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ABSTRACT

Motivation plays a central role in language learning process because it drives an individual to start taking action and maintain his or her progress. This paper aims to survey the motivation level of Political Science undergraduate students towards learning English; and to identify whether the Political Science undergraduate students are primarily integratively motivated or instrumentally motivated to learn English. 160 political science undergraduate students were chosen using the stratified sampling method to complete a package of online self-administered questionnaire adapted from Gardner's (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery and Prapphal's (1981) Attitude Testing. The respondents were also required to answer one open-ended question concerning how important learning English is for their lives. The quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistics and the open-ended answer was categorised into two main themes: instrumental motivation and integrative motivation. The results displayed that the students were very highly motivated towards learning English. Regarding their motivation, despite the high scores in both types, students were predominantly instrumentally motivated towards learning English. The findings also indicated that women were more motivated towards learning English than men were. Based upon this study's outcomes, some relevant and useful implications are recommended.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

In the globalised era in which technological developments and digital revolution are helping to link together people from all around the world, connectivity amongst people of different nationalities, cultures, and languages has become fundamental (Bilbao-Osorio, Dutta & Lanvin, 2013). In order to benefit from this globalisation trend, an individual needs to develop interpersonal communication skills (Popescu & Crenicean, 2013). That is to say, people of diverse backgrounds are, at an increasing rate, required to use the common means of communication, or languages, which are understandable between interlocutors. Linguists call this a ‘lingua franca’ (Holmes and Wilson, 2017). Central to this point, it is widely accepted that English is currently a global and highly powerful common language, with around 375 million English as a first language speakers and the double the amount of English as a second language speakers (Reddy, 2016). Moreover, it is notable that English is universally used in a variety of realms, such as education, business, technology, and government (Nunan, 2003).

However, in order to communicate with other people in English effectively, it is necessary for the communicators to attain language proficiency. Unlike English native speakers whose natural mother tongue is English, non-native speakers have to undergo the learning process so as to acquire English language skills. As a result, it is usual for every country that learning English has become the norm (Mahu, 2012). The underlying reason behind this phenomenon is that English is a key to unlocking better education and career opportunities (Ahmad, 2016). In regard to success in learning English, or being an efficient learner of English, Chumcharoensuk (2013) points out that it is crucial for learners to be driven by something to start the initial process and then maintain it. Amongst these possible things, motivation is usually placed as the top priority (Lordasa, 2007). Similarly, Ball (1977, 1) once made a clear statement, saying that 'motivation is a central concept in any theory of education.'
In terms of motivation, Gardner (1985) clarified that there are two major types of motivation that play a vital role in driving individuals to start learning language, namely, integrative motivation and instrumental motivation. The first type of motivation indicates that the learners begin to learn a target language because they are genuinely interested in integration with, or becoming more socially connected to, the group who speaks that language (Gardner, 2001). The second type of motivation, on the other hand, does not take into account the social dimensions of learning language such as involvement with or a feeling of closeness with the group of speakers, maintaining that the learners are motivated to learn a target language because they are focused on more practical benefits of learning a language, such as getting a better job or getting a higher education for instance (Gardner, 2001).

From the viewpoint of Mahadi and Jafari (2012), paying attention to language learners’ motivation types is especially important to language instructors because knowing the different motivation types of the learners can help teachers manage and design the teaching techniques that are most appropriate in order to optimise students’ language learning. Furthermore, as recent research studies in this field (e.g. Degang, 2010; Dongruangsri, 2013; Wimolmas, 2013; Sun, 2014; Phithakphongphan, 2014; Tanghom, 2014) maintain, the scrutiny of language learners’ motivation types could bear beneficial outcomes for language institutes and academic institutions as well, as the findings can provide useful guidelines for the concerned authorities with respect to the enhancement of the quality of teaching and learning. As a result, a number of research studies have been conducted to investigate the motivation types of the English learners enrolled in various academic programmes, in particular those who are English majors. Nevertheless, this does not mean that studies on other groups of students whose majors are not English are not worthwhile. On the contrary, the researcher of this current study finds that conducting a survey on students’ motivation towards learning English with a study group outside of English majors can also be fascinating and worth undertaking.

For this research study, the participants will be students from the Faculty of Political Science of a distinguished public university in Thailand. The faculty is composed of four departments: Government Department, International Relations Department, Sociology and Anthropology Department, and Public Administration.
Department. Due to the differences in admission requirements, the nature of the disciplines and list of courses, the findings, i.e. the motivation types of students towards learning English, may vary. As a consequence, the outcomes of this research will benefit not only the faculty, but also the Language Institute where the English compulsory courses are provided, as well as the Faculty of Arts where the English elective courses are offered, as these three units can review and evaluate their curricula and teaching methods.

The other details of the research are described in the following sections of this chapter.

1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This research paper sought to answer the following questions:

1.2.1 What is the level of motivation amongst the Political Science students towards learning English?

1.2.2 Are the Political Science students predominantly integratively or instrumentally motivated towards learning English?

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this research study were:

1.3.1 To survey the motivational level of political science students towards learning English.

1.3.2 To identify whether the political science students are primarily integratively motivated or instrumentally motivated to learning English.

1.4 DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

In order to build a mutual understanding between the researcher and the readers, the following terms are defined as below:
1.4.1 Motivation

This study employs Gardner’s (1985) definition of motivation. That is, motivation to learn language refers 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’ (p.10).

1.4.2 Integrative Motivation

Integrative motivation refers to a type of motivation residing in a learner who appears to learn language for the purposes of interaction with member of the targeted language community, or for social-emotional purposes. The examples are, but not limited to, being able to socialise into the other cultural societies, or being accustomed to targeted language society.

1.4.3 Instrumental Motivation

Instrumental motivation refers to a type of motivation residing in a learner who appears to learn language for the purposes of utilitarian value of language learning achievement such as getting a career promotion, or getting a higher salary.

1.4.4 Political Science student

Political Science student refers to current undergraduate students enrolled in any department of the Faculty of Political Science at a distinguished Thai university. Yet, this does not include foreign students studying at the aforementioned faculty as exchange students.

1.4.5 Faculty

The term 'faculty' throughout this research study refers to the Faculty of Political Science at a distinguished university in Thailand.

1.5 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This current study was conducted through questionnaire distribution with political science students. The sample group was derived from the whole population of political science students. A sum of 160 students from the total of 973 were
selected by means of the stratified sampling method. Regardless of their current year of study, 40 students from each department were chosen as departmental representatives, 10 of which represented their year. Among those 10 students, male-female respondents were of equal number. All the respondents received a link affording access to an e-questionnaire package through email, Facebook or LINE application. After completing the questionnaire, the researcher accumulated the completed questionnaires. The survey was conducted entirely online.

1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The significance of this research study can be categorized into three main areas.

1.6.1 The students’ answers should display their motivational stance towards English language. This finding will help the respondents develop their individual approaches to English learning, resulting in higher potential for English learning success.

1.6.2 The findings will provide useful guidelines for authorities of the Faculty of Political Science, the Language Institute and the Faculty of Arts, and enable them to develop their curricula and strategies in order to enhance the quality of learning and teaching.

1.6.3 This research can be used as a database for further studies.

1.7 ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

This research study is composed of five chapters in total. The introduction to this research study is described in Chapter One, including the research background, research objectives, research questions, definitions of terms, scope of study and significance of the study. The review of literature and related previous research are contained in Chapter Two. Chapter Three presents the methodology used to conduct this research, which includes participants, research instruments, research procedure, data collection, and data analysis. The results of the study will be reported in Chapter Four and be discussed and summarised in Chapter five. In addition to the results
discussion and summary, the fifth chapter will also provide recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter aims to review the selected literature in order to build a body of knowledge essential for conducting the current research. The chapter is divided into four major parts. The first part starts with the review of literature on theory and the concept of motivation. The second part is in regard to the definition of motivation with a focus on motivation in language learning and its types in the following part. The final part deals with the review of previous studies.

2.1 THEORY AND CONCEPT OF MOTIVATION

Although there is no agreement on the exact definition of motivation, the term itself is widely used in various contexts. In a general sense, it refers to “a reason or reasons for acting and behaving in a particular way” (Online Oxford Dictionary, 2017). The word itself, as Goleman (2011) explained, is derived from the Latin word Motere, or to move. In other words, motivation is the driving force behind every action that human beings take. It, therefore, plays a crucial role in many activities of human beings, including learning a new language (Delgado, 2016).

According to Stipek (1996), the early studies of motivation were originated in the literature on extrinsic reinforcement. Amongst these, the notable classics can be traced back to 1940s when Abraham Maslow proposed the idea of 'human motivation' that later became a compulsory foundation of its kind (Pardee, 1990). Therefore, it is necessary to initially review the tradition foundations of the study.

2.1.1 Maslow's 'Hierarchy of Needs Theory'

Maslow (1943) maintained that humans are inherently good and claimed that individuals possess the quality of seeking constant growth from an inner drive. He also introduced his theory of motivation with an illustration of the 'hierarchy of
needs', positing that the motives of all human beings can be categorised into five main levels, as follows (p. 372-385):

The first level is **physiological needs**. Maslow pointed out that physiological needs such as food, water, sex and shelter are undoubtedly the primary needs. Without these four things, anything else will be defined as unimportant.

The second level is **safety needs**. For the safety needs such as protection against danger, threat and deprivation, Maslow states that only after the physiological needs are relatively satisfied does there emerge a new set of safety needs. He views that human beings always seek safety and stability in the world. This can be seen through the human behaviour of preferring familiar things to unfamiliar things, and known things to the unknown.

The third level is **love needs**. Love needs such as giving and receiving of love, friendship, affection, belonging, association and acceptance normally appear after both physiological and safety needs are fairly well gratified. In the view of Maslow, after the fulfilment of the first two needs, human beings will hunger for affectionate relations with other people, and will strive with great effort to accomplish the goal. However, it is worth noting that, in this theory, love is not synonymous with sex.

The fourth level is **esteem needs**. Maslow contended that all people in the society, with the exception of a few cases, desire a stable, firmly-based, high evaluation of themselves, self-respect, self-esteem and the esteem of the others. This means that human beings strive for real achievement and respect from others. The needs for self-esteem, as noted above, are different from the needs for the esteem of the others. While the former indicates the desire or motivation for strength, for achievement, for confidence in the face of the world, the latter refers to the aspiration for reputation, prestige or acknowledgment.

The last level is **self-actualisation needs**. Even if all the aforementioned needs are acquired, Maslow insisted that human beings frequently – if not always – seek self-fulfilment, namely actualisation of what they are potentially. The emergence of these self-actualisation needs is clearly dependent upon the prior steps of needs, ranging from physiological needs to esteem needs.
2.1.2 Herzberg's 'Two-Factors Theory'

Another pioneer work regarding motivation from a similar period to Maslow's theory belonged to Frederick Herzberg, a behavioural scientist, who proposed a two-factor theory or the 'motivator-hygiene theory' in order to better understand employees' attitudes and motivation (Noell, 1976; Tan & Waheed, 2011). From his research based upon 200 engineers and accountants, Herzberg (1959 as cited in Yusoff, Tan & Idris, 2013) found that there were two types of factors that influence employees' working attitude and level of performance, namely Motivation Factors and Hygiene Factors.

Motivation Factors refers to intrinsic factors that will increase employees' satisfaction towards the job, whereas Hygiene Factors are extrinsic factors to prevent any employees’ dissatisfaction. The findings showed that intrinsic factors, or Motivation Factors, crucially contribute to employees' satisfaction. Extrinsic factors, or Hygiene Factors, on the contrary, played a less vital role. Nevertheless, Yusoff, Tan & Idris (2013) deems that these two factors – Motivation Factors and Hygiene Factors – are interdependent and not necessarily opposed to each other.

2.1.3 Vroom’s ‘Expectancy theory’

Proposed in 1964, Vroom's 'Expectancy Theory' has gained a high degree of popularity in the study of motivation (Van Eerde & Thierry, 1996). Moreover, his theory is different from the aforementioned motivation theories of Maslow and Herzberg since his theory focuses on the cognitive antecedents that go into motivation and on explaining the way they are related to each other; in contrast, the other two scholars highlight a description of what motivated people in the workplace (Lunenberg, 2011).

Vroom (1964) contends that people choose how to behave by solely considering the expected outcomes of their actions. In other words, individuals’ decisions on what to do are based on what they expect the outcome to be. Vroom's theory based on this point of view has three key elements: expectancy, instrumentality and valence.
Firstly, **expectancy** refers to a person's evaluation of the possibility that his or her effort would lead to the desired level of performance. The range for this possibility is 0 to 1; that is, when the employee sees no chance that effort will result in the supposed performance level, the expectancy is 0. On the contrary, when the employee is absolutely confident that the task will be completed, the expectancy is 1. However, it is worth noting that the absolute numbers of 0 and 1 are examples of two extremes. Employee's estimation of expectancy traditionally lies somewhere between them.

Secondly, **instrumentality** refers to a person's belief that his or her achievement in performance expectations would lead to various work outcomes, awards in particular. The range of instrumentality is the same as that of expectance explained above. That is, when employees see that their good performance will gain them rewards, the instrumentality is 1. When employees see this with a totally opposite view, the instrumentality is 0.

Thirdly, **valance** is the degree of an employee’s preference for a particular reward. In other word, each reward that employees expect might have different value to them. For example, some people might appreciate salary increases over all other rewards. However, the range of valence is not the same as that of those abovementioned elements. Valence can be negative, neutral or positive, ranging from −1 to 1. Positive valence means employees have a strong preference towards a reward. At the other extreme, valence bears a negative outcome. And, in case an employee is indifferent to a reward, 0 is the level of valence.

Vroom further suggests an equation that illustrates the relationship among motivation, expectancy and instrumentality and valence as follows:

Motivation = Expectancy X Instrumentality X Valence

### 2.2 THEORY AND CONCEPT OF MOTIVATION IN LANGUAGE LEARNING

It can be noticed that although the aforementioned theories – Maslow's 'Hierarchy of Needs', Herzberg's 'Two-Factors Theory' and Vroom’s ‘Expectancy
theory' are widely considered classical works in the study of motivation, these works do not completely fit this research context inasmuch as this current study specifically focuses on the study of motivation in language learning. The following is the literature review in regard to the topic.

According to Gardner and Lambert (1972), language learning motivation is based on a positive attitude towards the desire to communicate with the valued members of the society and to become similar to them. For the importance of motivation, Dörnyei (1994) claims that motivation is amongst the primary factors that affect accomplishment in second language learning.

Harmer (2001, 51) defines motivation as an ‘internal drive’ that pushes an individual to commit to doing something in order to accomplish it. In a similar vein, Gardner (1985a) depicts motivation as goal-directed behaviour that is mediated by social, cognitive and affective factors. Arguably, one of the most well-known definitions of motivation in respect to language learning context is Gardner’s (1985a) definition. In his view, motivation refers to ‘the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language’ (p.10). It can be concluded that the language learner would start their learning only after they are motivated to do so, and they are motivated because they have set goals to achieve. Therefore, in order to comprehend the motivation of the learners, it is essential to know what their ultimate goals are.

2.3 TYPES OF MOTIVATION

Motivation can be categorised in many ways, using different sets of standards. Harmer (2001), considering the goals, classified motivation into two types as follows:

A **short-term goal** means the motivation to achieve day-to-day targets, or targets of the near future. On the contrary, a **long-term goal** means the motivation to achieve targets of the distant future.

Gardner (1985a), looking at the learner’s orientation, points out that learners’ goals of learning language can be divided into two categories: Integrative Orientation and Instrumental Orientation. Both of them play an active role in affecting learning behaviour in one way or another.
Learners with an integrative orientation normally decide to learn a language so as to become socialised into that language society, or to be accustomed to native speakers’ norms and values. This type of motivation typically stems from positive attitudes towards being a membership of such society (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). Moreover, Dörnyei and Clement (2001) discovered that integrative orientation determines the language choice and degree of effort language learners put into a learning process.

Learners with instrumental orientation, on the other hand, are said to value the language learning on a utilitarian basis. This means that the ultimate goals of the learners relate to pragmatic considerations such as passing examinations or university requirements, or being promoted to a higher position. As this type of motivation has its stance in external appeals, it is sometimes called by another name; that is, extrinsic motivation (Jakobovits, 1971).

Although the distinction between the two types of motivation proposed by Gardner is clear, i.e., the integrative type of motivation highlights the importance of the eagerness to assimilate into a community of native speakers, or to be accepted as a member belonging to a society of native speakers, while an instrumental orientation is focused on the pragmatic value, such as career opportunity or prosperity, Hayamizu (1997) posits that these two types are not a binary position. A language learner can possess two types of motivation at the same time, yet the degree of each motivation might be different.

Looking at various research studies that employed Gardner's abovementioned distinction of motivation types, Noels (2001) contends that Gardner's theory is not applicable to most of the work since only instrumental motivation is significant in driving students to learn language. Integrative motivation has, on the other hand, a very low influence on students' learning behaviour. Then, based upon Ryan and Deci's (2000) work, she proposes a new and more dichotomous way of differentiating learners' motivation types, which are intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation.

Ryan and Deci (2000) argue that people with intrinsic motivation always move to act for the fun or challenge entailed rather than because of external factors such as pressure or rewards. They are driven primarily by the 'inner' or 'free-choice' motivation. On the other hand, people with extrinsic motivation are not eager to do
things per se. Instead, they are driven to take any action by the 'outer' motivation such as the salience of extrinsic rewards, the attempt to develop themselves vis-a-vis others, or the attainment of goals. In addition to intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, Ryan and Deci (2000) and Noels (2001) indicate that it is possible for an individual to be amotivated as well. Amotivation can be seen as contrary to the other types of motivation. In the absence of motivation, amotivated individuals are unable to perceive a relationship between their actions and the subsequent outcomes of those actions, and have no personal motivation towards goal-initiated behaviours (Lucas, Bernardo & Rojo-Laurilla 2016).

As described throughout this part, it can be noticed that a number of scholars have proposed many theories regarding the study of motivation. Each of the theories has its distinctive characteristics and functions, as well as different advantages and disadvantages. Nevertheless, this research study aims to employ Gardner's theory of motivation since his focus on the distinction between integrative orientation and instrumental orientation best serve the objectives of this study.

2.4 PREVIOUS STUDIES

Motivation towards English learning is not a new research trend in Thailand, since numerous pieces of work have been carried out. Yet, most of the work – if not all – was conducted with different groups of people at different places and different times. Thus, more research studies under the theme of motivation in English learning could yield different results from the previous studies.

In terms of research findings, much research on motivation towards English learning has been carried out in Thailand in a university context, and the majority of this has indicated that students’ instrumental motivation overweighs integrative motivation. Nuchnoi (2008), studying with English major undergraduate students, found that students' motivation towards English was primarily the instrumental type. Their high degree of instrumental motivation was mainly to pass their English courses and get good grades. Kitjaroonchai and Kitjaroonchai (2012) similarly determined that although Thai students who studied at Asia-Pacific International University had high levels of motivation towards learning English in both types, their instrumental...
motivation was found to be fairly higher than the integrative one. Studying from a comparative perspective, Chumcharoensuk (2013) discovered that both Thai and Cambodian undergraduate students in English major were instrumentally motivated to learn English.

The findings when investigating students whose majors are not English tend to be similar. Oranpattanachai (2008), surveying Thai engineer students, determined that integrative motivation, albeit significantly contributing to student's motivation strength, was outweighed by instrumental motivation. In addition, some more recent studies strongly confirm this finding. Hengsadeekul, Koul, and Kaewkuekool (2014) collected data from undergraduate students from various fields of study, finding that instrumental motivation occupies the first rank of most students, regardless of their main disciplines. Yet, the integrative orientation was also positive. They further determined that female students tended to possess higher levels of integrative goals vis-a-vis male students. In a similar vein, Choomthong and Chaichompoo (2015) found that first-year undergraduate students are instrumentally-motivated at a slightly higher degree than integratively motivated. Finding that Public Health students' motivation is primarily instrumental, Chairat (2015) stresses that students also displayed a very high degree of integrative motivation.

From the recent related studies reviewed above, it is clear that Thai undergraduate students are primarily oriented by instrumental motivation, yet it is still worth noting that, in some cases, students' degree of integrative motivation towards English learning is almost as high as that of instrumental reasons. Besides the Thai context, the researcher also reviewed the relevant studies conducted in other countries. Lai (1999) contends that the motivation of Asian students to learn English is predominantly instrumental. Conducting four surveys in different timeframes and analysing newspaper reports, she found that Hong Kong undergraduate students in different disciplines took English language courses based chiefly upon instrumental reasons – career preparation in particular. She also discovered that even though the students realise the importance of learning English, less than a half of them tried to continuously develop their English. As a result, she summarises that most of the students in her study were 'not motivated enough to put their belief into action' (p. 282).
Similarly, Mun (2011) conducted a survey with Chinese undergraduate students to determine their leading type of motivation, finding that instrumental reasons seem to prevail compared to integrative orientation. Furthermore, the majority of the participants learn English due to certain academic and professional reasons such as passing an examination or applying for a well-paid job. The similar findings, which indicate that students favour instrumental reasons over integrative ones, confirmed by a number of scholars working with learners of diverse nationalities; for example, Lebanese by Shaaban and Ghaith (2000); Japanese by Adachi (2009); Iranian by Ahmadi (2011); Pakistani by Rehman et al. (2014); Korean by Geddes (2016); and Vietnamese by Ngo, Spooner-Lane and Mergler (2017). In addition to the discovery of the predominance of a specific motivation type over the other, some studies further assert that female students were found to have stronger integrative motivation than their male counterparts (Kobayashi, 2002; Ahmadi, 2011; Nahavadi and Mukundan, 2013).

Notwithstanding the large number of studies maintaining that instrumental motivation outshines integrative motivation, the findings do not constitute a 'consensus'. That is to say, previous studies that favoured integrative motivation over instrumental motivation can be found as well. Degang (2010) reported that, notwithstanding the close outcomes, students majoring in Business English had stronger integrative motivation than instrumental motivation. Even though his group of participants contained only 50 students, his finding was noteworthy. Similarly, Nahavandi and Mukundan (2013) found an integrative trend after surveying nearly 600 engineering students. They posit that, according to their selected group of respondents, integrative motivation is considered significantly more favourable than instrumental orientation. Moreover, Duvernay (2007) suggests that the spread of Western culture plays a significant role in driving English learners towards integrative orientation, which thus made integrative desires stronger in Korea.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology used in this study. It is composed of six major sections: (1) population and sampling; (2) the research instrument; (3) the research site; (4) the procedures; (5) the data collection; and (6) the data analysis.

3.1 POPULATION AND SAMPLE

This study aimed to focus on the motivation towards the learning English of undergraduate students from the Faculty of Political Science at a distinguished Thai university. According to the university office of registrar (2017), the total number of students was 973. However, due to time and budget constraints, a sample of 160 students was chosen by stratified sampling method. As the faculty is composed of four departments, namely, Government Department, International Relations Department, Sociology and Anthropology Department, and Public Administration Department, 40 students from each department and 10 students from each year represented their respective departments. Moreover, to ensure the gender equality, male and female participants were chosen equally.

3.2 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The research instrument for this study was a questionnaire adapted from Gardner’s (1985b) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) and Prapphal’s (1981) Attitude Testing and an open-ended question created by the researcher. The questionnaire was composed of two parts. In the first part, all participants were asked to inform their general demographic information, including their name, age, gender and academic background. In the second part, 20 close-ended questions related to instrumental motivation and integrative motivation towards learning English were provided. The questions in the second part of questionnaire were randomly arranged.
between both types of motivation. The participants were required to rate their feelings based upon a five-point Likert (1932) scale.

The open-ended question sought participants’ relevant comments and suggestions on how important learning English is for their lives. The participants were asked to write their answers in the space given.

3.3 RESEARCH SITE

This research study took place at the Faculty of Political Science at a distinguished university in Thailand. This university is one of the oldest and most prestigious universities in Thailand. The campus is located in Bangkok and is composed of more than fifteen faculties. The total number of students is around 37,000, sixty per cent of which are undergraduate students and the rest are postgraduate students. Although Thai is the principal medium of instruction, the university also provides a variety of programmes where English is the working language.

The Faculty of Political Science is amongst the four initial faculties after the institution was upgraded from a college to a university. In the wake of the 1932 revolution in Thailand, the faculty was taken over by the revolutionists and transferred to be under another university, in which law and politics were the predominant focus. Fifteen years later, as the government assessed that there was still a need for more graduates in political science, the faculty was re-established in the same year, and it has been progressively developed until today. At the moment, the faculty is home to more than 1,500 students at both the undergraduate and postgraduate levels. For the undergraduate programmes, all courses are taught in Thai, while some postgraduate programmes are offered in English.

3.4 PROCEDURES

This study applied a quantitative method to analyse the data obtained from the participants via the questionnaires, and a qualitative approach with an open-ended question. To assure the validity of the questionnaire, it was revised in accordance with
the advice and suggestions received from the advisor and a board of academic specialists. The final draft was launched to 20 students as a part of pilot test so as to ensure that the questionnaire was comprehensible and the online system worked properly. Following the pilot test, the packages of e-questionnaire were distributed to the target groups via electronic channels of communication such as e-mail, Facebook, and LINE application.

3.5 DATA COLLECTION

Since all questionnaires used in this study were in the form of e-questionnaires, the researcher distributed a link to access the questionnaires to the target group via online channels. All the questionnaires could be accessed through any electronic device, and the completion of each questionnaire was automatically recorded. The distribution started when the researcher was permitted to do so, and it took approximately one month to obtain the required number.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistics were used to analyse the level of participants’ motivation through the Microsoft Excel programme. The results were interpreted, categorised, and displayed in different styles depending on the data as follows.

3.6.1 Demographic Information

Demographic information was analysed using descriptive statistics of the frequencies and percentages of the respondents. The analysed data is displayed in the form of tables.

3.6.2 Motivation Information

Motivation information was analysed using descriptive analysis with means, S.D. and medians. The analysed data is displayed in the form of tables.
3.6.3 Five-point Likert scale

A five-point Likert (1932) scale was used for rating the respondents’ degree of motivation and attitudes towards English languages. Since there are five intervals with a maximum score of 5.00 and a minimal score of 1.00, the range for each interval is equal to 0.80. The criteria for the rating scale is illustrated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean Range</th>
<th>Motivational Level</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>4.21 – 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.41 – 4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.61 – 3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.81 – 2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>1.00 – 1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.4 Open-ended question on the importance of learning English

The answers to the open-ended question were qualitatively analysed using a thematic approach. That is to say, the answers obtained from the participants were categorised according to their themes. There were two themes for this study, which were integrative motivation and instrumental motivation.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter describes the overall results of this study, including the demographic information of the respondents, overall mean scores, average mean scores of each motivation type as well as the summary of the respondents' answers on how important English learning is to their lives from the open-ended question.

The Microsoft Excel programme was employed to analyse the raw data gathered from the 160 political science undergraduate students. The respondents were requested to indicate using a five-point Likert scale on how important each statement was for their motivation towards learning English. Two types of motivation – integrative and instrumental – were based on Gardner's (1985) definitions.

The findings were interpreted according to the motivational levels outlined in Table 1 in Chapter three of this study, inasmuch as the higher the scores were, the more motivated students were in any motivational type contained in the statements. Moreover, in order to determine the levels and general tendencies in the students’ motivation towards learning English, this survey, taking all questions into consideration, computed the overall means of each motivational type.

4.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Demographic data of respondents are shown as follows:

4.1.1 Year of college study, department of study and gender

Table 2 displays the background information of the respondents with respect to their year of college study, department of study and gender.
Table 2: Respondents’ demographic information on their year of college study, department of study and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency (cf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 2, all respondents were chosen on the basis of stratified sampling. One stratum contained five respondents who represented their year in college, department and gender.

4.1.2 Year of studying English

Table 3 displays the background information of the respondents with respect to their year of studying English.
According to Table 3, the majority of the respondents had been studying English for 15 years or above. Also, none had been studying English for less than five years. Around one quarter had been studying English for 10-14 years, while only a few people had been studying English for 5-9 years.

### 4.1.3 English proficiency

Table 4 displays the background information of the respondents with respect to their English proficiency based on their Chulalongkorn University Test of English Proficiency (CUTEP) scores.

According to Table 4, a tiny majority of the respondents had scores between 70 and 98. The second largest group, at around one-third of all respondents, got 35-69 points. The number of respondents getting 99-120 scores was similar to that of people not knowing their exact scores, with less than ten per cent for each array. Only a few people got less than 34 points on the test.
4.2 OVERALL MOTIVATION

In this sector, the general results will be described in a descriptive manner. The following three tables (Table 5 and Table 6 and Table 7) show the overall motivation outcomes, overall integrative motivation outcomes and overall instrumental motivation outcomes respectively.

**Table 5: Respondents' mean scores of overall motivation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean of overall motivational level</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 5, the results showed that the respondents are very highly motivated to learn English.

**Table 6: Respondents' mean scores of instrumental motivation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Learning English is important because it enables me to get a good grade.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Learning English is important because it enables me to get a good job.</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Learning English is important because it enables me to be more socially respected.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Learning English is important because it enables me to be educated.</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Learning English is important because it enables me to obtain greater success in life.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Learning English is important because it enables me to earn a higher salary/wage.</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning English is important because it enables me to advance in my career.  

Learning English is important because it provides access to a great number of opportunities in life.  

Learning English is important because it enables me to earn a better living.  

Learning English is important because it enables me to study abroad.  

According to Table 6, with seven categories indicating a very high level of instrumental motivation, the result showed that the respondents’ level of instrumental motivation towards learning English was very high. To be more specific, the results clearly proved that having a good job (statement 3), getting opportunities in life (statement 15) and obtaining career growth (statement 13) were the top three most important reasons to learn English for them, with the scores of 4.76, 4.56 and 4.53, respectively. However, the participants agreed, at a much lesser extent, that English could make them socially respected as only 3.68 points out of five that were attributed to statement 5.

Table 7: Respondents' mean scores of integrative motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Learning in English is important because it enables me to express my feelings more openly like English speaking people do.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Learning English is important because it enables me to live as</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English is important because it enables me to access to wider knowledge sources, e.g. newspapers and journals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English is important because it enables me to appreciate English arts and literature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English is important because it will help me understand when native speakers speak English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English is important because it will help me keep in touch with English-speaking foreign friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English is important because it enables me to think critically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English is important because it will enable me to share my knowledge and experience with other people. e.g. presenting ideas in English or giving directions in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English is important because it enables me to understand the culture of English-speaking countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to speak English fluently in order to live in English-speaking communities/societies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | 4.71 | 0.62 | Very High |
| 8 | 3.91 | 0.99 | High |
| 10 | 3.50 | 1.05 | High |
| 12 | 4.56 | 0.69 | Very High |
| 14 | 4.11 | 0.91 | High |
| 16 | 4.32 | 0.80 | Very High |
| 18 | 4.09 | 0.88 | High |
| 20 | 4.40 | 0.81 | Very High |

\[ \bar{x} = 4.14, \quad \sigma = 0.94 \quad \text{High} \]
According to Table 7, with six and four categories indicating a high and very high level of instrumental motivation, respectively, the results showed that the respondents’ level of instrumental motivation towards learning English is high. For integrative motivation, the informants indicated that access to wider knowledge sources (statement 6), with 4.71 points, and the ability to understand English native speakers speaking (statement 12), with 4.56 points, are the two utmost priorities in learning English. On the contrary, the respondents rated the importance of English as a means to help them think critically (statement 10) at only 3.5, making this factor the least important among all the integrative items.

4.3 RESULTS FROM A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

The following section illustrates the study's major findings pertaining to the overall mean scores and average mean scores of each motivational type from a comparative perspective. The respondents' year of college study, department, gender, years of learning English and English proficiency serve as factors for classification as shown in Table 8 to Table 12, respectively.

4.3.1 The overall comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation

The comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation is shown in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Mean Score for Instrumental Motivation</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Mean Score for Integrative Motivation</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean Score</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 8, the respondents' instrumental motivation towards learning English is very high with the mean score of 4.34, while their integrative...
motivation towards the same purpose, albeit at a lesser extent, is high with the mean score of 4.14. Therefore, the respondents are primarily instrumentally motivated towards learning English.

4.3.2 The comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by gender

The comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by gender is illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9: Comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female's overall motivation</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male's overall motivation</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female's average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male's average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrative Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female's average integrative motivation</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male's average integrative motivation</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 9, female's overall motivation, average instrumental motivation and average integrative motivation towards learning English are all higher than those of their male counterparts. Besides, both female and male respondents were more instrumentally motivated than integratively motivated to learn English.

4.3.3 The comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by college year

The comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by college year is shown in Table 10.
Table 10: Comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by college year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 overall motivation</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 overall motivation</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 overall motivation</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 overall motivation</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrative Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1’s average integrative motivation</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2’s average integrative motivation</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3’s average integrative motivation</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4’s average integrative motivation</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 10, participants in year 1 were the most motivated to learn English, followed by the senior-year participants, with 4.30 and 4.27 points, respectively. However, only students in junior years possessed a high degree of motivation since the other groups had very high motivation. The result from this table also confirmed that regardless of the years in college, respondents were predominantly instrumentally motivated to learn English. Nonetheless, the college year classification did not have a significant impact on the respondents’ motivation towards learning English.

4.3.4 The comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by department

The comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by college year is shown in Table 11.
Table 11: Comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV’s overall motivation</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR’s overall motivation</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA’s overall motivation</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC’s overall motivation</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrative Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV’s average integrative motivation</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR’s average integrative motivation</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA’s average integrative motivation</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC’s average integrative motivation</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 11, only respondents in the department of Government and International Relations were very highly motivated – beyond 4.20 points – to learn English. The other two departments had only 'highly motivated' status. The GOV respondents were the most motivated English learners, whereas the SOC students were the least. In overall, the respondents, regardless of their departments, were principally instrumentally motivated. However, the results revealed the important roles that the department factor played in regards to students' English learning motivation. Although the students in the Government department were primarily instrumentally motivated to learn English, their integrative motivation was still higher than the instrumental motivation of students in both the Public Administration department and Sociology and Anthropology department. Another point worth
mentioning is that PA students were more instrumentally motivated than SOC students were, but for the integrative motivation aspect, the results were the opposite.

4.3.5 The comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by English proficiency

The comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by college year is shown in Table 12. Respondents whose exact CUTEP scores were unavailable were not taken into consideration. Respondents with scores of 14-34 were grouped as Tier 1. Respondents with scores 35-69 were grouped as Tier 2. Respondents with scores 70-98 were grouped as Tier 3. Respondents with scores 99 or above were grouped as Tier 4.

Table 12: Comparison between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation classified by English proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1’s overall motivation</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2’s overall motivation</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3’s overall motivation</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4’s overall motivation</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4’s average instrumental motivation</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrative Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1’s average integrative motivation</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2’s average integrative motivation</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3’s average integrative motivation</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 12 showing the respondents who fitted into tier 1, the group with lowest level of English command were the least motivated English learners. Unlike other groups that were very high in motivation towards learning English, only tier 1 students got merely 'high' status. However, English proficiency was not considered the sole factor having a direct impact on the degree of motivation as it can be noticed that tier 3 students, albeit having lower scores on the CUTEP, were, overall and from the instrumental perspective, more motivated to learn English than tier 4 students. On the other hand, tier 4 students were deemed to be the most integratively motivated to learn English.

**4.4 RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTION**

This section highlights the respondents' thoughts on how important English is for their lives. Unlike the close-ended parts of the questionnaire, in which the response rate was 100 per cent, the open-ended part had a response rate of 81.88 per cent. All the answers from the open-ended questions were analysed using a thematic approach. They were two themes in this study: instrumental motivation and integrative motivation. However, this does not mean that each answer must be in favour of only one side at an expense of the other. Some of the answers related to both instrumental motivation and integrative motivation.

**4.4.1 Instrumental motivation**

Around 80 per cent of all respondents asserted that English was important to them in instrumental ways. Three of the most commonly given reasons were (1) enabling them to get high-paid jobs or more career opportunities; (2) enabling them to get admitted to postgraduate schools where English is the medium of instruction; and (3) enabling them to travel abroad. Examples of the respondents’ answers are as follows:
“Learning English helps you to pursue your career easier and also allows you to understand this world better.” (respondent 63)

“It makes me be able to do a part-time job at the reception at the hotel and I get extra income.” (respondent 85)

“For me, learning English is important in terms of job advancement. The higher the English skill, the greater the chance of obtaining a high salary.” (respondent 97)

“Learning English is important to me because I want to study abroad and I want to join careers in which English skill is necessary; nowadays, most countries around the world learn and use English language so if you travel and get lost in other countries at least you can communicate with the native people and ask for their help.” (respondent 100)

“Learning English provides a greater chance of success and enables me to study in various fields which haven't become popular in Thailand.’ (respondent 110)

“There are three reasons … first, I would like to get a job at Google or Amazon … third, travel around the world.” (respondent 117)

“If I knew English better than other people, it would give me a good chance to get a good job and a high wage.” (respondent 125)

### 4.4.2 Integrative motivation

According to the answers, almost a half of all respondents believed that learning English was important to them in integrative ways. Their attitude was that English was important to their lives because English enabled them to communicate with people around the world. Respondent number 19 posited that “It is essential for everyone in this world because nowadays, globalization came in and communication is so important.” Apart from her, other respondents accepted the importance of learning English in the same way, as follows:

“We cannot deny that English is a universal language used worldwide. Therefore, there is no reason why we should not take every opportunity when it
comes to advancing our English skills as we are part of the global community.” (respondent 33)

“It is crucial nowadays as a communication skill in foreign language are vital for any aspect of our life. Learning English or any other language should be considered as mandatory, not optional.” (respondent 46)

“The current age is the age of globalization. International communication is emerging more. Sometimes information is not translated into Thai. I have to work with foreigners and they are my friends.” (respondent 129)

Furthermore, 13 respondents felt that learning English could help them understand media that used English to convey meaning. For instance, respondent number 13 claimed that “Learning English will expand [my] knowledge boundaries, e.g., philosophy, science etc.’ Similarly, respondents number 17 and number 41 maintained the following:

“I use English as a tool to widen my knowledge, my resources. It has also become one of the requirements to live in such [an] interconnected world.” (respondent 17)

“It's important because I can expand my knowledge and my world. I also love to speak English with foreigners.” (respondent 41)
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter describes (1) a summary of the study; (2) a summary of the findings; (3) discussion of the results; (4) limitations of the study; and (5) recommendations for further research.

5.1 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

This section summarises the objectives, participants, instruments and research procedures of this study.

5.1.1 Objectives of the study

This research study aimed to survey the motivational level of political science students in learning English; and to identify whether these students are primarily integratively motivated or instrumentally motivated to learn English language.

5.1.2 Participants of the study

This research study collected data from 160 participants who were undergraduate students in the Faculty of Political Science at a distinguished Thai university. All participants were recruited using the stratified sampling method. As the faculty is composed of four departments, namely, Government Department, International Relations Department, Sociology and Anthropology Department, and Public Administration Department, 40 students from each department and 10 students from each year represented their respective departments. Moreover, to ensure the gender equality, male and female participants were equally chosen.

5.1.3 Instruments of the study

The research instruments were a questionnaire adapted from Gardner’s (1985b) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) and Prapphal’s (1981) Attitude
Testing and an open-ended question created by the researcher. The questionnaire was composed of two parts. In the first part, all participants were asked to inform their general demographic information, including their name, age, gender and academic background. In the second part, 20 close-ended questions were provided to ask about instrumental motivation and integrative motivation towards learning English. Questions in the second part of the questionnaire were randomly arranged between both types of motivation. The participants were required to rate their feelings based upon a five-point Likert (1932) scale.

The open-ended question sought the participants’ relevant comments and suggestions on how important learning English is for their lives. The participants were asked to write their answers in the space given.

5.1.4 Research procedures of the study

The electronic link for an access to the e-instruments were distributed to participants via social media platforms, namely, the Facebook Messenger application and Line application. Email was also used as a supporting channel. All of the participants were requested to complete the questionnaires within a month after receiving the link. After obtaining all the required raw data, the researcher used Microsoft Excel to analyse the data using descriptive statistics.

5.2 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

This section summarises the results of the study, including the background information and motivation of the participants.

5.2.1 Background information of the participants

From a total of 160, the respondents were equally divided into 32 strata using year in college, department of study and gender as the means of classification. Five people represented the whole population in each stratum. Most of the respondents – 63.1 per cent – had been studying English for more than 15 years, followed by 10-14
years and 5-9 years with 29.4 per cent and 7.5 per cent, respectively. Nearly half of respondents had a CUTEP score between 70 and 98. The second largest group of 50 people got 35-69 points. Only three people (1.9 per cent) got less than 34 points out of the full score of 120.

5.2.2 Motivation of the participants

Obviously, the political science undergraduate students have different types of English learning motivation. Overall, their motivation level was very high. The data shows that all the respondents were both instrumentally and integratively motivated to learn English. Nevertheless, there was a difference between these two types, i.e., the instrumental type was very high, whereas the integrative type was high. Therefore, it can be concluded that the political science undergraduate students were predominantly instrumentally motivated towards learning English. Moreover, the findings also indicated that female respondents are more motivated to learn English than their male counterparts. The average mean score for the former was 4.28 and the latter was 4.20. For the year of college study, there is no clear evidence showing that this factor had a significant impact upon the students' motivation. Similarly, the English proficiency factor indicated that the group of students with the lowest CUTEP scores were the least motivated towards learning English; nonetheless, the group of students with the highest CUTEP scores did not equate to the group of students with the highest degree of motivation towards learning English. In terms of department of study, the departments in which respondents with the highest degree to the lowest degree of motivation were affiliated were in the following sequence: Department of Government, Department of International Relations, Department of Public Administration and Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

5.3 DISCUSSION

This section discusses the findings of the study in regards to four topics: motivation level of political science undergraduate students; the importance of gender on motivations towards learning English; and the importance of year in college,
Motivation of political science undergraduate students

The political science undergraduate students were very highly motivated to learn English although they were enrolled in a curriculum in which Thai is the sole medium of instruction. They were predominantly instrumentally motivated to learn English as they regarded that the pragmatic outcomes of learning English were more important than social-emotional purposes. However, this does not mean that they were not eager to learn English for integrative targets. From the results, they were integratively motivated to learn English at a high degree. Respondents admitted that career prospects, an instrumental motive, was the most important factor driving them to learn English enthusiastically. However, the second most important factor was in the integrative category, which was access to wider knowledge sources. The third most important factor among all was shared by both an instrumental target and an integrative goal since the respondents viewed that learning English enabled them to have opportunities in life and that learning English allowed them to understand English native speakers were equally important. The least important factor in the participants' opinions was that English could help them think critically, an integrative motive. Likewise, the second from the bottom was an instrumental motivation, which was learning English could enable them to be socially respected.

The finding of this study that students were predominantly instrumentally motivated reflects the same outcome as the majority of previous work carried out in Thai contexts, e.g. Nuchnoi (2008); Kitjaroonchai and Kitjariinchai (2012); Chumcharoensuk (2013), and non-Thai contexts, e.g. Shaaban and Ghaith (2000); Adachi (2009); Rehman et al. (2014).

Moreover, the respondents' answers from this study are also in agreement with those of Mun's (2011) work. Students highly respected the academic and professional importance of learning English such as studying abroad and getting a well-paid job.
5.3.2 The importance of gender on motivations towards learning English

According to the results, gender was a factor that impacted the extent of the motivation of the respondents. Females proved to be more motivated towards learning English in all three dimensions: overall motivation, instrumental motivation and integrative motivation. Apart from other general statements that both genders accepted the importance of learning English such as accessing English sources, watching English movies or getting higher incomes, females were the only gender that took the social aspect of prospective partners such as English native speaker boyfriends or husbands into consideration. Males, on the other hand, only mentioned online games as an important motivation to learn English.

Regarding the gender aspect, this study is also in line with the work of Kobayahi (2002), Ahmadi (2011), Nahavadi and Mukundan (2013) and Hengsadeekul, Koul and Kaewkuekool (2014). That is, women were generally more motivated to learn English than their male counterparts were.

5.3.2 The importance of year in college, department of study and English proficiency on motivation towards learning English

Due to the fact that the faculty of political science, regardless of the specific departments, provides only a curriculum in which Thai is the sole medium of instruction, the different year in college and different department of study were not deemed to have a significant direct impact upon the students' motivation towards learning English. Similarly, as the English proficiency tests were done as a part of requirements for all students entering the programme, this could not be used as an absolute identifier of students' English-learning motivation level.

5.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The findings of this study exclusively reflected the motivation of a certain group of participants, i.e., 160 political science undergraduate students at a
distinguished Thai university. Consequently, the results cannot represent nor be generalised to other groups of students, especially those in different disciplines. Likewise, the use of a questionnaire failed to gather in-depth information regarding their motivation and other factors that might affect their motivation.

Based on the abovementioned point of view, some research gaps still need to be filled. Thus, the following part will provide recommendations for further research.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the researcher would like to provide recommendations for further studies.

5.5.1 This study focused only on the political science undergraduate students. There should be other investigations carried out with students from different levels or different fields of study, since they may yield different outcomes.

5.5.2 This study surveyed 160 students. Further studies should be done with a larger sample size. The subjects could be current students or fresh graduates.

5.5.3 This study highlighted English learning. Further studies should be done on different languages such as French, Mandarin Chinese, Japanese or Spanish, which are also widely-used foreign languages in the field of political science.

5.5.4 This study did not take into account environmental factors such as family, neighbourhood or income level. Further studies could take these factors into consideration.

5.5.5 This study employed the survey method. Further studies should use qualitative methods of study; for example, interviews or experimentation, to gather more in-depth information.
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APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

Language Institute of Thammasat University
No. 2, Phrachan Road, Phranakorn, Bangkok, 10200
+66(02) 613-3101-3
litu_thammasat@hotmail.com

Motivation towards Learning English of Thai Political Science Undergraduate Students: A survey study

DEAR PARTICIPANTS,

This questionnaire is a part of my M.A. Independent Study. The objective is to understand Thai undergraduate students’ motivation towards English learning. Your responses are important in enabling me to obtain as full an understanding as possible of this topical issue. Nevertheless, your decision to participate in this survey is entirely voluntary, and you can stop doing it anytime as you wish in case you feel uncomfortable. If you decide to take part, the questionnaire should take you approximately 10 minutes to complete. Please frankly answer the questions in the space provided. If you wish to add further comments, please do. All your answers and personal information will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous. You will notice that you are not required to include your name or address anywhere on the questionnaire. The answers from your completion and others will be used as the primary data set for my research project for my Master’s Degree in Career English for International Communication (CEIC) at the Language Institute of Thammasat University (LITU). I hope that you will find completing this questionnaire convenient. Please feel free to telephone me on (66)85-967-5064
Thank you for your cooperation.
**Part I: General Background Information**

Instruction: Please mark an ‘x’ into the parentheses given the best describes you.

1. **Gender:**
   - ( ) Male
   - ( ) Female

2. **Years in college/university**
   - ( ) 1st Year
   - ( ) 2nd Year
   - ( ) 3rd Year
   - ( ) 4th Year

3. **Department**
   - ( ) Government
   - ( ) International Relations
   - ( ) Sociology and Anthropology
   - ( ) Public Administration

4. **Years of English learning:**
   - ( ) less than 5 years
   - ( ) 5-9 years
   - ( ) 10-14 years
   - ( ) 15 years or above

5. **English Proficiency Test (CUTEP)**
   - ( ) 14-34
   - ( ) 35-69
   - ( ) 70-98
   - ( ) 99-120
   - ( ) N/A

---

**Part II**

Instruction: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements; from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Learning English is important because it enables me to get a good grade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning in English is important because it enables me to express my feelings more openly like English speaking people do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning English is important because it enables me to get a good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learning English is important because it enables me to live as independently as English speaking people do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Learning English is important because it enables me to be more socially respected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Learning English is important because it enables me to access to wider knowledge sources, e.g. newspaper and journals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Learning English is important because it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enables me to be educated.

8. Learning English is important because it enables me to appreciate English arts and literature.

9. Learning English is important because it enables me to obtain a greater success in life.

10. Learning English is important because it enables me to think critically.

11 Learning English is important because it enables me to earn a higher salary/wage.

12. Learning English is important because it will help me understand when the native speakers speak English.

13. Learning English is important because it enables me to earn career advancement.

14. Learning English is important because it will help me keep in touch with English-speaking foreign friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Learning English is important because it enables me to earn a great number of opportunities in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Learning English is important because it enables me to share my knowledge and experience to other people. e.g. presenting ideas in English or giving direction in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Learning English is important because it enables me to earn a better living condition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Learning English is important because it enables me to understand culture of the English-speaking countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Learning English is important because it enables me to study abroad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I want to speak English fluently in order to live in English-speaking communities/ societies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref. code: 25605821040028YHI
Part III

Instruction: Please provide comments or suggestions to the space given (if any).

1. Can you explain more about how important learning English is to your life?

..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
# BIOGRAPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mr. Attawat Assavanadda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>September 07, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - 2014: B.A. (English), Ramkhamhaeng University, Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 – 2016: B.A. (Political Science) (Hons.), Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 – 2017: M.A. (CIEC), Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Position</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of International Relations, Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Born and raised up in Bangkok, the city of angles, I find my passion to be an academic in the field of International Relations. I love to travel to other places but I sometimes I find serenity is all I need. During the free time, I enjoy drinking hot Chinese tea and reading thought-provoking books, followed by a short meditation practice. I also fall in love with fine art and classical music in which I can indulge myself for pleasure. I am a socialable person with lovely friends across this planet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experiences</th>
<th>March – August 2016: Research Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Institute of Prevention and Social Research (IPSR, Bangkok Branch) and The University of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>