

Analysis of Motivational Factors Affecting English Communicative Competence in Higher Education Students From A Colombian University

Diana Katherine Gonzalez^{1*}, Ángela Patricia Arteaga², Alfonso Arce Ramírez³ and Erika Díaz Rincón³

¹Professor Unidad Central del Valle, Colombia

²Professor Universidad Minuto de Dios, Colombia

³Unidad Central del Valle, Colombia

*Correspondence to: Diana Katherine González Ocampo. 763021. 27th A No. 48-144. Km 1 South. Tuluá. Unidad Central del Valle del Cauca, Tuluá, Valle del Cauca, Colombia. Email: dkgonzalez@uceva.edu.co

Abstract

The purpose of this research work was to characterize the motivational factors influencing English Communicative Competence in higher education students from a BA program on Education with emphasis on Foreign Languages. Based on the need of studying the different types of motivation students presented at various levels of English as a Foreign Language, the study was carried out in students from A- to C levels. The research had a quantitative approach under a non-experimental transactional design, as the main instrument was the ELOS by Thu Huong Ngo (2015) questionnaire to measure motivation levels, language learning orientation scale and intensity motivation scale. The analysis was made through the interpretation of measures of tendency and the results of the English diagnostic tests in SPSS statistics software. The results demonstrated the population was highly motivated 5.9 average, 1.0 standard deviation by intrinsic means. Also, the population presented 5.9 average in intrinsic motivation aspects such as knowledge whereas achievement presented an average score of 5.3. Finally, the results evidenced there is no direct relationship nor significant differences between motivation in proficient and non-proficient English levels.

Keywords: Motivation, Intrinsic motivation, Extrinsic motivation, Amotivation, English Communicative Competence.

Introduction

During the last decades, Colombia has been developing several policies and projects in order to improve citizens English levels. A special focus has been brought to teachers as well as students, placing the educational system as one of the priorities to develop English communicative competence. Regarding the above, the national bilingualism plan expects that by 2019, eleventh grade students (11th grade) will have a B1 level of English according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). Now, undergraduate students from non-foreign language education programs must be intermediate speakers of English after finishing their five year program and the proficient exam taken. However, Colombian government has set another expectation for future English teachers and that is to prepare them to be proficient C1 level by the end of their bachelor program. If the future teachers are qualified, competent and proficient in English, this would ensure the competence development of Colombian population. Moreover, the result of national projects to become the country a bilingual nation had been ineffective. According to international PISA exams, Colombia is located in the 48th place out of 50 countries who were evaluated in English. Those data support the need of exploring the problem from a different perspective, particularly from the field of applied linguistics and the theories of second language acquisition. This theory is often supported by the idea of learners being motivated and how this state can lead to effective and non-effective learning process of English as a foreign language. It is necessary to mention motivation directly affects the learning interests that a person may have. Motivation is a factor of great influence on aspects of learning and it is necessary to analyze the possible causes of the negative attitude in the interest of getting to know and get involved in that language, so important conclusions can be risen and specific actions can be conducted in higher education.

Considering the general problem, a particular analysis was proposed in Uceva University. Initially an analysis of the proficiency test applied

to students were made, in order to determine the students' levels in comparison to the CEFR standards. The test showed students did not have the expected levels according to the national and the university scores. On one hand, third-semester students (who must present a level of English B1) do not have the ideal proficiency level at 61%, this percentage being more than half of the students, thus leaving to the smaller part in a 39% that refers to those that reach or surpass the B1 required in their semester. In the same way, 0% sixth-semester students obtained the expected B2 level according to CEFR. Finally, 15% out of 100% of the population of senior students about to graduate reached the C1 expected level.

The previous results, led to the need of studying the students' motivation levels and what motivation factors affected their English proficiency. Motivation is a factor that influences in different ways and provokes reactions in people. In educational settings, the teacher is in charge of directing, shaping, directing and building knowledge in the student. A perception of education where one hundred percent (100%) of the responsibility is attributed to the teacher, where the knowledge that the student possesses depends exclusively on extrinsic motivation, tends to be inaccurate, even though the teacher is the in charge of this motivation, the students fulfill a fundamental factor in the learning process. Given that, what is learned has to be connected with the needs of the individual so that there is interest in relating needs and learning. Each person has different cognitive, affective aspects that will be of great impact in their development and in the same way each one will have a different level of motivation depending on how appropriate their learning needs are with their personality and the moral commitment that will lead them to the importance for them. So, as relevant as it is to study motivation levels in future teachers, the proposed question for this study was what were the motivational factors influencing English Communicative competence in higher education students from a Colombian university?

Theoretical Framework

Learning is a process in which there is a modification of activities in response to all changes that may be in the field of growth of the organism Hilgard (1980). Learning is a continuous improvement of skills or the acquisition or assimilation of them thanks to experience and the contact with the information and that become permanent thanks to the assimilation and coding processes occurred in mind. When it comes to language learning, experience, contact and social interaction is crucial to develop knowledge or communication

Dongo (2008) says intelligence, learning and experience must be linked, in that sense, learning processes do not merely work under a single cognitive element but act in terms of the complement reusing from the three of them. That is to say, the plasticity emerged from cognitive structure has an effect on the way a learner adapt and prepare skills to obtain information from new resources. Subsequently, learning effective problem solving skills. Therefore, it can be said, the learning experience a subject can have directs the strategies they will use to react, adapt and be prepared for a new type of challenges that come up in a specific field of study what is also mentioned by Dewey (1940) "Learning by doing".

According to the prior, learning is also being competent. Chomsky (1998) managed to establish distinction between competence and performance. The first refers to the knowledge that the speaker - listener has of the language. Performance refers to the real use of the language in specific situations where knowledge can be explicit through communicative acts. Competence, on one hand, is an innate faculty of human beings equivalent to a grammatical competence focused in linguistic rules that could generate grammatically correct phrases. Performance, on the other hand, is related to the putting in use of the above mentioned phrases in the speech.

According to Harmer (1981) learning of a language can be possible if there is a continuous relationship with it. So, if the student has more spaces and opportunities to interact in the second language, learning will be directly proportional. This suggests the context in which the linguistic activity is developed is extremely important. Molina (2009) adds an extra element to learning and maintains learning occurs when the teachers manages to maintain students motivation during a learning process.

A: Motivation

Motivation can be understood as the individual inclination to learn. It is a series of desires and impulses which encourage learning. Gardner (1985). Koontz and Wehrich, (1999) define motivation as the dynamic root of behavior; that is, the factors or internal determinants that prompt an action. Similarly Gardner (1985) argues motivation can be understood as the individual inclination to learn "the motivation to learn a second language is a combination of the desire to learn, and the effort developed in that action" (p. 266). Likewise, Lee & Hammer (2001), define motivation as what the subject is willing to do in order to achieve an achievement.

However, Nereci (1991) mentions motivation is an activity that causes certain behavior in people, maintaining the activity or modifying it towards what one wants to learn. In other words. Individuals can carry out an action related to learning, and also, to modify their behavior according to their own interests and desires in the light of what they have learned. Thus, it can be affirmed, motivation can vary according to the behavior and attitude of the individual towards learning.

According to the definitions proposed by the previous authors it can be said motivation is aspiration to perform some kind of activity in

a pleasant way for the subject. However, it is an individual motivation which also favors learning, given that the presented motivation in each person is the one that governs the individual's behavior and attitude towards the learning that they intend to carry out. The behavior motivation generates can be directly oriented to achieve a result that is satisfactory for an individual, that produces welfare for himself, or, on the contrary, causes a behavior aimed at avoiding an impact, a negative or unpleasant for the subject

Negative motivation leads to the performance of behaviors to avoid an unpleasant consequence for the subject. In this way, the individual performs an activity adhering to this type of motivation, in order to avoid a negative effect, which most likely appears if this action is not carried out.

Hellriegel and Slocum (1991) mention that the recurrent negative effect can have an effect in the short term, but in the long term it can trigger a negative or undesirable behavior for learning.

Regarding the factors enhancing motivation, Gardner (1985) mentions Attitude and effort. The former refers to the situation and inclination of individuals individually and is acquired through learning. In addition, in the socio-educational model of Gardner makes a relationship between attitude and motivation along with learning a second language. Whereas Effort describes what you are willing to do to achieve or achieve the proposed goals. The effort emerges from several factors, such as social pressures, the need for achievement and the desire to please. (Gardner, 1985)

Now, with regards to types of motivation, Deci and Ryan (1985) indicate intrinsic motivation is the person's performance for their own good, without expecting anything in return. Whereas extrinsic motivation can be identified when the person performs an activity in search of an external reward. Unlike intrinsic motivation, in extrinsic motivation the person engages mainly in activities to obtain a reward, either as a reward or to prevent a punishment.

Extrinsic motivation can be observed when the person performs a specific activity to obtain what is wanted. This means that you want to achieve a goal outside the activity itself, carried out in order to obtain an external objective. Regarding extrinsic motivation, the person is involved mainly in activities to obtain a reward.

Intrinsic motivation arises from the incentives given to perform a task, in its difficulty, the subject seeks to undertake such action and conclude it satisfactorily. Intrinsic motivation is one in which people perform tasks or activities for the mere fact of liking what they do, regardless of whether they obtain recognition or not. Ajello (2003)

On the other hand, Burstall et al (1973) cited in Naiman states that it is perhaps impossible to distinguish between these two terms, since according to their position they are directly linked, where it is possible to be able to be an individual with instrumental motivation that comes to possess a motivation integrative and vice versa.

According to Brown (2000) there are 3 levels of motivation "Hierarchical model of Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation" which allow to study the motivation with greater precision. The highest level of motivation is global, here the individual develops a general orientation to interact with their environment, and this type of motivation can be intrinsic or extrinsic. Likewise the individual can also be affected by the attitudes of the teacher.

English learning and motivation

Motivation is one of the most common problems in education. There is no learning without motivation and therefore learning is proportional to motivation.

In the second language acquisition process, the factors intervening for learning are diverse. Azurmendi and Espi (1996) distinguish in their work variables related to: the teacher, the methodology, context of learning, the individual and the attitude to the second language defined above. Pintrich and Schunk (2002) mention that motivation is an influential cause in the teaching and learning aspects of a second language. Nakanishi (2002) supports the idea by expressing motivation determines the degree of effort one puts into learning the foreign language or second language. Motivation leads to learning success “(p. 1).

“Studying a second language is not the same as studying any other subject, since the study of a second language involves getting involved in the culture of the new language, incorporating new sounds, structures, that is, converting something foreign into something of your own” (Gardner, p.68). Learning a foreign language involves unpredictable elements, such as: students, teachers, environment and motivation which is the fundamental element of the present project to be developed.

To sum up, both, the elements and who transmits them (when and where) are to determine the level of success with which a learner achieves acquisition, competence or learning.

Method and Design

The study was developed under the quantitative approach given the main purpose was to analyze how motivation influences students’ English proficiency. “The quantitative approach uses data collection and analysis to answer research questions, relying on numerical measurement, counting and frequently the use of statistics to accurately establish patterns of behavior in a population” (Hernandez, Fernandez & Baptista, 2003, p.5). This quantitative approach was necessary to analyze the results of the data collection after students questionnaire completion. Statistical data were crucial to fulfill the proposed objectives, describing the relationship between the dependent variable described as English level and independent described as motivation, intervenient variables such as English years of study, genre, and semester were also considered but not manipulated nor measured under the objectives proposed for the study.

The research had also a non-experimental design, with a descriptive scope. Studies following this design purport to measure theoretical constructs or practical issues (Griffie, 2012). In this case, the theoretical construct studied was motivation. This design is characterized because it was carried out without manipulating variables, what was intended to discover was the phenomena (motivation) occurring in a natural context after the participants answered a questionnaire. In that sense, the research studied under the principles of a quantitative instrument, the levels of motivation and what factors influenced motivation in the population studied. Experiment was not conducted and population was not influenced, therefore any bias was detected when solving the questionnaire. The designed allowed an emergent descriptive hypothesis supporting proficient students tend to present higher levels of motivation in comparison to less proficient students.

A: Sampling

The population were students of the Bachelor degree on Education with emphasis on Foreign Languages. This population universe was composed by a total of 186 individuals 112 women and 74 men. The selection criteria were mainly the completion of the first-year program, due to the questionnaire was entirely conducted in English and having the results of the English proficiency test conducted by the University to measure students’ English level. To select the participants, a simple random sampling procedure was conducted with a ninety percent (90 %) of reliability and ten percent (10%) of margin of error. Participants were called to answer the questionnaire online in a single moment.

B: Instrument

The instrument used to collect the data was a questionnaire piloted by Thu Huong Ngo in his work *An investigation into students’ motivation to learn English In higher education in Vietnam in 2015*; the questionnaire was adapted from 2 main instruments: 21-item Language Learning Orientation Scale- Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Motivation and demotivation Subscales (LLOS-IEA) (Noels et al., 2000) the questionnaire version comprises 21 elements representing the different individual reasons for learning a second language.

These 21 elements form seven subscales, including demotivation (three items), introjected regulation (three items), identified regulation (three items) and intrinsic motivation – knowledge (three items), intrinsic motivation – achievement (three elements) and intrinsic motivation–stimulus (three elements). It has a Likert scale of 7 points (1= strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree).

The measurement of the LLOS-IEA instrument allowed students to indicate their level of correspondence according to the question; which ranges from 1 (Does not agree at all) to (Strongly agree) the correspondence to each question will be directly proportional to the level of motivation of which the question frames. For that matter, the use of SPSS statistics software was used, in order to determine whether there was a direct relationship between motivation and Communicative competence established by each threshold (Figure 1 and 2).

Results

The table 1 reports the measurements of central tendency obtained after the SPSS tabulation. The table evidences each motivation type and their standard deviation. According to the test evaluation scale, intrinsic motivation was reported at moderate high level with 5.7 mean and 1.0 σ . As regards extrinsic motivation, the population was placed at moderate levels as well (4.9) mean 0.7 σ , 0.1 more than intrinsic motivation, which strongly suggests students present higher levels of

Escala de Likert	
1	Strongly disagree
2	Disagree
3	Disagree somewhat
4	Not decided
5	Agree somewhat
6	Agree
7	Strongly agree

Figure 1. Likert measurement scale. LLOS-IEA

Source: (Noels et al., 2000)

Colors for motivational level	
Low	Red (1 a 3.5)
Moderate	Orange (3.6 a 5)
Moderate High	Yellow (5.1 a 6)
High	Green (6.1 a 7)

Figure 2. Motivational level evaluation scale.

Source: (Noels et al., 2000)

Table 1. Measures of central tendency. *LLOS-IEA*

	Mode	Mean	Median	Standard deviation
Extrinsic motivation	6	4.9	4.9	0.7
Intrinsic motivation	6	5.6	5.7	0.9
Amotivation	1	1.9	1.3	1.1

intrinsic attitudes towards learning English in comparison to extrinsic influences. Amotivation levels were expected to be low as the population currently studies English at higher education levels and willingly have chosen the undergraduate program. The σ suggests data scatter of 1.2. Those subtypes that measured the disinterest (Amotivation) and the effort to achieve something negative (Negative motivation) obtained an average of 1.9 and 3.03 respectively, indicating that it is at a low level, since it did not surpass the range of 3.5, revealing the motivation types that represent benefits and achievements are superimposed by those that represent a disinterest and negativism.

Subsequently, the pertinent statistical operations were carried out to obtain the median of the subtypes of motivation, for which the individual general averages were organized by subtype from least to greatest to identify the midpoint that would describe which is the central measure of the students, thus describing from what number are 50% of the population above and 50% below. Hierarchically, those subtypes that presented the highest median were the identified regulation and the intrinsic motivation (knowledge) with a level of 6, which means that 50% of the students obtained a general average below 6, and the other half reached results above that number. Similarly, negative motivation and amotivation remain those subtypes with a lower median, being 2.9 and 1.3 respectively, indicating that they are at a low level.

A: Intrinsic Motivation levels

The table 2 reports the results of the intrinsic motivation variables studied. As it can be seen, knowledge was the main affecting variable, (5.8) standard deviation (.99) which suggests the student internal desire to learn English in order to have a better understanding of the language, rather than a completing courses of making efforts to improve in the language. The least affecting variable was achievement (5.3 average) defined as the inclination to carry out an activity that generates well-being by the achievement of an accomplishment according to the needs and desires of the individual. The results prove students are less motivated by getting a reward or accomplish an objective than obtaining comprehension of what is being studied. Moreover, the overall intrinsic motivation results highlight the three aspects considerably influence intrinsic motivation in moderate levels according to the evaluation scale proposed by the instrument.

In relation to intrinsic motivation levels, the table 3 suggests, 43% of the total of the population is in higher moderate levels, whilst 35% were placed high levels. According to each level, it can be said, A threshold students find themselves intrinsic motivated, whereas B threshold students are highly motivated. In terms of the most motivated level it could be said A2 students feel more intrinsically activated. Nonetheless, there is an important 1-7% of students in B levels who are not motivated, in comparison to the rest of the levels. This important finding suggests students motivate internally at beginner levels (11% vs 25%). Finally, there were no data from A1 students, representing they did answered according to the evaluations scale. Intrinsic motivation (knowledge) relates to how the individual expresses that the fact of learning different things related to the outside world can be or generate a satisfaction of their own, referring to what the table reports that this Subtype has the highest levels in terms of intrinsic motivation.

B: Extrinsic motivation levels

The Table 4 reports the extrinsic motivation measurement of central tendencies. The overall extrinsic motivation level was 4.9, 0.7 standard deviation indicating a moderate high level according to the LLOS scale. Subsequently, among the variables affecting this motivation subtype, it could be observe a prevalence of identified regulation with a difference of 0.03 with external regulation and 1.0 in comparison with introduced regulation. The latter variable score was moderate according to the evaluation scale. External regulation is understood as the motivation stage that is directly connected to the stimulus, reward or external punishment. As an element of extrinsic motivation, external regulation is the one that depends least on the student and, therefore, is not usually a factor that influences the development of self-determination. Furthermore, introduced regulation happens

Table 2. Intrinsic motivation measurement.

	Knowledge	Achievement	Incitement	Intrinsic Motivation
Valid	60	60	60	60
N	0	0	0	0
Mean	5,878	5,380	5,697	5,655
Median	6,000	5,700	5,700	5,750
Standard devi	,9925	11,108	11,126	,9561
Min	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0
Max	7,0	7,0	7,0	7,0

Source: (González, Arce, Díaz, Arteaga, 2018)

Table 3. Intrinsic motivation levels per CEFR level.

English level	Intrinsic motivation levels				Total
	Low	Moderate	Moderate high	High	
A-	0	0	0	1	1
	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	1,7%	1,7%
	0,0%	1,7%	3,3%	3,3%	8,3%
A2	0	3	4	7	14
	0,0%	5,0%	6,7%	11,7%	23,3%
B1	1	6	15	6	28
	1,7%	10,0%	25,0%	10,0%	46,7%
B2	0	2	4	2	8
	0,0%	3,3%	6,7%	3,3%	13,3%
C1	0	0	0	2	2
	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	3,3%	3,3%
No	0	0	1	1	2
	0,0%	0,0%	1,7%	1,7%	3,3%
Total	1	12	26	21	60
	1,7%	20,0%	43,3%	35,0%	100,0%

Source: (González, Arce, Díaz, Arteaga, 2018)

Table 4. Extrinsic motivation measurement.

	Introduced Regulation	Identified Regulation	External Regulation	Extrinsic Motivation
Valid	60	60	60	60
N	0	0	0	0
Mean	3,617	5,700	5,445	4,922
Median	3,300	6,000	5,700	4,950
Standard devi	1,1696	1,0436	,8955	,7919
Min	1,0	1,0	2,7	2,3
Max	6,7	7,0	7,0	6,9

Source: (González, Arce, Díaz, Arteaga, 2018)

once the student has internalized the causes of his motivation. Finally, the identified regulation is described as the final stage of extrinsic motivation. Contrary to external regulation, the identified one presents high levels of self-determination on the part of the student.

At this level, students propose their limitations or progress opportunities for learning and decision making is based on internal criteria of reward or punishment. The primary conduct in this regulation is the autonomy to make decisions. The above results suggest the students surveyed are extrinsically motivated at a moderate level. However, the regulation that presents the greatest level of influence is identified regulation. From this it is inferred the population receives external stimuli that influence its motivation. Unconsciously, students assume such motivation as their own, because they have developed self-determination, which is an essential aspect for the development of intrinsic motivation.

With regards to the percentage of people with the different extrinsic motivation levels, the table 5 suggests the majority of the population corresponding 51.7% is moderately extrinsic motivated. Whereas a 38% is in high moderate levels. This initial analysis led to determine the population is generally motivated. Furthermore, students placed in A thresholds maintain an increasing extrinsic motivation from low to moderate levels. B levels present significant differences in their extrinsic motivation, for example B2 presented the same population in both moderate and moderate high levels. However, B1 had the majority of its population in moderate levels. Also, A2 level showed a small percent of their population in low levels as well as B1 levels. Which suggests people in low beginning and pre intermediate levels struggle at the moment of finding external influence relevant when learning a language. In contrast with intrinsic motivation which had the majority of students in A2 levels, according to the table 5, B1 students tend to be more motivated by external factors. Followed by A2 levels and B2 levels demonstrated less extrinsic motivation levels.

C: Amotivation

As for the amotivation it was identified that it is in a low level, because its general average did not exceed the threshold of 3.5 to only reach an average of 1.9.

Table 5. Extrinsic motivation levels per CEFR level.

English level	Intrinsic motivation levels				Total
	Low	Moderate	Moderate high	High	
A-	0	0	1	0	1
	0,0%	0,0%	1,7%	0,0%	1,7%
A1	0	3	2	0	5
	0,0%	5,0%	3,3%	0,0%	8,3%
A2	1	7	5	1	14
	1,7%	11,7%	8,3%	1,7%	23,3%
B1	2	17	8	1	28
	3,3%	28,3%	13,3%	1,7%	46,7%
B2	0	4	4	0	8
	0,0%	6,7%	6,7%	0,0%	13,3%
C1	0	0	2	0	2
	0,0%	0,0%	3,3%	0,0%	3,3%
No	0	0	2	0	2
	0,0%	0,0%	3,3%	0,0%	3,3%
Total	3	31	23	3	60
	5,0%	51,7%	38,3%	5,0%	100,0%

Source: (González, Arce, Arteaga, Díaz, 2018)

Table 6. Amotivation measurement

	Amotivation	Amotivation 2	Amotivation 3	Amotivation ave
Valid	60	60	60	60
N	0	0	0	0
Mean		2,1000	1,667	1,902
Median		1,000	1,000	1,300
Standard devi		1,6743	1,2975	1,1726
Min		1,0	1,0	1,0
Max		7,0	7,0	5,7

Source: (González, Arce, Arteaga, Díaz, 2018)

Table 7. Amotivation levels.

English level	Amotivation levels			Total
	Low	Moderate	Moderate high	
A-	1	0	0	1
	1,7%	0,0%	0,0%	1,7%
A1	5	0	0	5
	8,3%	0,0%	0,0%	8,3%
A2	13	0	1	14
	21,7%	0,0%	1,7%	23,3%
B1	28	0	0	28
	46,7%	0,0%	0,0%	46,7%
B2	4	4	0	8
	6,7%	6,7%	0,0%	13,3%
C1	2	0	0	2
	3,3%	0,0%	0,0%	3,3%
No	2	0	0	2
	3,3%	0,0%	0,0%	3,3%
Total	55	4	1	60
	91,7%	6,7%	1,7%	100,0%

Source: (González, Arce, Arteaga, Díaz, 2018)

Amotivation can be defined as the absence of internal or external stimuli that lead an individual to carry out an activity, taking into account that it is the motivation that moves the subjects to perform an action, it is convenient to identify that the amotivation is found at a low level, because his general average did not exceed the threshold of 3.5 to only reach an average of 1.9.

As the table 6 suggests students present low levels of amotivation which can be considered as an important variable to describe the students' motivation in general. The table confirms 1.7% of the A2 levels feel highly demotivated which is related to the fact there were A2 students with low levels of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation.

Discussion

After analyzing the results obtained against each objective from the statistical analysis, the relevant findings are presented, in order to highlight important information on the influence of motivation learning English and different inferences from authors and studies have addressed the issue and additionally have postulated theories or have reached conclusions that support or disagree with the results presented.

The first finding allowed suggests students presented higher levels of intrinsic motivation, this has been widely discussed by Deci et al. (1991) and Kimberly et al. (2001) who report that intrinsic motivation is related to the fact of voluntary activities, that is to say the student learns in this case a particular interest against any activity and self-satisfaction. Furthermore, Brown (2000) states intrinsic motivation has connections with metacognition and therefore is superior to

extrinsic. Similarly, it was found that the intrinsic motivation subtypes (knowledge, achievement stimulus) had a moderate high level of motivation, this means students found interest in learning English carrying out welfare activities generate them according to their needs and desires. Also, this finding supports the theory of self-determination on intrinsic motivation therefore is beneficial to acquire a second language (Deci and Ryan, 2012).

The current results have significant differences with the ones proposed by Saheb (2014) where extrinsic motivation had more influence on the studied population since they were constantly surrounded by English speaking contexts. However, participants in this research only had contact with the English language in academic contexts which strongly affects their intrinsic levels. For that reason, students' extrinsic motivation was also regulated by introduced variables which strongly connect to the individual's relationship with external learning contexts. This view was opposite to the ones found in Budiana, K.M., & Djuwari. (2018) where their students were not motivated towards English because of the lack of external exposure to the language. However, the two studies presented similar conclusion in terms of the importance of English in the world. An aspect which was also evident in students answer related to extrinsic motivation.

This event supports the research study conducted by Thu Huong Ngo (2015) in the thesis entitled "An investigation into students' motivation to learn English in Higher Education in Vietnam" whose conclusion indicated that intrinsically motivated students persisted longer in their race, which yields similar to those of the present study results, since in both studies subjects perceived learning English as a pleasurable experience and self-interest.

Moreover, from the statistical analysis was evidenced the identified regulation (this being a subtype of extrinsic motivation) was found as the subtype motivation with higher responses compared to other subtypes. Individuals identify an academic activity that may have an important value for itself, or as an instrument to achieve a challenge, thus the individual adapts to a sense of psychological well-being to establish this conduct as a result of own choices Assor, Roth and Deci (2004) also when the subject envisions learning as direction or purpose and not as a requirement is named as internalization by Koestner et al. (1996).

In accordance with the foregoing, the question pertaining to the identified regulation which obtained responses on a higher level I am studying English Because I think it is good for my personal development, is directly related to the personal development of the individual, which conceptualized as such actions that enhance awareness and identity and stimulates the preparation of personal characteristics from those actions, subjects adopt new behaviors, beliefs and attitudes which tends to show an improvement in different aspects of their lifetime. That said, for a subject to reach this process, it is necessary to incur dissatisfaction, which creates a need for change by the individual. Therefore, it can be inferred that, among many other existing activities for the population surveyed, learning English is part of the actions they intend to take as an identity or action that generates development in internal skills, awareness of knowledge and that such attitudes have to be adopted or discarded in order to obtain the expected personal development. These results are compared to Bravo et al (2017) where Ecuadorian students feel attracted by the work opportunities and the economic influence English has in higher education programs. Furthermore, Darwesh & Anwar (2017) differed from this study results, since their population showed higher extrinsic motivation levels. Which suggests the population studied had particular individual learning desires. Besides, Anderson (2018) supports the importance of learning English for professional development (achievement and effort) and for having

contact with other cultures and learning settings.

On the other hand, research study conducted by Thu Huong Ngo in 2015 in his thesis entitled "An investigation into students' motivation to learn English in Higher Education in Vietnam" showed as a result that its population surveyed, only one third of this (6 / 18) he indicated that sought to learn English in order to obtain personal development, since, in their perception, personal development means more confidence and more knowledge about the world. In disagreement with this study, the population surveyed displaying learning English is part of the half (31/60) prefer learning English as a goal to achieve growth in behaviors and attitudes

Patterns that follow the results of the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation towards learning English are very similar, as could be observed in those most motivated students, who had the lowest and highest levels of English. Given that these two types of motivations go hand in hand in the learning process and to find that the subtype of extrinsic motivation (identified regulation) is autonomous, allowed to understand that in developing this factor, students begin to have more motivation and less apathy by class, as they found Beltran & Salgado, (2010) in his thesis "Learning a second language in preschool," where he concludes that bringing motivate the student activities, academic performance increased. Similarly (Ryan & Deci 2000) mention that such levels of autonomy, self-determination and desire for such activities that will bring benefits to themselves, are characteristics that are shared with the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Regarding to the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation Yang (2018) proposes having a domain motivation is further a disadvantage and teachers instead of feeling threatened by the lack of students extrinsic motivation they must encourage intrinsic regulation and motivation.

The above fact is consistent with the result provided by the statistical analysis, where it was shown that the highest subtype extrinsic motivation is identified regulation, being at the same level as the intrinsic motivation and each of the three subtypes. In addition, although it should be noted that as mentioned by Huitt (2005) teachers and external factors can take steps to increase motivation in students, which should preferably be intrinsic such as show and explain why it is important to learn particular content, because if only extrinsic measures are taken, such as to reward simple learning; these will not be when the learning process terminated and the individual is in a real context, although that has internalized, it will start to behave according to their internal consequence of not being under the influence of external factors desires. So that intrinsic motivation will grow if there has been a well-internalized extrinsic motivation by the student (Heider, 1958 & Weiner, 1974).

Moreover Stipek (1988) presents different theories of why students are not motivated to learn, which mentions that one of the most common reasons is that the satisfaction of achieving the goals set with this learning seem to be in the distant future or even that important individual goals come into conflict with the activities being undertaken at present. This indicates that the activities proposed to be undertaken by external factors individuals cannot be geared to the needs or goals set by students when they began their learning process. To this regard González, Córdoba and Giraldo suggest, increasing motivation and self confidence come from implementing activities where studies can monitor themselves. Methods such as PBL often provide opportunities for students diminish their affective filter and to develop intrinsic motivation. González, Molina, Cardona (2017). Similarly, the national history called "Obstacles in learning EFL in two groups of Bogota population" by Roldán (2016), concluded that there are so negative emotional factors that greatly influence the learning process, which are anxiety and fear causing attrition, and lack of motivation.

Conclusions

After having made the relevant analyzes and interpretations that corresponded to each of the objectives in relation to the instrument and the results provided by the population under study, it is concluded that:

Students in Foreign Language with Emphasis in English have a level of intrinsic motivation superior to the other types, presenting an average of 5.7 reaching a high moderate level as well as its three subtypes, organized as follows: Intrinsic motivation (knowledge) 5.8 intrinsic motivation (achievement) 5.3 and finally intrinsic motivation (stimulus) 5.7, so in synthesis of the above, students are mostly motivated to learn English by internal factors that external agents or other outside intrinsic motivation.

In agreement with the hierarchy established by each question belonging to each type and subtype of motivation, the students of the program of Bachelor of Foreign Languages with Emphasis in English, presented a higher frequency in question number 10, pertaining to external regulation, which was I am studying English because I think it is good for my personal development, answered with the highest number on the scale of measurement 7 (Totally agree) by 31 students, making reference to 52% of the total shows, which shows that students are mostly motivated by behaviors regulated by external factors that have been internalized by them, especially by obtaining personal development.

References

1. Ajello, A. M. (2003). La motivación para aprender. En C. Pontecorvo , [Motivation to learn in C] . Manual de psicología de la educación (pp. 251-271). España: Popular.
2. Anderson, R., "Second Language Learning Motivation" (2018). Culminating Projects in Teacher Development. 30. http://repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed_etds/30.
3. Azurmendi & Espi (1996). *Motivation, attitudes and learning of Spanish as a foreign language*. RESLA, 11, (63-76).
4. Beltran, J. & Salgado, G. (2010) Aprendizaje de la segunda lengua en edad preescolar: Estrategias didácticas para la enseñanza en el aula. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana
5. Bravo, J., Intriago, E., Villafuerte, J., Molina, G., Ortega, L., Motivation and Autonomy in Learning English as Foreign Language: A Case Study of Ecuadorian College Students. *English Language Teaching*; Vol. 10, No. 2; 2017 (100-113).
6. Brown, D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning And Teaching*. New York: Longman.
7. Chomsky, N. (1998). Una aproximación naturalista a la mente y al lenguaje. [A naturalistic approach to mind and Language]. Barcelona, Spain, Prensas Ibéricas.
8. Budiana, K.M., & Djuwari. (2018). The non-native students' motivation in learning English at STIE Perbanas Surabaya. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 12(2), 195—202.
9. Darwesh, H. & Anwar, Motivation towards Learning English as a Second Language among First Stage Students in English Department at the Garman University. *K. Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce* 4172 International Refereed Research. Vol.-VIII, Special Issue-3(1), July 2017 (66-71)
10. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Motivation, personality, and development within embedded social contexts: An overview of self-determination theory. In R.
11. Deci, E. y Ryan, R. (1980). The empirical exploration of intrinsic motivational processes. New York: Ed. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 13.
12. Deci, E. Vallerand, R., Pelletier, L. y Ryan, R. (1991). Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language. *Language Learning*, 44 (3), 417-448.
13. Dewey, J. (1938), (1997 edition) *Experience and Education*, New York: Touchstone.
14. Dongo A. (2008) La teoría del aprendizaje de Piaget y sus consecuencias para la praxis educativa. [Piaget's learning Theory and its consequences in educational praxis] Universidad Estadual Paulista campus de Marilia, Brasil. Vol. 11
15. Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, E. W. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13(4), 266-272. Doi: 10.1037/h0083787
16. Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and language learning: The role of attitudes and motivations*. London: Edward Arnold.
17. González, D.K Córdoba, A. Giraldo A.S. (2019). The affective filter role in learning English as a Foreign Language through Project Based Method in high school students from a school in Colombia. *Revista Boletín REDIFE* 8 (8): 18-23 - August 2019 - issn 2256-1536.
18. González, D. K., Molina, J. C., & Cardon, B. S. R. (2017). Project-based Learning to Develop Oral Production in English as a Foreign Language. *International Journal of Education and Information Technologies*, 11, 87-96.
19. Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J. & Woodman, R. (1999) *Comportamiento organizacional*, [Organizational Behavior] 8. D.F, México: International Thomson Editores.
20. Harmer J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Cambridge UK. Pearson Longman. Fourth Edition.
21. Hernández, R., & Fernández, C. (2010). *Metodología De La Investigación*. [Research Methodology]. Mcgraw-Hill / Interamericana Editores, S.A. De C.V.
22. Hilgard, E. & Bower, G., (1980) *Teorías del Aprendizaje*. [Learning theories]. Trillas, México.
23. Hilgard (1980) the Trilogy of Mind: Cognition, Affection and Conation. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*.
24. Huitt, W. (2005). Increasing engagement on classroom tasks: Extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University
25. Kimberly, A.; Noels, K.; Clément, R. & Pelletier, L., (2001). Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Integrative Orientations of French Canadian Learners of English. *CMLR* 57, (3), March
26. Lee, J. J., & Hammer, J. (2011). Gamification in education: what, how, why bother? Definitions and uses. *Exchange Organizational Behavior Teaching Journal*, 15(2), 1-5. Retrieved 18 October 2016 from <https://www.uwstout.edu/soe/profdev/resources/upload/Lee-Hammer-AEQ-2011.pdf>.
27. Molina, V. (2009). La motivación en el aprendizaje del idioma inglés en la escuela secundaria, [Motivation in Learning English at secondary school] Morelia, Michoacán.
28. Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, M., & Todesco, A., *The good Language Learner*. Ontario, Canada. Wayside Books.
29. Nakanishi, T. (2002). Critical Literature Review on Motivation. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 1(3).
30. Nereci, I. (1991). *Hacia una didáctica general dinámica*. [Towards general dynamic didactics] Buenos Aires, Argentina, Kapelusz.
31. Ngo, Thu Huong (2015) An investigation into students' motivation to learn English in higher education in Vietnam, Queensland University of Technology. Vietnam.
32. Nunan, David. (2005) *Tasks of English Education: Asia-wide and Beyond*. The Asian EFL Journal Vol 7

33. Pintrich, P.R. y De Groot, E. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academia performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 33-40.
34. Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (2002). *Motivation in Education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
35. Roldán, A (2016) Obstáculos en el aprendizaje del inglés como lengua extranjera en dos grupos de población bogotana. [Obstacles in learning English in two groups of Bogota population] Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas.
36. Saheb, V. (2014) *Motivation in English as a Foreign Language Learning: A study of motivation toward English language learning in Stockholm's upper secondary schools for adults (KOMVUX)*. University of Halmstad. Stockholm, Sweden.
37. Schunk, D., (1982). Effects of effort attributional feedback on children's perceived self-efficacy and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 548-556
38. Stipek, D., (1988). *Motivación para aprender: de la teoría a la práctica*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
39. Swain, M., & Canale, M. (1981). A Theoretical Framework for Communicative competence. En *The construct validation of test of communicative competence* (E. Cataño Franco, & M. López Medina, Trads., págs. 31-36). In Palmer, A., Groot, P., & Trosper, G. (Eds.).
40. Wehrich, H. & Koontz H. (1999) *Management: A global perspective*. 10th ed. McGraw-Hill. Inc.
41. Yang, M. (2018) Learning Motivation among University English-language Majors under Hierarchical Teaching Model. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 18(6), 3543-3549. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12738/estp.2018.6.265>