (2011). Quality assurance at a distance: international accreditation in Taiwan higher education. *High Education, 61*, 179-191.
- Hou, A. Y., Morse, R., Chiang, C., & Chen, H. (2013). Challenges to quality of English medium instruction degree programs in Taiwanese universities and the role of local accreditors: a perspective of non-English-speaking Asian country. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 14*(3), 359-370.
- Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (1999). Rethinking the value of choice: A cultural perspective on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 349-366.

- Jensen, H., & Johannesson, H. (1995). Engineering courses taught in English: an experience from Denmark. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 20(1), 19-23.
- Kahng, Y. (1999). Immersion education in Southeast Asia. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 5, 79-101.
- Kang, S., & Park, H. (2005). English as the medium of instruction in Korean engineering education. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21(1), 155-174.
- Kim, E. (2002). Voices of learners from English-medium lectures. *Journal of the Applied Linguistics Association of Korea*, 18(2), 145-163.
- Kim, J. (2010). L2 Learner's perspectives of how personal and instructional factors influence achievement in online EFL learning environment. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 16(4), 39-69.
- Kim, T. (2009). The dynamics of L2 self and L2 learning motivation: A qualitative case study of Korean ESL students. *English Teaching*, 64(3), 49-70.
- Kirkgöz, Y. (2005). Motivation and student perception of studying in an English-medium university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 1(1), 101-122.
- Kormos, J., Kiddle, T., & Csizér, K. (2011). Systems of goals, attitudes, and self-related beliefs in second language learning motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, 3(5), 495-516.
- Kozaki, Y., & Ross, S. J. (2011). Contextual dynamics in foreign language learning motivation. *Language Learning*, 61(4), 1328-1354.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007). Reflecting on the cognitive-social debate in second language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 773-87.
- Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 20, 71-94.
- Liu, J. Y., Chang, Y. J., Yang, F. Y., & Sun, Y. C. (2011). Is what I need what I want? Reconceptualising college students' needs in English courses for general and specific/academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(4), 271-280.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Methods and results in the study of anxiety in language learning: A review of the literature. *Language Learning*, 41, 85-117.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Legatto, J. J. (2011). A Dynamic system approach to willingness to communicate: Developing an idiodynamic method to capture rapidly changing affect. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(2), 149-171.
- Manakul, W. (2007). Role of English in internationalization of higher education: The case of the Graduate School of Engineering, Hokkaido University. *Higher Education and Lifelong Learning*, 15, 155-162.

- Manh, L. D. (2012). English as a medium of instruction at tertiary education system in Vietnam. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 9(2), 97-122.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J. C. McCroskey & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personal and interpersonal communication* (pp. 129–156). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Murray, G. (2007). Classroom motivation of Korean EFL students from the perspective of self-determination theory. *English Teaching*, 62(4), 391-409.
- Nguyen, L. V. (2010). Computer mediated collaboration learning within a communicative language teaching approach: A sociocultural perspective. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12, 202-233.
- Noels, K. A., Clément, R., & Pelletier L. G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 23-34.
- Noels, K. A., Clément, R., & Pelletier L. G. (2001). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French Canadian learners of English. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 424-440.
- Noels, K., Pelletier, L., & Vallerand, R. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivation orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 57-85.
- Oh, H., & Lee, H. (2010). Characteristics of effective English medium instruction and supportmeasures. *Modern English Education*, 11(1), 191-202.
- Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12–28.
- Pae, T. (2007). Why do they want to learn English? A self-determination theory perspective. *English Teaching*, 62, 177-191.
- Phan, H. (2010). A theoretical perspective of learning in the Pacific context: A sociocultural perspective. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 8, 411-428.
- Tsuneyoshi, R. (2005). The dilemmas and possibilities of study abroad programs using English. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 4(1), 65-86.
- Turuk, M. (2008). The relevance and implication of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory in the second language classroom. *Annual Review of Education, Communication, and Language Sciences*, 5, 244-262.
- Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 271-360). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senécal, C., & Vallières, E. F. (1992). The academic motivational scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic,

- and amotivation in education. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 1003-1017.
- Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senécal, C., & Vallières, E. F. (1993). Assessment of intrinsic, extrinsic and amotivation in education: Evidence on the concurrent and construct validity of the academic motivation scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 159-172.
- Vandergrift, L. (2005). Relationships among motivation orientations, metacognitive awareness and proficiency in L2 Listening. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(1), 70-89.
- Wold, K. (2011). Blending theories for instructional design: creating and implementing the structure, environment, experience, and people (SEEP) model. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(4), 371-382.
- Yang, E. (2009). Korean EFL learners' reading motivation and their L2 reading behavior. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 15(4), 217-235.
- Yang, E. (2011). Korean college students' English learning motivation and listening proficiency. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 17(2), 93-114.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire Items

1. Speaking English is important for the study of my major.
2. I study English speaking in order to get a more prestigious job later on.
3. I study to show that I am a good global citizen by speaking English well.
4. I study English speaking because I would feel ashamed if I couldn't speak to my friends or teachers in English.
5. I think studying English speaking is important for self-improvement.
6. I study English speaking for the feeling of acquiring knowledge about the English-speaking community and their way of life.
7. I study English speaking for the enjoyment I experience when I am accomplishing difficult exercises in dialogs.
8. I feel like to study English speaking more for the "high" feeling that I experience while speaking and hearing in English.
9. I don't know why I study English. I feel like I am wasting my time in studying English speaking.
10. I feel comfortable in the English speaking class taught by a foreign instructor.
11. Foreign instructors are helpful to practicing English speaking.
12. I feel like to study English speaking more because of my university's slogan of 100% English lecture.
13. English speaking skill is very important because all the classes are taught in English in my university.