

WHICH ONE IS MORE ESSENTIAL FOR SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS: INSTRUMENTAL OR INTEGRATIVE MOTIVATION?

Syarifuddin

Abstract: There are some major factors which influence second language learning. Motivation is an important factor that determines the success of learners of Arabic or English as second language. There are two types of motivation: Instrumental motivation and integrative motivation. The instrumental motivation is the desire to achieve the goals from the study of a language without having opportunity or chance to use the target language with members of the target community. In contrast, the integrative motivation refers to language learners that interact with members of the target language group, and refers to language learners who admire the country and the culture of target language. This essay will compare and contrast both types of motivation. This essay, then, argues that instrumental motivation is more important than integrative motivation. This is because of some reasons. For example, meeting the requirements of school or university, getting good grades, passing the exam, looking for a job or looking for higher salary job based on foreign language skills, etc.

Keywords: Second language learning; Motivation; Instrumental motivation; Integrative motivation

The most successful learners of a language are those who have certain characteristics in their learning such as good attitude in exercise, goal orientation, desire for achievement, maximum aspirations, perseverance, etc (Naiman et al., 1978). It has been suggested that there are some major factors which influence second language acquisition; personality, intellectual ability, motivation or age (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). Motivation probably is one of the most interesting topics. Motivation also has been approached from many angles. Initially, motivation was the topic of psychology only (Dornyei, 2001), and then it was also considered as language's topic, especially second language acquisition (SLA). In other words, motivation is one of SLA research for many years and also one of the important factors which determines the success of second language learning. For this reason, this essay will identify what motivation is, and which type of motivation is more influential (integrative and instrumental motivation). This essay will also compare and contrast both motivation and then it will argue that instrumental motivation is more important compared to integrative motivation. It will explain why instrumental motivation is more essential than integrative motivation in achieving second language proficiency.

Definition of Motivation

Motivation theories have been popular due to Robert Gardner who initially acknowledged in psychology (Dornyei, 2001). Gardner (1985, p. 10) defines motivation in language terms as ‘referring to the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity’. Motivation is a complex issue. There is no single definition about it. Many experts define it. For example, Rod Ellis (1994, p. 715) defines motivation in SLA as ‘the effort which learners put into learning an L2 as a result of their need or desire to learn it’. Also Lightbown and Spada (2001, p. 33) define it as ‘a complex phenomenon which can be defined in terms of two factors: learners’ communicative needs and their attitudes towards the second language community’.

Instrumental and Integrative Motivation

There are two types of motivation in learning language. They are instrumental and integrative motivation (Gardner, 1972, 1979, 1988; Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972). Lightbown and Spada, (2001) note that research has shown that second language learning is successful closely relates to two types of motivation, instrumental and integrative motivation. Even though those two types of motivation are old characterization (see, for example, Gardner & MacIntyre, 1991), Ely (1986) notes that this characterization is useful for categorization.

Instrumental motivation is the desire to achieve the goals from the study of a second language (Gardner, 1972, 1979, 1988; Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972; Hudson 2000), for example, meeting the requirements of school or university, getting good grades passing the exam, looking for a job or looking for higher salary job based on foreign language skills. This motivation refers to language learners that do not need opportunity or chance to use the target language with members of the target community. In contrast, integrative motivation refers to language learners that interact with members of the second language group and language learners that admire the country and the culture of the target language (Falk 1978; Gardner, 1972, 1979, 1988; Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972).

Which One Is More Essential?

It has been argued that it is probably difficult in practice to make a distinction between instrumental motivation and integrative motivation (Burstall et al., 1974). However, this article will try to distinguish, compare and contrast between those two forms of motivation and then decide which one is more essential.

Firstly, it is argued that integrative motivation affects the learners level of proficiency more compared to instrumental motivation (for example, Taylor, Meynard & Rheault 1977; Ellis 1994; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). It is also claimed that interaction with the group of target language is important to achieve certain level of second language proficiency. Benson (1991) says that university students in Japan often cannot speak English even though they have good understanding in grammar. He argues that those learners have motivation in studying English but they lack of practice in speaking. So he believes that for this case of Japanese students who study English, integrative motivation will give more influence to them (Benson, 1991).

However, a study conducted in Quebec, Canada, shows that school children who learn French with instrumental motivation got higher scores compared to learners with integrative motivation (Genesee, 1978). Also, a study conducted in China by Wei (2007) reports that instrumental motivation is more essential than integrative motivation. The learners in her studies were motivated because their school's curricula requirement requires them to learn. Their concern about their career and academic results was also motivating them (Wei, 2007).

Furthermore, LoCastro (1996) says that an entrance exam requirement for university is the main factor of the increase of students' motivation in studying English. There are many studies that support this claim. For example, a study conducted by Berwick and Ross (cited in Norris-Holt, 2001) reports that 90 first-year Japanese university students who studied in commerce and English course were evaluated for determining their type of motivation. This study found that instrumental motivation is an influential factor of students' success. This is

because English is a compulsory exam for students who want to study in university. A similar study by Berwick and Ross (cited in Norris-Holt, 2001) reports that students' motivation is at its peak when they are in a final year of their high school and want to continue to study in university. After they enter university, their motivation decreases or is even lost. In other words, their motivation is instrumental which increases significantly when they study English for entrance exam requirements for university.

In addition, in terms of foreign language acquisition settings, Dornyei (1994) notes that instrumental motivation is more important even though in particular aspects integrative motivation also give effects on language learners. This is because Dornyei (1994) makes distinction between two different settings, second language (SL) setting and foreign language (FL) setting. He argues that Gardner's studies were conducted in SL setting (not FL setting) that have big chance to interact with society of the target language and surely different with FL context which is only as a subject (Dornyei, 1994). From those studies, it is clear that instrumental motivation affects school or university learners more than integrative motivation does.

Lastly, it is also asserted that in achieving good proficiency in second language, learners have to have two forms of motivation. Brown (2000) notes that when students learn second language, they have combination of both instrumental and integrative motivation. The example from Brown is that students from around the world who study in the United States. They study English for academic purposes (EAP) and during their EAP course they integrate to the people and the culture of United States.

However, language learners do not necessarily have to combine both forms of motivation. In a study conducted at University of Norway, American and Europeans students tend to be successful in learning language with integrative motivation. In contrast, Middle Eastern students tend to have instrumental motivation (Svanes, 1987). From this, Svanes concludes that the types of

motivation are related to the background and culture of the learner. Supporting this view, Clement and Kruidnier in their studies (1983) argue that 'the integrative orientation appeared only in multicultural contexts among members of a clearly dominant group' (p. 72).

In addition, Dornyei (1990, p. 48) says, "The nature and effect of certain motivation components might vary as a function of the environment in which the learning takes place". He also adds, "Instrumentality and especially integrativeness are broad tendencies or subsystems rather than straightforward universals, comprising context-specific clusters of loosely related components" (1990, p. 70).

Lukmani studies (1972) show that instrumental motivation is more essential than integrative motivation in English as second language female students in Bombay. In this case, the type of motivation is determined by learners' social situation. This is because the social situation of those learners in Bombay is non-westernized, so instrumental motivation is more important than integrative motivation (Lukmani, 1972). From studies and discussion above, it is clear that integrative motivation is less important to the language learners compared to instrumental motivation.

Conclusion

Based on the explanation above, even though both integrative and instrumental motivation are important parts of success in learning a second language, instrumental motivation is more important or essential compared to integrative motivation. This is because although learners do not admire the target language, the people, and the culture of the language and also do not communicate with the group of the language, they still have good ability in acquiring proficiency of second language. Therefore, learners from different culture who may not like the culture of the language or learners who never communicate with the group of language do not necessarily worry about their success in learning new language because by their instrumental motivation they can still achieve their successful learning of second language.

REFERENCES

- Benson, M.J. (1991). *Attitudes and motivation towards English : A survey of Japanese freshmen. RELC Journal*, 22(1), 34-48.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching (4th ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Burstall, C., Jamieson, M., Cohen, S. & Hargreaves, M. (1974). *Primary French in the Balance*. Slough: NFER Publishing Co.
- Clement, R., & Kruidenier, B.G. (1983). *Orientations in second language acquisition: The Effects Of Ethnicity, Milieu And Target Language On Their Emergence*. *Language Learning*, 33, 273-291.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt R.W. (1991). *Motivation : Reopening The Research Agenda*. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512.
- Dornyei, Z. (1990). *Conceptualizing Motivation In Foreign-Language Learning*. *Language Learning*, 40(1), 45-78.
- Dornyei, Z. (1994). *Motivation And Motivating In The Foreign Language Classroom*. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 273-284.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ely, C. (1986). *Language learning motivation: A descriptive and causal analysis*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(1), 28-35.
- Falk, J. (1978). *Linguistics and language: A survey of basic concepts and implications* (2nd ed.). John Wiley and Sons.
- Gardner, R. C. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C. (1979). Social psychological aspects of second language acquisition. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair, (Eds.), *Language and Social Psychology* (pp. 287-301). Oxford: Blackwell Press.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (1988). *The socio-educational model of second language learning: assumptions, findings and issues*. *Language Learning*, 38, 101-126.

Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*: 13.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gardner, R.C., & MacIntyre, P.D. (1991). An instrumental motivation in language study: Who Says it isn't effective". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 57-72.

Genesee, F. (1978). Individual Differences in Second-Language Learning. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 34: 490 – 504.

Hudson, G. (2000). *Essential introductory linguistics*. Blackwell Publishers.

Lightbown, P. M. & Spada N. (2001). Factors affecting second language learning. In: Candlin, C.N. & Mercer, N. (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context*. London: Routledge.

Lightbown, P. M. & Spada N. (2001). *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press.

LoCastro, V. (1996). English language education in Japan. In H. Coleman, *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 40-58). Cambridge University Press.

Lukmani, Y.M. (1972). Motivation to learn and language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 22, 261-273.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H.H. and Todesco, A. (1978). *The Good Language Learner*. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Norris-Holt, J. (2001). Motivation as a Contributing Factor in Second Language Acquisition. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. VII, No. 6, June. Retrieved 29 September 2008 from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Norris-Motivation>

Svanes, B. (1987). Motivation and cultural distance in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 37. 341-359.

Taylor, D.M., Meynard, R., & Rheault, E. (1977). Threat to ethnic identity and second-language learning. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 99-118). Academic Press.

Wei, M. (2007). The Interrelatedness of Affective Factors in EFL Learning: An Examination of Motivational Patterns in Relation to Anxiety in China. *TESL-EJ*. June, Vol. 11, No. 11. Retrieved 29 September 2008 from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej41/a2.html>