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Abstract

This thesis reports on a study of whether motivation in foreign language learners in multilingual and monolingual areas differs. The study was conducted in the northern Italian province of South Tyrol and its results were compared to those of Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh’s (2006) longitudinal study on L2 learning motivation in Hungary from 1993 to 2004. Additionally, the similarities and differences in LX motivation across the three South Tyrolean language communities (German, Italian and Ladin) were investigated.

Data was collected by means of a quantitative online survey focusing on the motivational factors: Integrativeness, Instrumentality, Attitudes Towards the LX Speakers and Community, Cultural Interest, Vitality of the LX Community, Milieu and Linguistic Self-Confidence and South Tyrol relevant issues such as participants’ Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country and Content and Language Integrated Learning.

Full data from 1,214 Year 8 students from 28 schools was obtained and analysed in general, across gender, geographical distribution and the three language groups. Moreover, Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh’s (2006) full structural model was tested on.

Results confirmed that the retrieved motivational dimensions influencing monolingual L2 learners have an impact on multilingual LX learners but additional aspects do also play a role. The comparison of the three language communities showed Italian and Ladin LX learners to be the most motivated whereas the German students the least motivated.
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Chapter 1   Introduction

The first chapter describes the aim as well as the organisation of the thesis and the area of research which is situated in the multilingual region of South Tyrol in the territory of Italy.

1.1 Aim of the thesis

This section outlines the aim of the thesis and its underlying study. According to Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh (2006) “most teachers and researchers would agree that motivation is one of the key factors that determine language learning achievement” (p.vii). Consequently, language-learning motivation has become a popular research topic. This research interest has led to a representative data focus on English as the most acquired L2, in mainly monolingual areas such as Hungary and Finland and in predominately Eastern countries such as China and Japan, some L2 motivation researchers’ countries of origin. In addition, tertiary education students have been investigated the most, since they can be accessed more easily due to their proximity to research institutions (Boo, Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015, p.156).

By following Boo, Dörnyei and Ryan’s (2015) recommendations to do more motivational research in ‘underrepresented’ secondary schools and on LX different from English to provide further insights into the complex process of language acquisition, the major interest of the study is to find out differences in attitudes to LX language acquisition between students having grown up in a multilingual area and those from monolingual areas. The study should lead to a better insight into multilingualism as an individual and societal phenomenon in multilingual societies and the complex system of motivation in, and attitudes towards, language learning which
could enhance the promotion of becoming a plurilingual society in today’s Europe, as it has been a major objective of the EU since 2002 to facilitate communication between different communities and thus to go beyond the limits of one’s own world.

For this purpose, an online questionnaire survey with Year 8 students from the multilingual area of South Tyrol was conducted and the results are compared to those of Dörnyei and his associates’ 1993-2004 longitudinal study (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006) in Hungary to identify similarities and differences between students living in multilingual and monolingual areas. Additionally, the results for each of the three South Tyrolean language groups (German, Italian and Ladin) were separately analysed to gain further insight into the variations within this area.

After outlining the aim of this thesis, information about the content and structure of the thesis will be provided.

1.2 Organisation of the Thesis

The thesis is organised in 6 Chapters. Chapter 1 provides an overview of the multilingual area of South Tyrol, presenting its linguistic, historical, educational and socio-political context. Chapter 2 is the literature review chapter which encompasses the relevant research literature on which the study for this thesis is based. First there is a focus on multilingualism in general, in European as well as in South Tyrolean terms. This is followed by a presentation of information and theories on general motivation, L2 motivation and L3/X motivation as well as the status quo of LX motivation research in South Tyrol. Finally, the concept of Content and Language Integrated Learning and its benefits for a multilingual education and Content and Language Integrated Learning in South Tyrol are laid out. Chapter 3 portrays the research methodology and the data
collection process by pointing out the research questions, study design, methodology and the data analysis parameters. Chapter 4 illustrates the findings of the study in two parts. Part 1 outlines the South Tyrol data in contrast to that of the Hungarian as well as comparing all three language groups and part 2 provides an insight into the results of those of the South Tyrol specific variables in general and sorted by language group. Chapter 5 comprises the data discussion. Chapter 6 concludes the thesis with the conclusion, proposals for future research and an outline of the limitations of the study.

As previously mentioned, this thesis is divided into 6 chapters focusing on the theoretical framework as well as the empirical data of the underlying study conducted in South Tyrol. In order to provide an insight into the characteristics of the research area, the following section includes a portrait of multilingual South Tyrol.

### 1.3 Multilingual South Tyrol

This subchapter presents relevant information about South Tyrol, the research setting of this study. South Tyrol is an Italian province and, together with the province of Trentino, forms Italy’s most northern region, the Autonomous Region of Trentino – Alto Adige/ Südtirol. It borders the trilingual Swiss canton Graubünden in the west, the Austrian federal state (Bundesland) Tirol in the northwest, north and east, the Italian province of Sondrio in the southwest, the province of Trentino in the south and the province of Belluno in the southeast.

The province is politically subdivided into eight districts (the so-called Bezirksgemeinschaften/ Comprensori) as shown in figure 1.
Due to its special geographical location in the heart of the Alps, South Tyrol represents a bridge between Northern and Southern Europe and thus comprises a multilingual population which will be described next.

1.3.1 Linguistic Landscape

In the following section a linguistic portrait of South Tyrol will be presented. South Tyrol has a population of 520,891 inhabitants (ASTAT, 2016c, p.9). 106,441 of them live in the capital Bozen (ASTAT, 2016c, p.9). It consists of 69.5% German, 26% Italian and 4.5% Ladin speakers (ASTAT, 2012, p.4). Consequently, German is the local majority language and the national majority language Italian forms a minority language together with Ladin. According to ASTAT (2016a, p.4), in 2015 8.9% of the population was of foreign origin but due to the fact that every South Tyrolean officially has to declare their belonging or affiliation to either the German, Italian or Ladin language group in the Population Census, there is no official data about their first languages.

Italian as well as German and Ladin are the three official languages of South Tyrol. The majority of German native speakers speak various German dialects.
depending on the valley they live in but they learn Standard German at kindergarten and primary school. They live in the rural valleys, in towns and the capital Bozen.

Italian native speakers, the second biggest population group, tend to speak a more standardised Italian rather than a dialect like those living in all other Italian regions. Most of them live in the urban area as well as the capital of South Tyrol. (Meraner, 2011 p. 163)

Ladin is a Romance language consisting of a group of dialects almost exclusively spoken in the Dolomite area. In South Tyrol, Ladin speakers mainly live in the Gröden and Gadertal Valley as well as the capital. (Tourism Board Alta Badia, 2017)

Due to its troubled history and subsequent political decisions, every South Tyrolean must be multilingual and study German and Italian (and in case of the Ladin speaking community Ladin too) as their first language (L1) and second language (L2) as well as English as their first foreign language from primary school onwards. In secondary school a possible second foreign language (French, Spanish, Russian, Latin or Ancient Greek) can be added. Significantly, dialect(s) play an important role as almost all German-speaking South Tyroleans use it as means of communicating in everyday life. (Meraner, 2011 p. 162)

Initially, it is important that the terminology regarding the languages used in this thesis is explained. The use of L1 for the first acquired language, L2 for the second, L3 for the third etc. often implies a linear acquisition of these languages and the assumption of one L1, one L2 and one L3. Hammarberg (2014, p.13) explains that this terminology is not perceived as a problem in a trilingual setting, because L1 and L2 are automatically identified with the native and the non-native background language, and L3 with the target language. However due to the increasing focus of research on
language learning in multilingual contexts, this linear model of language acquisition is not suitable because multilinguals often learn languages not following one linear order. In addition, in today’s globalised world, people often comprise partial language competences e.g. only receptive competences. Therefore one needs to set the parameters for when a language can be defined as ‘known’. Consequently, Hammarberg (2014, p.13) calls for a future reflection on the terminology opting for different terms to provide more transparency. Until then, the use of the terms L1, L2 and L3 should be clearly defined in advance.

Whereas De Angelis (2007, p.11) proposes the use of the notion ‘third or additional language’ instead of ‘third language’ and Cenoz (2000, pp.39-42) understands L3 as the next language learned after having simultaneously acquired two languages since infancy, in this thesis L1 will be used for the first language, L2 only if exclusively discussed about one’s second language and L3 only if exclusively referring to one’s thirdly learnt language. The most preferred term will be LX, as used by Dewaele (2013), to define any acquired language after the first language especially when focusing on multilingual South Tyrol to guarantee it can be applied to the language repertoires of all South Tyroleans.

This complex linguistic landscape clearly characterises South Tyrol as a highly remarkable multilingual research area since every South Tyrolean is supposed to speak between three and five languages. This is a consequence of history as explained in the next subchapter.

1.3.2 The historical background

As previously mentioned, the population of the North-Italian region of South Tyrol is multilingual because of a series of historical events. These will be outlined in
the following section to provide an insight into the circumstances which have shaped this area.

Südtirol weist in historischer, kultureller und sozialer Hinsicht zahlreiche Besonderheiten auf. Seine kulturellen Lebenswirklichkeiten sind reichhaltig, teils widersprüchlich, denn in Südtirol sind sich zu allen Zeiten die deutsche und die italienische Sprach- und Kulturwelt begegnet; sie haben sich gegenseitig befruchtet und bereichert, waren sich Ansporn, Streitanlass und schöpferische Quelle zugleich. (Pädagogisches Institut Bozen, 2000, p. 39)

According to the Pädagogisches Institut Bozen, South Tyrol comprises a special linguistic and cultural world in which the question concerning identity, self-concept and cultural affiliation has more often been questioned than anywhere else due to its historical background.

With the ratification of the Treaty of Saint Germain in 1919, at the end of World War I, the mainly German speaking area of South Tyrol was separated from Austria and annexed by Italy to readjust its geographical frontiers. This was seen as a great injustice by both Austrians and Tyroleans and led to discussions about how to govern South Tyrol between its politicians and the Italian government in the following years. (Alcock, 2001, pp.1-2)

When Benito Mussolini and his Fascist regime came to power in Italy in 1922, these political discussions were stopped and a process of forced assimilation of all cultural minorities in Italy was started, the so-called *Italianization*. Consequently, the South Tyrolean population faced serious consequences as Italian became the exclusive language of public life. German was not only banned in courts and public offices but also geographical names as well as family names had to be translated. The Fascist regime aimed to abolish the German culture, schools and newspapers as well as strongly promoted Italian immigration to South Tyrol by means of public funding.
To accelerate the process of *Italianization* of South Tyrol, an Industrial Zone was built in its capital Bolzano leading to a rapid increase in the number of Italians living and working in the urban areas of the region. (Alcock, 2001, p.3)

The South Tyrolean minority, mainly living in the rural areas, were treated like foreigners in their own land. However, they strongly resisted these changes and in particular the ban on German schools and the requirement to only study in Italian, by organising secret *catacomb schools* to continue studying German. (Südtiroler Landtag, 2002, p.5)

With the rise of Adolf Hitler in Germany, South Tyroleans began to hope for a better future. However, Hitler and Mussolini decided on the so-called *Option* for South Tyrol and a few other municipalities in the neighbouring province of Belluno and Trento, giving them a choice to emigrate to the German Reich and give up their homes or to stay and become fully Italianized. This led to tense discussions among South Tyroleans and split the population. Due to the outbreak of World War II, only 75,000 South Tyroleans were resettled but this process was hugely divisive. The minority of those who decided to stay in South Tyrol were severely intimidated by those who wanted to leave. This resentment also continued after the end of World War II and was later extended to the Italian minority living in South Tyrol. (Südtiroler Landtag, 2002, pp.7-9)

In the subsequent years South Tyroleans fought for their rights and South Tyrol caught the world’s attention which eventually led to a unique set of policies (the 2nd Autonomy Statute, 1972) to protect all three South Tyrolean communities by giving them equal rights and including a linguistic policy which introduced language parity,
guaranteed every South Tyrolean could be educated in their mother tongue as well as requiring that every person employed in public administration had to achieve the certification of bilingualism. (Alcock, 2001, pp.11-18)

As illustrated in this subchapter, South Tyrol’s population and consequently its linguistic situation have been shaped by its separation from Austria, the Fascist government’s policy of Italianisation, the consequences of Hitler’s and Mussolini’s South Tyrolean Option Agreement and the 2nd Autonomy Statute (1972). They have also defined South Tyrol’s politics and educational system which will be outlined in the next subchapter.

1.3.3 Educational and socio-political background

As a result of several historical incidents described previously, South Tyrol comprises not only a particular linguistic but also a complex political situation. Understanding it is crucial to comprehend its school system. Therefore, it is essential to explain the impact of the 2nd Autonomy Statute (1972) and the resulting political measures imposed on the South Tyrolean population, and their language use and learning, before providing an overview of the South Tyrolean educational system.

The 2nd Autonomy Statute (1972) protects all language groups and guarantees the equal status of German, Ladin and Italian in all aspects of life as well as the use of German, next to the official national language Italian, in court and public administration. As a consequence, people who would like to work in public administration, court, law enforcement, etc. have to be officially bilingual and need to be in possession of the so-called South Tyrolean Certificate of Bilingualism. The certificate can be acquired by passing an exam at the Office for Bilingualism and Foreign Languages in Bozen. (Südtiroler Landesregierung, 2009)
The 2\textsuperscript{nd} Autonomy Statute (1972) provided South Tyrol with legislative competences in several areas such as culture and education. Thus it also laid the foundation for the development of the South Tyrolean school system. Article 19 says that every South Tyrolean child has the right to be educated in their mother tongue, in other words German and Italian, and by teachers whose mother tongue is the same as theirs apart from the L2 teachers who have to be native speakers of the respective L2 language. For Ladin speakers, there is a special regulation which guarantees them Ladin kindergarten education and bilingual primary and secondary education divided in 50% German and 50% Italian lessons. This article also states that there are three individual school authorities, the German, Ladin and Italian Schulamt which are responsible for the administration of their schools and teachers. (Südtiroler Landesregierung, 2009, pp.74-76)

As a matter of fact, South Tyrol disposes of German schools for German speakers, Italian schools for Italian speakers and Ladin schools for Ladin speakers. These circumstances have helped to ethnically separate its population, e.g. there are separate sports and cultural associations for each language group, as well as destroy the potential of the multilingual area being a paradise for language learning e.g. there are wide rural areas in which only German is spoken and separate Italian-only quarters in Bozen and some major towns. (Meraner, 2011, pp.162-163)

According to Baur, Mezzalira and Pichler (2009, pp.46-47), it is even possible to identify three socio-linguistic areas in South Tyrol, the urban area, the bigger valleys and the mountain areas. In Bozen and the bigger towns, 40% to 70% of the population speak Italian, which generally motivates both Germans and Italians to learn their L2. The number of Italian-speaking South Tyroleans living in the bigger valleys is far lower
(10% to 40%). Consequently there are fewer incentives to learn the L2 especially for German-speakers who rarely need to use their L2 in daily life. The mountain areas are almost exclusively populated by non-Italian native speakers leading to practically no motivation to acquire the L2 amongst their inhabitants.

Whereas the German and Italian schools offer all subjects apart from LX lessons in the respective school language, Ladin schools can provide a more multilingual education as already mentioned. This facilitates Ladin learners to the extent that they are able to grow up in a more multilingual manner.

In 2002 the EU Commission started to take into consideration that in a multicultural and multilingual world it is not enough to only speak one language and drafted the EU Barcelona objective. In order to support linguistic diversity and language learning, the EU Commission has been working with national governments to enable EU citizens to communicate in a minimum of two other languages than their mother tongue since then (European Council, 2002, p.19). As a consequence, South Tyrolean school authorities have introduced several measures to implement the Barcelona objective and to support language learning in South Tyrol (Meraner, 2011, pp.165-169). Ladin schools have continued to further elaborate their multilingual education system by for example implementing English already in Year 4 in primary school. So Ladin students are given the opportunity to learn four languages, Ladin, German, Italian and English, already from primary education onwards. Italian schools have implemented several language projects and initiatives such as an increased number of weekly L2 lessons starting as early as primary school onwards and regular Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) lessons from Year 7 onwards thanks to their direct link to the national education authority MIUR (Ministero dell’ Istruzione,
The German school authority has also tried to implement new measures to support the consolidation of multilingualism in German South Tyroleans by raising the number of L2 lessons, introducing L2 lessons in the 1st form and English as LX already in the 4th form of primary school. However these initiatives and plans for introducing CLIL lessons to foster LX learning as in Italian schools have led to lengthy political discussions and resistance based on Article 19 of the 2nd Autonomy Statute (1972). As a result, German schools are able to only slowly follow Italian and Ladin schools and only provide their students with limited opportunities to benefit from their multilingual surroundings as for example, two CLIL pilot phases for a number of secondary schools. (Meraner, 2011, pp.168-169)

The most recent attempt to promote the importance of fostering multilingualism is the Förderung der Mehrsprachigkeit in der deutschen Schule (2016-2020) package which includes L1 and LX language promotion measures such as the introduction of a multilingual curriculum. Nonetheless, these implementations have also been critically monitored by supporters of the Article 19.

Die deutsche Schule in Südtirol stellt sich bewusst der Herausforderung, die Förderung der Mehrsprachigkeit bei allen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern als eines ihrer vorrangigen Ziele zu setzen. […] Mehrsprachigkeit ist keine Gefahr für die Erstsprache Deutsch, wenn der Erstsprache die notwendige Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet wird. […] Die deutsche Schule in Südtirol ist sich aber bei aller Wertschätzung und Förderung der Mehrsprachigkeit stets bewusst, dass die deutsche Sprache, insbesondere das Hochdeutsche, für die Südtiroler und Südtirolerinnen von besonderer Bedeutung ist. (Deutsches Bildungsressort, 2016, p.4)

Aware of the reactions to Article 19 (2nd Autonomy Statute, 1972), the German school authority has been trying to raise awareness of the importance of this issue by especially pointing out that other languages should not be seen as a danger to the L1, focusing on the importance of German for South Tyroleans and highlighting that South
Tyrol as a border region between the Germanic and Romanic area should not focus on being a border but rather on being a bridge open for communication and cooperation (Deutsches Bildungsressort, 2016, p.4).

South Tyrol’s 2nd Autonomy Statute (1972) and its Article 19 have successfully assisted in protecting the minorities of Ladin and German South Tyroleans by guaranteeing their equal status to the Italian language as an official language. However they have also led to the socio-linguistic as well as ethnical separation of the Ladin, Italian and German language groups by on the one hand, triggering more and less motivated areas as well as language groups to study the respective L2 and on the other, introducing a divided school system with different consequences for the various language groups. The Italian South Tyroleans who can profit from still being closely connected to the rest of Italy and the national language policy, the Ladins who have been provided with the best opportunity to benefit from living in a multilingual area and the German speakers who have certainly been protected by Article 19 but also hindered to focus on the advantages of multilingualism to a certain extent. Taking this situation into consideration, South Tyroleans’ motivation to learn languages represents a highly interesting and valuable research topic.
Chapter 2  Literature Review

This chapter focuses on three main theoretical frameworks. Firstly definitions of multilingualism, the current state of research and multilingualism in Europe as well as in South Tyrol will be given. Secondly an overview of the key stages in LX motivation will be presented that lay the foundation for this study. Thirdly the concept of ‘Content and Language Integrated Learning’ and its role in Italian and South Tyrol Education will be examined.

2.1  Multilingualism

2.1.1  Definition

Initially the term ‘multilingualism’ as used in this thesis will be defined. This will be followed by a brief overview of the latest state of research on multilingualism and its importance in Europe and in South Tyrol. Finally the European and the South Tyrolean language policies and a selection of related documents will be briefly outlined.

Although multilingualism cannot be considered as a new concept anymore since there have been numerous examples of multilingual individuals such as polyglot *Emperor Charles V* and *Frederick the Great of Prussia* and multilingual regions such as Switzerland in history, when looking for a concise and common definition of multilingualism, one will be surprised about how many different denominations, interpretations and subcategories of this concept it is possible to find in literature (Braunmüller & Ferraresi, 2003). Wei lists a total of 37 forms of bilingualism (Wei, 2000, pp.3-4).
The International Encyclopedia of Linguistics (Hakuta, 1992, p.176) mainly uses the term 'bilingualism' for this concept and defines a bilingual person “as someone who controls two or more languages”. It also highlights the complexity which lies beyond this concise definition. There are several criteria to take into consideration when attempting to define this concept such as the degree of controlling a language and the sequence of learning the languages, either simultaneously or consecutively. However is a bilingual speaker someone who has native-like competences in all languages and who has learnt all of their languages at the same age? Hakuta (1992, p.176) also explains that scholars have disagreed on which criteria to apply to define bilingualism. Consequently various types of bilingualism have been created such as simultaneous versus sequential bilingualism differing in the time when the languages were acquired.

According to the Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics, a bilingual person is simply “someone with the possession of two languages” (Wei, 2006, p.1), just as the term’s Latin root -bi (twice or two) suggests. Wei (2006, p.1) also takes into account that “there are people in the world who have varying degrees of proficiency in, and interchangeably use, three, four or even more languages” denoting them multilingual people and thus using a different term to clearly distinguish them from bilingual people. Wei (2006, p.2) even adds that it is essential to note that “a multilingual speaker uses different languages for different purposes and does not typically possess the same level or type of proficiency in each language”. He does not only clearly distinguish between the number of languages a speaker uses but also highlights that someone can be called ‘multilingual’ despite their varying level of
language competence and the context each language is used in. Oskaar (2003, p.31) proposes the following definition:

Mehrsprachigkeit ist die Fähigkeit eines Individuums, hier und jetzt zwei oder mehr Sprachen als Kommunikationsmittel zu verwenden und ohne Weiteres von der einen auf die andere Sprache umzuschalten, wenn die Situation es erfordert.

According to Oskaar, multilingualism is the ability to communicate in two or more languages switching between the languages whenever required in a certain situations regardless of whether speakers change between foreign languages or between varieties of their first language such as dialects or the standard variety.

Dewaele (2015, pp.2-3) argues that although there might be less Google Scholar results for ‘multilingualism’ than for ‘bilingualism’ and related associations disagree on its exclusive use, the former term is “broad and inclusive” if using numbers of spoken languages to categorise people at all and alternatively proposes the ‘total frequency score’, “the sum of scores for self-reported frequency of use in the different languages” as a more effective measure to distinguish between a mono- and multilingual individual.

In other research on the acquisition of more than two languages e.g. by Haarmann (1980) and Herdina & Jessner (2002), bilingualism is seen as a variation of multilingualism and the authors preferably use the term multilingualism as an umbrella term in their publications.

Since this definition represents the linguistic reality of the multilingual area of South Tyrol, the terms ‘multilingual’ and ‘multilingualism’ used in this thesis are based on his definition and function as an umbrella term similar to those in other researchers’ publications.
To summarise, multilingualism is a broad concept that has been interpreted based on different criteria by different scholars. The term ‘bilingualism’ can partly be used as a synonym but also as only knowing two languages at an often native-like level. Multilingualism as used in this thesis includes the knowledge and the competence of shifting from two to more languages as well as varieties as is the case for most inhabitants of the research area of South Tyrol. The following subchapter will provide a concise overview of the research on multilingualism with a special focus on foreign language learning in recent years and will serve as a basis to comprehend the theoretical background of European and South Tyrolean language policies.

2.1.2 Current state of research

This section outlines the status quo of research on multilingualism and its influence on third language acquisition to provide a theoretical framework for the subsequent subchapters focusing on multilingualism in the supranational context of the European Union as well as in the local one of South Tyrol.

Cummins and Persad (2014, p.4) state that languages have been taught by applying the direct method which requires the exclusive use of the target language and the exclusion of the L1 or any other language e.g. in Canada and most European countries e.g. Basque Country for various reasons such as to avoid interference between the L1 and LX, to increase motivation in learners, to reduce workload for teachers and to protect the minority language and culture (Gorter & Cenoz, 2016, p.6). Even language assessment has had a monolingual focus during which a language learner is compared to “a monolingual native speaker without taking into account the student’s knowledge of other languages and penalizing the influence and use of other languages” (Gorter & Cenoz, 2016, p.7).
However, multilingualism has recently become a main field of interest because, according to Franceschini (2011, p.348), “it became more and more evident that bi- and multilingual speakers share characteristics that distinguish them from monolinguals, for example, codeswitching and translation”. Consequently, criticism of learning languages independently has increased and several approaches to further research in this field have been made to investigate the cognitive outcomes of multilingualism, multilingual language processing and cross-linguistic interaction, only to mention a few (Cenoz, 2013, pp.7-10). With regard to Grosjean’s (1982) holistic view of bilingualism in which the LX learner is not seen as a defective LX speaker but as a whole person, Cook (1991, pp.112-114) developed the concept of ‘multicompetence’ to study language learning in LX speakers. He claims that by learning and using an LX, they develop multicompetence which provides them with a different knowledge of their first and their second language and leads to a different language processing system. In addition, it encourages the development of a different kind of language awareness, making them better language learners. His concept has become broadly supported and further theoretically and empirically worked on by more researchers in this field (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011; Cenoz, 2013; Jessner, 2008). For instance, Cenoz (2013, p.11) agrees with Cook on the importance of this approach for teaching and researching multilingual education to facilitate language learning in multilinguals:

It analyses the gap between the traditional focus on one language at a time in research on multilingualism and multilingualism in real-life communication involving all the languages and multilingual discursive practices. It explores the possibility of establishing bridges that can link these two realities so that multilingual students can use their own resources to a larger extent in formal education.
Alongside multilingualism, the study of third language acquisition has also increased in the last few years due to the collaboration of second language acquisition (SLA) and bilingualism although traditionally ignoring each other. Cenoz (2003, p71) states the following:

Third language acquisition shares many characteristics with second language acquisition but it also presents differences because third language learners have more language experience at their disposal as second language learners, are influenced by the general effects of bilingualism on cognition, and have access to two linguistic systems when acquiring a third language.

Consequently, several studies have been carried out to research on the effect of multilingualism on third language acquisition from different perspectives varying in the languages involved and the degree of proficiency in the different languages by various researchers (e.g. Cenoz, 1991; Cenoz, 2003a; González-Ardeo, 2008; Hufeisen, 2000; Jessner, 2006; Sanz, 2000;). For example, Cenoz (1991) and Sanz (2000) researched on the effect of multilingualism on general LX proficiency in secondary school students in the Basque Country and Catalonia. They compared the proficiency level of English in monolinguals and bilinguals after controlling factors such as general intelligence, exposure to English, socioeconomic status and motivation. Both studies confirmed that multilinguals showed a higher degree of proficiency in English than monolinguals. Nevertheless Cenoz (2003b, p.75) also states “the effect of factors such as general intelligence and motivation was more important than the influence of bilingualism“. In other words, multilingualism plays an essential role in facilitating LX learning but so does the degree of intelligence and motivation in language learners.

Therefore, it is important to not only focus on monolingualism but also to take multilingualism into account alongside other relevant factors, such as motivation, when conducting research on foreign language acquisition considering that according
to Cook (1991, pp.112-114) multicompetence, which has proven to benefit language learning, is not the sum of monolingual competences as previously explained.

Consequently, political interest in multilingualism has been increasing within Europe. In order to gain a closer understanding of multilingualism in South Tyrol, it is essential to become familiar with multilingualism as promoted by the European Union laid out in the following.

2.1.3 Multilingualism in the European context

This subchapter provides an overview of multilingualism in the European Union starting with a view on national identities and national languages, individual versus societal multilingualism moving over to the EU’s multilingualism policy and its aims.

As previously mentioned, multilingualism already existed in the past and was “a necessary precondition for mastering the various tasks in everyday life” (Braunmüller & Ferraresi, 2003, p.3) e.g. at work, for trade, in the church, etc. At that time Europe consisted of numerous regional language varieties. However, in the 18th and 19th centuries certain regions grew more powerful and national states were created. The demand for national linguistic identities increased favouring the most dominant language of each country to take over that role. Consequently, Europe started to shift from multilingualism to monolingualism (Carson, 2003, p.18).

Since the foundation of the European Union, multilingualism has been institutionalised at a supranational level by adopting all the national languages of its member states as official languages and legally guaranteeing that all citizens are allowed to communicate with all EU institutions in their national languages. Nonetheless, English and French have become the two most important working languages within the EU institutions (Carson, 2003, pp.18-19).
The introduction of nation states and national languages has promoted monolingualism within national territories but there are also a small number of border regions with more than one official language such as Alsace, the Basque country and South Tyrol, and even whole territories such as Switzerland, Luxembourg and Belgium. According to Carson (2003, p.21), it is important to distinguish between “macro-multilingualism, or the language policies and politics that affect a geographical entity, and micro-multilingualism, the interaction of several languages in the lives of individuals”. In other words, the terms societal or collective multilingualism and individual multilingualism could either be used for officially multilingual countries but with a number of citizens only having competences in one language or, as in the before-mentioned case, officially monolingual countries with a group of multilingual citizens. The latter ones especially often had to hide their multilingualism because the regional dialects were often suppressed during the creation of the national states in the past e.g. in Alsace and in South Tyrol during the Fascist era. (see 1.2.2) In addition, the terms additive and subtractive bilingualism (Lambert, 1975) should be briefly introduced which, especially in such regions, could have played or can still play a vital role. For example, if learning the majority language of the region is felt as a pressure and undermines people’s minority first language and culture, this can cause a subtractive situation consequently negatively influencing the motivation to learn this language. Whereas learning an additional language and culture is unlikely to threaten the L1 language and culture can be experienced as a linguistic and cultural benefit thus positively influencing the LX learning motivation. This is also called an additive bilingual situation. According to Rindler Schjerve & Vetter (2012, p.10), since the European Union’s creation in 1993, the following has become one of its main goals:
Respecting the existing linguistic diversity and enhancing the multilingual competences of the European citizens have been conceived as important premises on which integration into a Union bound together by common values should be fostered.

Since the EU has acknowledged that enhancing and stimulating multilingualism is vital for the continuing unification process of its member states and has thus become an integral part of its political agenda. As a consequence it has introduced several language policies such as the EU Barcelona objective mentioned above in 1.2.3 – the requirement for all EU citizens to study their mother tongue plus two additional languages - and has launched funded mobility programmes such as ERASMUS (university students can study for one or two semesters in another European country) and COMENIUS (exchange programmes for secondary school pupils and teachers), which have been part of ERASMUS PLUS since 2014.

In addition, the Council of Europe released a series of publications including the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in 2001 to promote collaboration among educational institutes within the EU, to provide a common basis to facilitate the mutual recognition of EU citizens’ language competences and to support language learners as well as all people and authorities involved in the language acquisition process to have a common working basis (Council of Europe, 2001). Furthermore, the Framework of Reference for Pluralistic Approaches to Languages and Cultures (FREPA) promotes the use of pluralistic didactic approaches in all subjects, in other words more than one language or variety of languages or cultures are included in the teaching process to enhance the development of plurilingual and intercultural competences in learners. (Candelier et al., 2012) All these initiatives, policies and publications are proof of the considerable efforts the EU has been devoted
to not only fostering societal but also, and especially, individual multilingualism to unite Europe and prepare its citizens for living in a globalised world.

As seen in this subchapter, multilingualism has long been a part of European life and history, before the 18th and 19th century, commonly used to master everyday tasks especially for the nobility, during the creation of national states with one national language, forbidden but still present within certain individuals and border regions and since the foundation of the EU, a major issue on the political agenda to facilitate integration as well as the unification of Europe and to lay the foundation for Europeans to become world citizens. Consequently, the EU has reminded its member states to include multilingualism in their educational curricula and to set corresponding facilitating measures. In the following section the Italian border region South Tyrol and its current state of multilingualism will be analysed by highlighting the latest approaches to further increase multilingualism in its population.

2.1.4 Multilingualism in South Tyrol

Fostering multilingualism in its citizens has been intensively promoted by the European Union since its foundation. As a consequence, national governments and education authorities have also added this goal to their national political agendas and launched several initiatives to implement the corresponding EU regulations and requirements. So too have Italy and its autonomous region South Tyrol. Especially the latter’s situation and approaches to enhance multilingualism within an already multilingual area will be outlined next.

As already discussed in sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.3, South Tyrol’s linguistic landscape qualifies as an area with a collective or societal multilingualism despite all of its historical issues and the previously mentioned ethnical separation of its population.
e.g. due to different school systems for all three language groups. However, according to the 2014 Sprachbarometer (ASTAT, 2015a) with a representative sample of the South Tyrolean population (aged 16 and over), only 7% of the South Tyroleans described themselves as monolingual due to their age or low educational background. The rest claimed to be competent in at least one or more languages other than their mother tongue. Members of the German language group ranked higher than the Italian group, whilst the majority of the Ladin speakers declared themselves to be proficient in both L2s, German and Italian. This survey generally shows that language competency in South Tyrol depends on age, educational background and place of residence stating that younger and more highly educated inhabitants are more linguistically competent. In particular, when looking at the results regarding the competences in English as the first foreign language, data clearly confirms this assumption with 4 out of 5 younger South Tyroleans declaring knowledge of the language (ASTAT, 2015, pp.2-3). These results suggest that South Tyroleans, in particular the younger and better educated, are linguistically competent and represent the EU’s targeted ideal of individual multilingualism. To a certain extent, they also support the assumption that the language policies and various initiatives to encourage language learning by all three school authorities and the local government have had the desired effects.

However when considering the results of the 2015 exams for the certification of bilingualism which only 40% of all candidates passed (ASTAT, 2017), as well as other relevant studies such as the linguistic part of the EURAC’s KOLIPSI study (Abel, Vettori & Wisniewski, 2012a+b) about South Tyrolean high school students and their second language with a final sample of 777 students from all three language groups, there are
indications that the level of L2 competences of both Italian and Germans is still below the standard level. Abel, Wisniewski and Vettori (2012) state that the proficiency in the L2s proved to be contingent upon several factors such as gender, with girls excelling more than boys, the type of school students attended, those from the ‘Gymnasium’ (generally more academic high schools) showed better linguistic command than those from the ‘Fachoberschulen’ and ‘Lehranstalten’ (more technical high schools), and their perceived affiliation to the group of the bilingual South Tyroleans. Their findings reveal a different reality in which the numerous attempts to improve South Tyrolean’s L2 competences have not been as successful as was presented by the 2014 Sprachbarometer.

As previously stated (see 1.3.3), the local school authorities have taken various steps to support South Tyroleans taking advantage of living in a multilingual region such as increasing the number of L1 and LX lessons, improving L2 teachers’ teaching programmes, supporting language and language teaching concepts and fostering school partnerships between South Tyrolean schools with different languages of instruction (Deutsches Bildungsressort, 2016). Whereas those initiatives mainly concentrated on improving the L2 linguistic competences, the latest step, the Förderung der Mehrsprachigkeit in der Deutschen Schule (2016-2020) measure package, focuses more on promoting multilingualism in its fullest sense by not almost only aiming at increasing language competences but in fact raising awareness of the importance of multilingualism as a valuable personal competence, means to better communication as well as integration and a benefit for every citizen of a globalised world. Hence, an expert panel of the German school authority elaborated a multilingual curriculum for South Tyrol called Mehrsprachencurriculum based on the
FREPA with a special focus on how to create synergies in language teaching by combining various languages and varieties and how to profit by connecting languages also within other subjects at school and taking into account Hufeisen’s (2011, p.15) idea of a common curriculum:

Im Rahmen eines curricular verankerten Mehrsprachigkeitskonzeptes werden mehr Sprachen gelernt, wovon Sprachen wie Französisch profitieren können, Sprachen werden anders gelernt (weniger Jahre, dafür intensiver und in bilingualen Sach-Fachkombinationen, ... ), Sprachen konkurrieren nicht miteinander, sondern bauen aufeinander auf, und Deutsch als Muttersprachen, Deutsch als Zweitsprache und Herkunftssprachen werden mit einbezogen.

Such a curriculum leads to an increase in language learning which can take place in different manners thanks to Content and Language Integrated Learning (see 2.3), a better collaboration between the various languages as well as the inclusion of the country’s L1, LX and the student’s L1 in case of minority languages.

When presenting the publication about the Mehrsprachencurriculum to the public, Ferdinand Patscheider (2016), the current headmaster of the European School Frankfurt am Main and former superintendent at the local German school authority, stated it is not enough to only be committed to multilingualism, it is in fact an educational mission. In addition to justifying the urgency for a multilingual curriculum, he illustrated the importance of the concept of ‘decompartmentalization’, not seeing every language and every subject as a separate learning box but as an interplay for succeeding in fostering multilingualism and of the same tenor as the concept of the holistic view on multilingualism as laid out in 2.1.2.

However, reconsidering the factors influencing the L2 linguistic competences identified in the KOLIPSI study (Abel, Vettori & Wisniewski, 2012a+b) and comparing them to the measures launched by South Tyrol’s education boards which have
supported a certain development of the awareness of the value of multilingualism, Forer’s (2009, p.8) argumentation can be shared that despite all efforts “not much interest has been paid to the motivation of the population with respect to L2 learning“ so far and that more research on the factors with a positive impact on LX motivation is required to encourage the consolidation of multilingual competences in South Tyroleans in the long-term.

In this subchapter, the status quo of multilingualism has been outlined, starting from the assumption that South Tyrol could be an example of societal multilingualism due to its historical and socio-linguistic background. However, as the 2014 Sprachbarometer (ASTAT, 2015a) shows, multilingualism in South Tyrol seems to be present on a more individual level just as promoted by the EU especially in the younger and higher educated population. Nevertheless, linguistic competences in the L2 are still assumed to be below the required level in many cases as the KOLIPSI study (Abel, Vettori & Wisniewski, 2012a+b) and the 2015 bilingual certificate exam statistic showed. The reason for this could be the mainly atomic view on fostering multilingualism through an increase in the L1 and LX linguistic development of South Tyroleans without being beware of the holistic view on language learning and teaching as well as the motivational aspect of language learning. Whereas the introduction of a multilingual curriculum shows that the South Tyrolean education policy has recently started to consider the importance of LX learning and teaching in a collaborative manner to consolidate multilingualism in its citizens, there still have not been any approaches towards taking motivation in LX learning into account. In the following section, the motivational aspects in language learning will be discussed in more detail.
2.2 Motivation

Dörnyei & Ryan (2015, p.72) highlight the importance of motivation for language learning by claiming:

It provides the primary impetus to initiate L2 learning and later the driving force to sustain the long, often tedious learning process; indeed, all the other factors involved in SLA presuppose motivation to some extent. Without sufficient motivation, even individuals with the most remarkable abilities cannot accomplish long-term goals, and neither are appropriate curricula or good teaching enough on their own to ensure student achievement. On the other hand, high motivation can make up for considerable deficiencies both in one’s language aptitude and learning conditions.

Hence motivation is a major stimulant to learning an additional language and that all other factors influencing this process depend on it to such an extent that on the one hand language acquisition without motivation will not be successful and on the other a highly motivated language learner can succeed despite lacking intellectual skills for instance. Consequently in the following subchapters, the motivation theory underpinning this study will be outlined.

2.2.1 Motivation and the Social Sciences

In this section, the term ‘motivation’ is defined and some examples of approaches in general motivation research are presented.

Attempting to define the term ‘motivation’, the Oxford Online Dictionary (2017) explains motivation as being “a reason or reasons for acting or behaving in a particular way” as well as a “desire or willingness to do something”. Since the beginning of the 20th century these reasons and desires to activate goal-oriented behaviour have been studied in various branches of social sciences due to their high complexity and still today “there is no general consensus on the definition of the notion” (Dörnyei, 1996, p.9).
As a consequence, there are various theories about what generates and fosters motivation. Freud’s *Psychoanalytic theory* in the 1920s, for example, claims humans consciously and unconsciously make decisions based on drives and forces. Their fulfilment creates feelings of pleasure and consequently the main goal of human action is the reduction of aversion to increase pleasure (Atkinson, 1975). Despite the difference in the psychoanalytical perspective, Hull’s theory in the 1930s, also called a *drive-reduction* theory of motivation, was based on drives. According to him, they result from biological needs such as hunger or thirst that animals as well as humans feel as something uncomfortable and thus seek to eliminate them through certain behaviour. Drive was seen as the leading force that triggers behaviour. He even invented a formula to anticipate the probability of specific behaviour. His theory was applied to learning, seeing drive reduction as a necessary condition for learning e.g. students have to feel the drive for learning which must satisfy their needs (Dewey, 2014). Although Hull’s behaviourist ideas of motivation were abandoned in the 1950s and 1960s because many predictions of his equations did not prove true, he had a big impact on motivational research since many motivational theories from those years were reactions to his theory. Maslow’s *motivational psychology* from the 1970s can be seen as an alternative approach. He states that humans are influenced by a hierarchy of needs suggesting that basic needs such as breathing, thirst and hunger, first have to be satisfied before other needs like psychological needs such as love and friendship, and self-fulfilment needs can be progressively satisfied (Maslow, 1962, pp.204-205).

To sum up, despite the absence of a generally recognized definition of the term ‘motivation’ and probably because of it, motivation has become a prominent research
topic not only in psychology as shown before but also in Second and Foreign Language Learning research outlined in the next subchapter.

2.2.2 Historical Overview of L2 motivation research

In the following subchapter, a portrait of the development of motivational research in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and a selection of main motivational concepts relevant for this study will be provided. There will be an emphasised focus on Dörnyei’s longitudinal motivation study in Hungary from 1993 to 2004 also pointing out its importance for L2 motivation research.

Since the 1950s motivation has also become a popular research topic within SLA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>Schumann 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Control</td>
<td>Kuhl 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex, dynamic systems</td>
<td>Larsen-Freeman 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnolinguistic vitality</td>
<td>Giles and Byrne 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative motivation</td>
<td>Gardner 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International posture</td>
<td>Yashima et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Norton, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 motivational self system</td>
<td>Dörnyei 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner autonomy</td>
<td>Ushioda 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological approaches</td>
<td>Schumann et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Model</td>
<td>Dörnyei &amp; Otto 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>Noels 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td>Clément 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task motivation</td>
<td>Jülkunen 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to communication</td>
<td>MacIntyre 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gardner and Lambert’s (1959) work in bilingual Canada laid down the foundations for L2 motivation and can therefore be considered as a vital reference point for the development of all later L2 motivational concepts. MacIntyre, Noels and Moore (2010,
pp.2-3) identify fifteen key motivational concepts which can be seen as the most influential ones in second language learning. As shown in Table 1, motivation in second language learning has been studied from various perspectives leading to different theoretical approaches. Dörnyei & Ryan (2015, pp.73+74) speak of three and Ushioda & Dörnyei (2011p. 396) of four, sometimes overlapping, stages in the evolution of L2 motivation theory:

(a) The social psychological period (1959–1990) – characterized by the work of Robert Gardner and his students and associates in Canada.

(b) The cognitive-situated period (the 1990s) – characterized by moves to shift the research agenda away from its social psychological roots toward a realignment with mainstream educational psychology, mainly driven by cognitive theories originally developed in non-L2-specific research.

(c) The process-oriented period (turn of the century to the present day) – characterized by an interest in motivational change, especially concerned with how motivation emerges from interaction between individuals and contexts (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015, pp.73-74).

(d) The socio-dynamic period (current), characterized by a concern with dynamic systems and contextual interactions.

Since Dörnyei (1998, p.131) highlights that “motivation is indeed a multifaceted rather than a uniform factor and no available theory has yet managed to represent it in its total complexity”, a review of the main motivational concepts of the social psychological, the cognitive-situated and the process-oriented period which form the theoretical basis for this study is provided whereas the present state of the socio-dynamic period in motivation research is not dealt with.

According to Dörnyei (2003), Dörnyei & Ryan (2015), Dörnyei & Ushioda (2011), MacIntyre, Noels & Moore (2010), Ushioda & Dörnyei (2011) motivation research in SLA started in 1959 with Gardner and Lambert’s first research on language aptitude (a person’s ability for language learning) and motivation in Canadian L2 learners of
French followed by a series of similar studies considering motivation and attitudes towards language learning. The results of these research studies eventually led to the development of a pioneering L2 language acquisition model shaping L2 motivation research, later also known as the socio-educational (SE) model of second language acquisition (Gardner, 1985; 2009). Gardner’s research instrument, the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB), consisted of 11 subtests with internally consistent and valid scales testing the following five factors’ impact on language achievement, Attitudes Towards the Learning Situation, Motivation, Instrumental Orientation, a pragmatic interest in language learning, Language Anxiety, anxiety occurring in L2 classroom and non-classroom learning, and Integrativeness, “a genuine interest in learning the second language in order to come closer to the other language community” (Gardner, 2001b, p.5). In the SE model Language Achievement is influenced by two variables, Language Aptitude and Motivation. Motivation is a complex concept seen as a driving force to acquire an L2 depending on three elements, effort, desire and affect. In other words, a motivated learner wants to learn the language, puts effort in and enjoys the learning process. This perspective led to the development of the concept of integrative motivation which comprises Attitudes Towards the Learning Situation (e.g. evaluation of the L2 teacher and course), Motivation (e.g. desire to learn L2 and attitudes towards learning L2) and Integrativeness (e.g. attitudes towards L2 community and interest in foreign languages). (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011) Thus integratively motivated language learners feel positive about their language learning situation, are motivated to acquire the L2 as well as enjoy interacting and identifying with the L2 community. Gardner clearly distinguished integrative motivation as a counterpart of instrumental motivation,
motivation based on the benefits of learning another language e.g. having a better professional perspective in the future, and mainly focused his research on integrative motivation stating that “the model doesn’t attempt to show ... all the possible variables, since the intent is to focus on the role of integrative motivation” (Gardner, 2001a, p.7) because his studies clearly revealed integratively motivated L2 learners as being more successful L2 learners than instrumentally motivated ones.

Although Gardner’s theory was very prominent, especially in the following twenty years of L2 research, the socio-psychological period also saw the development of several other noteworthy motivation theory models such as Clément’s (1986) social context model and its emerging linguistic self-confidence concept and Giles and Byrne’s (1982) intergroup model. Clément and his colleagues studied the impact of attitudinal factors on L2 learning. Linguistic self-confidence referring to a learner’s perception of their abilities to successfully achieve a goal, appeared to be the most vital for L2 learning motivation not only in multicultural environments where it is encouraged by positive contact with the L2 community but also in unicultural foreign language contexts with an indirect L2 contact such as through the media. (Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1994; Dörnyei, Csizér, & Németh, 2006)

Dörnyei & Ushioda (2011, p.44) explain that according to Giles and Byrne’s (1982) intergroup model “the extent to which members identify with their own ethnic in-group and perceive it to have strong ethnolinguistic vitality and hard in-group boundaries may determine the degree to which they acquire and exhibit target-like features of the majority language”.

Giles and Byrne (1982) claim that when in-group identification, group boundaries and ethnolinguistic vitality such as status factors, demographic factors and institutional
support are weak, members of social groups are presumably more likely to acquire an
L2 than those of social groups with stronger factors. In particular, ethnolinguistic
vitality became a key factor in following studies (e.g. MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, &

By the end of the 1980s and early 1990s, more and more scholars urged for
alternative perspectives on motivation research to not completely abandon the socio-
psychological perspective but to develop more comprehensive theoretical
frameworks. Ushioda & Dörnyei (2011, p.397) explain the main research goals of the
cognitive-situated period as the following:

This period was characterised by two interrelated trends: (a) the need to bring L2
motivation research in line with cognitive theories in mainstream motivational
psychology, and (b) the desire to move from the broad macro perspective of
ethnolinguistic communities and learners’ general dispositions to L2 learning to a
more situated analysis of motivation in specific learning settings (e.g. classrooms).

The development of self-determination theory perspectives in L2 learning is a
good example of how motivational researches included concepts from mainstream
psychology into their studies. The Canadian researcher Noels based her studies on Deci
and Ryan’s (1985) theory of self-determination focusing on the intrinsic and extrinsic
motivational aspects (Deci & Ryan 2000) and created the Language Learning
Orientation Scale, “a new L2 specific instrument for assessing L2 learners’ orientations
from a self-determination perspective” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p.56) similar to the
AMTB during the social- psychological period. She and her associates revealed that if
learners can learn in an autonomy- supportive environment, they are more likely to
develop intrinsic as well as self-determined orientations of motivation and become
successful L2 learners because they also tend to feel less anxious in such a learning
situation (Noels, Pelletier, Clément, & Vallerand, 2003). Dörnyei and Ryan (2015, p.82) explain the role of their findings as:

Self-determination theory thus functioned as a bridge linking two paradigms of L2 motivation research, once again reflecting the ‘one foot in the past and the other in the future’ phenomenon: On the one hand, we see Noels and colleagues seeking to establish continuity with established concepts within the socio-educational model of L2 motivation; on the other hand, the approach was forward-looking by shifting the focus onto motivation coming from within the learner as well as from the micro-contextual determinants.

In other words, self-determination theory as well as other theories of the cognitive-situated period could be seen as vital for the future of L2 motivation research since their focus drifted from the macro to the micro level of L2 learning, e.g. from the analysis of motivation of a whole community to motivation in the language classroom and thus laid the foundation for a new paradigm shift in the new millennium.

During the process-oriented period, a new interest in analysing L2 motivation from a temporal perspective arose which resulted in longitudinal studies such as Dörnyei’s 1993-2004 Hungarian longitudinal study (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006), which laid the foundation for this thesis, and other studies on motivation and time later triggering a shift to a focus on investigating the dynamic processes of motivational development which eventually led to the turn to the current socio-dynamic period.

The new millennium in motivational research was also characterised by an increasing interest in the rise of English as a worldwide L2 and lingua franca. Since L2 motivation research had been initiated in and mainly concentrated on Canada where English and French speaking communities live together, second language motivation theories had traditionally comprised the physical presence of the L2 community.
Consequently, the development of the notion of integrative orientation in tradition L2 motivation research as “a positive interpersonal/ affective disposition toward the L2 group and the desire to interact with and even become similar to valued members of that community” (Dörnyei, 2003, p.5) was not surprising. However, second language learning does not only occur in bilingual areas but also in areas where the contact with the LX community is limited or even non-existent such as in the case of learning English in Italy or in Hungary. Dörnyei (1990, pp.5-6) argued “in the absence of a salient L2 group in the learners’ environment, ... the identification can be generalized to the cultural and intellectual values associated with the language, as well as to the actual L2 itself”.

As a result, Dörnyei and other researchers started to carry out intensive research on factors which might have an impact on motivation to learn a second language in a monolingual country. Dörnyei and his associates’ longitudinal study on motivational change over time is a very ambitious example because it investigated 13,391 Hungarian 13-14-year old Year 8 students’ L2 motivation with a questionnaire regarding the following seven motivational aspects: Integrativeness, Instrumentality and Linguistic Self-Confidence as already introduced factors, as well as Vitality of the L2 Community, Attitudes Towards the L2 Speakers/ Community, Milieu and Cultural Interest (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, pp.10-15). Vitality of the L2 Community refers to the previously outlined ethnolinguistic vitality of Giles and Byrne’s (1982) intergroup model. Dörnyei and his colleagues included items related to the perceived wealth and importance of the L2 communities worldwide into their research.
The Attitudes Towards the L2 Speakers/ Community component originated in Gardner’s Canada studies. Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh (2006, p.13) explain the origin of Gardner’s concept as:

Facing an ethnolinguistically split society, Gardner’s main interest in motivation was its potential impact on the relationship between Francophone and Anglophone communities, in the sense that learning the other community’s language – which is driven by L2 motivation – is a central process leading to interethnic affiliation and reconciliation.

Consequently, Gardner saw successful language learning depending on the positive attitude of a learner towards the L2 community following Spolsky’s (1969) postulation that the learner’s attitude towards the language and its speaking community is one of the most influential motivational factors in L2 acquisition and was able to scientifically prove this theory with several studies in Canada. Dörnyei and his team adapted this factor to monolingual Hungary and perceived direct contact with the L2 community by “meeting L2 speakers and travelling to their country” (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p.13).

In L2 motivation research, ‘milieu’ refers to “the social influence stemming from the immediate learning environment” (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p.13). Therefore, this term does not only comprise the influence of parents, family and friends but also the role of the teachers and the peer group and has been considered as a vital factor in L2 motivation. Clément, Dörnyei & Noels (1994) were among the first to investigate group dynamics’ influence on the motivation of L2 learners. They outlined, “the tasks, the teacher, and the learner group are perceived as interdependent aspects of classroom reality, significantly affecting student L2 learning behaviour” (Clément, Dörnyei & Noels, 1994, p.440) based on their findings in a study with Hungarian students and presented an incentive for several colleagues to research
the impact of the peer group on L2 learning. For instance, Hinger (2001; 2006) found in her qualitative analysis of *The Distribution of Instructional Time and its Effects on Group Cohesion in the Foreign Language Classroom* in Austrian secondary schools that the more time learners spend together in class, the more significantly their group cohesion increases and thus their L2 learning motivation. Her results confirm Ehrman and Dörnyei’s (1998, p. 141) argument that “a very important factor is simply the amount of time spent together ... Generally speaking, the longer people spend together, the stronger their cohesiveness becomes”. Spolsky (2000) also highlights that the learner’s peer group’s effect is a part of the Milieu factor.

The last variable in Dörnyei’s Hungarian L2 motivation research was Cultural Interest. In areas such as bilingual Canada, it is possible for L2 learners to be in direct contact with the L2 community which according to Gardner (1985) and other associates is vital for successful L2 acquisition as was discussed before (see Integrativeness). However, in so-called ‘foreign language learning environments’, learners are almost exclusively in touch with the L2 in formal school context and the language is primarily learnt in absence of the L2 community (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006). There is only indirect L2 contact through the media for example as already mentioned and as confirmed by strong results on the *English Media* factor in Clément, Dörnyei and Noel’s (1994) Hungarian study. As a matter of fact, Dörnyei based his Cultural Interest component including L2 media and cultural products on this theory. Later Yashima further investigated this aspect of L2 motivation with Japanese L2 learners of English and even extended this concept calling it *International Posture*. Yashima, Nishide and Shimizu (2004, p125) explained their theory as:
Included in the concept, among other things, are interest in foreign or international affairs, willingness to go overseas to stay or work, and a readiness to interact with intercultural partners.

Japanese students did not understand English as a language referring to the British and American language community but rather an international community and representing a means facilitating communication with foreigners from all over the world (Yashima, 2009). This concept has been included in several studies on attitudinal factors affecting L2 acquisition when English being the L2 and its relevance in L2 motivation research has been ensured in a world of English as a lingua franca where traditional L2 motivational concepts do not present the ultimate solution.

Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011, p.72) also recognise the problematic aspect of English for L2 motivation research stating:

The ownership of Global English clearly does not rest with a specific geographically-defined community of speakers, especially as English is widely used as a lingua franca between speakers of other languages and not simply in interactions between so-called ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ speakers. Consequently, traditional concepts of L2 motivation such as Integrativeness and attitudes to target language speakers and their culture begin to lose meaning, as there is no clear target reference group and English is seen simply as a basic educational skill (much like literacy, numeracy or computer skills) not tied to a particular culture or community.

Consequently, in their Hungarian survey, Dörnyei and his associates (2006) also found a clear trend towards preferring acquiring English as an L2 since being a ‘must-have’ language on the one hand and a substantial decrease in student’s motivation towards learning other foreign languages. As a result, Dörnyei (2005) proposes to distinguish in future research on L2 motivation whether the acquired L2 is English or another language since there might be a qualitative difference in learning English and learning another language due to English’s role of increasingly becoming a basic requirement in education.
Furthermore, Dörnyei and his colleagues also revealed in their Hungarian study that “Integrativeness is closely associated with two very different variables, ‘faceless’ practical incentives and ‘personal’ attitudes toward members of the L2 community” (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005, p.29). Gardner’s traditional definition of Integrativeness did not include Instrumentality and thus they had to reinterpret the term ‘Integrativeness’ so that it could include both factors (Dörnyei, 2010b). This led to the definition of a new approach to explain L2 motivation, the L2 motivational self-system. It is based on “a number of influential theoretical L2 constructs with findings of self research in psychology” (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p.16). Most noteworthy, are Markus and Nurius’ (1986) work on possible selves and Higgins’ (1987) work on the distinction between the actual/own self-state and ideal self-states. Starting from this theoretical framework, Dörnyei’s concept includes the Ideal L2 Self, the Ought-to L2 Self and the L2 Learning Experience. The Ideal L2 Self is the “L2-specific facet of one’s ‘ideal self’” (Dörnyei, 2009c, p.29). The Ideal Self represents the goals a language learner would like to achieve and represents a strong motivating force triggering the desire in a person to reduce the gap between the actual and the ideal self. This motivational component includes the traditional motivational factors Integrativeness and Instrumentality with the Attitudes Towards the L2 Speakers and Community. The Ought-to L2 Self includes all characteristics a person would like to possess. This component refers to the non-internalised instrumental motives such as fear of punishment, etc. (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p.93). L2 Learning Experience comprises the former learning experiences and aspects such as the role of the teacher and the learning group (Dörnyei, 2009c, p.29). Because of their results from the Hungarian study, Dörnyei and his associates positioned the Ideal L2 Self in the centre
of L2 learning motivation and consequently proposed a new definition of L2 motivation as being “the desire to achieve one’s ideal language self by reducing the discrepancy between one’s actual and ideal selves” (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005, p.30).

According to Boo, Dörnyei and Ryan (2015, p.146) the L2 Motivational Self System is currently the dominant model of learner motivation. Nevertheless there has been an enormous research interest in the complexity of L2 motivation leading to a consolidation of the L2 Motivational Self System and the development of Complex Dynamic System as well as Person-in-Context (learner seen a dynamic unique individual) approaches challenging L2 motivational researchers in the current socio-dynamic period. Since 2005 Boo, Dörnyei and Ryan (2015, p.145) identified a L2 motivation publication “boom, but also established that the publication trajectory was still on a significant incline” and confirmed the exclusive prominence of this research discipline.

As could be seen in this part of the thesis, research on attitudinal components influencing L2 acquisition was initiated in bilingual areas mainly focusing on L2 learning under constant influence of the presence of the L2 community. Due to the increase of school language learning in monolingual countries and the spread of English as a global language, new approaches towards L2 motivational research have risen and have led to a reshape of former theories taking the challenge to further analyse the complexity of motivation in L2 learning under the new influence of a globalised world. This overview mainly concentrated on the research focus on L2 language learning motivation. Bearing in mind the research question of this thesis, next it is also necessary to look into LX motivation research’s status quo to provide a full theoretical framework for the discussion of the empirical data.
2.2.3 L3/ LX motivation

This section provides an explanation for the need to distinguish between the motivational aspects influencing L2 and L3/ LX acquisition, followed by a short review of the current state of L3/LX motivation research.

Research has traditionally concentrated on developing theories for the L2 acquisition not really considering multilingualism as Dörnyei (2009b, p.23) states:

The traditional approach to first language acquisition has typically adopted a monolingual framework (i.e. it has usually been implicitly assumed that the child learns only one L1 without interference from other languages), and SLA research has been similarly concerned with how one additional language can be added to the already attained mother tongue.

Jessner (2006, p.121) confirms that in the past only little attention was paid to L3 learning in the school context emphasising that learning more languages is more complex than simple L2 learning as already pointed out in 2.1.2. De Angelis (2007, p.4) even speaks of a former ‘no-difference’ assumption towards LX apart from L2 in many SLA researchers and explains that it was only “upon those, who actively work on multilingualism and language acquisition” to highlight the differences between these learning processes.

As 2.2.2 shows, motivational research has also mainly concentrated on developing motivation theories for L2 acquisition only. According to Henry (2011, pp.235-236) however, there have been two major developments in L2 motivation research which have created opportunities to focus on attitudinal factors in LX acquisition, the introduction of the L2 Motivational Self System with ‘the self’ in the research focus thus making it possible to take various LX selves into consideration and the ‘social turn’ in L2 research and research methodologies (e.g. the person-in-context
approach), which “offer the potential to gain insights into the relationship and interplay of L2 and L3 motivational processes and their effects on learning behaviours”.

As a result, Henry (2015, p.315) states that “the simultaneous learning of more than one foreign language (FL) has begun to attract the interest of motivation researchers” who have started to focus on LX motivation mainly investigating the impact of English, as L2 or L3, in its role as a global language on the motivational aspects in the acquisition of other languages. All these studies show that there is a reasonable influence on LX motivation.

Since learning English has become compulsory in many countries worldwide due to its lingua franca status, it is often perceived as the only needed language to successfully communicate in every aspect of life resulting in a decline in additional foreign language learning. Due to its dominance, English is even seen as the ‘killer language no. 1’ which is about to replace all other languages and thus a threat to multilingualism (Vollmer, 2001, p.91; Jessner, 2006, p.133).

Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh (2006), investigating motivational attitudes towards English, French, Russian and Italian as well as Csizér and Dörnyei (2005, pp.656+657), researching motivation for studying English and German, found clear evidence for a shifting interest towards learning English preferring it to other foreign languages in their Hungarian quantitative studies claiming:

Although it is beneficial for a student to have a wide interest in foreign languages in general, as this seems to result in a more established and salient ideal language self and, subsequently, increased intended language learning effort, being motivated to learn more than one L2 at the same time also causes interferences in that positive attitudes toward one language can exist at the expense of another. ... In this competition the clear winner appears to be World English.
Csizér and Lukács’ (2010) study with more than 200 simultaneous learners of English and German aged 16-17 in Hungary included one half of the sample studying English as L2 and German as L3 and the other German as L2 and English as L3. They revealed that the LX motivation process is even more complex when acquiring two LX at the same time as is the case in various other European countries. Their results showed that learners’ motivation towards English was higher in general and if German was studied as L2 and English as L3, there was even a negative influence on German learning motivation. This could be explained when analysing the relevance of acquiring English in Hungarian context. As shown by former studies, English is the most preferred language to be learned in Hungary. Thus Csizér & Lukács (2010, p.12) postulate:

When students are given a choice concerning what foreign language to learn at school, the accommodation of their choices, or the lack of it, will influence their motivational characteristics in the long run, hence the initial language choice is an important condition of language learning success.

Dewaele (2005) performed an analysis of 100 Flemish high school students’ motivation regarding the acquisition of French and English. These students also comprised more positive attitudes towards their L3 English despite the fact that they had been studying French as L2 for longer and more intensively. Although Dewaele (2015, p.133) states that this is partly an effect of “a long history of tense socio-political relations between Dutch and French in Flanders” and suggests as well that Flemish students’ positive attitudes towards learning English might be a consequence of “the perception of English as a lingua franca” being a good tool to communicate with people from abroad.
Studies in Sweden (Svensson, 2003; Glockner, 2013; Henry, 2010; Johansson, 2006) also confirm the tendency towards learning English having a negative impact on further LX acquisition. Henry (2010) conducted a longitudinal study with 182 secondary school students for three years starting in Year 6 after having learned English for a minimum of 3 years and Spanish, French or German for one. Henry’s (2015, p.315) findings revealed that “in competition for the learner’s time and resources, L2 English can have negative effects on L3 motivation”, especially with boys. An additional interview study to further analyse the impact of L2 English on girls’ and boys’ L3 selves (Henry, 2011b, p.12) showed that some girls were able to overcome this negative influence:

For the girls, some seem to be successful in offsetting the potentially negative influence of the L2 English speaking/using self in L3 learning situations by constructing cognitive barriers between these two linguistic self-concepts (Henry, 2011b).

Despite the variety in studies supporting the negative influence of English on the acquisition of other foreign languages, some researchers also found proof of non-negative or even positive trends. For instance, in a Hong Kong research study based on Dörnyei and his associates’ longitudinal study, Humphreys and Spratt (2008) investigated motivational aspects of English, Mandarin, Japanese, French and German in tertiary students. They were all compulsory learners of either English or Mandarin and optional learners of one of the other foreign languages. Among the compulsory languages, motivation regarding English clearly outweighed that of Mandarin as primarily Hong Kong Chinese with English had been a constant part of their identity for a longer period. With regard to the optional languages, Japanese scored highest in all motivational dimensions, in some aspects even higher than English. Humphreys and
Spratt argued that at the time of the survey Japanese Youth culture and the Japanese language were enjoying great popularity among the younger generation. This could be proof of no negative influence of Global English on foreign language learning. However, Humphrey and Spratt did not preclude the future possibility of foreign language acquisition in Hong Kong also being threatened by English.

Mohd Nor, Yusuf and Salleh (2016) conducted a qualitative and quantitative study on attitudes towards Japanese, Spanish and German as foreign languages among Chinese, Malay and Indian students attending LX courses at a university in Malaysia. Students are free to choose if and what foreign language course to attend. These courses have become very popular since interest in foreign language learning is currently rising according to Mohd Nor, Yusuf and Salleh. Consequently, the overall results of the study revealed that students are well motivated and have positive attitudes towards learning all three languages mainly because of instrumental factors. Additionally, Indian students especially preferred learning European languages because they have similar characteristics to their previously learned L2 English that facilitate understanding and acquiring these languages more effectively.

Nevertheless, Henry (2011a, p.254) calls for further research such as future studies including English as L3 and longitudinal studies to fully understand LX motivation and the impact of Global English on the acquisition of other languages.

As could be seen in this section, SLA scholars only shared little interest in LX motivation in past. Due to the increasing interest in multilingualism and its researchers explicitly highlighting the differences between L2 and further LX learning, interest in LX motivation has begun to rise with a clear focus on English as a lingua franca’s impact on additional foreign language learning. Whereas the results supporting a more
negative effect of English on the motivation regarding additional LXs are currently prevailing, the demand for further investigations to gain a better insight in the even more complex process of LX acquisition is high especially when fostering individual multilingualism is a major goal. After looking into L2 and LX motivational research on a general and more international level, the next section will inform on the present situation of LX motivation research in the research area South Tyrol.

2.2.4 LX motivational research in South Tyrol and its findings

In this subchapter, an overview of the current state of research regarding LX motivation in South Tyrol is provided to underpin the relevance of this study.

As already mentioned, enormous financial effort has been devoted to support language learning in South Tyrol such as increasing numbers of language lessons, initiating school partnerships and other such initiatives. However they have not always brought the desired success and have led school authorities as well as politicians to continue searching for the key to success. Interestingly enough though, there have been investigations into many aspects of the linguistic situation in South Tyrol so far (e.g. Baur, 2000; De Angelis, 2012; De Angelis & Jessner, 2012; Egger, 2001; Jessner, 2006; Lanthaler, 1990), but only little attention has been paid to motivational factors for LX learning in the attempt to foster multilingualism in South Tyrol which the scant research on South Tyroleans’ attitudinal aspects towards language learning in general and particularly towards foreign language learning is proof of.

For example, the South Tyrolean statistical office ASTAT (2005; 2015a) has conducted two surveys on South Tyroleans’ language use and language identity, the first in 2004 and the second with about 1,500 online questionnaires and interviews in 2014. Both surveys included questions about first experiences with the L1, L2 and
foreign languages also in the cultural context, language identity as well as living in a multilingual area. In addition data and opinions regarding the bilingualism certificate exam and the language use in everyday life and at work were collected. The 2014 results relevant for this thesis reveal that 68.2% have had positive experiences with the L2. However only 47.6% have remained satisfied with their L2 competences acquired at school, noting that Ladins and bilinguals have been the most and Italians the least satisfied. In terms of proposed measures to improve the L2 teaching, Italians opted for the introduction of L2 instruction as early as pre-school age, whereas the German language group would prefer more exchanges between schools with different languages of instruction and the Ladins pleaded for teaching some subjects in the L2, which reflects the teaching traditions of their school system. In addition almost half of all respondents admitted to having attended additional language courses, language trips as well as private tuition to improve their L2 skills which could be evidence for the significant importance of adequate L2 competences for South Tyroleans. Regarding LX learning, on average 60% stated that they have learned a minimum of one foreign language. The group aged 16-34 formed the majority of those knowing at least one foreign language with 92.2% in contrast to those aged 60 and older with only 28.5%. These figures have to be considered by noting that English language classes had not been introduced in most of South Tyrol’s compulsory schools until the early 1990s when it was implemented countrywide in middle school (Year 6-8). Since the academic year 2008/09 it has been taught from primary school (Year 4-5) onwards. Consequently, most students have acquired English, followed by French and Spanish. This is consistent with the Italian results of the annual Eurostat survey about LX acquisition of European middle school students that revealed that in 2015 95.8% of all
Italian students were studying two foreign languages, English being the first and French the second most learned language. Only Luxembourg and Finland had more LX learners (Eurostat Pressestelle, 2017). The most recent results of the 2014 South Tyrolean Sprachbarometer (ASTAT, 2015a) to mention are that half of all participants comprised a very positive attitude towards English and believed that every European should be able to communicate in this language otherwise this would disadvantage them. Nonetheless, nearly 10% indicated that English weakens the national languages due to its role as a lingua franca which shows that South Tyroleans are also aware of the negative impact of Global English (ASTAT, 2015a+b).

These results are interesting and although have frequently been used as stimuli for new measure packages, they only provide the basis for further studies since no scientific theories were used in their interpretation by the ASTAT (2015a+b). As a result, only two major scientific studies focusing on LX motivation having been conducted in South Tyrol so far which are the Motivation und Kontakte study (Baur, 1996) carried out in 1996 and the 2012 study, South Tyrolean School Students and the Second Language (L2): a Linguistic and Socio-Psychological Investigation (KOLIPSI) (Abel, Vettori, & Wisniewski, 2012a+b).

The Motivation und Kontakte study (Baur, 1996) included 600 South Tyrolean students from the final classes of the primary, middle and secondary school and was divided into two groups, ‘Kontaktzone A’, students living in high contact areas with about 30-70% of Italians and Germans and ‘Kontaktzone B’, students living in low contact areas with Italians being a clear minority. This survey consisting of both questionnaires as well as interviews included questions about South Tyroleans’ intrinsic, extrinsic as well as personal motivation. It aimed to reveal the factors that
had an influence on motivation towards L2 learning and intercultural linguistic as well as social action. However it was based more on mainstream psychological theories such as Maslow’s (1962) *Motivation and Personality* (see 2.2.1) and Deci and Ryan’s (1985) *Self Determination theory* (see 2.2.2) yet not considering L2 motivational models. The study also provided incentives and proposed a few measures for policy and decision makers about how to positively influence those aspects and consequently improve L2 and intercultural learning. For instance, the need for more extensive political education lessons, an increase in extracurricular exchanges between the German and the Italian language groups, better cooperation between German and Italian sports associations, etc. were among these proposals focusing on improving L2 competences by enhancing the social contact between the language groups (Baur, 1996). Its results, though, have never been officially published.

The KOLIPSI study (Abel, Vettori & Wisniewski, 2012a+b) aimed at documenting and analysing the L2 competences of South Tyrolean high school students (Year 9-13) from a linguistic, sociolinguistic and psychosocial perspective on the one hand and investigating relations between linguistic performance as well as non-linguistic factors and their positive or negative impacts on linguistic competences and linguistic behaviour on the other hand (Abel, 2007). Abel (2007, p.6) highlights the uniqueness of this investigation in South Tyrol as follows:

Genau hier möchte die vorgestellte Studie ansetzen und zum ersten Mal versuchen, Zusammenhänge und Wechselwirkungen zwischen sprachlichen und außersprachlichen Faktoren zu ermitteln, die das Zweitsprachlernen und die Verwendung der Zweitsprache im Südtiroler Kontext beeinflussen.

For that reason, data from 1,200 Italian and German South Tyrolean students aged 17-18 was collected by means of qualitative as well as quantitative research.
methods. In addition they also collected data from parents. Due to the purpose of this thesis, only the underpinning theoretical background and the results of the psychosocial survey referring to motivation will be considered.

The psycho-social part of the survey included questions regarding *Integrativeness, Instrumentality, ethnolinguistic vitality* (see 2.2.2) and *fear of assimilation* among others which are not particularly relevant for L2 motivation. The latter represents the negative pole of the primary motivational process which according to Clément and Kruidenier (1985, p.24) “is rooted in the affective regard held by the individual toward the second language community”. Fear of assimilation can be seen as the counterpart of Integrativeness in LX learning motivation since it might include fears regarding one’s own language group e.g. the fear of losing its cultural uniqueness and thus vanishing over time as well as personal fears such as the fear of losing one’s own cultural identity while speaking the LX.

The KOLIPSI study (Abel, Vettori & Wisniewski, 2012a+b) revealed that although the majority of students consider L2 learning as essential for pragmatic reasons, instrumental orientation does not correlate with L2 competences. Consequently, Vettori, Wisniewski and Abel (2012, pp.27-28) postulate that in the South Tyrol context, “stressing the pragmatic benefits of mastering the L2 does not contribute to improving the pupils’ competences at all”. Integrative motivation seems to be more vital to achieve good L2 results for both German and Italian speaking students but the latter ones’ integrative orientation correlates slightly higher with L2 skills indicating the crucial role that integrative goals might have in fostering and preserving motivation among Italian-speaking students. Furthermore direct contact between the language groups seems to be highly influential since the more friends from the other language
group someone has, the more positive the attitudes towards the L2 group are and the more motivated to learn the L2 they are. With regard to intergroup contact, the study uncovered that German-speaking students tend to use the L2 more than the Italian-speaking students when it comes to intergroup communication.

However the trend concerning how to promote L2 learning in South Tyrol is different which could lead to negative impacts on L2 learning at least for Italian speaking students in the future and is explained by Vettori, Wisniewski & Abel (2012, p.28) as follows:

Both school and society rhetorically tend to focus exclusively on the importance that a good L2 mastery has for the pupils’ future professional career, neglecting in a sense both the mere presence of the L2 community and the need and pleasure to get in touch with it. If this does not change things much for German-speaking pupils, as the vast majority of them normally speak Italian in intergroup communication, it does matter for the Italian-speaking ones who tend to constantly rely on their L1.

Therefore the results of their study investigating both linguistic and psychosocial aspects in L2 learning should serve as a comprehensive reference tool for a conscious and future-oriented language and education politics which aims at fostering bi- as well as multilingualism and the quality of the cohabitation in South Tyrol. Consequently, Abel, Vettori, Forer and Paladino (2012, p.403) recommend taking advantage of the benefits of the language groups living in one and the same area and propose a dynamic cooperative language model for South Tyrol. It includes the promotion of mono- as well as a multilingual mode in intergroup communication plus ‘variety-switching’ which refers to competences that allow speakers to flexibly change between a dialect and the standard language depending on the situation to avoid the constant use of the same language of communication between the two groups (Abel, Vettori, Forer & Paladino, 2012, p.403). In this way all South Tyroleans could benefit from this
multilingual background and seize the opportunity to improve and consolidate their L2
skills. In addition since according to the KOLIPSI study (Abel, Vettori & Wisniewski,
2012a+b) extended contact seems to positively affect attitudes towards the L2 and
consequently motivates students to acquire the L2, Abel, Vettori, Forer and Palladino
(2012, p.407) call for a new culture of contact following the motto the more intensive
and positive the contact, the better South Tyroleans get along.

To sum up, despite the high value of especially the KOLIPSI study (Abel, Vettori &
Wisniewski, 2012a+b) for motivational research in South Tyrol, it has to be noted that
both, the *Motivation und Kontakte* (Baur, 1996) as well as the KOLIPSI study (Abel,
Vettori & Wisniewski, 2012a+b) only focused on L2 acquisition, thus exclusively
investigating German and Italian in South Tyrol whose language groups are physically
present in the region and consequently directly influencing L2 learning motivation. In
addition, they did not collect and consider data from the Ladin group excluding one of
the three language groups living in South Tyrol. Therefore they both do not offer a
comprehensive insight into all motivational aspects towards language learning in South
Tyrol. This is where the results of the underlying study for this thesis will build on and
attempt to support moving a step closer towards better understanding the complexity
of language learning in this multilingual area. However before looking into the
empirical data, one more theoretical concept relevant to LX learning motivation,
*Content and Language Integrated Learning*, has to be reviewed especially with regard
to its possible potential to increase LX motivation and thus support fostering
multilingualism in South Tyrol.
2.3 Content and Language Integrated Learning

In this subchapter the concept of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) will be focused on. After a general introduction into this educational approach, CLIL’s benefits and especially its potential motivating role in multilingual education will be analysed. The review ends with a short overview of the current situation of CLIL in South Tyrol.

2.3.1 The CLIL concept

This section aims at providing an insight into the CLIL approach and its development.

Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010, p.1) define CLIL as follows:

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language. That is, in the teaching and learning process, there is a focus not only on content, and not only on language. Each is interwoven, even if the emphasis is greater on one or the other at a given time. CLIL is not a new form of language education. It is not a new form of subject education. It is an innovative fusion of both.

In other words, CLIL combines teaching and learning content with an LX and can be seen as “an umbrella term covering a dozen or more educational approaches (e.g. immersion, bilingual education, multilingual education, language showers and enriched language programmes) (Mehisto, Marsh & Frigols, 2008, p.12). According to Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010, p.1) “good CLIL practice is realized through methods which provide a more holistic educational experience for the learner than may otherwise be commonly achievable” and thus show the relevance of this concept for LX learning.
Although the term ‘CLIL’ was coined within the European context in 1994, CLIL practices have been applied for much longer, indeed since the Akkadians conquered the Sumerians and decided to acquire their language by means of the Sumarian language in teaching several subjects like botany and zoology (Mehisto, Marsh & Frigols, 2008, p.9). One of the most noteworthy examples in more recent CLIL history was the introduction of French immersion programmes for English-speaking students in Canada between the mid 1960s and the 1970s. Worried parents who were not able to afford private school tuition in the L2 country for their children required these programmes due to their fear of their children thus being disadvantaged in their future career. These immersion programmes enabled access to bilingual education to all students.

Despite that, CLIL includes practices of various educational approaches, some scholars (Dalton-Puffer, Llinares, Lorenzo, & Nikula, 2014; Coyle, 2006) explicitly point out that CLIL differentiates itself from other approaches such as immersion programmes since “in essence it operates along a continuum of the foreign language and the non-language content without specifying the importance of one over another” (Coyle, 2006, p.2). In addition, CLIL aims not only at enhancing content and language learning but also at developing learning skills such as cognitive and social skills (Coyle, 2006; Mehisto, Marsh & Frigolis, 2008). Mehisto, Marsh & Frigolis (2008, p.12) also highlight the flexibility of this approach as one other characteristic that is not shared by other single approaches referring to the example of the amount of time dedicated to teaching and learning through the LX:

CLIL allows for low- to high-intensity exposure to teaching/learning through a second language. The approach can also be used for short-term high-intense exposure.
This flexibility also offers the opportunity to adapt CLIL syllabuses to the demands of learners in each country or region. As a result, there are a great variety of CLIL programmes offered as was confirmed by the 2006 Eurydice report (p.19) on CLIL in Europe which stated:

Seven countries (Estonia, Spain, Latvia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Austria and Sweden) provide scope for trilingual CLIL provision combining the national language and two foreign languages (Spain and Latvia), or the national language, a foreign language and a minority language (Estonia, Latvia, the Netherlands, Austria and Sweden).

Also Cenoz and Ruiz de Zarobe (2015, p.1) emphasise the various forms of learning through an additional language identifying four current learning situations:

A. Speakers of local languages that are not used at school ... e.g. Quechua in Peru.
B. Speakers of languages that are not part of the curriculum of the host country ... e.g. children with Turkish as a home language who live in the Netherlands ...
C. Speakers of majority languages that are used at school but who are taught some subjects through the medium of a local minority language so as to ... provide them with better opportunities ... e.g. English as a home language in English–Spanish dual immersion programmes in the USA ...
D. Speakers of majority or minority languages that are used at school but who are taught some subjects through the medium of an international language ... so as to improve their language skills and job prospects ... e.g. in bilingual regions in areas where English is taught as a third language such as ... South Tyrol ...

The versatility of the CLIL approach can be seen as an enormous benefit to meet the current challenges for education and consequently for teaching and learning of additional languages due to the effects of globalisation, technical advances and the Knowledge Age because CLIL does not exclusively promote English as a global language but “is embedded in the socio-economic, political and cultural traditions of different nations” (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010, p.9). Therefore this approach can play a vital
role in fostering multilingualism. Given that fact, the Council of Europe and the European Commission have strongly promoted the implementation of CLIL to develop multilingualism among all European citizens.

In conclusion, the brief review of the Content and Language Integrated Learning approach showed that CLIL integrates content and language learning as well as the development of essential learning skills. Although CLIL is related to other educational approaches thanks to common historical roots, it also comprises unique characteristics which facilitate the adaption of the approach to local needs as well as the inclusion of all languages, not only Global English, thus being a benefiting supporter of the development of multilingualism. How exactly CLIL can positively influence multilingual education will be examined in the following section.

2.3.2 CLIL and its benefits for multilingual education

Next the advantages of CLIL for LX learning with a special focus on its effects on LX motivation will be looked at. Thereby related empirical data from several European CLIL contexts will also be consider.

Although CLIL might also negatively affect language learning, e.g. a study on how successful content had been learned by Finish CLIL students and contemporarily investigating effective learning aspects such as self-esteem and motivation revealed that CLIL students seemed to have a low self-concept of their LX knowledge despite being strongly motivated and having appropriate content knowledge (Seikkula-Leino, 2007). Therefore, there are clear benefits of CLIL for LX learning.

According to Marsh (2000, p.7), CLIL provides “opportunities to youngsters to practice what they learn whilst they learn” and thus helps to make school education more effective. While ‘learning by doing’, CLIL students take more advantage of their
school time which leads to greater learning outcomes than in non-CLIL classes. Based on her and various other scholars’ findings (e.g. Lasagabaster, 2008; Ruiz de Zarobe, 2008), Dalton-Puffer (2011) claims that CLIL triggers several learning outcomes in students. For instance, since CLIL students usually also continue having standard LX classes, they have more time to acquire the LX at their disposal in contrast to non-CLIL students. Furthermore, CLIL students seem to possess larger overall receptive and productive vocabulary due to their continuous exposure to various ranges of language. One of the most notable linguistic benefits of CLIL seems to be CLIL students’ better spontaneous oral production because of the higher flexibility and self-assurance students appear to acquire in CLIL lessons. Coyle (2006) adds even more advantages of CLIL such as that it helps to develop problem-solving, risk-taking, general communication skills, etc. and it raises cultural and global awareness as several UK CLIL reports revealed (e.g. Wiesemes, 2005).

However as already briefly mentioned before, most of all, CLIL “can nurture a youngster’s feel good attitude as they themselves see that success can be achieved” (Marsh, 2000, p.7). Coyle, Hood & Marsh (2010, p.11) argue that is as a result of the fact that CLIL offers “a natural situation for language development” to students of all ages and “this natural use of language can boost a learner’s motivation towards, and hunger for, learning languages”. Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009, p.13) agree by adding that through this natural context for language use in CLIL lessons the language becomes the means rather than the end in itself which facilitates to decrease learner anxiety and further motivates students.

This impact of CLIL on motivation has been on the research agenda of several scholars (e.g. Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2014; Lasagabaster, 2011; Lasagabaster &
Sierra, 2009; Lorenzo, Casal & Moore, 2010; Pfenninger, 2016). For example, Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009) conducted a quantitative research on 393 multilingual Basque students aged 12-13 and 14-15 attending English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and CLIL courses. Their results revealed that CLIL students were more intrinsically and instrumentally motivated and comprised higher interest in the LX, thus confirming the highly motivating impact of CLIL on LX learners.

Pfenninger’s (2016) study aimed at uncovering which of the three aspects, starting age of learning, motivation and type of instruction, have a stronger influence on long-term LX learning in multilingual Switzerland. For this purpose, 200 Swiss high school students aged 17-20 filled in a questionnaire and a language test (including grammar, vocabulary and listening comprehension tasks), 100 of them were attending CLIL classes and 100 only EFL classes. Her findings also verified previous CLIL research results related to CLIL’s benefit for LX learning motivation. Additionally, her study indicated that although CLIL students were more motivated than EFL students, in general highly motivated students obtained better results in the language tests regardless of the type of instruction.

Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009) further investigated beneficial aspects of CLIL towards Basque’s secondary students’ attitudes to all three languages taught in the regional school. Being a multilingual area, the fear of losing the minority language through the influence of the majority language Spanish Basque and Global English is high and consequently the implementation of CLIL lessons was met with concern. However, Lasagabaster and Sierra’s survey revealed that “CLIL students held significantly more positive attitudes not only towards English but also towards Spanish and Basque” (Lasagabaster, 2015, p.25). Lasagabaster (2009, p.39) confirmed in an
addition study in Basque high schools that CLIL supports fostering multilingualism and states:

CLIL can help multilingualism to get rid of a too-often-attached elitist label, as in Spain its spread from the current experimental programmes to core subjects will mean that it will be accessible to many of our students.

Nonetheless, he calls for more longitudinal research on that aspect and if these positive attitudes can be preserved throughout compulsory education in other educational contexts such as his and Doiz’ longitudinal study (2015) which has revealed that within the CLIL framework, the languages do indeed complement than actually exclude one another (Merino & Lasagabaster, 2015).

As could be seen, despite the fact that there can be some negative impacts of CLIL on e.g. self-esteem which should not be disregarded, CLIL has enormous potential to facilitate LX learning not only from a linguistic and cognitive perspective but also for the promotion of multilingualism. Consequently, CLIL has already started to play a role in South Tyrolean educational politics which will be examined in the next section.

2.3.3 CLIL in South Tyrol

This last section about CLIL deals with CLIL in South Tyrol focusing on the status quo, obstacles, reactions and its future.

In 2010 MIUR (the Italian Ministry of Education) issued a mandate regarding CLIL in some types of Italian high schools as the only European country to legally mandate CLIL so far at that time according to Leone (2015, pp.43-44). All linguistic ‘Gymnasiums’ should teach one non-linguistic subject in a foreign language from Year 10 (3rd form of high school) to the final Year 13 (5th form of high school) and an additional non-linguistic subject should be taught in another foreign language. In addition students of
all other ‘Gymnasiums’ should attend one non-linguistic subject in a foreign language in the final year. CLIL lessons could be taught in either a foreign language or in one of the minority languages in certain multilingual regions such as French in Aosta or German in South Tyrol. In 2011, MIUR officially introduced CLIL in the final year of all types of high schools from the 2013-2014 academic year onwards. Furthermore, MIUR started to offer related teacher training courses and set strict regulations such as that content teachers needed to acquire a C1 level competence in the language they would use to teach CLIL (Leone, 2015, p.47). Particularly the language qualification guideline was too restrictive and had to be lowered in the following years to find enough teachers for the implementation. Although CLIL lessons are a compulsory part of the high school curriculum, still today not enough qualified CLIL teachers are available, what is a serious issue for the regional school authorities. However this has already been discussed by several institutions and scholars and would go beyond the purpose of this thesis (e.g. Di Martino & Di Sabato, 2012).

Since having primary legislative competence in the area of education, the South Tyrolean government had to separately implement the CLIL concept in South Tyrolean schools following the national example of moving one step closer towards reaching individual and not only societal multilingualism. However, this turned out to be more difficult than expected especially in case of the German language group. Article 19 of the 2nd Autonomy Statute (1972) forbids the use of any other language of instruction than German in non-linguistic subjects as well as Italian having to be taught by a teacher with Italian as their mother tongue. Both points are in total contrary to the CLIL philosophy. Nevertheless, the South Tyrolean government passed a law allowing CLIL projects in the 4th form (Year 12) and 5th form (Year 13) of all South Tyrolean high
schools for definite periods with the special regulation for German high schools that all competences acquired in such language projects can be tested and evaluated using the students’ mother tongue to respect Article 19 (Südtiroler Landesregierung, 2013). Some innovative high schools, which had already been experimenting with CLIL within the framework of their language development programme, could now officially implement CLIL projects. Soon, several high schools, especially Italian and Ladin schools, were working with CLIL. In order to provide incentives for more German high schools to initiate CLIL projects, the German school authority launched a 2-year pilot project for 10 high schools (in the academic years 2013/14 and 2014/15) to teach one subject in Italian and one subject in English for one semester in the fourth and fifth form in the case of the linguistic ‘Gymnasien’ and one subject in Italian for one semester in fourth and fifth form as well as one subject in English for one semester in the fifth form of ‘Fachoberschulen’ (Deutsches Schulamt, 2013). Students and teachers of the participating schools filled in an entry and a final questionnaire, students had to take entry and exit language tests in both languages and parents were asked to give feedback in a final questionnaire. In general, the pilot project was positively evaluated by all stakeholders with one common request for future projects, the introduction of CLIL projects at an earlier age to avoid collisions with the final exam (equivalent to UK A-levels), in which all subject exams apart from those of the LXs have to be taken in the mother tongue, to allow students to have more time at their disposal to get acquainted with the subject related terminology in the LX. The evaluation results also revealed that students’ motivation towards CLIL remained stable regarding future CLIL lessons in Italian and even increased regarding future English CLIL projects. Parents confirmed the positive motivation of their children. They also highlighted the
importance of such projects to foster LX learning which according to them is principally essential for future work life and only secondly for communicating with members of the other language group, thus confirming the before mentioned trend of promoting instrumental orientation in children by South Tyrolean parents (see 2.2.4). Teachers agreed on still being motivated to work with CLIL, but they additionally demanded more appreciation for the extra preparation work for CLIL lessons and their willingness to participate in specific training course in their free time from the school authority (Cavagnoli, 2015).

Despite the stakeholders’ positive impressions of the CLIL project, critical voices especially among politicians and the media of the German-speaking group have been heard since the beginning of CLIL in South Tyrol. Their main concerns are the violation of Article 19 (2nd Autonomy Statute, 1972) leading to a possible loss of the mother tongue and the fear of a possible re-edition of the past Italianisation process. Nonetheless parents, teachers, students as well as business representatives in South Tyrol have been calling for increased promotion of individual multilingualism to comply with the requirements of being part of a globalised world. Therefore, the implementation of more bilingual classes similar to those some Italian schools have already established as language development projects in the framework of the school autonomy could be helpful (Scochi, 2011). However, the enormous protest of some of the German political parties will exclude such initiatives in the near future.

Given these circumstances, CLIL projects are all the more essential in this process. Consequently, the South Tyrolean government (2016 & Ebert 2015) extended the law about the implementation of CLIL already from Year 9 (2\textsuperscript{nd} form of high school) onwards and created specific CLIL teaching positions for qualified teachers. This
governmental initiative provides the legal background and sets incentives for the continuation and the further establishment of CLIL in South Tyrol such as through a second CLIL pilot project. CLIL supporting measures are also included in the before-discussed *Förderung der Mehrsprachigkeit in der deutschen Schule (2016-2020)* measure package to foster multilingualism (see 1.3.3). However an area-wide compulsory introduction of CLIL in all high schools like in the rest of Italy is still missing.

To sum up, the CLIL methodology has become a compulsory part in Italian high schools despite the lack of qualified teachers. Also in the autonomous area of South Tyrol CLIL some CLIL projects have been launched especially in Italian and Ladin schools but also such as the first CLIL piloting project by the German school authority which helped to increase the motivation of students and teachers towards future CLIL projects. However, the CLIL concept mainly for German high schools has also been encountered with critique because of Article 19 (2nd Autonomy Statute, 1972), which has so far inhibited the area-wide implementation of CLIL in all high schools. Nonetheless, the potential of CLIL in the fossilisation of multilingualism has been recognised and future CLIL projects will thus continuously support LX learning in South Tyrol. The following chapter will focus on the research methodology and the data collection of the study.
Chapter 3 Research Methodology and Data Collection

In the following section the research methodology and data collection as well as analysis process of the study about motivational factors affecting LX learning in multilingual areas will be described. The chapter consists of four parts. In the first the research questions will be presented. The second part comprises an outline of the study design including information about participants, piloting and data collection. The third part focuses on research methodology and the variables researched on in the study. The fourth and final part explains the stages of data analysis and the related parameters.

3.1 Research Focus

As the literature review indicated there is a debate about whether LX learning motivation is influenced by other aspects than L2 learning. Consequently, the study aims to investigate whether multilingual South Tyrolean LX learners gauge their LXs English, French, Spanish and Russian through the same mental framework as was identified by Dörnyei and associates’ 1993-2004 study with monolingual L2 learners. This should contribute to a better insight into the motivational aspects influencing LX learning as well as into multilingualism as an individual and societal phenomenon in multilingual societies to foster language learning and thus the promotion of becoming a plurilingual society. To do this, three main research questions and two sub-questions were formulated:

1) Are multilingual LX learners motivated by different attitudinal factors than monolingual learners?
a) Do multilingual learners’ attitudes towards living in a multilingual area and
towards CLIL have an additional impact on LX motivation?

2) Does LX motivation differ among learners from the three language groups of
multilingual South Tyrol?

b) Which role does gender and geographical distribution play in LX
motivation?

3) Does English L3 learning have any negative impacts on the motivation of
further LX learning in multilingual South Tyroleans just as English L2 learning
had in monolingual Hungary

Similarly to Dörnyei and his associates’ study (2006), a quantitative research
approach was used to answer these questions (see 3.2).

This section showed there were five research questions in the study to
contribute helpful findings to the debate on LX in contrast to L2 learning motivation
and better understanding multilingualism in multilingual societies. Next, the design of
the study will be explained to provide a better insight into the most crucial part of the
survey conduction.

3.2 Research Design

This part provides general information about the research project and describes
the participants as well as the data collection process.

The project was based on a longitudinal study with 13,391 13-14-year old Year 8
students in Hungary including national surveys conducted in 1993, 1999 and 2004
(Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006).
As mentioned in 1.3.1, German, Italian, English, French, Spanish and Russian can be acquired as LX in South Tyrolean school context. Based on this, the study focused on South Tyrolean students’ attitudes and motivation towards learning these languages.

So far there have only been a few online surveys (e.g. Dewaele, Petrides & Furnham, 2008). However online administration allows a researcher to also access difficult remotely located citizens. Furthermore, research time can be saved and costs can be reduced because test administration does not require the physical presence of the study conductor and data is directly entered to the online research tool by the participants (Dörnyei, 2010a, pp. 69-70). For all these reasons it was chosen to perform this project’s data collection by means of a web-based questionnaire. Hence, the questionnaire was digitalised using the tool LimeSurvey, an open-source software which has to be installed on a webserver or a personal computer.

After a general introduction of this research project, next there will be a focus on the sample of the study.

3.2.1 Participants

In the following section, details about the sampling process and the participants of the study will be provided.

In total 1,233 Year 8 students from 29 South Tyrolean middle schools participated in the study. Parents’ consent was obtained by each school according to their official regulations. Due to technical issues, the students of one middle school only partly completed the questionnaire and thus, their results could not be considered in the data analysis. As a result, the final sample consisted of 1,214
students representing about 20% of all South Tyrolean Year 8 students, about 2% of all South Tyrolean students and about 0.2% of the total population. Table 2 provides an overview of the size of the sample as well as the total number of South Tyrolean students and schools at the time of the survey.

Table 2 Academic Year 2015/16: South Tyrolean Schools and Students + Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Authority</th>
<th>Total South Tyrol</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Total Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Non-sample related data from ASTAT, 2016c, p.25 and the German, Italian and Ladin school authorities

a 19 students of an additional Ladin school participated. Due to slow internet connection students only completed part 1+2 of the questionnaire.

Since it is impossible to investigate the whole population, a good sample (= group of participants in a study) is close to the target population (= the group of people the study is about) (Dörnyei, 2007, p.97). There are a number of sampling strategies which can be divided into two categories, (a) ‘probability sampling’ and ‘non-probability sampling’. According to Dörnyei (2007, p.97) the former includes “complex and expensive procedures that are usually well beyond the means of applied linguistics”. The latter involves several sampling strategies which try to achieve a “reasonably representative sample using resources that are within the means of the ordinary researcher” (2007, p.97). As a result, a non-probability sample was employed in this study, in fact the most common type in LX research, the ‘convenience’ or ‘opportunity sample’. Such samples are selected on behalf of whether members of the target population meet practical criteria for the researcher e.g. easy accessibility,
availability during a certain timeframe, geographical closeness or enthusiasm to voluntarily participate in a research project. However these samples are rather seldom only made by applying convenience-based criteria since respondents need to be in possession of relevant traits for the purpose of the study. Consequently, the limitations of such samples and the composition of the sample have to be highlighted referring to which characteristics of the target population it possesses before making claims about the possible general relevance of the results.

As a matter of fact, it is ideal to choose the sample so that it represents the target population’s typical feature as closely as possible. Thus, the sample of this research project included participants from all three language groups as well as from 7 out of 8 South Tyrolean districts which Table 3 clearly shows. Consequently, data from all socio-linguistic areas as discussed in 1.3.3 were available and the sample represented all socio-linguistic and geographical characteristics of the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>School Authority</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burggrafenamt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisacktal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pustertal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salten-Schlern</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Überetsch-Unterland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinschgau</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wipptal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students from Year 8 were considered ideal candidates for the South Tyrolean survey because Year 8 is the third grade and final year of middle school in Italy and
thus also the year when students need to decide on their future secondary or professional education and whether they would like to acquire additional LXs in the future which is of particular interest to this study.

As could be seen, the sample of this study presents the characteristics of the multilingual area of South Tyrol well and can thus be considered as being close to the target population. The description of the participants is followed by an overview on the data collection process.

3.2.2 Data Collection Procedures

This section informs on all data collection phases. In order to find volunteers to take part in the study, an email outlining the research interest and requesting their support was sent to all three school authorities at the beginning of the academic year 2015/16 in autumn 2015. Data collection was scheduled for early spring 2016. However the school authorities had not responded to the request until spring 2016. Thus data collection had to be postponed.

The head of the Ladin school authority in South Tyrol declared to support the study if schools volunteered to participate in the survey. Consequently, the Principals of all Ladin middle schools were approached by email (see Appendix 1). The L2 superintendent of the Italian school authority in South Tyrol also sent an official note (see Appendix 2) about the aim and scope of the research project to the Principals of all Italian middle schools in May 2016 and directly contacted some Italian schools to arrange their participation after only one school had initially agreed to support the survey. The director of the Bereich Innovation und Beratung from the German school authority in South Tyrol assisted in promoting the study in German middle schools. For
this purpose, an official note about the study was forwarded to the Principals of all German middle schools at the beginning of May 2016 (see Appendix 3).

Since the German school authority has already often used the LimeSurvey for their surveys, they also granted permission to work with LimeSurvey via their blick server thus providing all technical requirements and an enormous database to store all conducted data. Consequently, the questionnaire could be created there and made available to respondents by providing an access code directly leading to the questionnaire hosted by that server.

The email to the Ladin Principals as well as the official notes to the Italian and German schools’ principals included detailed information about the research project, a parents letter and a request for a contact person responsible for organizing the study administration at each school including the parents’ permission, the best date and time for their students to fill in the questionnaire, the PC room bookings and the test surveillance. This person was provided with the access code for the initially communicated date and number of participants as well as related test administration information (see Appendix 4+5). Each school received only one school access code to guarantee the anonymity of the students. In order to avoid students learning about the questionnaire questions in advance, no copy of the questionnaire was provided to the schools. However, to guarantee schools and teachers would not feel unsettled about the study, they were informed that the focus of the study was exclusively on the students and not on the teachers’ work. Thus, no school or classroom evaluation and comparisons between the participating schools’ work could be made with the conducted data.
For the data collection, students had to respond to the online questionnaire which lasted about 25 minutes but an approximate duration of 40 minutes was indicated to the schools to also cover the PC and study login and logout process and could thus be completed within one school lesson.

The online survey did not involve any paperwork for the schools because conducted data was automatically transmitted upon termination. Nevertheless, schools needed to have PC rooms available with access to the Internet and good Internet speed. Although every middle school in South Tyrol possesses at least one PC room with Internet connection, the Internet speed is still problematic in a few schools in the smaller valleys. As a result, two schools rejected their participation due to this technical issue and as already mentioned in 3.2.1, one school did not manage to complete their questionnaires in time.

Since definite contact with the middle schools had not been established before mid May 2016, data collection was set to take place from mid May 2016 to mid June 2016. This period is considered an intensive time for teachers as well as students because this is the end of the academic year in Italy and Year 8 students have to sit graduation exams to receive their final graduation certificates. As a result, a number of schools, especially Italian ones, were not willing to participate in the study since teachers and students had to focus on exam preparations. However, this period was ideal for conducting the study since parts of it focused on their future and students had already had to enrol themselves to their future secondary or vocational school until March 2016.
Following the data analysis process and the termination of this thesis, a letter to the Principals and responsible teachers of each participating school thanking them for their collaboration and outlining some results of the project will be sent.

In this subchapter, all steps of the data compilation from the search for participants to the eventual conduction of the study in the classrooms were presented and related issues were explained. The construction of the online questionnaire used to converge the empirical data is described in the following section.

3.3 Research Instrument

This part comprises an overview of the construction of the online questionnaire describing quality standards for quantitative research methods, the piloting and the included questions as well as the variables.

3.3.1 Quantitative Research

A brief outline of the characteristics and quality criteria of quantitative research methodology is provided in the following section. Originating from social sciences, survey research is a part of quantitative research and analyses the attitudes, opinions, characteristics and expected behaviour of a large group of people on behalf of data collected from a smaller sample of this group.

The quality of the results of quantitative research is measured according to three main criteria, their objectivity, reliability and validity (e.g. Dörnyei, 2007; Bortz & Döring, 2016). Tests or results are considered as objective if they are not influenced by or dependent on the researcher. The reliability of research instruments indicates “the extent to which our measurement instruments and procedures produce consistent results in a given population in different circumstances” (Dörnyei, 2010a, p.50). In
other words, it shows if the instrument exactly measures what should be measured which can be tested on the basis of the Cronbach Alpha coefficient calculated by statistical programmes such as SPSS. It measures the internal consistency of a group of items and informs about how closely they are related to each other (Bühner, 2006, p.132). The criterion of validity refers to if a test does in fact measure what it is assumed to measure.

The consideration of these three quality criteria is vital to gain scientifically legitimate data and thus have to be considered in the construction of a questionnaire which will be described next.

3.3.2 Questionnaire

This section is dedicated to outlining how the questionnaire was designed based on the questionnaire construction theory and thus, also includes information about the piloting.

Survey research intends to “collect self-reported data from individuals” and the written questionnaire is the most common instrument for this purpose (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012, p.74). That is a result of this research instrument’s benefits such as “unprecedented efficiency in terms of (a) researcher time, (b) researcher effort, and (c) financial resources” (Dörnyei, 2010a, p.6). As a consequence, “no single method has been so much abused” (Gillham, 2007, p.1) in research over the last years. This has led to scholars more explicitly highlighting the disadvantages of questionnaires such as the possibility of too simple and superficial answers or unreliable and unmotivated respondents, to raise awareness of the limitations of this type of research instrument (Dörnyei, 2010a).
However, Dörnyei (2010a, p.11) points out the following which supports the continuous use of questionnaires in future studies:

It is true that respondents are often unmotivated, slapdash, hasty, and insincere, yet it is also an established fact that careful and creative questionnaire construction can result in an instrument that motivates people to give relatively truthful and thoughtful answers, which can then be processed in a scientifically sound manner.

Therefore, based on the Hungarian questionnaire used in the 1993-2004 survey, a 58-item online questionnaire was developed for this research project.

According to Dörnyei and Csizér (2012, pp.75-79) good questionnaire designing includes six key issues to obtain reliable and valid data:

1. Appropriate sampling of content and using multi-item scales,
2. Choosing the main types of questionnaire items,
3. Writing items that work,
4. Choosing the format of the questionnaire,
5. Translating the questionnaire,
6. Piloting the questionnaire;

In order to be comprehensive, since a researcher cannot analyse what is not measured, a well-designed questionnaire is expected to comprise multi-item scales which are scales that refer to “a cluster of several differently worded items that focus on the same target” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 103). In other words, multi-item scales contain a series of similar questions to obtain more adequate data since their use avoids participants’ answers being influenced too much by the actual words used in a question. However, similar to Dörnyei and his team (2006), the numbers of items focusing on each variable in this project’s questionnaire had to be reduced, on the one hand to avoid the fatigue effect in respondents, which refers to inaccurate responding due to a too long and monotonous test, but on the other hand, to still include all relevant variables to achieve the scope of the research project.
With regard to the items, the format and the language, the items for this questionnaire were adopted from the English questionnaire of the Hungarian study, which comprised sufficient reliability and validity values and was amended with South Tyrol relevant items. Then with the help of a team of native speakers and language teachers, it was translated into German, Italian and Ladin, all three official languages in South Tyrol, allowing all South Tyroleans to read and complete it by using their L1 to avoid communication problems. After translating the questionnaire, the feedback of the supervisor of this thesis was included to finish the first version of the questionnaire for the pilot study, which was conducted in autumn 2015. This pilot group consisted of 10 14-year old students of German, Italian and Ladin mother tongue and thus closely corresponded to the sample group. These students were provided with access codes to the online questionnaire and individually filled it in at home. Afterwards, they provided written feedback on the items, the duration as well as the technical handling of the online questionnaire, which was eventually incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire.

The final questionnaire consisted of three parts (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, pp. 27-29). Part 1 comprised 26 five-point Likert scales related to the five (or six in the case of the Ladin students) target languages: English, French, Spanish, Russian, Italian and German as well as the six target language communities comprising:

- Items about the students’ various reasons for learning the given languages (5 items).
- Attitudes towards LX (3 items).
- Intended effort students were willing to invest into acquiring the given LX (1 item).
- Parents’ language proficiency (2 items).
- Attitudes towards the LX speakers and communities, the extent to which learners comprised positive feelings towards the given LX countries and citizens (2 items).
• The perceived international importance of the LX communities (2 items).
• The quantity (2 items) and the quality (5 items) of contact with these languages and its speakers.
• Interest and need for Content and Language Learning (2 items).
• Interest in working and studying in LX countries (2 items).

In all items, the UK and the USA were separately indicated since they are two different communities although both being English-speaking countries.

Part 2 included 15 five-point Likert scales that were not specific to any LX:

• Students’ view on growing up in a multilingual area (4 items).
• Students’ attitude towards LX learning at school (1 item).
• Contact with LXs through friends, the Internet and social media (3 items).
• Fear of assimilation, the extent to which students believed that acquiring as well as using LXs might negatively influence them and let them lose their mother tongue language and culture (2 items).
• Language learning milieu related to their parents’ (1 item) and their friends’ attitudes towards LX learning (1 items).
• Self-confidence in acquiring and using LXs (3 items).

Part 3 comprised 7 open-ended and 10 multiple-choice items to collect information about the respondents’ background:

• Personal variables such as the students’ year of birth, gender and language learning background (16 items).
• Language Choice: participants were asked to indicate three languages they would like to learn in the following school year (1 item).

The complete questionnaire in English, German, Italian and Ladin can be consulted in Appendix 6, 7, 8 and 9. Students were allowed to fill in the questionnaire in their school’s main teaching language.

As illustrated, the construction of the research instrument applied in the data collection process of this research project followed the criteria of how to design a good quality questionnaire. Next the variables tested in this study will be presented.
3.3.3 Variables

This part provides a short summary of the main variables included in the study.

Following Dörnyei and associates’ (2006) survey, this questionnaire investigated *Integrativeness, Instrumentality, Linguistic Self-Confidence, Vitality of the L2 Community* (for the purpose of this study called *Vitality of the LX Community*), *Attitudes Towards the L2 Speakers and Community* (in this survey called *Attitudes Towards the LX Speakers and Community*), *Milieu* and *Cultural Interest* which represent some of key motivational concepts in second and foreign language acquisition (see 2.2.2 for detailed descriptions of these variables). To take into account the differences between monolingual Hungary and multilingual South Tyrol, the variables *Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country* and *CLIL* were added. The former refers to students’ opinion about growing up in multilingual South Tyrol and whether positive or negative experiences could have an impact on LX learning. The latter measures students’ view on CLIL as well as its efficiency for improving their LX competences, relevant to explore due to its recommended implementation as a means to foster multilingualism as explained in 2.3.2.

To sum up, the questionnaire employed in this research project focuses on nine major constructs relevant for investigating LX motivation in a multilingual country. To round off the chapter about research methodology and data collection, the last part informs on how data was processed and statistically evaluated.

3.4 Data Analysis

In the following section, the data analysis process is described. After data collection was terminated, data was exported from LimeSurvey into Excel where it was
converted for the eventual import into IBM SPSS Statistics for Mac (Version 23). There data was coded and negatively worded items were recoded for the analysis.

The next step was to reduce the number of variables and to compute multi-item scales relating to the nine before-mentioned constructs to facilitate data analysis (see 3.3.2). According to Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh (2006, pp.32-33), researchers do that on behalf of three information sources, (1) the initial theoretical design of the questionnaire, (2) factor analysis and (3) reliability analysis. When designing a questionnaire, items are created based on a certain theoretical background. However, they rarely perfectly correspond to that theoretical structure. Thus, a post hoc analysis of the questionnaire items is necessary to verify the suitability of the reduced set of variables. For that purpose, a factor analysis can be applied. This is a multivariate method to decrease a number of variables to a few ‘supervariables’ or ‘factors’ which comprise only those variables encompassing similar information (Venetz & Zurbriggen, 2015, p.1). Then these factors have to be interpreted on the basis of the project’s underlying theory. So factor analysis can contribute to diminishing variables by proving if our previous conceptualisation does correspond with what is found in a researcher’s sample.

However, as Werner (2014, p.14) states results from such analyses can often be rather subjective:

Due to the variety of methods that can be used in such analyses and the wide scope for interpreting its results, the identified factors the various questionnaire items should belong to have to be considered with caution. They could be seen as guides leading to the determination of the final clusters of variables. Thus they have to be compared with the underlying theory and their reliability has to be additionally verified by testing their ‘internal consistency’.

Such a test has to be carried out to investigate the internal coherence of the items in each cluster and thus verify that they indeed measure the same in accordance with the quality criteria for scientific research (see 3.3.1). Consequently, first factor analyses were administered with SPSS. More precisely, one analysis for each language (items 1-26) as well as for the non-LX related items (items 27-41) was conducted. Then a calculation of the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was executed to finalise the determination process of the variable clusters.

The computed sets of variables were used to perform descriptive statistical tests, as well as interference statistical tests such as analysis of variance (ANOVA), correlation analysis, multiple regression analyses and t-test analysis. Additionally, structural equation modelling (SEM) was used to interpret “the relationship among several variables within a single framework” (Dörnyei, 2007, p.238) as done in the data analysis process of the Hungarian survey. According to Dörnyei (2007, p.238) SEM is ideal for researchers because:

SEM makes it possible to test cause-effect relationships based on correlational data, ... which makes SEM a powerful analytical tool as it combines the versatility of correlation analysis and the causal validity of experimental research.

In SEM, researchers have to come up with a so-called measurement model which describes the relationships between the variables and the influence of a previously
determined variable. If the study is more complex, it needs more such models which lead to the development of a full structural model that combines all measurement models. SEM verifies if these models are acceptable by indicating goodness-of-fit values and additionally proposes indices for modifying the models (Dörnyei, 2007, p.239). The AMOS software was used to apply SEM to the data of this research. Since this study aimed to compare the motivational aspects in LX learning in South Tyrol with those of Hungary, the Hungarian SEM models were tested using the data of this survey rather than developing new models.

The final part of this chapter provided an outline of the analysis procedures used in this research project. The consecutive chapter comprises the data presentation.
Chapter 4 Data Presentation

In this chapter the findings of the study will be presented regarding all participants and sorted by language groups. First, the results of the factor analyses for the LX-related items as well as the non-LX-related items and the computation of the multi-item scales will be portrayed to give proof of the reliability of the study. Then, the outcome of the variables shared with Dörnyei and associates’ study will be laid out. Finally, an insight into the South Tyrol only variables’ results will follow.

4.1 Factor Analyses

This section presents the outcome of the factor analyses for the LX-related as well as the non-LX-related items of the survey questionnaire.

As Table 4 illustrates, the factor analysis for the LX-related items based on a maximum likelihood extraction method, oblique rotation and scree test distributed the data of this study over five factors comparable to those in the Hungarian study. The emerging factors were similar for all foreign languages but not identical. Loadings smaller than .30 were oppressed allowing for a meaningful data interpretation and in general items were assigned to the factor with the highest loading in case of cross-loadings if that was in accordance with the underlying theoretical concepts (Bortz & Schuster, 2010, p.422).

Factor 1 in English GB, English US, French, Spanish and Russian received prominent loadings from Items 14, 17, 20, 25 and 26. All these items refer to the evaluation of direct contact with LX speakers and communities. Consequently, this factor can be termed Attitudes Towards the LX speakers and communities. Interestingly, Item 12 about how much CLIL would be liked obtained loadings on this factor for French, Spanish and Russian. This could be explained because it is possible
that students, who probably have not experienced CLIL teaching yet, might imagine that CLIL lessons will be taught by a native speaker and thus they could help them to directly get in touch with the LX community. In addition, Item 11 scored on this factor in these languages which for English GB and English US was associated with another factor representing a merge of two concepts into one factor as subsequently explained in the description of factor 3.

Factor 2 in English GB, English US, French, Spanish and Russian showed noticeable loadings from Items 2, 3, 6 and 7. Since they all focus on knowing a language for pragmatic and thus instrumental reasons, this factor can be named Instrumentality. Item 4 also loaded on this factor in all languages referring to the usefulness of knowing the LX culture for learning a language and the contribution it makes to become an educated person in contrast to Dörnyei and team’s study in which it loaded with their factor Integrativeness and rather concerned a positive view of the LX culture. Moreover, Item 13 loaded on this factor in French, Spanish and Russian to highlight the utilitarian value of CLIL for acquiring these languages as previously mentioned in contrast to English where this item received prominent loadings on another factor (see 2.3).

Factor 3 was associated with Items 1, 10 and 11 in English GB and English US and since these items concern a positive view on the LX and its culture which can be interpreted as the wish to become similar to the LX speakers and thus resembles Gardner’s (1985) concept of Integrativeness, this factor was termed Integrativensess. For French, Spanish and Russian only Item 10 achieved salient loading whilst Item 11 loaded with factor 1 as well as Item 1 for French and Spanish. Similar to the Hungarian study Integrativeness and Attitudes Towards the LX Speakers and Community partly
merge together which might be an effect of the low number of LX speakers visiting South Tyrol and consequently the opportunity to come in contact with them is provided when South Tyroleans spend their holidays in these countries. Therefore, Dörnyei and his associates (2006, p.37) argue that “the positive outlook on the community (as reflected by Integrativeness) is very closely associated with qualitative aspects of the time spent in these countries (as reflected by Attitudes Towards the L2 Speakers/ Community).” Another difference between the loadings in the various LXs can be found in Items 12 and 13 having loaded for English GB and English US. The reason for this could be that the Global English language community cannot be seen as only the inhabitants of Great Britain and the USA but, as the previously explained concept of International Posture (Yashima, 2014) indicates, as a world community and learning not only general but also technical English and various contents through that language might foster the assimilation process to this LX community.

Factor 4 had striking loadings of Items 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24 in all languages. They can all be attributed to the enjoyment of cultural products related to the LX communities such as music, films, TV programmes and magazines. As a result this factor was labelled Cultural Interest.

Factor 5, the last factor, was called Vitality of LX Community since for almost all LXs, it loaded on Items 15 and 16 which both focus on the perceived wealth and importance of the LX communities in the world. Only English GB did not have any loadings for this factor since these two variables had merged into one with Attitudes Towards the LX Speakers and Community probably indicating that for this particular case the Vitality of the LX Community influences the notion of the members of the LX community.
Table 4 Results of the factor analysis of the attitudinal items: variable clusters determining each LX language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td>14 travel to country</td>
<td>6 useful for travel</td>
<td>12 Like CLIL</td>
<td>19 Like TV programmes</td>
<td>15 country: developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GB)</td>
<td>20 Like LX speakers</td>
<td>3 LX important in world</td>
<td>1 like LX</td>
<td>18 Like films</td>
<td>16 country: important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Meet LX speakers</td>
<td>2 become knowledge.</td>
<td>10 Like watching films, videos, series in LX</td>
<td>21 Often watch LX TV programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Study in LX country</td>
<td>7 useful for career</td>
<td>13 CLIL helpful for LX</td>
<td>22 Like magazines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Work in LX country</td>
<td>4 get to know culture</td>
<td>11 Similar to LX speakers</td>
<td>24 Like music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 country: developed</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 country: important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td>25 Study in LX country</td>
<td>6 useful for travel</td>
<td>12 Like CLIL</td>
<td>19 Like TV programmes</td>
<td>15 country: developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(US)</td>
<td>26 Work in LX country</td>
<td>3 LX important in world</td>
<td>1 like LX</td>
<td>18 Like films</td>
<td>16 country: important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Like LX speakers</td>
<td>2 become knowledge.</td>
<td>10 Like watching films, videos, series in LX</td>
<td>21 Often watch LX TV programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Meet LX speakers</td>
<td>7 useful for career</td>
<td>13 CLIL helpful for LX</td>
<td>22 Like magazines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 travel to country</td>
<td>4 get to know culture</td>
<td>11 Similar to LX speakers</td>
<td>24 Like music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>Factor 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong></td>
<td>26 Work in LX country</td>
<td>3 LX important in world</td>
<td>10 Like watching films, videos, series in LX</td>
<td>19 Like TV programmes</td>
<td>15 country: developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Study in LX country</td>
<td>2 become knowledge.</td>
<td>18 Like films</td>
<td>16 country: important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Meet LX speakers</td>
<td>4 get to know culture</td>
<td>22 Like magazines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Like LX speakers</td>
<td>6 useful for travel</td>
<td>21 Often watch LX TV programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Similar to LX speakers</td>
<td>7 useful for career</td>
<td>24 Like music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 like LX</td>
<td>1 like LX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Like CLIL</td>
<td>13 CLIL helpful for LX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 travel to country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish</strong></td>
<td>25 Study in LX country</td>
<td>3 LX important in world</td>
<td>10 Like watching films, videos, series in LX</td>
<td>19 Like TV programmes</td>
<td>16 country: developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Work in LX country</td>
<td>2 become knowledge.</td>
<td>18 Like films</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Like LX speakers</td>
<td>4 get to know culture</td>
<td>22 Like magazines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Meet LX speakers</td>
<td>6 useful for travel</td>
<td>21 Often watch LX TV programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 travel to country</td>
<td>7 useful for career</td>
<td>24 Like music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Similar to LX speakers</td>
<td>1 like LX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Like CLIL</td>
<td>13 CLIL helpful for LX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 like LX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>26 Work in LX country</td>
<td>3 LX important in world</td>
<td>10 Like watching films, videos, series in LX</td>
<td>16 country: important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Study in LX country</td>
<td>2 become knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 country: developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Like LX speakers</td>
<td>4 get to know culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Meet LX speakers</td>
<td>6 useful for travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 travel to country</td>
<td>7 useful for career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Like CLIL</td>
<td>1 like LX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Similar to LX speakers</td>
<td>13 CLIL helpful for LX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: maximal likelihood extraction and oblique rotation were applied; only loadings above 0.30 are shown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>7 useful for career</td>
<td>10 Like watching films, videos, series in L2</td>
<td>4 get to know culture</td>
<td>8 mother’s language proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 Similar to L2</td>
<td>2 become knowledge.</td>
<td>9 father’s proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 like L2 speakers</td>
<td>3 L2 important in world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Like CLIL</td>
<td>6 useful for travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>12 Like CLIL</td>
<td>1 like L2 speakers</td>
<td>7 useful for career</td>
<td>9 father’s proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 CLIL helpful for L2</td>
<td>11 Similar to L2 speakers</td>
<td>3 L2 important in world</td>
<td>8 mother’s language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Like watching films, videos, series in L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 get to know culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Similar to L2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 like L2 speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Like CLIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: maximal likelihood extraction and oblique rotation were applied; only loadings above 0.30 are shown.
The results of the factor analysis for Italian and German varied significantly as presented by Table 5. One can observe that both languages received prominent loadings from diverse items thus not allowing their association to the same theoretical concepts as those of the foreign languages studied in South Tyrol which implies that South Tyroleans gauge their L2s and their other LXs through different mental frameworks. Therefore, no variable reduction was conducted.

As Table 6 illustrates, the factor analysis of the items not related to an LX or LX community issued a four-factor solution which could be reduced to a three-factor solution since one factor had several cross-loadings and could not clearly be distinguished from the other three factors in terms of the theoretical framework. This will be subsequently explained in the description of factor 2.

Factor 1 obtained prominent loadings from Items 36, 37, 38, 40 and 41. All these items refer to the opinion about growing up in a multilingual area. Thus this factor was termed Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country.

Factor 2 had loadings from Items 27, 28, 32, 35, 36, 37 and the parents’ mean language proficiency across all LXs (Items 8 and 9). This factor received cross-loadings as well as loadings from items with different theoretical background e.g. Items 27 as well as the cross-loaded Items 36 and 37 are aspects that play a role when living in a multilingual area. Item 28 can be associated more with one’s linguistic self-confidence and Items 32 and 35 with contact to LX speakers and communities by media usage. Last but not least, the parents’ mean language proficiency loaded on this factor although only lowly with .35. It would rather be expected to receive loadings on the Milieu factor, but the fact that this item only refers to the students’ perceived parents’
LX competence might have depressed the results (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006). As a consequence this factor could not be taken as a separate factor.

Factor 3 received loadings from Items 29 and 34 which are congruent with Clément’s (1986) concept of Linguistic Self-Confidence and thus this factor was labelled respectively.

The last factor, factor 4, could be associated with Items 30, 31, 33 as well as 39 and named Milieu because these items involve “the general appreciation of foreign languages in the learners’ immediate environment, like the school context and friends’ and parents’ views” (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p.38).

All in all, the factor analyses of all foreign languages and the non-LX-related variables verified that South Tyrolean students’ foreign language motivation is affected by eight broad and interrelated motivational dimensions: Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community, Instrumentality, Integrativeness, Cultural Interest, Vitality of the LX Community, Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country, Linguistic Self-Confidence and Milieu. Whilst the factor analysis of L2 learning revealed that other attitudinal dimensions are influential, these still have to be defined, however that would go beyond the aim of this thesis. Next the computation of the multi-item scales based on the outcome of the factor analyses will be illustrated.
Table 6  Factor Analysis of the non-LX specific items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. I think growing up in a multi-lingual country like South Tyrol is great.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I think growing up in a multi-lingual country is advantageous for my future career.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Learning German + Italian (+ Ladin) since my first school year has been an advantage for me when learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I have a lot of friends who have another mother tongue than me.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I often chat with people from foreign countries in social networks like Facebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I often watch foreign language films, videos, series on the Internet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Learning foreign languages supports me to further develop my mother tongue skills.</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Learning three languages since primary school has motivated me to learn more foreign languages.</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I am sure I will be able to learn a foreign language well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Learning a foreign language is a difficult task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I think I am the type who would feel anxious and ill at ease if I had to speak to someone in a foreign language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. My parents do not consider foreign languages important school subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I don’t think that foreign languages are important school subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. People around me tend to think that it is a good thing to know foreign languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I am anxious that because of learning foreign languages I don’t have enough time to further develop and increase my mother tongue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ mean language proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Negative worded items have been reversed and maximal likelihood extraction and oblique rotation were applied; only loadings above 0.30 are shown
4.2 Multi-Item Scales and their Reliability

In the following section the formation of the multi-item scales used to analyse the data conducted in this study will be described and the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients (CA) for each LX will be provided.

Since the results of the factor analyses virtually corresponded with the theoretical concepts underlying the questionnaire, eight multi-item scales based on the dimensions extracted by the factor analyses of the LX- and non-LX-related items were computed including only a few variations in accordance with theoretical background such as Item 4 which was added to Integrativeness. During the calculation of the internal consistency of the scales, Items 12 and 13 had to be deleted since Instrumentality as well as Integrativeness and Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community obtained higher Cronbach Alpha coefficients without these items. Thus an attempt to form a ninth multi-item scale was made and apart from Russian (.65) all LXs obtained Cronbach Alpha values of ≥ .70 which is acceptable according to Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). In addition, Items 27, 32 and 35 as well as the parents’ mean language proficiency were proposed to be deleted to receive higher Cronbach Alpha coefficients by SPSS.

As Table 7 illustrates, most of the multi-item scales displayed good reliability with Cronbach Alpha coefficients of ≥ .70 and thus the overall mean Cronbach Alpha was .75. In general, almost all Cronbach Alpha coefficients exceeded those of the 2004 Hungarian study (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, pp.40-41) and since most of the items used in this questionnaire were taken from previously proven research tests and given the size of the sample, the reliability of the findings of this survey can be considered as high.
Table 7 The Composition of the multi-item scales and the Cronbach Alpha coefficients for each scale – South Tyrol versus Hungary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrativeness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How much do you like these languages?</td>
<td>English .71</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How important do you think learning these languages is in order to learn more about the culture of its speakers?</td>
<td>French .73</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish .74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian .69</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How much do you like watching film, videos, series, etc. in these languages?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How much would you like to become similar to the people who speak these languages?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumentality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How much do you think knowing these languages would help you to become a more knowledgeable person?</td>
<td>English .83</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French .84</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish .84</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How important do you think these languages are in the world these days?</td>
<td>Russian .85</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much do you think knowing these languages would help you when travelling abroad in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How much do you think knowing these languages would help your future career?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 7 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach Alpha</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How much would you like to travel to these countries?</td>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How much do you like meeting inhabitants of these countries?</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. How much do you like the people who live in these countries?</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. How much would you like to study in these countries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. How much would you like to work in these countries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vitality of L3/L4 Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How rich and developed do you think these countries are?</td>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How important a role do you think these countries play in the world?</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How much do you like the films made in these countries? (Write 0 if you don't know them.)</td>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How much do you like the TV programs made in these countries? (Write 0 if you don't know them.)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How often do you watch films/TV programs made in these countries?</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How much do you like the magazines made in these countries? (Write 0 if you don't know them.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. How much do you like the music of these countries? (Write 0 if you don't know it.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milieu</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Tyrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. People around me tend to think that it is a good thing to know foreign languages.</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I don’t think that foreign languages are important school subjects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. My parents do not consider foreign languages important school subjects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I am anxious that because of learning foreign languages I don’t have enough time to further develop and increase my mother tongue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Linguistic Self-Confidence                                             | .43           | .47     |
|                                                                        |               |         |
| 34. Learning a foreign language is a difficult task.                  |               |         |
| 28. I am sure I will be able to learn a foreign language well.        |               |         |
| 29. I think I am the type who would feel anxious and ill at ease if I had to speak to someone in a foreign language. |               |         |

| Attitudes towards living in a multilingual country                    | .75           |
|                                                                        |               |
| 36. Learning three languages since primary school has motivated me to learn more foreign languages. |               |
| 37. Learning foreign languages supports me to further develop my mother tongue skills. |               |
| 38. Learning German and Italian (and Ladin) since my first school year has been an advantage for me when learning foreign languages. |               |
| 40. I think growing up in a multi-lingual country like South Tyrol is great. |               |
| 41. I think growing up in a multi-lingual country is advantageous for my future career. |               |
As shown in this passage, the variables of the questionnaire could be reduced to nine multi-item scales which demonstrated adequate reliability. These sets of variables and their associated motivational dimensions provide the basis for the actual analysis of the data conducted in this study which will be described in the subsequent part of the thesis starting with a presentation of the results of the variables that were also part of the Hungarian study.

4.3 Results of Common Variables

Subsequently, the findings regarding the variables that this questionnaire shared with the Hungarian survey will be presented for the most part, sorted by the three language groups, gender and geographical distribution.

4.3.1 Seven Main Motivational Dimensions

In the following section the results regarding the seven most relevant attitudinal factors will be shown. Initially there will be a focus on the general findings, which will be followed by a display of the results across the three language groups, gender and geographical distribution.
Table 8 provides general descriptive information about the seven main motivational dimensions in South Tyrol comparing them with those in Hungary. As can be seen, also in South Tyrol, English is by far the most popular foreign language learned and each aspect of it is highly appreciated by students. Furthermore, these LX learners similarly perceive US English to be more closely related to Global English than UK English when items had to be separately answered for UK and US English despite the fact that South Tyrolean school English lessons also mainly focus on teaching on British English.

French as well as Spanish rank second in the most preferred LXs to be acquired and thus the two first languages that are not compulsory subjects in South Tyrolean middle schools. They both achieved an almost identical mean in all language-related attitudinal factors only differing in Vitality of the LX Community where French had 3.65 and Spanish 3.18. This difference reflects the fact that France is a member country of the G7, thus belonging to the world’s major highly industrialised economies next to the UK, the USA, Canada, Germany, Italy and Japan and so its perceived worldwide importance and wealth outnumber those of economically weaker Spain.

Russian comprised the lowest ratings regarding almost all language-related motivational aspects in LX learning in South Tyrol apart from Vitality of LX Community where it reached 3.70 and thus marginally exceeded the mean of French. Possible reasons for this students’ perception could be that Russia has been playing an increasingly noteworthy role in world politics and the economy as well as European tourism in the last few years and is thus often present in the media. Nevertheless, the generally low means of Russian can be explained by Russians’ role in South Tyrol. On the one hand, it is only possible to learn Russian in a few schools and on the other, so
far the number of Russians visiting South Tyrol, although rising, has been low with only 0.5% of all foreign tourists visiting this area in 2015 and consequently the need to acquire Russian is not particularly high (Südtiroler Marketing Gesellschaft, 2016, p.7).

When focusing on the motivational dimensions in detail, four trends could be identified. Firstly, it is striking that the rank of attitudinal factors involved in LX acquisition in the South Tyrol study was the same as in the Hungarian one apart from one difference related to Cultural Interest. Instrumental motivation proved to play the most important role in all four LX learning situations which complies with the findings of Abel, Vettori, & Wisniewski (2012a+b), followed by Milieu, Vitality of the LX Community and Attitudes Towards the LX Community. Integrative aspects as well as Linguistic Self-Confidence ranked next and Cultural Interest ended the list. In the Hungarian study Cultural Interest scores outnumbered those of Integrativeness and Cultural Interest in British and US American culture even exceeded the scores for Linguistic Self-Confidence. The scores in South Tyrol varied from .94 for Russian to 2.61 for British culture with an exception of 3.70 for US American culture. Consequently, there is a trend of cultural attitudes generally being the motivational dimension with the lowest impact in LX learning in South Tyrol but it should perhaps be noted that standard deviation ranged from .91 for Russian to even 1.31 for British culture suggesting that some students also showed interest in British and even more in US American culture.
Table 8 Descriptive information about the seven main motivational dimensions comparing South Tyrol and Hungary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Dimension</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality of LX Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Self Confidence</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2004 Hungarian results taken from Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, pp.43-45

Secondly, all language-related attitudinal factors for English, French and Spanish, apart from Cultural Interest as previously mentioned and English US in Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community which scored 4.10 in contrast to 3.98, received slightly lower scores than in the Hungarian study. However, almost all ratings reached
the mid-point of ‘3’ and higher on a five-point scale. The scores for French and Spanish regarding integrative motivational aspects failed to reach the mid point of the scale with 2.74 and 2.71 respectively. Also the scores for Milieu were marginally lower with 4.31 in comparison to with 4.46. Thus, a slight general negative trend in the motivation of English, French and Spanish learning in South Tyrol in contrast to Hungary could be noticed but the standard deviations of all of these dimensions apart from Integrativeness were higher than in the Hungarian results indicating that several respondents were even more positively motivated towards acquiring English, French and Spanish.

Thirdly, although Russian ranked last out of the four LXs more closely investigated in this study due to the previously-made assumptions, apart from Cultural Interest, where the mean was lower, and Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community, where the means were similar, the South Tyrolean means for Russian were thus slightly higher than the Hungarian means which during the three survey phases had been experiencing the effects of the collapse of the Soviet union, the consequent abandoning of the Communist rule and the welcomed opening up to the western world. As a consequence, a small positive countertrend in the motivational aspects for Russian could be noticed in a generation which has neither directly nor indirectly experienced the disappearance of the Iron Curtain and the aftermath of the collapsing of the USSR.

Fourthly, Linguistic Self Confidence in South Tyrol obtained a marginally higher score with 3.44 in contrast to 3.33. This can lead to the assumption that South Tyrolean LX learners felt more positive about their general ability to learn languages well which provides a good basis for future LX learning.
When looking at the outcome of the main attitudinal dimensions comparing all three South Tyrolean language groups, it is worth mentioning, as Table 9 illustrates, that the German language group resulted in being the least motivated group in South Tyrol probably as a result of their historical drive to keep their German identity and because many of them live in the more rural rather monolingual areas of South Tyrol. Across all seven dimensions, the means of the respondents from this group were lower than those of the other two. Only very few exceptions in the scores were found such as in the interest in French culture where the German mean was 1.60, the Italian 1.89 and the Ladin 1.56, which however was not significantly higher than that of the Ladin participants according to the computed Post hoc comparison. In particular, the difference in relation to the Italian respondents was thus significant in regards to all motivational aspects apart from the variables related to Russian, integrative motivation in acquiring French and Linguistic Self Confidence where no significant contrasts between the German, Italian and Ladin participants could be found. This makes the Italian students the most motivated LX learners in South Tyrol possibly resulting from their early need to acquire the L2 since it is essential for daily life in South Tyrol and as their school system is open to all kinds of language projects as previously mentioned.

Regarding the Ladin respondents only a few significant distinctions from the other respondents could be identified. For example, the significant difference between the Ladin and German group with regard to their attitudes towards the British, US American, French and Spanish language community, where Ladins ranked significantly higher than Germans which is not particularly surprising since the Ladin valleys are among the most popular tourist destinations in South Tyrol and thus foreign visitors
belong to everyday life. The most striking and unexpected finding was related to Milieu, where Ladins scored lower than Italians despite their multilingual education system and them learning two L2s instead of one like their Italian colleagues which would lead to the assumption that their friends and family positively support their LX learning.

**Table 9** Descriptive information about the main motivational dimensions and ANOVA statistics comparing all three language groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lang. Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Post Hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.387*</td>
<td>1&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.082*</td>
<td>1&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>20.751***</td>
<td>1&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.517</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>12.433***</td>
<td>1&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.135</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>21.715***</td>
<td>1&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 &gt; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 9 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lang. Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Post Hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>13.357***</td>
<td>1&lt;2, 1&lt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>28.352***</td>
<td>1&lt;2, 1&lt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>14.732***</td>
<td>1&lt;2, 1&lt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>32.937***</td>
<td>1&lt;2, 1&lt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.559</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Interest</strong></td>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>6.328**</td>
<td>1&lt;2, 1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>7.044**</td>
<td>1&lt;3, 2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>7.044**</td>
<td>1&lt;3, 2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>6.375**</td>
<td>1&lt;2, 1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>35.747***</td>
<td>1&lt;2, 1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2 &gt; 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lang. Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Post Hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vitality of LX Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>6.854**</td>
<td>1&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>5.961**</td>
<td>1&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>13.580***</td>
<td>1&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>14.336***</td>
<td>1&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milieu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>4.754**</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic Self Confidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Post hoc LSD comparison. Numbers refer to the language groups. ‘ns’ indicates non-significant differences between two values, whereas ‘<’ or ‘>’ denote significant differences. * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001

Next the findings broken down by gender will be outlined. Table 10 illustrates the South Tyrolean results in comparison to those of the Hungarian survey revealing that female LX learners’ tendency to score higher than boys could be confirmed in all but six cases with mean differences sometimes exceeding .30.
Table 10 *Gender*’ mean scores of the seven main motivational dimensions Hungary vs. South Tyrol and gender comparison in South Tyrol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumentality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrativeness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Towards LX Speakers and Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
The two motivational dimensions showing the least gender diversity were Cultural Interest and Vitality of the LX Community where girls ranked slightly lower than boys (e.g. interest in Spanish culture: boys 1.82 and girls 1.49) or no significant difference could be found (e.g. vitality of the US American community: boys 4.68 and girls 4.66). Although, this questionnaire was not designed to offer explanations for gender differences similar to that of Dörnyei and his associates, in general these

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vitality of LX Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milieu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Confidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2004 Hungarian results taken from Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, pp.57-59
findings confirmed the frequent observation in motivational research about girls’ significant higher scores and Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh’s (2006, p.56) observation that the girls’ higher scores did “not really stem from a differential perception of the importance of the target languages and communities” as their higher ratings for each language clearly indicate.

To round off the data presentation regarding the seven main attitudinal factors, there has to be a focus on the geographical variation as illustrated by Table 11. Despite the fact that South Tyrol is a relatively small area measuring 7,400 km², its geographical variety of mountains, valleys and basins has characterised the country and its people who live at an altitude ranging from about 200 to 3,900 m (ASTAT, 2015). About a fifth of the population live in the capital city whilst the rest either lives in urban areas and towns of about 5,000 to 40,000 inhabitants or traditional and largely rural villages. Thus their contact to foreign visitors and their need to acquire LXs clearly differ. According to the Südtiroler Marketing Gesellschaft (2016), the Burggrafenamt, Pustertal and Salten-Schlern are most famous South Tyrolean tourist destinations next to the capital Bozen followed by the Eisacktal, the Überetsch-Unterland and the Vinschgau coming last. Thus it is not surprising that when looking at the geographical variations in the LX motivational factors, the respondents from the Vinschgau had most of the lowest scores and especially in comparison to the capital several significant differences could be found across English, French and Spanish e.g. with regard to instrumental and integrative motivation for learning English and Spanish as well as their attitudes towards the British and US American community. Also in comparison to Salten-Schlern, one of the two areas where most Ladins live, there were some significantly divergent results in e.g. the instrumental motivation for learning
Russian and the attitude towards the British and French community. Having the lowest number of foreign visitors and being a relatively rural area, the population of the Vinschgau is also mainly German speaking with Italian speakers being a rare exception. Nonetheless, no significant difference in the scores for Milieu and Linguistic Self-Confidence was found suggesting that LX learning will be supported by friends and family and they feel as positive about their general ability to learn languages well as the rest of their South Tyrolean peers. The students from the Überetsch-Unterland, the most southern district of South Tyrol which directly borders the Italian-speaking Trentino, were the second group to obtain significantly diverse scores from the capital and especially Salten-Schlern with regard to English and more precisely the British community. For example, their scores for instrumental motivation and Attitude Towards the LX Speakers and Community were significantly lower than those of the two other geographical districts and their Cultural Interest in the British community appeared to be lower than that of LX learners in Bozen which is a result of less Britons visiting that area since it is a very prominent tourist destination for German and Italian-speaking tourists. What however is surprising is their reported lower linguistic self-confidence in contrast to that of LX learners in Bozen and thus having the lowest self-confidence of all South Tyrolean students. When looking at the respondents from the other South Tyrolean districts, if significant differences were found at all, then there were mostly higher scores in comparison to those of the Vinschgau and rarely for the Überetsch-Unterland like the LX learners’ higher interest in Spanish culture in the Burggrafenamt than in the Vinschgau or higher attitude towards the French community in the Eisacktal than in the Überetsch-Unterland. In general, there were variations within the seven South Tyrolean districts especially in contrast to the
Vinschgau and sometimes also the Überetsch-Unterland but the rankings of the seven attitudinal factors in all districts were consistent to their overall ranking in the whole of South Tyrol.

All in all, South Tyrolean results related to the seven main motivational dimensions were found to be similar to those of the Hungarian study apart from Cultural Interest which appeared to be even lower but its negative trend had already been noticeable during the three survey phases in Hungary. South Tyrolean girls scored higher than boys in most of the cases confirming the Hungarian as well as many other LX motivational study results. Last but not least, several variations between LX learners, in particular those living in the Vinschgau and the Überetsch-Unterland could be found in contrast to those of the capital Bozen and Salten-Schlern, whereby the latter significantly exceeded the former revealing that a certain degree of contact to the LX communities can have a positive influence on LX motivation. The following section outlines the findings for Language Choice and Intended Effort, two key aspects of motivated human behaviour.
Table 11 Seven motivational dimensions according to the geographical distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Instrumentality</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bozen</td>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burggrafenamt</td>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisacktal</td>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pustertal</td>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salten-Schlern</td>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Überetsch-Unterland</td>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinschgau</td>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.462</td>
<td>4.169</td>
<td>5.581</td>
<td>3.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-Value</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-hoc</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 &gt; 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 &gt; 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 &gt; 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 &gt; 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 &gt; 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 &gt; 7</td>
<td>3 &gt; 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 &gt; 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Integrativeness</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bozen</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burggrafenamt</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisacktal</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pustertal</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salten-Schlern</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Überetsch-Unterland</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinschgau</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.055</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>4.769</td>
<td>2.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-hoc</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 &gt; 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 &gt; 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 &gt; 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 &gt; 7</td>
<td>3 &gt; 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English UK</th>
<th>English US</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bozen</strong></td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burggrafenamt</strong></td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eisacktal</strong></td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pustertal</strong></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salten-Schlern</strong></td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Überetsch-Unterland</strong></td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vinschgau</strong></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>5.534</td>
<td>5.055</td>
<td>5.927</td>
<td>3.397</td>
<td>2.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p-Value</strong></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-hoc</strong></td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 &gt; 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 &gt; 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 &gt; 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 &gt; 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 &gt; 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 &gt; 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 &gt; 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(continued)*
Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Cultural Interest</th>
<th>English UK</th>
<th>English US</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bozen</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burggrafenamt</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisacktal</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pustertal</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salten-Schlern</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Überetsch-Unterland</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinschgau</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>4.275</td>
<td>4.320</td>
<td>2.249</td>
<td>7.929</td>
<td>1.543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p-Value</strong></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-hoc</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 &gt; 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 &gt; 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 &gt; 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 &gt; 7</td>
<td>1 &gt; 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 &gt; 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 &gt; 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 &gt; 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Vitality of LX Community</th>
<th>English UK</th>
<th>English US</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bozen</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burggrafenamt</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisacktal</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pustertal</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salten-Schlern</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Überetsch-Unterland</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinschgau</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.458</td>
<td>4.775</td>
<td>4.075</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-Value</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-hoc</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 &lt; 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 &gt; 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 &gt; 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 &gt; 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Milieu</th>
<th>Linguistic Self Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bozen</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burggrafenamt</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisacktal</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pustertal</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salten-Schlern</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Überetsch-Unterland</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinschgau</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>3.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p-Value</strong></td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-hoc</strong></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>&gt; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Post hoc LSD comparison. Numbers refer to the districts. 'ns' indicates non-significant differences between two values, whereas '<' or '>' denote significant differences.*
4.3.2 Language Choice and Intended Effort to Learning LXs

Language Choice and Intended Effort are essential in motivating human behaviour since they are their direction and magnitude (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006). Consequently, this part provides an overview of the results regarding both variables for each of the five LXs in general, sorted by language groups, gender and geographical distribution. Finally, the findings of the calculations regarding the general relationship between the motivational scales and both Language Choice and Intended Effort together with a comparison of the three language groups will be presented.

To obtain comparable results to those of the Hungarian study, the same method of computing the popularity index of all languages indicated by the respondents was carried out. If a language was indicated as the respondent’s first choice, it received three points, two points were assigned to the second choice and one point for the third choice. Languages not ranked by the respondents were given zero points. Table 12 provides an outline of South Tyrolean learners’ Language Choice in contrast to that of their Hungarian peers. English is among South Tyrolean learners also the most popular foreign language. However, the dramatic effect of Global English on other foreign languages could not be confirmed with a simple .29 difference in its mean and that of French, the second most popular foreign language in contrast to a .84 difference between English and German, the second most popular LX in Hungary at that time. Spanish ranked third although both French and Spanish performed similarly in the attitude figures. In Hungary, Spanish had only been the fifth choice since it had not been common to learn the language at school and Spain had also not been a popular holiday destination for Hungarians at that time. Thus it was only of marginal importance to Hungarian students.
### Table 12 The learners’ language choice preferences South Tyrol (1,214 participants) vs. Hungary (4,798 participants in 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Tyrol</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>11,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>3,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>3,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>7,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Only languages with a score greater than 10 are listed participants.*

2004 Hungarian results taken from Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p.52

Italian appeared to be surprisingly only the fourth most popular language to learn in South Tyrol despite the fact that it is the national language and the L2 of the majority of the participants. This questionnaire item asked participants to come up with their individual language preferences without providing any pre-determined answers and since the item referred to foreign languages, it might have been possible that the L2s did not come to mind. Nonetheless, it could also be proof of the importance Italian plays for LX learners in South Tyrol which would confirm the general
impression of especially German-speaking LX leaners’ preference of English over Italian as often experienced by teachers and employers. A similar explanation could be given for German only ranking sixth. Also interesting is the fact that Russian is South Tyrolean students’ fifth most popular language and actually achieved higher scores than those in the Hungarian survey with a fourth of its number of participants which is clear evidence of the negative trend in the popularity of Russian at that time due to its historical role in Hungary. Chinese, Latin, Japanese and Portuguese cover the next four ranks completing the top-ten most popular LXs in South Tyrol. These are the same languages as in the Hungarian study but in a different order thus showing the growing increase in the interest in learning Chinese nowadays. The last result to point out is the result for Ladin. Only a very small number of South Tyrolean students stated an interest in Ladin indicating its lack of importance for them despite being one of the three official languages in South Tyrol. Thus it only ranked seventeenth.

Next an insight into the findings regarding the effort South Tyrolean students intend to make in learning LXs will be provided. Table 13 illustrates that respondents were willing to channel the most effort into acquiring English with an almost identical mean as in the Hungarian study. German and Italian follow English. The two L2s received far higher means than the second rank German in Hungary consequently showing that although Global English continues to be the number one language, the gap between it and other LXs is smaller in the South Tyrolean than in the Hungarian context. Furthermore, South Tyrolean LX learners were prepared to make similar, and thus third most, effort into French and Spanish, with French almost equalling the Hungarian results. Russian ranked last like in Hungary but again with a higher mean. All in all, the pattern of the previous table regarding foreign languages can be confirmed
but the L2s clearly ranked higher but still did not receive the same interest as Global English.

Table 13 The learners' intended effort for all LXs in South Tyrol in contrast to Hungary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>South Tyrol Mean</th>
<th>South Tyrol SD</th>
<th>Hungary Mean</th>
<th>Hungary SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2004 Hungarian results taken from Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p.54, the Standard Deviations were not available

When comparing the three language groups, there were significant differences between German, Italian and Ladin LX learners in their Language Choice as well as in their Intended Effort into acquiring LXs. Table 14 shows that German and Ladin students would equally choose to learn English and French the following year which indicates that the negative effect of Global English as confirmed by Dörnyei and associates’ study as well as other similar motivational studies can not be detected for these two language groups. However, Italians’ enthusiasm for English was much higher with a difference of .97 between English and Spanish and .98 between English and French. Consequently, findings also revealed that due to the Italian participants’ having the largest interest in English, they were least interested in learning French and Russian which clearly agrees with previous results. With regard to the choice of the foreign languages, Ladin students had the highest means for French and Russian. There were no significant notable differences in relation to Spanish. When looking at the results of the L2s, it is highly interesting that Ladins ranked second behind the Italians regarding German and again second behind the Germans regarding Italian, with
German obtaining higher means than Italian. This could be evidence of Ladin LX learners no longer regarding German and Italian as important languages to continue studying due to them being like an additional L1 because of their role as languages of instruction in the multilingual Ladin school system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Choice</th>
<th>Lang. Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>Post hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>16.054</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1 &lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 &gt; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.806</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1 &gt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 &lt; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>11.531</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1 &gt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 &lt; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>70.646</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1 &gt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 &gt; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 &gt; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>42.998</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1 &lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 &gt; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Post hoc LSD comparison. Numbers refer to the language groups. ‘ns’ indicates non-significant differences between two values, whereas ‘<’ or ‘>’ denote significant differences.
Table 15 confirms the results in 4.3.1 that the German-speaking respondents also rank last in the language group comparison of Intended Effort. These students are less willing to put effort into learning French, Spanish and Russian than Italians and Ladins and less regarding English where despite a lower mean no significant difference towards their Ladin peers was found.

**Table 15** Descriptive statistics and ANOVA comparisons of Intended Effort across the three language groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lang. Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>Post hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>8.675</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1&lt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>6.205</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1&lt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20.755</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1&lt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>5.019</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1&lt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4.204</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Post hoc LSD comparison. Numbers refer to the language groups. ‘ns’ indicates non-significant differences between two values, whereas ‘<’ or ‘>’ denote significant differences. Post hoc tests not performed for German and Italian because there are fewer than three groups.
Concerning the gender differences in Language Choice, a significantly lower difference between English and other LXs in South Tyrol in contrast to Hungary is also clearly visible across gender as illustrated by Table 16. Moreover, South Tyrolean girls did not seem to be negatively influenced by the popularity of English since their mean for French was even marginally higher with 1.52 in contrast to 1.46, whereas South Tyrolean boys had a higher mean in English and consequently a far lower mean in the second choice French. This confirms that their interest in English is higher than that of the girls’ which leads to girls’ higher interest in all other LXs apart from Russian where no significant difference was found.

**Table 16 Gender’ mean scores of Language Choice and Intended Effort in South Tyrol vs. Hungary and gender comparison in South Tyrol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Choice</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Effort</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: 2004 Hungarian results taken from Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p. 59*
With regard to the Intended Effort boys and girls are willing to put effort into learning, the previously indicated ranking of the LXs as well as girls’ higher means are also confirmed across gender groups. In addition, boys’ disposition towards working on English is again bigger than that of girls’, just like girls’ willingness to work on the other LXs. In general, boys’ ranking was English, Spanish, French and Russian with a clearer preference for English and girls’ ranking was English, French, Spanish and Russian with smaller differences between the LXs.

When focusing on the various districts, significant variations with relation to the Language Choice and the Intended Effort across some were identified. First of all, Table 17 illustrates that the ranking regarding Language Choice was not consistent with that of the general outcome in all districts. Results for students from Bozen, Burggrafenamt, Eisacktal, Pustertal and Vinschgau went along with the previously mentioned pattern of the popularity of the foreign languages with English being number one in urban areas with higher means than in the more rural ones, either French and Spanish being both second or French being second and Spanish being third followed by Russian. In the Überetsch-Unterland English, Spanish and French appeared to have almost identical means thus no real language preference could be identified. In the Salten-Schlern district, students’ most popular language for learning the following year was French with a .47 difference from Spanish and even a .60 difference from English only being third choice. Thus both, and especially the latter, districts additionally provided evidence for English not constantly having the monopolistic status among all LXs in South Tyrol despite its role as the worldwide lingua franca. As a consequence, most significant differences could be found in comparison with Salten-Schlern. Furthermore, whereas the Vinschgau obtained most of the lowest results with
regard to the seven main motivational dimensions, its results for the popularity of English, Spanish and Russian were similar to those of the other non-urban areas. Only regarding Spanish did students in the Vinschgau have the lowest mean and for example significant differences to the Überetsch-Unterland could be found. What is additionally striking is the fact that the Vinschgau even achieved the highest mean for Italian with a significant difference from all districts apart from the Pustertal and the biggest difference with .65 from Bozen. As already mentioned, the related item focused on foreign languages and thus the results for Italian and German could have been influence by this formulation. Given that, students in the Vinschgau, which definitely belongs to that socio-linguistic area with less than 10% Italian citizens as described in 1.3.3, might identify Italian as a foreign language and thus probably more easily think of it as a foreign language. Finally, the Eisacktal showed the highest mean for German across all South Tyrolean districts and thus significant variations from all districts but Bozen were found. This result could be obtained since half of all participants from the Eisacktal were from an Italian school.

Concerning the effort South Tyrolean students are willing to put into learning LXs, Table 18 shows significant differences regarding the foreign languages but not for the L2s revealed across some of the districts. Most significant variations could again be found for the Vinschgau especially in comparison to Bozen, the Salten-Schlern and the Eisacktal with LX learners in the Vinschgau showing the poorest effort for English and Spanish. With regard to French, it is accompanied by the Überetsch-Unterland. When it comes to Russian, students from the Eisacktal were willing to significantly put more effort into learning it than their peers in Bozen, the Überetsch-Unterland, the Burggrafenamt and the Vinschgau and Salten-Schlern with significantly higher means.
than the Burggrafenamt and the Vinschgau, which in the case of the Eisacktal, not being major tourist destination of Russian tourists, was surprising but in the case of the Salten-Schlern confirmed the previous results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bozen</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burggrafenamt</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisacktal</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pustertal</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salten-Schlern</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Überetsch-Unterland</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinschgau</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.204</td>
<td>4.787</td>
<td>4.687</td>
<td>7.443</td>
<td>10.247</td>
<td>6.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-Value</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-hoc</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 &lt; 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 &gt; 5</td>
<td>1 &gt; 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 &lt; 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 &lt; 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 &lt; 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 &gt; 5</td>
<td>2 &gt; 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 &lt; 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 &gt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 &gt; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 &gt; 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 &gt; 5</td>
<td>3 &gt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 &gt; 6</td>
<td>3 &gt; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 &lt; 7</td>
<td>3 &gt; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 &gt; 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 &lt; 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 &lt; 7</td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td>5 &lt; 7</td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 &gt; 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 &lt; 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Post hoc LSD comparison. Numbers refer to the districts. ‘ns’ indicates non-significant differences between two values, whereas ‘<’ or ‘>’ denote significant differences.
Table 18 *Intended effort according to the geographical distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bozen</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burggrafenamt</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisacktal</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pustertal</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salten-Schlern</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Überetsch-Unterland</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinschgau</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.951</td>
<td>5.521</td>
<td>5.514</td>
<td>6.353</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>1.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-Value</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-hoc comparison

- 1 ns 2 1 ns 2 1 ns 2 1 ns 2
- 1 ns 3 1 ns 3 1 ns 3 1 < 3
- 1 ns 4 1 ns 4 1 ns 4 1 ns 4
- 1 ns 5 1 ns 5 1 ns 5 1 ns 5
- 1 ns 6 1 ns 6 1 ns 6 1 ns 6
- 1 ns 7 1 ns 7 1 > 7 1 ns 7
- 2 ns 3 2 ns 3 2 ns 3 2 < 3
- 2 ns 4 2 ns 4 2 ns 4 2 ns 4
- 2 ns 5 2 < 5 2 ns 5 2 < 5
- 2 ns 6 2 ns 6 2 ns 6 2 ns 6
- 2 ns 7 2 ns 7 2 ns 7 2 ns 7
- 3 ns 4 3 ns 4 3 ns 4 3 > 4
- 3 ns 5 3 ns 5 3 ns 5 3 ns 5
- 3 ns 6 3 ns 6 3 ns 6 3 > 6
- 3 > 7 3 ns 7 3 > 7 3 > 7
- 4 ns 5 4 ns 5 4 ns 5 4 ns 5
- 4 ns 6 4 ns 6 4 ns 6 4 ns 6
- 4 > 7 4 ns 7 4 ns 7 4 ns 7
- 5 ns 6 5 > 6 5 ns 6 5 ns 6
- 5 > 7 5 > 6 5 > 7 5 > 7
- 6 ns 7 6 ns 7 6 ns 7 6 ns 7

Note: Post hoc LSD comparison. No post hoc LSD comparison was computed for German and Italian due to F-test p-value >.05. Numbers refer to the districts. ‘ns’ indicates non-significant differences between two values, whereas ‘<’ or ‘>’ denote significant differences.
With regard to Language Choice and Intended Effort, an essential question is also how much the main motivational factors affect actual language learning. Consequently, correlations between the seven scales and Language Choice and Intended Effort were calculated to identify possible influences and variations to Hungary and within the language groups. To additionally verify the findings similar to Dörnyei and Clément (2001), a multiple regression analysis was carried out in which all motivational scales plus the two South Tyrolean variables were entered as a block to anticipate Language Choice and Intended Effort, the dependent variables in both calculations, for each LX. All results related to the South Tyrolean variables will be shown in 4.4.

As Table 19 illustrates, Integrativeness and Instrumentality besides Attitudes towards the LX speakers and Community, do also play a role in South Tyrol when it comes to investigating the impact of the seven motivational dimensions on Language Choice. In South Tyrol, Cultural Interest was also revealed to participate in this process. However, differences in the motivational impact of the seven dimensions on the popularity of English and the other LXs could be identified. On the one hand, the correlation coefficients for English in South Tyrol were significantly lower than those obtained in the Hungarian study. Integrativeness being the most dominant dimension in Hungary with .33, still received the highest correlation with .19 but a decrease in its relevance for Language Choice could be found. Instrumentality with .10 only ranked third after Cultural Interest with .11, which received a similar coefficient to the one in the Hungarian results. Also Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community with .07 and Linguistic Self-Confidence with .03 scored lower and showed to marginally affect South Tyrolean learners’ Language Choice. Milieu did not obtain any significant results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th></th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumentality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrativeness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vitality of the LX Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-.10***</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milieu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>-.10***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic Self Confidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>.06***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Results from 1999 taken from Dörnyei & Csízér (2002, p.442), no degree of freedom and exact p-values provided, * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001; no relevant data from 2004 available.*
On the other hand, the correlation coefficients for Integrativeness, Instrumentality and Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community were almost identically high with .45, .43 and .45 illustrating that these three motivational factors are equally important determinants of actual Language Choice. In contrast, in Hungary, Integrativeness was the most dominant dimension influencing the LX choice and thus had a single status as “‘core’ of the learners’ attitudinal/ motivational disposition, subsuming, or mediating most other variables” (Dörnyei & Clément, 2001, p.415). Cultural Interest with .25, Vitality of the LX Community with .24 and Milieu with .18 also received noteworthy correlation coefficients although far lower the those of the before-mentioned dimensions. Linguistic Self-Confidence appeared to only play a minor role when it came to choosing which LX to learn. The findings for Spanish and Russian were not that meaningful since almost no significant values could be determined.

Across the three language groups, significant values could mainly be calculated for English and French as Table 20 illustrates. Germans again revealed to obtain the lowest values in contrast to their Italian and Ladin peers. Regarding Instrumentality for English (.24), Attitudes towards French speakers and community (.55), Interest in French culture (.34) and Vitality of the French Community (.34), Ladin participants’ scores were the highest and most significant ones. Italian respondents ranked highest in Integrativeness for English (.22) and French (.55), Attitudes toward English Speakers and British community (.15), Interest in British culture (.17), Milieu (.17) and Linguistic Self-Confidence (.15). These findings lead one to assume that Italians’ Language Choice is mostly affected by Integrativeness although by far less than their Hungarian peers, Ladins by Instrumentality and Attitudes towards the LX speakers and community and
Germans in the case of English by Integrativeness and in the case of French by Integrativeness, Instrumentality and Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community likewise.

**Table 20 Correlations between the seven main motivational dimensions and language choice across the language groups measured with Spearman Correlation Coefficient**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumentality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrativeness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English UK</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>909</th>
<th>.179</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>English US</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English UK</th>
<th>.03</th>
<th>909</th>
<th>.372</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: r = .10 weak correlation, r = .30 moderate correlation, r = .50 strong correlation (Cohen, 1992)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Choice</th>
<th>Instrumentality</th>
<th>Integrativeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 21 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russian</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Interest**

| **English** | **German** | **Italian** | **Ladin** | **Total** |
| UK | 0.06 | 1.20 | 0.231 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| US | 0.02 | 0.42 | 0.678 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| **French** | **German** | **Italian** | **Ladin** | **Total** |
| | -0.20 | -0.58 | 0.562 | -0.25 | -0.02 | -0.02 |
| **Spanish** | **German** | **Italian** | **Ladin** | **Total** |
| | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.944 | 0.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| **Russian** | **German** | **Italian** | **Ladin** | **Total** |
| | -0.02 | -0.53 | 0.593 | -0.05 | -0.02 | -0.02 |

(continued)
Table 21 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Vitality of LX Community</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English US</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-2.84</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Milieu   | English                  | German   | -.03     | -.84     | .402     | -.03     | -.03     | -.03     |
|          | Italian                  | .07      | .77      | .443     | .10      | .06      | .05      |
|          | Ladin                    | .14      | .94      | .352     | .15      | .11      | .10      |
|          | Total                    | .01      | .31      | .754     | .01      | .01      | .01      |
| French   | German                   | .09      | 2.80     | .005     | .22      | .09      | .08      |
|          | Italian                  | -.04     | -.56     | .575     | .03      | -.04     | -.03     |
|          | Ladin                    | -.02     | .18      | .961     | .19      | -.02     | -.02     |
|          | Total                    | .05      | 1.77     | .078     | .18      | .05      | .05      |
| Spanish  | German                   | -.01     | -.21     | .830     | .19      | -.01     | -.00     |
|          | Italian                  | .09      | 1.72     | .088     | .18      | .12      | .08      |
|          | Ladin                    | .08      | .67      | .507     | .31      | .08      | .06      |
|          | Total                    | .01      | .38      | .705     | .05      | .01      | .01      |
| Russian  | German                   | .01      | .32      | .749     | .06      | .01      | .01      |
|          | Italian                  | -.09     | 1.18     | .241     | -.09     | -.09     | -.08     |
|          | Ladin                    | .22      | 1.67     | .100     | .17      | .19      | .19      |
|          | Total                    | -.05     | -1.19    | .233     | -.06     | -.04     | -.04     |

(continued)
The results obtained from multiple regression analyses for all dimensions and Language Choice as illustrated by Table 21 confirm that Integrativeness and partly also Instrumentality are important predictors for Language Choice. For all other dimensions, the equations were not significant thus the relevant results cannot be completely confirmed.

When looking at the relationship between the seven motivational aspects and Intended effort, the results for Integrativeness are almost identical to those of the Hungarian survey according to Table 22. Moreover, Instrumentality obtained even higher correlations than in Hungary with similar values for Integrativeness despite in the case of English where it obtained a marginally lower correlation, which showed that students’ personal preference for English plays a higher role than its practical quality regarding the effort they would put into learning it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Dimension</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality of the LX Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Self Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Results from 1999 taken from Dörnyei & Csizér (2002, p.443), no degree of freedom and exact p-values provided, * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001; no relevant data from 2004 available.
In contrast to Hungary, Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community also revealed to have an impact on participants’ intended effort to study LXs. This is particularly the cases for the correlation coefficients with relation to the other LXs French, Spanish and Russian which were significantly high clearly proving this dimension to be vital for motivation in learning other LXs than English. All other dimensions obtained similar results to those of the Hungarian study which confirms they are essential to LX motivation but only to a certain extent.

Table 23 Correlations between the seven main motivational dimensions and intended effort across the language groups measured with Spearman Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 23 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English UK</th>
<th>.42</th>
<th>993</th>
<th>.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Interest</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
**Table 23 continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English UK</th>
<th>(r)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vitality of LX Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milieu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic Self Confidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(r = .10\) weak correlation, \(r = .30\) moderate correlation, \(r = .50\) strong correlation (Cohen, 1988)
The rank of the motivational factors with Integrativeness and Instrumentality being first (apart from English Instrumentality) and Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community could also be confirmed across all three language groups as illustrated by Table 23. However interestingly, Ladins appeared to be the group with the lowest values across all dimensions this time, whereas Germans and Italians received similar correlations in each construct. Especially for the factors Attitudes towards English speakers and communities, the Ladin coefficients were by far lower than those of their Italian and German peers which proves that Integrativeness and Instrumentality have the major influence on intended learning.

As can be seen in Table 24, the multiple regression analysis confirms the findings for Integrativeness and Instrumentality in general and across all three language groups. The coefficients for Attitudes towards the LX speakers and community appeared to be relevant for French, Spanish and Russian for Italian and German respondents only.

To sum up, the South Tyrolean results with relation to Language Choice and Intended Effort revealed that the negative impact of Global English on other LXs could not definitely be confirmed since only small or even no differences between English and French/Spanish were found especially in the German and Ladin language groups’ results. However, Italian students seem to be more influenced by English. Consequently it often received significantly higher scores than the other LXs. In addition, more interest in Spanish and Russian could be found than in Hungary. Whereas Asian languages, Portuguese and Latin also received higher scores, Ladin only proved to be of marginal interest to South Tyrolean LX learners.
Table 24 Regression analysis of the motivational scales with intended effort as the dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Effort</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>13.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>11.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>11.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>11.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 24 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Ladin</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Ladin</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Ladin</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cultural Interest

| English UK                                | -.04   | -1.10   | .271  | .28   | -.04   | -.03    |       |       |        |         |       |       |
| English US                                | -.01   | -30     | .766  | .27   | -.01   | -.01    |       |       |        |         |       |       |
| French                                    | -.02   | -.67    | .502  | .38   | -.02   | -.01    |       |       |        |         |       |       |
| Spanish                                   | .00    | .07     | .944  | .38   | .00    | .00     |       |       |        |         |       |       |

(continued)
Table 24 continued

| Language | English UK | German | Italian | Ladin | Total | English US | German | Italian | Ladin | Total | French | German | Italian | Ladin | Total | Spanish | German | Italian | Ladin | Total | Russian | German | Italian | Ladin | Total | Milieu | German | Italian | Ladin | Total |
|----------|-----------|--------|---------|-------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|-------|-------|--------|--------|---------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------|-------|-------|-------|
|          | .04       | -1.20  | .229    | .27   | -.04  | .03       | .45    | .653    | .25   | .03   | -.10  | -1.90  | .059    | .34   | -.14  | -.07  | -2.19  | .028    | -.05  | -.05  | -.02  | -.32  | .748    | .10   | -.01  | -.06  | -.03  |
|          | .01       | -.30   | .766    | .27   | -.01  | .03       | -.51   | .612    | .16   | -.04  | .08    | -.74   | .463    | .23   | -.09  | -.05  | -2.24  | .016    | -.05  | -.05  | -.02  | -.38  | .704    | .30   | -.03  | -.02  | -.03  |
|          | .00       | .06    | .957    | .26   | .00   | .03       | .15    | .880    | .17   | .02   | .02    | .85    | .393    | .32   | -.03  | .02   | .16   | .18    | .09   | .04   | .03   | .03   | .53     | .34   | .01   | .03   | .01   |
|          | -.06      | -.32   | .748    | .10   | -.01  | .03       | .53    | .599    | .34   | .04   | -.11   | -1.09  | .281    | .28   | -.13  | -.05  | -2.24  | .016    | -.05  | -.05  | -.02  | -.32  | .830    | .19   | -.01  | -.03  | -.03  |
|          | .00       | .06    | .952    | .31   | .00   | .03       | .40    | .691    | .30   | -.05  | .02    | .67    | .507    | .31   | .08   | .00   | .08   | .12    | .18   | .12   | .08   | .08   | .67     | .31   | .08   | .08   | .08   |
|          | .05       | .90    | .372    | .36   | .07   | .03       | .40    | .691    | .30   | -.05  | .08    | .67    | .507    | .31   | .08   | .00   | .08   | .12    | .18   | .12   | .08   | .08   | .67     | .31   | .08   | .08   | .08   |
|          | .00       | .14    | .887    | .32   | .00   | .03       | .40    | .691    | .30   | -.05  | .00    | .01    | .933    | .24   | .00   | .00   | .12   | .12    | .18   | .12   | .12   | .12   | .933    | .24   | .00   | .00   | .00   |
|          | .00       | .01    | .990    | .20   | .00   | .00       | .01    | .990    | .20   | .00   | .00    | .01    | .990    | .20   | .00   | .00   | .15   | .15    | .19   | .15   | .15   | .15   | .990    | .20   | .00   | .00   | .00   |
|          | .00       | .04    | .972    | .11   | .00   | .00       | .01    | .990    | .20   | .00   | .00    | .01    | .990    | .20   | .00   | .00   | .01   | .01    | .01   | .01   | .01   | .01   | .990    | .20   | .00   | .00   | .00   |

(continued)
In general, South Tyrolean LX learners endeavour to learn English the most, closely followed by the L2s Italian and German and then by French, Spanish and Russian. It was also revealed that the German language group was willing to put in the least amount of effort into acquiring LXs apart from Italian where Ladins obtained lower means. In contrast to boys and their Hungarian peers, South Tyrolean girls proved not to be negatively influenced by English when it comes to learning other LXs. Thus boys were willing to invest more into learning English and girls more into acquiring the other LXs. Additionally, English was revealed to be the most popular LX in most South Tyrolean districts but not in all of them. In the other cases, French and Spanish seemed to play a bigger role. With regard to the Intended Effort, students from the Vinschgau and, in some cases, also from the Überetsch-Unterland obtained the lowest means. Finally, the results of the correlation and regression analyses for Language Choice and Intended Effort showed they correlate with the Hungarian ones.
when confirming the role of Integrativeness in shaping LX motivation as claimed by Gardner (1985, 2001a+b) and the fact that Instrumentality has to be taken into account when it comes to defining what influences LX learners’ attitude. Moreover, Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community was found to be of greater importance in multilingual South Tyrol than in other studies particularly regarding other LXs than Global English. The next step in the data presentation provides a deeper insight into the comparison between motivational aspects in monolingual Hungary and multilingual South Tyrol by portraying the findings of the Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) to display the tested relationship between the motivational factors and Language Choice.
4.3.3 Structural Equation Modelling

The following section displays the results of the Hungarian Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) applied to the South Tyrolean study to find proof of whether the internal structure of South Tyrolean language learning motivation is similar to that of the Hungarian. Initially, the goodness-of-fit measures applied in the processing of this study are briefly outlined. Then descriptions of the measurement models, the full and the final full structural model calculated on the general data conducted in the South Tyrolean study follow and finally the outcome of the attempt to apply the final full structural model to the data of each language group will be demonstrated.

There are several goodness-of-fit measures which can be used to assess the overall model fit. The chi-square statistics and the chi-square divided by the degrees of freedom (CMIN/df) are among the most often used ones. However, meeting traditionally accepted fitted indices values based on the chi-square analysis is extremely difficult to do since the size of a sample has a vital impact on them (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008; Jöreskog, 1969). Therefore, Dörnyei and his associates (2006, pp.77-78) decided to use the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) as well as the Bentler-Bonett normed fit index (NFI), the Tucker-Lewis-Index (TLI) or the also called Bentler-Bonett non-normed fit index (NNFI), the Parsimony-adjusted Comparative Fit Index (PCFI) which includes the degree of freedom of the tested model and the Root-Mean-Square-Error-of-Approximation (RMSEA) to analyse their models based on such a large sample. Consequently, these indices were also applied to interpret the models for this study by taking the following cut-offs into consideration: ~.90 - .95 with a maximum of 1 for the CFI, ~.95 with a maximum of <1 for the NFI and the NNFI, .50 - .90 for the
PCFI and <.06 - .08 with a maximum of 1 for the RMSEA (Bühner, 2006; Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008).

Complying with the Hungarian survey, three measurement models for each language and country were tested based on the results presented in 4.1 and 4.2. The first model includes the non-language specific variables Milieu and Self-Confidence represented by seven questionnaire items in total. As expected, the goodness-of-fit statistics illustrated in Table 25 do not provide evidence as strong as those of Dörnyei and his team (2006, p.77) since the intention of this thesis is not to come up with one’s own optimized models but the focus on the similarities and differences in the paths included in the models. However, all loadings and covariances in the module were significant and a similarly strong correlation between Linguistic Confidence and Milieu as in the Hungarian study could be found thus confirming that parental support also influences Linguistic Self-Confidence in South Tyrolean LX learners.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 2** The two-factor measurement model of the non-language specific variables with standardised parameter estimates

**Self-Confidence**
- 28: Sure to be able to learn LX well
- 29: Would feel anxious to speak LX
- 32: Learning LX is a difficult task

**Milieu**
- 30: People around me think it is good to know a LX
- 31: LXs are important school subjects *
- 33: Parents think LXs are important school subjects*
- 39: Would feel anxious lose time to develop mother tongue because of LX learning

* Originally negatively worded.
Table 25 The statistical data of the measurement models for the non-language-specific variables South Tyrol vs. Hungary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milieu ↔ Self-Confidence</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confidence → 28</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confidence → 29</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confidence → 34</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu → 30</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu → 31</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu → 33</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu → 39</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected fit measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square/ degree of freedom</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>16.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNFI</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCFI</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2004 data taken from Dörnyei, Csizér, & Németh, 2006, p. 182

The second measurement model presents the relationship of the county-specific variables Vitality of the LX Community, Attitudes towards the LX Speakers and Community and Cultural Interest represented by a total of twelve questionnaire items. Figure 3 only shows the model for US-English but Table 26 illustrates the statistical data regarding all countries. Again the goodness-of-fit indices are not as strong as those of the Hungarian data but the cut offs for CFI and PCFI were met across all countries and RMSEA for both UK and US-English UK. All loadings and covariances were significant and high intercorrelations between all variables were found just like in the Hungarian models. Consequently, these findings confirm those of Dörnyei and his associates during their Hungarian longitudinal study and indicate that the higher South Tyrolean LX learners rate a country with regard to its vitality, the higher their interest is in its culture and the more positive their attitudes are towards its speakers.
Figure 3 The three-factor measurement model of the country-specific variables with standardised parameter estimates (English US)

Vitality of LX Community
15: Country: developed
16: Country: important

Cultural Interest
18: Like films
19: Like TV programs
21: Frequency of watching films
22: Like magazines
24: Like music

Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community
14: Travel to country
17: Meet LX speakers
20: Like LX speakers
25: Like studying in this country
26: Like working in this country
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>English US</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality ↔ Att. Tw. LX Sp.</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality ↔ Att. Tw. LX Sp.</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att. Tw. LX Sp. ↔ Cult. Int.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality → Vit. 15</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality → Vit. 16</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att. Tw. LX Sp. → Vit. 14</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att. Tw. LX Sp. → Vit. 17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att. Tw. LX Sp. → Vit. 20</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att. Tw. LX Sp. → Vit. 25</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att. Tw. LX Sp. → Vit. 26</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cult.Int.</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>0.73</th>
<th>0.68</th>
<th>0.66</th>
<th>0.63</th>
<th>0.65</th>
<th>0.62</th>
<th>0.72</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>0.70</th>
<th>0.74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cult.Int.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult.Int.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult.Int.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult.Int.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected fit measures

| Chi-square/ df | 8.05 | 8.63 | 8.84 | 5.25 | 10.79 | 9.41 | 11.69 | - | 9.26 | 7.96 |
| NFI | 0.935 | 0.998 | 0.921 | 0.999 | 0.904 | 0.998 | 0.909 | - | 0.914 | 0.997 |
| NNFI | 0.911 | 0.997 | 0.891 | 0.999 | 0.866 | 0.996 | 0.872 | - | 0.882 | 0.996 |
| CFI | 0.942 | 0.998 | 0.929 | 0.999 | 0.912 | 0.998 | 0.916 | - | 0.923 | 0.998 |
| PCFI | 0.616 | 0.533 | 0.607 | 0.533 | 0.596 | 0.532 | 0.599 | - | 0.603 | 0.532 |
| RMSEA | 0.074 | 0.040 | 0.078 | 0.030 | 0.087 | 0.042 | 0.091 | - | 0.080 | 0.038 |

Note: 2004 data taken from Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p.184
The third and final measurement models consist of the language-specific variables Instrumentality and Integrativeness represented by eight questionnaire items in total. Figure 4 depicts the data for US-English whereas Table 27 illustrates the complete statistical data of all language-specific measurement models. Similar to the models presented above, the goodness-of-fit measure do not support the acceptance of these models as strongly as the Hungarian ones, but again statistically significant values were obtained. Similarities regarding the strong correlation between Instrumentality and Integrativeness could be found to additionally contribute evidence for the mutual supportive function of both factors in shaping LX learners’ motivation.

**Figure 4** The two-factor measurement model of the language-specific variables with standardised parameter estimates (English)
Table 27 *The statistical data of the measurement models for the language-specific variables South Tyrol vs. Hungary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrat. ↔ Instrument.</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrat. → 1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrat. → 4</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrat. → 10</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrat. → 11</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument → 2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument → 3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument → 6</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument → 7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected fit measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-square/ degree of freedom</th>
<th>8.052</th>
<th>18.9</th>
<th>10.54</th>
<th>29.7</th>
<th>12.08</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>15.28</th>
<th>29.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNFI</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCFI</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: 2004 data taken from Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p.186*
The next model to look at is Dörnyei and team’s initially tested full structural model applied to South Tyrolean data (see Figure 5). This model had originally been built proposing hypothetical relationships based on several motivational theories and earlier analyses of their data (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006). Consequently, they had included a direct path from Self-Confidence to Language Choice based on Clément (1980), according to Gardner (1985) a direct link from Integrativeness to its two assumed antecedents Attitudes Towards the L2 Speakers/Community and Cultural Interest and one also linking these two variables. Since their measurement models had verified Gardner’s argument that Instrumentality and Integrativeness are not mutually exclusive factors in LX motivation, they had also been linked in the model. In addition, the Hungarian researchers had included a direct path between Instrumentality and Milieu based on the presumption that “perceived utilitarian benefit of a language depends on a social agreement of its importance” (Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p.82). The final direct paths had been inserted from Vitality of the L2 Community to Attitudes Towards L2 Speakers/Community and Instrumentality in accordance with Giles and Byrne’s (1982) intergroup model and from Self-Confidence to Milieu, Attitudes Towards L2 Speakers/Community and Cultural Interest in accordance with Clément’s work.

According to Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh (2006), their initial model had received acceptable goodness-of-fit indices, but the four presumed links Self-Confidence to L2 Choice, Self-Confidence to Attitudes Towards the L2 Speakers/Community, Instrumentality to L2 Choice and Cultural Interest to Integrativeness had not obtained significant values. The South Tyrolean model’s goodness of fit measures once more do
not provide particularly strong evidence for the acceptance of the model. However, similar problems with the four relationships mentioned above could be found.

**Figure 5** The initially tested full structural model (English US)

**Self-Confidence**
- 28: Sure to be able to learn LX well
- 29: Would feel anxious to speak LX
- 32: Learning LX is a difficult task

**Vitality of LX Community**
- 15: Country: developed
- 16: Country: important

**Cultural Interest**
- 18: Like films
- 19: Like TV programs
- 21: Frequency of watching films
- 22: Like magazines
- 24: Like music

**Instrumentality**
- 2: Become knowledgeable
- 3: LX important in the world
- 6: Useful for travel
- 7: Useful for career
* Originally negatively worded.

**Milieu**
- 30: People around me think it is good to know a LX
- 31: LXs are important school subjects
- 33: Parents think LXs are important school subjects
- 39: Would feel anxious about losing time to develop mother tongue because of LX learning

**Attitudes Towards LX Speakers and Community**
- 14: Travel to country
- 17: Meet LX speakers
- 20: Like LX speakers
- 25: Like studying in this country
- 26: Like working in this country

**Integrativeness**
- 1: Like LX
- 4: Get to know the culture
- 10: Become similar to LX speakers
- 11: Like watching films, videos, series, etc. in LX
Table 28 Selected goodness-of-fit measures for the initial full structural model (English US)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square/ degree of freedom</td>
<td>5.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentler-Bonnet normed fit index</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentler-Bonnet non-normed fit index</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative fit index</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony-adjusted comparative fit index</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi-square 1873.770; df 337; p.001;

No significant values could be achieved for the link between Instrumentality and Language Choice as well as between Cultural Interest and Integrativeness in all models whereas the links from Self-Confidence to LX Choice and from Self-Confidence to Attitudes Towards the LX Speakers and Community obtained weak statistical significance in some models but the intercorrelations coefficients were very low and thus could not be differently interpreted. Therefore, South Tyrolean data again supported Dörnyei and his associates’ findings as Table 28 illustrates.

The last model to analyse is the final full structural model based on the initial full model as explained above after eliminating the four previously discussed insignificant relationships. Dörnyei and his team tested this model extensively for each L2 and L2 community, during all three research phases and for both Language Choice and Intended Effort and managed to achieve consistently good fit indices confirming the validity of the proposed inter-relationships throughout the whole survey period. Figure 6 portrays the final full model for the South Tyrolean results for US-English.
Figure 6 The final full structural model with the standardised estimates (English US)

Table 29 illustrates the statistical data of the final full structural model for all LXs and LX Communities in South Tyrol in contrast to Hungary. Although Dörnyei and his team had also calculated this model for Intended Effort, the findings mainly relating to Language Choice were discussed in the papers dedicated to the study. Consequently, the South Tyrolean final full models only focus on the interrelations with Language Choice. As can be seen the alternative goodness-of-fit indices in the South Tyrolean models are again not as good as those in the Hungarian ones, only the RMSEA met the cut-offs and the CMIN/df were by far closer to the cut-offs than those of the Hungarian study. Nevertheless, the interrelation coefficients came close to those of the Hungarian ones apart from those from Integrativeness to Language Choice, which were lower for UK and US-English and considerably higher for the other LXs. Interestingly enough, Dörnyei and his associates had also experienced a decrease in the relationship of Integrativeness and English Language Choice and an increase in the relationship of Integrativeness and the other L2s Language Choice. They had believed that fact to be a
result of L2 learners choosing to acquire Global English less because of motivational reasons but rather as an obvious part of 21st Century education and the non-world L2s more because of their personal motivation since they are generally not a compulsory part of the school curriculum and thus not expected to be studied as much. Taking this explanation into consideration, the South Tyrolean final full structural model findings are again in accordance with Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh’s (2006).

Finally, an attempt to apply the final full structural model to the data of each language group was made to test if the findings are consistent with each of them. Table 30 illustrates the statistical data for all three language group models and Figure 7 portrays the full model for US-English based on the German participants’ data.

**Figure 7** The final full structural model with the standardised estimates (English US) for the German language group
Table 29: The inter-relationship of the various variables and Language Choice in the final full models and model data fit measures South Tyrol vs. Hungary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>South Tyrol</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>English US</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu ←→ Self-Confidence</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu → Vitality</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu → Instru.</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self.Conf. → Cult.Int.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult.Int. → Att.Tw.LX Sp.</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality → Att.Tw.LX Sp.</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vitality → Instru.</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att.Tw.LX Sp. → Integr.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instru. → Integr.</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integr. → Choice</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected fit measures

- CMIN/ df: 5.25, 16.1, 5.57, 16.1, 6.08, 21.4, 6.76, - 6.30, 42.2
- NFI: 0.860, 0.989, 0.843, 0.989, 0.840, 0.982, 0.830, - 0.829, 0.956
- NNFI: 0.860, 0.988, 0.841, 0.988, 0.836, 0.979, 0.822, - 0.823, 0.947
- CFI: 0.883, 0.990, 0.867, 0.990, 0.862, 0.983, 0.850, - 0.851, 0.957
- PCFI: 0.741, 0.805, 0.728, 0.805, 0.724, 0.799, 0.714, - 0.715, 0.779
- RMSEA: 0.057, 0.056, 0.059, 0.056, 0.062, 0.065, 0.067, - 0.064, 0.093

Note: 2004 data taken from Dörnyei, Csizér & Németh, 2006, p.84+85
The alternative goodness-of-fit parameters of the German models were, like the South Tyrolean ones, in general not as good as those of the Hungarians but the CMIN/df of the Italian and Ladin models were within the threshold of < 2-3 which could also be due to the smaller size of the sample since the alternative fits were again beyond the cut-offs (Bühner, 2006). However, interrelations between all variables could be found across the language groups similar to those in the Hungarian model although in case of Vitality and Instrumentality the Italian and Ladin models only showed minimal relationships. In the case of the link between Integrativeness and Language Choice, the pattern of low interrelations for English and higher ones for the other LXs could be confirmed with German LX learners surprisingly having the lowest values across all the LXs. This complies with most of the previous findings regarding personal motivation being the lowest within the German language group. In general, South Tyrolean data could additionally approve the Hungarian final full structural model.

All in all, the application of the Hungarian Structural Equation Modelling to the South Tyrolean data revealed that the various relationships between the variables were stable for all models, LXs and LX communities and language groups which shows that motivation in South Tyrolean LX learners is affected by similar aspects. However the models’ goodness-of-fit indices were not that good as those of the original study which indicates that additional aspects might have an impact on LX motivation in multilingual South Tyrol. In addition, this study investigated South Tyrolean related variables to contribute findings about possible differences to Hungary. Their presentation follows in the next section.
### Table 30  The inter-relationship of the various variables and Language Choice in the final full models and model data fit measures across the language groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ger</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Lad</th>
<th>Ger</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Lad</th>
<th>Ger</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Lad</th>
<th>Ger</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Lad</th>
<th>Ger</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Lad</th>
<th>Ger</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Lad</th>
<th>Ger</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Lad</th>
<th>Ger</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Lad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milieu ↔ Self-Conf.</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu ➔ Vit</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu ➔ Ins.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self.Conf. ➔ Cult.Int.</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult.Int. ➔ Att.Tw.LX.Sp</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality ➔ Att.Tw.LX.Sp</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vit. ➔ Instr.</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att.Tw.LX.Sp ➔ Integr.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. ➔ Inte</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inte ➔ Choice</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected fit measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CMIN/ df</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>PCFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English UK</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English US</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Results of South Tyrolean Variables

This part is dedicated to outlining the results of the variables CLIL and Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country only found in this study in general, sorted by the three language groups, gender and geographical distribution. Additionally, their influence on Language Choice and Intended Effort in general and across the three language groups will be analysed. Finally, the results of the correlation between students’ growing up in a multilingual home and having friends with other mother tongues with Language Choice and Intended effort will be outlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 31 Descriptive information about the South Tyrolean variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 31, South Tyrolean students did not rate Content and Language Integrated Learning as being particularly important for their LX learning. The highest mean, 3.31, was obtained for English and the lowest, 2.05, for Russian. However, it should be noted that standard deviation ranged from 1.16 to 1.27 suggesting that some students might feel that CLIL could be relevant for their LX learning. The Attitudes Toward Living in a Multilingual Country construct obtained a general mean between 3 and 4 which correspond to partly true, partly untrue and mostly true. This illustrates that South Tyrolean LX learners saw their growing up in a multilingual environment as predominately beneficial.
Table 32 Descriptive information about the South Tyrolean multi-item scales and ANOVA statistics comparing all three language groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Post Hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Towards Living In Multilingual Country</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Post hoc LSD comparison. Numbers refer to the language groups. ‘ns’ indicates non-significant differences between two values, whereas ‘<’ or ‘>’ denote significant differences. * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

When comparing the participants’ results across the three language groups, significant differences between the CLIL-related findings of the Germans and the Italians in English, French and Spanish, with higher means for the latter, and between the Italians and the Ladins in Spanish, with higher means for the former could be found as illustrated by Table 32. This might be a result of the Italians’ greater experience with the CLIL method and the fact that CLIL is more critically discussed in public especially among German citizens, media and politicians as outlined in 2.3.3.

With regard to the respondents’ Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country, the Italian LX learners’ mean was significantly lower than those of the
German and Ladin ones, between whom no significant variation was revealed. Their mean was 3.37 and with a standard deviation of .86, their opinion about growing up in multilingual South Tyrol is closer to neutral, thus not particularly positive or negative. In the gender comparison, girls evaluated the importance of CLIL for their LX acquisition as far higher than boys although only CLIL in English received means above 3.00 as can be seen in Table 33.

Table 33 Gender comparison of the South Tyrol only variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes Towards Living In Multilingual Country</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequently, there was a more adverse attitude towards CLIL notable across gender in all LXs apart from Global English. Also girls’ attitudes towards living in a multilingual environment was .40 higher than that of boys, proving that girls demonstrated having a positive opinion about being part of a multilingual society and boys a more neutral one.

When looking at the results distributed by geographical districts, only a few significant variations could be discovered. Table 34 illustrates that the Vinschgau obtained significantly lower means than Bozen for CLIL English and Spanish and also lower than the Eisacktal for CLIL Spanish. In general, students in the Vinschgau
comprised the most neutral means in the case of CLIL English and the most negative opinion towards CLIL French, Spanish and Russian, confirming the lowest means they obtained in almost in all situations. Moreover, the participants from the Vinschgau also revealed to have the lowest mean for Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country but this time the students from the Burggartenamt joined them ranking in last place which is highly interesting since in contrast to the Vinschgau, the Burggartenamt comprises more Italian speakers and thus the contact between the language groups is bigger than in the Vinschgau suggesting that geographical proximity does not automatically increase students’ positive attitude towards multilingualism but it can also have a negative impact. Consequently, significant differences amongst respondents from these two districts and those from the Salten-Schlern could be found which were the districts with the highest mean of 3.71. They even had a higher mean than that of Bozen, the area with the most multilingual society suggesting that the LX learners from the Salten-Schlern were the most optimistic about the benefits of growing up in a multilingual environment. Since a considerable proportion of the participants from that district were from the Ladin community, presumptions about the beneficial impact of early multilingual education on Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country can be made.
### Table 34 South Tyrol variables according to the geographical distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country</th>
<th>CLIL English</th>
<th>CLIL French</th>
<th>CLIL Spanish</th>
<th>CLIL Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bozen</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burggrafenamt</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisacktal</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pustertal</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salten-Schlern</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Überetsch-Unterland</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinschgau</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>5.797</td>
<td>2.560</td>
<td>4.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-Value</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-hoc</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
<td>1 ns 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
<td>1 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
<td>1 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
<td>1 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
<td>1 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 &gt; 7</td>
<td>1 ns 7</td>
<td>1 &gt; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
<td>2 ns 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
<td>2 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 &lt; 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
<td>2 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
<td>2 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
<td>2 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
<td>3 ns 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
<td>3 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
<td>3 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
<td>3 &gt; 7</td>
<td>3 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
<td>4 ns 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
<td>4 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
<td>4 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
<td>5 ns 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 &gt; 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
<td>5 ns 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
<td>6 ns 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Post hoc LSD comparison. Numbers refer to the districts. ‘ns’ indicates non-significant differences between two values, whereas ‘<’ or ‘>’ denote significant differences.*
Since Language Choice and Intended Effort also revealed to be influenced by the seven motivational aspects as shown in 4.3.2, the impact of CLIL and Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country was tested.

Table 35 Correlations between the South Tyrolean variables and language choice in general and across the language groups measured with Spearman Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIL</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: r = .10 weak correlation, r = .30 moderate correlation, r = .50 strong correlation (Cohen, 1992)
As can be seen in Table 35, correlation coefficients for Language Choice indicated that CLIL significantly correlated with the popularity of English, French and Spanish with .38, .30 and .07 which leads to the assumption that Content and Language Integrated Learning has a relevant impact on motivation for acquiring Global English as well as French being the next other LX South Tyrolean students would like to learn. Although Spanish ranked as the next foreign language to learn, CLIL revealed not to have a relevant effect on the motivation of learning Spanish in South Tyrolean LX learners. Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country had significant correlations with all languages, whereas English and French obtained an almost moderate correlation with .21 each, Spanish and Russian obtained lower values with .09 and .07. Consequently, this variable only seems to display some relevant effect on motivation to learn English and French.

When comparing the three language groups, significant correlations with CLIL were only found in case of French. Each group even obtained marginally higher correlations with CLIL. Concerning Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country, significant correlations could be identified only for the German and the Ladin groups with relation to French where the German coefficient equalled that of the general result (.21) and the Ladin one with .26 being even higher. Additionally, an almost moderate correlation of .23 with Spanish was found for the Ladins and a marginal correlation of .09 with Russian in the case of the Germans.

The multiple regression analysis did not reveal any significant results for CLIL and the popularity of English, French, Spanish and Russian regarding future LX learning. Thus, the general effect of CLIL on LX motivation in South Tyrol cannot be confirmed.
### Table 36: Regression analysis of the South Tyrol related variables with language choice as the dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIL</th>
<th>Lang. Group</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Zero-order</th>
<th>Lang. Group</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-65</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIL</th>
<th>Lang. Group</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Zero-order</th>
<th>Lang. Group</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-4.18</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-65</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Regression analysis was calculated together with the seven motivational dimensions see Table 21; .10 small, .30 medium, .50 large effect size (Cohen, 1988)
With regard to Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country, the multiple regression analysis revealed that in the cases of Spanish and Russian very low significant values were found in general and no relevant variations among the three language groups (see Table 36). In the case of English, significant values were revealed overall and with regard to the German and Italian language groups. However the coefficients were negative and thus considerable differences between them and the correlation coefficients could be displayed which leads to the assumption that Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country might have some certain influences on LX motivation but further investigation will be necessary to better understand its role in the motivation process in multilingual LX learners.

When looking at the correlation analyses for the South Tyrolean variables and Intended Effort, significant correlations between CLIL in all languages and Intended Effort were revealed indicating that learning content and language in an LX can strongly and positively affect learners’ willingness to work harder for acquiring LXs. In terms of the correlations between Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country and Intended Effort, moderate correlations for English, French and Spanish and weak correlations for Russian were found indicating that this variable also influences LX learning motivation.

In the language group comparison (see Table 37), Italians obtained the highest correlations with relation to CLIL, followed by Germans and again Ladins’ ranked last as the only language group having only moderate correlations regarding CLIL’s influence on Intended Effort in all LXs. Differences in the correlations between the second South Tyrolean variable and Intended Effort were significant for English and French where Germans and Italians obtained slightly higher values than Ladins but all coefficients
were above or very close to the .30 level indicating moderate correlations. For Spanish and Russian, no significant values for Ladins could be found. Germans and Italians still received moderate correlations for Spanish and weak to moderate values for Russian.

Table 37 Correlations between the South Tyrolean variables and intended effort in general and across the language groups measured with Spearman Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLIL German</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Italian</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Ladin</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German French</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Spanish</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Russian</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Towards</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in a Multilingual Country German</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German French</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Spanish</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Russian</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $r = .10$ weak correlation, $r = .30$ moderate correlation, $r = .50$ strong correlation (Cohen, 1992)
Table 38 Regression analysis of the motivational scales with intended effort as the dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Regression analysis was calculated together with the seven motivational dimensions see Table 24; .10 small, .30 medium, .50 large effect size (Cohen, 1988)

As Table 38 illustrates, the results of the multiple regression could not confirm those of the correlation analysis. In case of CLIL, significant coefficients could be found but apart from CLIL in French for Italians with .20, no other coefficient reached the .10
level, neither the general nor the language group specific ones. The outcome of the analysis of Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country and Intended Effort also did not reveal any significant data. Consequently, CLIL and Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country’s impact on intended LX learning effort could not be clearly supported by this data thus acting as proof for the necessity of further research.

Table 39 Regression analyses of the multilingual home and friends with another mother tongue with language choice and intended effort as the dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Choice</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English friends</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French friends</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish friends</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian friends</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German friends</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian friends</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Regression analyses were separately calculated for each depend variable and interdependent variables were entered in one block; .10 small, .30 medium, .50 large effect size (Cohen, 1988);
Finally, an insight into the results of the multiple regression analysis about if having a multilingual home and friends with another mother tongue affects Language Choice and Intended Effort and consequently LX motivation will be provided. Table 39 illustrates that growing up in a multilingual family and having friends from other linguistic communities only appear to have little impact on Language Choice. For example, having parents and/ or relatives with different mother tongues does only have very weak positive influence on the Language Choice of French and weak negative on learning German. Friends seem to affect learners’ Language Choice for Spanish and German slightly more and, interestingly enough, against Italian. No significant values for English and Russian were found. In general, all the predictors regarding Language Choice are of marginal strength since only one value was above the .10 threshold and therefore their meaningfulness might be limited. The impact on Intended Effort revealed to be marginally stronger with having friends from another linguistic community affecting learners’ willingness to make more effort in learning Spanish (.18), Italian (.14) and English (.12) and with having a multilingual home positively influencing learning Italian (.13), Spanish (.12) and French (.11). No significant values were obtained for German and for Russian, the threshold of .10 was not reached thus the validity might be restricted. In conclusion, having friends with another mother tongue slightly affects South Tyrolean LX learners’ endeavour to work on LXs more than having multilingual parents and relatives.

To conclude, the results for the South Tyrolean related variables revealed that South Tyrolean LX learners’ view on the importance of CLIL in their language acquisition process was mixed whereas the Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country appeared to be fairly positive. The language group comparison showed that
German students seemed to be less CLIL enthusiast and Italians more neutral about living in a multilingual society. Generally, girls see both aspects more positively whereas LX learners from the Vinschgau demonstrated to be less convinced of the relevance of CLIL for their LX learning and growing up in a multilingual area, and in the latter survey students from the Burggrafenamt revealed to have the same opinion. Participants from Salten-Schlern displayed the most positive attitudes regarding their multilingual environment, even more positive than their peers in the capital. With regard to the South Tyrolean variables’ impact on Language Choice and Intended Effort, results were not explicit thus further research is required. The investigation of effect on growing up in a multilingual family and with friends speaking another native language indicated that they do not particularly influence students’ Language Choice but their willingness to learning LXs can be positively stimulated and thus their LX motivation. These were the last figures of the underlying study to be presented in this thesis. Consequently, the next chapter comprises the discussion of all findings and the attempt of answering all research questions adequately.
Chapter 5 Discussion

This chapter is dedicated to the discussion of the results of this study in contrast to those of the Hungarian study based on the existing literature as presented in Chapter 2 with regard to the initially defined research questions.

The study primarily aims at comparing Dörnyei, Németh and Csizér’ (2006) results from monolingual Hungary with those from multilingual South Tyrol to identify connections and variations in the LX motivational process of various target languages. Therefore, the results regarding the eight attitudinal factors as presented in the Hungarian study will be discussed first.

5.1 The Role of the Eight LX Motivational Dimensions in South Tyrol

This section discusses the results related to the language learning attitudes investigated by Dörnyei and his associates during their longitudinal study about L2 learning motivation in Hungary from 1993 to 2004. The Hungarian study demonstrated that monolingual L2 learners in Hungary evaluated different L2s through the same mental framework consisting of the following interrelated attitudinal dimensions: Instrumentality, Integrativeness, Attitudes Towards the L2 Speakers and Community, Cultural Interest, Vitality of the L2 Community, Milieu and Linguistic Self-Confidence.

The results obtained in this study showed that L2 learning and foreign language learning in South Tyrol are perceived through different mental schemas. The factor analysis produced significantly different results for each L2 and thus a different theoretical framework would be required to interpret related data, however this goes beyond the scope of this thesis. As a matter of fact, it could only be confirmed that foreign language learning in multilingual South Tyrol is affected by the same variables
as indicated by the Hungarian survey but it was revealed that interest in the LX culture only has marginal relevance for South Tyrolean LX learners. This might seem somewhat surprising since in the current globalisation era people are confronted with individuals and products from other cultural backgrounds in almost every aspect of social life. However, most of the South Tyrolean population lives in the countryside rather than in urban areas and with numerous household that still do not have access to the Internet, and, furthermore, due to South Tyrol’s troubled history as described in Chapter 1, each language group has focused strongly on living and preserving its own culture and traditions. As a consequence, each culture has devoted itself to concentrating on life within its community which sometimes still leads to a somewhat ignorant attitude towards other cultures.

Nevertheless, South Tyroleans are aware of the fact that LX learning is vital in today’s globalised world for utilitarian reasons such as finding a job. Thus, Instrumentality appeared to be the motivational factor with the highest means with Milieu following second as the direct antecedent of Instrumentality indicating that the social support for studying foreign languages from family and friends is high in South Tyrol and that utilitarian anticipations regarding an LX are socially constructed despite the sometimes rather ethnocentric perspective.

In addition, when considering the results of the application of Dörnyei and associates’ (2006) SEM model to the South Tyrolean data, it can be confirmed that Integrativeness is the only variable to directly affect South Tyrolean LX learners’ Language Choice which is in accordance with Gardner’s (1985; 2001a+b) concept as explained in 2.2.2. However, the South Tyrolean data also supports Dörnyei’s additional findings about instrumental and integrative motivation not excluding but
rather complementing each other which led to the reinterpretation of the concept of Integrativeness by Dörnyei developing the currently most dominant model of language learning motivation, the L2 motivational self-system as outlined in 2.2.2. In this system, Integrativeness/ integrative motivation and the extrinsic motives of Instrumentality (as investigate upon in this study) as well as Attitudes Towards L2 Speakers/ Community are seen as vital antecedents and make up the Ideal L2 Self, one of the three L2 selves forming the L2 motivational self-system described in 2.2.2.

Consequently, the findings of the KOLIPSI study (Abel, Vettori & Wisniewski, 2012a+b) as presented in 2.2.4, where Vettori, Wisniewski and Abel (2012) postulated that instrumental motivation does not contribute to improving South Tyrolean L2 learners’ competences, could not be confirmed for foreign language learning since instrumental motivation was revealed to positively influence integrative motivation and thus the overall LX learning motivation in accordance with Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh’s (2006, p.146) findings and Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self-System that theorizes “in the idealised image of ourselves we want to appear personally agreeable and professionally successful at the same time”.

To sum up, the study revealed that the motivational dimensions affecting monolingual LX learners’ motivation do indeed have a similar impact on that of multilingual LX learners. Additionally, the impact of South Tyrolean LX students’ opinion about growing up in a non-monolingual area and effects of a multilingual background on LX learning motivation was investigated and the related results will be analysed next.
5.2 The Factor Multilingualism in South Tyrolean LX Learners

This section discusses the findings of the ninth and thus non-Hungarian construct tested in the study, Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country and the influence of having a multilingual home and friends on South Tyrolean LX learners.

Besides the eight motivational dimensions from the Hungarian survey, analyses also showed that South Tyrolean LX learners’ Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country do have an influence on LX motivation to the extent that the more positive the LX learners’ opinions were about growing up in a multilingual environment, the better it was for their language learning. This implies that South Tyrolean LX learners do appreciate growing up in a multilingual area and allows for the assumption that they are aware of the benefits of doing so. This is an important element when fostering individual multilingualism since any European and/ or local initiative to support language learning, no matter how thoughtfully planned, is destined to fail if those who should benefit from it do not possess such positive attitudes towards multilingualism.

However, can an immediate multilingual personal background further support LX learning motivation and consequently the development of individual multilingualism? Findings revealed that being part of a multilingual family and having friends from another language community do not particularly affect 13/14-year old South Tyrolean LX learners’ particular Language Choice but the effort they are willing to out into language learning. Whereby friends do play a marginally bigger role than parents and relatives.

These results concur with the KOLIPSI study’s (Abel, Vettori & Wisniewski, 2012a+b) findings about the importance of intergroup contact in L2 learning
motivation, which found that the more friends and thus direct and extended contact a learner has, the better their attitude towards the L2 community was and the more motivated the L2 learners were as presented in 2.2.4. This impact was also found for foreign language learning but not to the extent of L2 learning which indicates that only being befriended with members of the L2, who do not necessarily speak the LX as well as natives, does not have as strong an impact as being in extensive direct contact with speakers of the corresponding LX community. Therefore, extended direct contact to the LX speakers and community should be supported to additionally boost LX motivation and funded mobility programmes such as ERASMUS PLUS (see 2.1.3) are thus a perfect opportunity which should be taken advantage more of.

After looking at the role of Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country and in an immediate multilingual environment, a discussion about the relationship of Language Choice and LX motivation in South Tyrolean learners will follow.

5.3 Language Choice in South Tyrol

In the following section, findings regarding Language Choice and LX motivation will be analysed. Hungarian research revealed that English was the most popular and Russian the least popular L2 among Hungarian L2 learners and that during their longitudinal study the importance of acquiring other L2s than English was decreasing so that Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh (2006, p.143) even spoke of an “Englishisation process” and defined the study of the other L2s as an “increasingly marginal specialisation field” as well as “likely to remain optional choices for a minority of students”.

181
Research into multilingual South Tyrol could only partly confirm this assumption since although English is still the favourite LX to acquire and is thus more popular than the L2s Italian and German, the difference between the L2s, the other LXs French, Spanish as well as Russian and English is considerably less dramatic than in the Hungarian study and English does not appear to act as “the killer language n°1”, as supposed by Vollmer (2001) and thus by Jessner (2006) and discussed in 2.2.3. Russian and Spanish even grew in popularity. That implies that multilingual LX learners still tend to be more motivated to learn other LXs than monolingual learners despite them also being attracted by Global English and its role in a globalised world.

Consequently, it can be assumed that being multilingual does not only facilitate the development of multicompetence to unfold particular language awareness thus making LX speakers better language learners as Cook (1991) postulated and described in 2.1.2, but it additionally has a beneficial impact on learners’ attitudes towards language learning and thus LX motivation. Furthermore, LX motivation is an essential incentive, if not the most essential, to move from only societal to more individual multilingualism needed to become a plurilingual society to permit easier communication with the members of other language communities and to meet the requirements of today’s globalised world as promoted by the EU and laid out in 2.1.3.

To sum up, multilingual LX learners are more motivated to learn LXs than their monolingual peers despite the presence of Global English but to what extend gender and geographical location influence motivation will be discussed in the following section.
5.4 Gender and Geographical Distribution in LX Learning Motivation

In this subsection the results of gender and geographical location as modifying factors of motivation in LX learners will be reviewed.

Dörnyei and his team found a growing homogeneity towards how learners appraise L2s which was also consistent across gender showing that variations in language preferences, for example, were decreasing from the initial phase of their investigation in 1993 to the end in 2004 with English, German and Russian only being slightly more preferred by male learners and French and Italian by more female learners. The fact that the gap in English had almost completely disappeared in the course of the study led them to assume that due to its role in today’s world, English would become the clear first L2 choice for everybody, boys and girls alike. The findings of this study confirm that South Tyrolean boys and girls are affected by the same motivational factors as their Hungarian peers, boys slightly more by Instrumentality and girls by Integrativeness, however they do not support Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh’s assumption mentioned above since English was found to be the clear first foreign Language Choice for only male South Tyrolean LX learners whereas female LX learners are still highly attracted to French. Therefore, English only ranks second in their Language Choice list with Spanish also being highly ranked, lying third. This indicates that female South Tyrolean learners of foreign languages are not at all negatively influenced by Global English and thus more open-minded towards multiple LX learning.

Similarly to Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh (2006), some geographical variations in LX learners’ language disposition could also be found in South Tyrol. In accordance with Baur, Mezzalira and Pichler’s (2009) claim regarding the existence of different
socio-linguistic areas in South Tyrol as presented in 1.3.3, LX learners living in the capital with a mixed linguistic population and being a major tourist destination are highly motivated to learn LXs. By contrast students from the Vinschgau were revealed to be the least motivated LX learners in South Tyrol. This confirms that areas almost exclusively populated by one language community are less motivated to acquire other languages since they do not see the necessity in knowing another language in their daily life apart from those that they need at school. However interestingly, and in contrast to Baur, Mezzalira and Pichler’s theory, learners from the Überetsch-Unterland were also revealed to have lower LX motivation than their peers in the rest of South Tyrol despite being a socio-linguistic area with a high number of Italian and German speakers and their geographical proximity to a big LX community living in the Trentino region and to the capital city. Particularly regarding Linguistic Self-Confidence across all languages, these students obtained the lowest scores which is highly surprising for such an area where one would assume that LX learners would feel more at ease and positive about speaking in another language. However, the study shows that living close to another LX community does not automatically indicate the groups interfering and positively influencing each other. As is highlighted in 1.3.3, due to its historical background and the consequent creation and implementation of the Second Autonomy Statute (1972), the South Tyrolean population is ethnically separated in almost every aspect of life. Thus, no benefit for LX learning can automatically develop by simply living in a multilingual area but has to be supported by personal and public initiatives. This fact can also be monitored when analysing the findings related to each language group in the following section.
5.5 The Three Language Groups and LX Motivation

A main objective of this thesis was also to find out whether there are any differences in the pattern of LX motivation amongst the three language communities living in South Tyrol. For this purpose, all analyses of the whole data amount were also carried out for each language group and afterwards compared.

The study revealed that German LX learners are the least motivated and surprisingly, Italians the most motivated alongside Ladins in the language community comparison. The findings regarding the German community were not unexpected due to several reasons. First of all, German speakers are the biggest language group in South Tyrol as outlined in 1.3.1 and a lot of them live in the more monolingual areas of the region. Consequently, their daily need to speak and learn other languages is by far the least important. Secondly, the historical impact of the Italianisation process, as explained in 1.3.2, has led to a strong identification with the German dialect and the German South Tyrolean culture and traditions. Therefore, Dialect is proudly spoken and the fear of losing this hard-fought right is so high among some German South Tyroleans that simply mentioning LX learning presents a possible threat to their mother tongue. Thirdly, the presence of three different school systems as a consequence of the Second Autonomy Statute (1972) and the strict language policy of the German school system due to Article 19 as described in 1.3.3, have also facilitated a more monolingual attitude in German students and thus a lower motivation to learn other languages.

However, a multilingual school system is clearly not the only key to success since Ladin middle school students, as the only South Tyrolean language group to benefit from such an educational system, were not found to be the most motivated LX
learners at all since the differences between Italians and themselves were not particularly significant. This could be as a result of them experiencing that the routine of attending lessons in Italian and German has become so normal to them that it does not significantly influence their motivation towards LX learning.

When discussing the findings for the Italian language group, it is essential to point out that Italian LX learners were revealed to be more motivated to learn English and consequently the motivation regarding the other LXs was not as strong which is evidence of certain negative impacts of Global English as was also uncovered by Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh (2006) in Hungary, whereas Ladins’ and Germans’ LX motivation was not revealed to be influenced in that way by English as mentioned in 5.3. Since the Italian participants, and Italians in general as explained in 1.3.1, mainly live in urban areas where they can access the Internet more easily, the contact to foreigners, the available range of international products and the entertainment offers are greater and more varied, they are more likely to integrate into a more modern and globalised world similar to that of their Hungarian monolingual peers. Thus, language globalisation could affect them more than their South Tyrolean peers.

Nevertheless, as discussed in 5.3, multilingual LX learners’ motivation to acquire additional LXs was revealed to not be considerably negatively influenced by English as their monolingual peers’. Consequently, the promotion of multilingualism is essential also to diminish the negative effects of the language globalisation. This leads to the next discussion, concerning the findings regarding South Tyrolean learners’ perceptions of CLIL’s role in fostering their LX motivation and learning.
5.6 Content and Language Integrated Learning and South Tyrolean LX Learners

In the following section, the results for the perceived impact of CLIL on South Tyrolean LX learners’ motivation and learning will be reviewed. As outlined in 2.3.3, several scholars (e.g. Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009; Marsh, 2000) postulate that the CLIL method has a stimulating effect on LX motivation and should thus be implemented to foster multilingualism. However, the South Tyrolean findings were not that straightforward. In general, South Tyrolean students’ impression of CLIL is a neutral one but with strong variations across all study participants revealing a considerable uncertainty about CLIL amongst LX learners. This can be an effect of variations in implementing CLIL across the three school systems which is also confirmed by the fact that Italians were revealed to be the most CLIL enthusiastic and Germans the least. This is not surprising, since as explained in 2.3.3, CLIL is a very common teaching method in Italian schools and thus students have already had a lot of experience with this teaching concept which helped them to form an opinion. As explained in 2.3.3 and shortly mentioned in 4.4, German LX students’ experience with CLIL is quite limited since it is not in accordance with Article 19 if strictly interpreted and thus more CLIL projects have so far not been implemented. Furthermore, these projects officially only concern secondary education excluding the participants of this study. Consequently, they were likely to have been shaped by German media in South Tyrol which has been strongly influenced by political opinions.

Nevertheless, some of the results show that CLIL could be influential regarding the effort students are willing to put into LX learning. This helps to suggest that despite not all South Tyrolean LX learners having personal experiences with CLIL which
therefore does not allow them to easily estimate how much CLIL would foster the LX learning process, they believe they could be motivated to work harder on LXs thanks to CLIL and thus its beneficial effect on their LX motivation. As a matter of fact, the implementation of CLIL on a more regular and widespread basis should be targeted to permit South Tyroleans learners to have more experience with and benefit from this teaching concept for their personal learning. After discussing the most important findings of the study, some suggestions for fostering LX motivation and thus the development of individual multilingualism in South Tyrol based on them will be provided.

5.7 Recommendations for Future Language Policy

After reviewing and analysing the outcome of this study, it is time to form some proposals for supporting motivation in South Tyroleans LX learners to make South Tyrol the language learning paradise it has so far failed to be (Meraner, 2011).

As highlighted in 1.3.3, all three South Tyroleans school authorities have already taken various measures to encourage LX learning to meet the EU’s Barcelona objective. Nevertheless, collaboration between the three school authorities has to be improved to the extent that in the future common measures will be set to promote a common attitude towards the value of language learning and growing up in a multilingual area. Since not only the measures themselves but even more conveying such values and attitudes in a common and thus much stronger way can positively influence LX learners and most of all their motivation, this study revealed that positive Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual Country can encourage LX motivation.
Furthermore, fostering multilingualism in all inhabitants should be the number one goal in a multilingual region especially when considering the demands of the current globalisation era. Therefore, the development of a Mehrsprachencurriculum that facilitates a more language sensitive education as portrayed in 2.1.4 marks a first step in the right direction. In this way languages are no longer only subjects in school or other learning contexts but they help create synergies among all languages existing in a school or area which allows non-world languages to keep their importance in a world characterised by an increasing language globalisation. Moreover and even more important, synergies with other subjects can be generated so that languages also become a natural means to an end as the reality of professional life shows. The implementation of such a curriculum needs qualified teachers to eventually be able to build those synergies to enhance multilingual competence in students. So far, there have been a series of related teacher training courses but most focus has been laid on language teaching and language teachers who generally are very open-minded and willing to support such initiatives. However, to exploit its full potential, it is necessary to also reach the subject teachers who require special language sensitive training and incentives to again convey a positive common attitude towards the importance of languages and positively influence students’ language learning motivation.

Accordingly, the role of CLIL as an LX motivator as laid out in 2.3.2 has to be highlighted. Although it was only possible to reveal that it could potentially have an impact on South Tyrolean students’ willingness to put in more effort to LX learning due to a general lack of experience in South Tyrolean students, CLIL should be implemented on a more regular basis since it can assist in increasing linguistic as well as professional competences and this should be carried out in a natural and thus more
motivating way. However, it is not enough to only initiate CLIL projects, which are then often underappreciated and thus rather seen as something unnatural and intruding, the opposite of what CLIL actually stands for. In order to let CLIL play its LX motivation enhancing role, it is essential that it becomes an integral position in South Tyrolean multilingual education with specially trained volunteering teachers applying this method on students at an early stage so that it can become the natural way of learning it was designed to be. Moreover, these teachers should not have to be idealistic lone soldiers but rather have a strong supportive team of subject and language teaching colleagues to assist them as well as having a convinced principal and school authority who appreciate their extra work and commitment.

In addition, since the study has revealed in accordance with Dörnyei and his associates’ findings that a positive Attitude Towards the LX Speakers and Community does positively enhance LX learning motivation, it is essential to highlight that language trips, language courses abroad, exchange programmes and school partnerships are ideal occasions to get in touch with the LX community in a more extended way than simply meeting a tourist in the street. Nevertheless, such initiatives are usually connected to a high financial impact for parents as well as schools so that often only wealthier students can afford them. Thus, funded mobility programmes such as the EU’s ERASMUS PLUS present good opportunities for all students to benefit from a more extended contact with LX speakers as discussed in 5.2. Furthermore, they can also be an incentive for students to continue working on their LX competences to be able to communicate well with LX speakers and thus foster instrumental motivation, which together with Attitudes Towards LX Speakers/ Community confirmed to help increase integrative motivation, a core element of LX learning.
motivation. As a consequence, it is essential to further promote such initiatives. The role of the school authorities is a vital one in this context first of all to inform teachers and headmasters of the existence and the benefits of such programmes but even more to motivate them to participate in and support them to prepare such EU projects so that LX learners can benefit from these initiatives and thus increase their LX motivation and eventually their LX learning.

However, since politics lays the overarching foundation, it is up to South Tyrolean politicians to look beyond the borders of South Tyrol and while still appreciating their mother tongues and traditions, not overrate their international impact and offer the South Tyrolean youth, no matter which linguistic community they belong to, more opportunities to meet the requirements of a globalised world and thus the current job market where LX skills do play an essential role. As a consequence, Article 19 (2nd Autonomy Statute, 1972), which was drafted to protect South Tyroleans and their identity, should not be interpreted in such a strict way that it discriminates them instead and taken as a veto in every discussion about fostering multilingualism in South Tyrol and thus South Tyrolean youth’s future. South Tyrolean politicians should see multilingualism as a precious part of the region’s identity which is well-worth developing and supporting. As a consequence, they should focus on the establishment of a unitary school system for all South Tyrolean students no matter which linguistic community they are part of to provide all of them with the same opportunities for a multilingual education and thus allow them to equally benefit from its advantages for living and working in a globalised world. Since this is still a long and uneven path, it should be possible in the meantime to introduce multilingual classes in German schools to send out a clear and positive message about the importance of
language learning also for German speaking South Tyroleans. In addition, this would allow each linguistic community to experience a multilingual education and thus contribute vital findings to the development of the South Tyrolean education system.

To round off the discussion part of this thesis, practical suggestions for enhancing individual multilingualism in South Tyrol were offered. The following and final chapter of this thesis includes the conclusion, limitations of the study and proposals for future research.
Chapter 6  Conclusion, Limitations and Future Research Perspectives

The last chapter of this thesis begins with a summary of the study and relevant final thoughts. It concludes with the limitations of the study and provides suggestions for future research.

The primary purpose of this study was to reveal whether motivation in foreign language learning in multilingual areas differs from that in monolingual areas by comparing the data of this study with the results obtained during Dörnyei and associates’ (2006) longitudinal study on L2 learning motivation in Hungary from 1993 to 2004. The second objective was to identify similarities and differences in LX motivation across three different linguistic communities. In this manner, the study sought to contribute to providing missing elements to the incomplete picture of motivational LX research, which so far has typically focused on either L2 learning in a bilingual context with direct contact to the L2 community, or L2 (in a few cases L3) learning in monolingual countries mainly focusing on English L2 learning. However, LX learning in multilingual areas without direct contact to the LX communities has not been taken into consideration and Boo, Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) and Henry (2011a) also mentioned the lack of LX motivation research in areas where English is not the L2 but rather the L3 to fully understand LX motivation and Global English’s effect.

The study was conducted in the multilingual northern Italian province of South Tyrol amongst Year 8 students from all three linguistic communities (German, Italian and Ladin). A quantitative research design was used to examine the differences and similarities in LX motivation. Data was obtained by administering an online survey containing 58 questions based on Dörnyei and his team’s questionnaire and South Tyrol relevant issues such as participants’ Attitudes Towards Living in a Multilingual
Country and Content and Language Integrated Learning. The study was carried out by first making a pilot survey with a small number of students containing the same characteristics as the sample group in November 2015. After making adaptations based on the findings from the pilot, the final data collection process took place from May to June 2016 covering a four-week period during which 1,233 Year 8 students from 29 schools filled in the questionnaire. Due to technical issues related to a slow Internet connection, full data from 1,214 students from 28 schools was eventually obtained and analysed in general, across gender, geographical distribution and the three language groups.

Since Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh (2006) revealed that L2 motivation for different target languages is generally characterised by the same interplay of Integrativeness, Instrumentality, Attitudes Towards the L2 Speakers/ Community, Cultural Interest, Vitality of the L2 Community, Milieu and Linguistic Self-Confidence, their findings were compared to those obtained in this study and their model was tested on South Tyrolean data.

The South Tyrolean results confirm that all revealed motivational dimensions influencing monolingual L2 learners are consistent with multilingual foreign language learners. However, L2 learning motivation in these multilingual students was revealed to be based on a different theoretical background and thus needs further investigation. South Tyrolean students’ motivation to learn English, French, Spanish and Russian is affected, in particular, by instrumental and integrative motivation which are verified to be vital antecedents as proposed in Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self-System. Additionally, a decline in the interest in LX cultures was revealed giving proof
of a more ethnocentric trend, which however does not negatively influence students’ motivation to acquire LXs.

The study’s findings reveal a strong relationship between the attitudinal factors and Language Choice as well as Intended Effort also showing that Integrativeness is the core factor in LX motivation, mediating other variables as postulated by Gardner (1985). With regard to Language Choice, English is the number one LX to be learnt in South Tyrol too. Nevertheless, it was generally revealed not to have a considerable negative impact on learning other non-world languages as in Hungary showing that already being multilingual can counteract this trend of LX demotivation as a result of an increasing presence of Global English.

Analysing the data obtained for the South Tyrolean variables, a general positive attitude towards growing up in a multilingual environment emerged also revealing that having friends from another linguistic community can potentially have a more positive effect on Intended Effort than having a multilingual home with regard to LX learning. Moreover, due to the different school systems, uncertainty about the beneficial support of CLIL in language learning motivation and thus learning process was detectable. Nonetheless, a clear positive statement about CLIL increasing their Intended Effort was made by most of the participants.

Interesting variations across gender and geographical location were found. Girls generally showed to be more motivated as well as positive about learning LXs and living in a multilingual area as well as showing to be highly interested in non-world languages, whereas boys appeared to be more instrumentally motivated and attracted to learning English. Students from socio-linguistic areas with few inhabitants from other L2 communities such as the Vinschgau admitted to being the least motivated LX
learners and those in the capital or in major tourist destinations the most, thus confirming Baur, Mezzalira and Pichler’s (2009) theory. However, students from the Überetsch-Unterland despite being an district where Germans live close to Italians, were also revealed to be among the least motivated LX learners indicating that living in a multilingual area does not automatically motivate students to learn more LXs. Thus, direct contact with the LX speakers and community does have a higher impact on LX learning which is in accordance with the KOLIPS study’ (Abel, Vettori & Wisniewski, 2012a+b) results.

Comparing the data gathered for each linguistic community, a clear picture was established. German students, who are the most protected by Article 19 (2nd Autonomy Statute, 1972) and thus do not have access to a multilingual educational system, are the least motivated in terms of LX learning. Ladin, despite being immersed in German and Italian teaching from an early age onwards, are only as motivated to learn LXs as their Italian peers with only several multilingual projects running such as CLIL teaching.

The findings of the study show that motivation in LX learners living in a multilingual society is similar but even more complex than in those living in monolingual countries because all motivational factors that influence a monolingual learner do also influence a multilingual learner but additional aspects do play a role as well.

Although it was possible to confirm several assumptions and L2 motivation theories, the current study, like all previous studies, is not without its limitations. One questionnaire cannot include and test all LX motivation related theories in a reasonable way. Thus, only disperse data for Italian and German as L2s could be found.
Furthermore, these results describe LX motivation only in one particular age group and area, 13/14-year-old multilingual LX learners in South Tyrol. Consequently, results obtained from surveys with younger or older participants from different countries as well as different regions in one country can vary. The fact that the main purpose of this thesis was to compare and contrast South Tyrolean with Hungarian data imposed additional limitations to this study since the same approaches and theories had to be included in the research design to permit the data comparison and therefore it was not possible to optimize the models based on the South Tyrolean data to obtain better measures.

Consequently, Dörnyei’s (1998, p.131) postulation that “no available theory has yet managed to represent motivation’s total complexity” as cited in 2.2.2, has to be confirmed however this study can be seen as a valuable starting point for further research on LX motivation in multilingual learners in multilingual settings. Therefore, continuing research, where qualitative approaches can undoubtedly complement quantitative data collection, with regard to L2s other than English and LXs in multilingual areas based on the L2 Motivational Self System or other future LX motivation theories is needed and appears fully justified to obtain deeper insights into LX motivation to foster individual multilingualism which is a highly relevant issue in European language policy and politics.
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Appendices

Appendix 1 – Email Invitation for Ladin Schools

Sehr geehrte/r Herr/ Frau Direktor,


Die Ergebnisse der Studie dienen ausschließlich als objektive Grundlage für eine Planung und Weiterentwicklung von motivationsfördernden Maßnahmen im Fremdsprachenunterricht in mehrsprachigen Ländern wie Südtirol und keinesfalls als situations- und schulspezifische Unterrichtsevaluation.

Um den Aufwand für die Datenerhebung an den Schulen möglichst gering zu halten, wird der Fragebogen in digitaler Form zur Verfügung stehen und kann von den Schülerinnen und Schülern in den Computerräumen der Schulen in ca. 40 Minuten online ausgefüllt und gesendet werden.


Die Teilnahme der Schülerinnen und Schüler an der Studie ist freiwillig und die Beantwortung des Fragebogens erfolgt anonym. Die Beantwortung der Fragebögen sollte von einer Lehrperson betreut werden, die für den geordneten Ablauf der Befragung sorgt und eventuelle Verständnisfragen der Befragten klären kann. Es empfiehlt sich eine Englischlehrperson mit dieser Aufgabe zu betreuen.

Nach Abschluss der Datenerhebung werden die Daten mit denen der Schülerinnen und Schüler der italienischen und deutschen Mittelschulen zusammengeführt und anschließend im Vergleich mit den Daten einsprachiger Länder wie Ungarn analysiert.

Die Ergebnisse der Studie und die daraus gewonnenen Erkenntnisse werden im Rahmen einer Fortbildungsveranstaltung an Sprachenlehrpersonen weitergegeben und dabei motivationsfördernden Maßnahmen für Fremdsprachenunterricht in mehrsprachigen Ländern vorgestellt.

Für die Durchführung der Onlineumfrage an Ihrer Schule bitte ich Sie um die Kontaktdaten einer Ansprechperson und die genaue Anzahl der teilnehmenden Schülerinnen und Schüler.

Ich hoffe ich konnte Sie von der Wichtigkeit dieser Studie und der Teilnahme der ladinischen Schulen überzeugen. Ich freue mich über eine positive Rückmeldung Ihrerseits.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen
Studie von NMag. Marylin Egger
im Rahmen des Doktoratstudiums im Unterrichtsfach Englisch
betreut von Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Barbara Hinger

„Motivation zum Lernen der schulischen Fremdsprachen bei Schülerinnen und Schülern im mehrsprachigen Südtirol im internationalen Vergleich mit einsprachigen Ländern“

Vorstellung der Studie

Theoretische Hintergründe

Besonders im schulischen Kontext stellt die Motivation oft einen Erklärungsversuch für Erfolg oder Misserfolg von Schülerinnen und Schülern beim Sprachenlernen dar.


Dörnyei orientierte sich an seinem bis heute international anerkannten Motivationsmodell.
demzufolge sich die Motivation beim Fremdsprachenlernen in drei Ebenen sowie weitere Unterebenen untergliedern lässt: die Ebene der Fremdsprache, die Ebene der Lernenden und die Ebene der Lernsituation. Die Einstellungen gegenüber der ziel­sprachlichen Kultur erwiesen sich dabei als eher unbedeutend, nachgewiesen wurde hingegen die Relevanz genereller Dispositionen gegenüber dem Fremdsprachenlernen, wie z.B. das allgemeine Interesse für fremde Sprachen und Kulturen, die Wertschätzung der jeweiligen Fremdsprache im Besonderen, die intellektuelle Herausforderung des Sprachenlernens und der Leistungswille (need for achievement) sowie die Einschätzung früherer Erfahrungen beim Sprachenlernen.

Die Studie

Bisher wurden Studien zur dieser Motivation nur in einsprachigen Ländern wie Ungarn durchgeführt. Aus diesem Grund möchte die Studie Wesentliches zu wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen darüber beitragen, inwiefern sich Motivationsaspekte in Bezug auf die schulischen Fremdsprachen in ein- und mehr-bzw. zwei­sprachigen Ländern unterscheiden oder gleichen. Und hier bietet sich das Land Südtirol als ideale Forschungslandschaft an, zumal Südtirol nicht nur ein zwei­sprachiges Land ist und dadurch auch die Südtiroler Bildungslandschaft vom europäischen Schwerpunkt der Mehrsprachigkeit geprägt ist.


Die Erhebung der Daten erfolgt mittels eines ca. 40-minütigen Online-Fragenbogens für alle Schüler/innen der dritten Klassen der deutschen, italienischen und ladinischen Mittelschulen.

Der Fragebogen basiert auf jedem von Zoltán Dörnyei Studie in Ungarn und wurde auf die Situation in Südtirol angepasst.

Er umfasst folgende Abschnitte:
- Fragen zur Einstellung der Schülerinnen und Schülern zu den verschiedenen Sprachen und Ländern, in denen die jeweiligen Sprachen gesprochen werden;
- Fragen zu Freizeit und Zukunftsplänen der Schülerinnen und Schülern;
- Fragen zu ihrer Sprachenbiografie;
- Daten zur Person (Alter, Geschlecht, Muttersprache)

Die Fragebögen werden eigenständig von den Schülerinnen und Schülern ausgefüllt und sind völlig anonymisiert.

Zu betonen ist, dass in dieser Studie keine situations­spezifischen Zusammenhänge erhoben werden, d.h. es werden ganz bewusst keine Fragen zum Unterricht der schulischen Fremdsprachen oder zur jeweiligen Schule oder Lehrperson gestellt. Diese Studie soll sich als objektiver, internationaler Bezugspunkt eignen können. Sie bezieht sich daher nicht auf Einzelpersonen und vermeidet zur Gänze einen subjektiven Fokus.

Appendix 2 – Official Note regarding the study released by the Italian School Authority

Prot. Nr.
Bozen,

Al Dirigenti delle scuole secondarie di 1° grado statali e paritarie

Loro sedi

Oggetto: rilevazione dati per uno studio sulla motivazione all'apprendimento delle lingue straniere

Gentile direttore,

La professoressa Marylin Egger, insegnante d’inglese nella scuola tedesca della nostra provincia, sta svolgendo un dottorato di ricerca presso l’Università Leopold-Franzens di Innsbruck sulla motivazione all’apprendimento delle lingue straniere.

Lo studio vuole rilevare se esistono delle differenze o delle affinità per quanto riguarda gli aspetti motivazionali dell’apprendimento di una lingua straniera in un ambiente multilingue, rispetto a un contesto plurilingue. La raccolta dati, che avverrà online, cerca di apportare un contributo di valore alla ricerca scientifica in linea con quanto svolto negli anni 1990, 1995 e 2004 dal ricercatore ungherese Zoltán Dörnyei in uno studio sulla motivazione di 13.000 scolari 14 anni (cfr. Allegato 1).

Ai fini di raccogliere i dati, la professoressa intende raggiungere tramite un questionario online qualsiasi più studenti possibilmente delle classi terze delle scuole secondarie di primo grado della scuola altoselena.

I risultati dello studio serviranno come base per la pianificazione e lo sviluppo di iniziative che hanno come scopo l’incremento della motivazione all’apprendimento di lingue straniere in contesti plurilingui come quello altoselene. Non si tratta di una valutazione del sistema educativo e pedagogico delle Sue scuole.

La rilevazione dei dati avverrà a scuola, in forma digitale e il questionario potrà essere compilato dagli studenti, in modalità online, in circa 40 minuti e spedito subito dopo. La compilazione del questionario dovrebbe avvenire tra il 23 maggio e il 15 giugno. Ogni singolo istituto potrà scegliere a propria discrezione il giorno più congeniale. Ai fini di dare attendibilità scientifica alla ricerca, è importante che le classi terze della stessa scuola, che intendono partecipare alla rilevazione, compiano il questionario lo stesso giorno.

Per rendere l’operazione più agevole, si chiude cortesemente di individuare un insegnante che possa fungere da riferimento per lo svolgimento dell’iniziativa che dovrà, entro il 10 maggio, mettersi in contatto via mail con la professoressa Marylin Egger per fornire il numero effettivo degli studenti che intendono partecipare al sondaggio. La professoressa fornirà a tale referente il link per poter accedere alle domande. Sarà anche utile la presenza di un insegnante che possa seguire lo svolgimento delle operazioni autonome, se necessario, gli studenti.

La partecipazione a questo sondaggio è libera e anonima.

I dati della rilevazione delle scuole di lingua italiana conterranno con quelli raccolti dalle scuole di lingua tedesca a latina e saranno messi a confronto con i dati degli anni che vivono in contesti multilingue.
In allegato si trova la lettera informativa per i genitori (cfr Allegato 2).

Per eventuali domande la dott.ssa Marylin Egger è a Sua disposizione.

Grazie per la collaborazione.

Distinti saluti

LA SOVRINTENDENTE SCOLASTICA
-Nicoletta Minne-

Firmato da Nicoletta Minne
Data: 11/05/2016 16:12:55
Leopold Franzen Universität Innsbruck
Institut für Fachdidaktik
Bereich Didaktik der Sprachen

Studio della dott.ssa Marylin Egger
per il dottorato di ricerca nell’ambito dell’insegnamento della lingua inglese
seguita della Prof. Mag. Dr. Barbara Hinger

“Quali motivazioni spingono gli scolari plurilingui sudtirolei allo studio delle lingue straniere rispetto agli scolari che vivono in un contesto monolinguale”

Presentazione dello studio

Premesse teoriche

Nel contesto scolastico spesso si giustifica e si spiega un successo, od un insuccesso, nell’apprendimento di una lingua, con la motivazione.

Numerosi fattori esterni ed interni ricoprono un ruolo decisivo nell’apprendimento di una lingua, rendendolo un processo strettamente individuale. La motivazione dei discenti rappresenta sicuramente un punto essenziale e non induce solo la spinta all’apprendimento di una lingua, ma ne promuove oltre allo studio, un’applicazione costante e un consolidamento delle conoscenze linguistiche.

Non esiste una definizione universale del concetto motivazione. Per questo ci sono varie teorie e approcci nella ricerca della motivazione all’apprendimento di una lingua straniera. Fino agli anni ’90 predominava il concetto socio-psicologico di Robert Gardner. Gardner sottolinea l’importanza del singolo atteggiamento rispetto sia alla lingua, sia al Paese parlante e ai parlanti, che all’orientamento motivazionale dell’apprendente. Lui sosteneva che per apprendere una lingua devono essere tenuti in considerazione soprattutto l’aspetto culturale e il confronto con il gruppo linguistico e la relativa cultura.


Dörnyei fa riferimento al suo modello motivazionale riconosciuto a livello internazionale. Questo modello ha tre livelli che includono altri sottolivelli: il livello della lingua straniera, il livello del discente e il livello del contesto in cui si apprende. Dörnyei ha evidenziato che l’approccio nei confronti della cultura relativa alla lingua straniera d’apprendere è quasi insignificante, mentre la disposizione all’apprendere una lingua straniera è più rilevante, p. es. l’apprazzamento della lingua straniera, la sfida intellettuale e le esperienze pregresse rispetto all’apprendimento.

Lo studio
Fino ad ora queste ricerche sono state fatte solamente in contesti monolingui come ad esempio in Ungheria. Per questo motivo desidero apportare un contributo essenziale al suddetto discorso scientifico, mettendo a confronto l’apprendimento linguistico in territori monolingue e plurilingue. La provincia trilingue dell’Alto Adige è sicuramente il luogo ideale per svolgere questo tipo di ricerca.

L’obiettivo di questa indagine è, in poche parole, l’analisi della motivazione all’apprendimento delle cosiddette lingue straniere scolastiche inglese, francese, spagnolo e russo da parte degli scolari bi- o trilingui altoatesini in confronto agli scolari che vivono in un contesto monolingue.

La rilevazione dei dati avverrà a scuola, in forma digitale e il questionario online potrà essere compilato dagli scolari di lingua italiana, tedesca e ladina in circa 40 minuti.

Le domande del questionario si basano su quelle di Zoltan Dörnyei e sono state adattate alla realtà altoatesina.

Il questionario si suddivide in :

- Domande riguardo all’approccio degli scolari nei confronti delle diverse lingue e dei Paesi in cui queste lingue vengono parlate;
- Domande sul tempo libero e sui progetti futuri degli scolari;
- Domande riguardo alla loro biografia linguistica;
- Dati personali (Età, sesso, madrelingua);

La partecipazione a questo sondaggio è libera e anonima. Non si tratta assolutamente di una valutazione del sistema educativo e pedagogico relativo a scuole e insegnanti. Lo studio sarà oggettivo per renderlo valido al livello internazionale.

Per eventuali domande la dott.ssa Marylin Egger è a Vostra disposizione.
Leopold Franzen Universität Innsbruck

Institut für Fachdidaktik
Bereich Didaktik der Sprachen

Studio della dott.ssa Marylin Egger
per il dottorato di ricerca nell’ambito dell’insegnamento della lingua inglese
seguita della Prof. Mag. Dr. Barbara Hinger

“Quali motivazioni spingono gli scolari plurilingui sudtirolese allo studio delle lingue straniere
rispetto agli scolari che vivono in un contesto monolingue”

Gentili genitori,

In qualità di insegnante di inglese nella scuola altoatesina mi occupo da molto tempo della motivazione nell’apprendimento delle lingue straniere, in quanto nel contesto scolastico spesso si giustifica e si spiega un successo od un insuccesso nell’apprendimento di una lingua con la motivazione.

Numerosi fattori esterni ed interni ricoprono un ruolo decisivo nell’apprendimento di una lingua, rendendolo un processo strettamente individuale. La motivazione dei discenti rappresenta sicuramente un punto essenziale e non induce solo la spinta all’apprendimento di una lingua, ma ne promuove oltre allo studio, un’applicazione costante e un consolidamento delle conoscenze linguistiche.

Fino ad ora queste ricerche sono state fatte solamente in contesti monolingui come ad esempio in Ungheria. Per questo motivo desidero apportare un contributo essenziale al suddetto discorso scientifico, mettendo a confronto l’apprendimento linguistico in territori monolingue e plurilingue. La provincia trilingue dell’Alto Adige è sicuramente il luogo ideale per svolgere questo tipo di ricerca. Le riflessioni scaturite dai risultati dello studio saranno presentate agli insegnanti di lingue.

Il questionario verrà sottoposto a tutti gli scolari italiani, tedeschi e ladini delle classi terze delle scuole superiori di primo grado dell’Alto Adige. Per evitare uno spreco di tempo la rilevazione dei dati avverrà a scuola, in forma digitale tra il ... e il 15 giugno e il questionario potrà essere compilato online dagli scolari in circa 40 minuti e quindi spedito subito. La partecipazione a questo sondaggio è libera e anonima.

Per ulteriori informazioni rivolgersi al responsabile presso la Vostra scuola __________________________ o a dott.ssa Marylin Egger __________________________

Distinct saluti

dott.ssa Marylin Egger

Il/La dirigente

Se NON volete che Vostro/a figlio/a partecipi al suddetto studio, compilate per cortesia la seguente comunicazione e consegnatela all’insegnante responsabile:

Il/la sottoscritto/a __________________________, in qualità di __________________________ si rifiuta di far partecipare il/la proprio/a figlio/a __________________________ al suddetto studio.

Data: __________________________ Firma: __________________________
Mitteilung

Studie:

Motivation zum Lernen der schulischen Fremdsprachen bei Schüler/innen im mehrsprachigen Südtirol im internationalen Vergleich mit einsprachigen Ländern

Sehr geehrte Frau Direktorin, sehr geehrter Herr Direktor,


Diese Studie untersucht einher eine Fragebogenhebung, inwieweit sich Motivationsaspekte im Bezug auf die schulischen Fremdsprachen in ein- und mehrsprachigen Ländern unterscheiden oder gleichen und so Wesentliches zu wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen darüber beitragen. Genaue Informationen dazu finden Sie in der Anlage 1.


Die Teilnahme der Schülerinnen und Schüler an der Studie ist freiwillig und die Beantwortung des Fragebogens erfolgt anonym. In der Anlage 2 finden Sie ein Informationenbogen für die Eltern.


Nach Abschluss der Datenhebung werden die Daten mit denen der Schülerinnen und Schüler der italienischen und ladinischen Mittelschulen zusammengeführt und anschließend im Vergleich mit den Daten einsprachiger Länder wie Ungarn analysiert.


Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Der Schulamtsleiter/Der Rossordinatore
Dr. Peter Höllrigl

I. A. Dr. Rudolf Morazan

Anlage 1 – Informationen zur Studie
Anlage 2 – Informationsschreiben für die Eltern
Vorstellung der Studie

Theoretische Hintergründe

Besonders im schulischen Kontext stellt die Motivation einen Erklärungsversuch für Erfolg oder Misserfolg von Schülerinnen und Schülern beim Sprachenlernen dar.


Dörnyei orientierte sich an seinem bis heute international anerkannten Motivationsmodell,
demzufolge sich die Motivation beim Fremdsprachenlernen in drei Ebenen sowie weitere Unterebenen untergliedern lässt: die Ebene der Fremdsprache, die Ebene der Lernenden und die Ebene der Lernsituation. Die Einstellungen gegenüber der zielsprachlichen Kultur erwiesen sich dabei als eher unbedeutend, nachgewiesen wurde hingegen die Relevanz genereller Dispositionen gegenüber dem Fremdsprachenlernen, wie z.B. das allgemeine Interesse für fremde Sprachen und Kulturen, die Wertschätzung der jeweiligen Fremdsprache im Besonderen, die intellektuelle Herausforderung des Sprachenlernens und der Leistungswille (need for achievement) sowie die Einschätzung früherer Erfahrungen beim Sprachenlernen.

Die Studie
Bisher wurden Studien zur dieser Motivation nur in einsprachigen Ländern wie Ungarn durchgeführt. Aus diesem Grund möchte die Studie Wesentliches zu wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen darüber beitragen, inwiefern sich Motivationsaspekte in Bezug auf die schulischen Fremdsprachen in ein- und mehrsprachigen Ländern unterscheiden oder gleichen. Und hier bietet sich das Land Südtirol als ideale Forschungslandschaft an, zumal Südtirol nicht nur ein zwei-, sondern auch ein dreisprachiges Land ist und dadurch auch die Südtiroler Bildungslandschaft vom europäischen Schwerpunkt der Mehrsprachigkeit geprägt ist.


Die Erhebung der Daten erfolgt mittels eines ca. 40-minütigen Online-Fragenbogens für alle Schüler/innen der dritten Klassen der deutschen, italienischen und ladinischen Mittelschulen.

Der Fragebogen basiert auf und von Zoltán Dörnyei studierte in Ungarn und wurde auf die Situation in Südtirol angepasst.

Er umfasst folgende Abschnitte:
- Fragen zur Einstellung der Schülerinnen und Schülern zu den verschiedenen Sprachen und Ländern, in denen die jeweiligen Sprachen gesprochen werden;
- Fragen zu Freizeit- und Zukunftsplänen der Schülerinnen und Schülern;
- Fragen zu ihrer Sprachenbiografie;
- Daten zur Person (Alter, Geschlecht, Muttersprache)

Die Fragebögen werden eigenständig von den Schülerinnen und Schülern ausgefüllt und sind völlig anonymisiert.
Zu betonen ist, dass in dieser Studie keine situationsspezifischen Zusammenhänge erhoben werden, d.h. es werden ganz bewusst keine Fragen zum Unterricht der schulischen Fremdsprachen oder zur jeweiligen Schule oder Lehrperson gestellt. Diese Studie soll sich als objektiver, internationaler Bezugs punkt eignen können. Sie bezieht sich daher nicht auf Einzelpersonen und vermeidet zur Gänze einen subjektiven Fokus.

Sehr geehrte Eltern,


Für nähere Informationen wenden Sie sich an die zuständige Lehrperson Ihrer Schule ____________ oder an:
Frau MMag. Marylin Egger

Mit freundlichen Grüßen und herzlichem Dank,

__________________________
MMag. Marylin Egger

__________________________
Der Direktor / Die Direktorin

Falls Sie NICHT wünschen, dass Ihr Sohn/Ihre Tochter an der Studie teilnimmt, füllen Sie bitte diesen Abschnitt aus und übergeben Sie ihn der Lehrperson.

Unterfertigte/r ______________ in der Eigenschaft als ______________ des Kindes verweigere die Beteiligung meiner Tochter/meines Sohnes ______________ an dieser Studie.

Wenn erwünscht, können Sie Ihre Entscheidung begründen:

________________________________________________________
Datum __________________ Unterschrift ___________________
Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen,

im Anschluss finden Sie ein paar Informationen für das Ausfüllen des Onlinefragebogens.


- Die Fragen werden auf Deutsch gestellt und beantwortet.

- Der Fragebogen dauert max. 40 Minuten und besteht aus 58 Fragen. Manche Fragen öffnen sich allerdings nur bei bestimmten Antworten.


- Es kommen alle Fremdsprachen vor, die von den Schüler/innen in Zukunft in der nächsten Schulstufe in Südtirol erlernt werden können (z.B. auch Spanisch, Französisch und Russisch).

- Jede Frage muss beantwortet werden. Bereits gegebene Antworten können nicht korrigiert werden. Daher sollten sich die Schüler/innen die Fragen genau durchlesen bevor sie antworten.

- Am Ende der Befragung werden die Ergebnisse automatisch gespeichert und die Schüler/innen können die Webseite einfach schließen.

- Sollte ein/e Schüler/in aus irgendeinem Grund den Fragebogen vor Beendigung schließen, kann der Link erneut angeklickt werden. Allerdings könnte es sein, dass der Fragebogen von vorne ausgefüllt werden muss.

Bei Fragen oder Problemen stehe ich Ihnen zur Verfügung.
Ich bedanke mich für Ihre Unterstützung

Mit freundlichen Grüßen
Marylin Egger
Appendix 5 – Test Administration Sheet Italian

Leopold Franzen Universität Innsbruck
Institut für Fachdidaktik
Bereich Didaktik der Sprachen

Studio della dott.ssa Marylin Egger
per il dottorato di ricerca nell’ambito dell’insegnamento della lingua inglese
seguita della Prof. Mag. Dr. Barbara Hinger

“Quali motivazioni spingono gli scolari plurilingui sudtirolesti
allo studio delle lingue straniere
rispetto agli scolari che vivono in un contesto monolingue”

Gentili colleghi e colleghette,

In seguito Vi vorrei fornire delle informazioni utili per la compilazione del questionario online.

- Questo link conduce i/le Vostri/e alunni/e al questionario online:
- Tutte le domande sono scritte e possono essere compilate in italiano.
- Il questionario contiene 58 domande e il tempo massimo per la compilazione è di 40 minuti. Alcune domande si aprono soltanto se gli/le alluni/e hanno scelto certe risposte.
- Le domande si basano sulle opinioni e motivazioni personali degli/delle allunni/e. Per questo devono essere compilati in modo assolutamente indipendentemente. Vi chiedo di aiutarli/le durante la compilazione nel caso in cui qualche domanda risultasse poco chiara.
- Il questionario contiene domande che riguardano tutte le lingue straniere che possono essere studiate in futuro presso una scuola secondaria in Alto Adige (i.e. anche lo spagnolo, il francese e il russo).
- Ogni domanda deve essere compilata. Le risposte già date non possono essere corrette. Per questo gli/le alunni/e devono leggere le domande attentamente prima di rispondere.
- Dopo aver compilato il questionario, le risposte verranno salvate automaticamente e il sito potrà essere chiuso normalmente.
- In caso di chiusura involontaria del questionario, gli/le alunni/e possono nuovamente cliccare sul link. Purtroppo potrebbe succedere di dover ricominciare dall’inizio.

Per eventuali domande sono a Vostra disposizione ☐
Vi ringrazio per il Vostro aiuto.

Cordiali saluti
Marylin Egger
Appendix 6 – Questionnaire translated into English

Copyright © Meryln Egger. Dissertatin an der Universität Innsbruck. Institut für Fachdidaktik

Questionnaire about your attitudes towards foreign languages

I would like to ask you to help me for my research project by answering the following questions about foreign language learning. This is not a test so there are no “right” or “wrong” answers and you don’t also have to indicate your name. I’m only interested in your personal opinion. Please answer sincerely as only this will guarantee the success of this study. Thank you very much for your help.

1. In the following section I would like you to answer some questions by simply giving points from 1 to 5 for each question and language.

   5= very much  4= quite a lot  3= so-so  2= not really  1= not at all

For example, if you like “hamburgers” very much, “barley soup” not very much, and “spinach” not at all, click this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How much do you like these dishes?</th>
<th>hamburger</th>
<th>barley soup</th>
<th>spinach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How much do you like these languages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. How much do you think knowing these languages would help you to become a more knowledgeable person?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How important do you think these languages are in the world these days?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How important do you think learning these languages is in order to learn more about the culture and art of its speakers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How much effort are you prepared to expend in learning these languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much do you think knowing these languages would help you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How much do you think knowing these languages would help your future career?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How well does your mother speak these languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How well does your father speak these languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How much do you like watching film, videos, series, etc. in these languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How much would you like to become similar to the people who speak these languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How much would you like if a subject like Geography or History were taught in these languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How helpful for learning these languages do you think would it be if a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject like Geography or History were taught in these languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 14. How much would you like to travel to these countries? |
| 15. How rich and developed do you think these countries are? |
| 16. How important a role do you think these countries play in the world? |
| 17. How much do you like meeting foreigners from these countries? |
| 18. How much do you like the films made in these countries? (Write 0 if you don’t know them.) |
| 19. How much do you like the TV programs made in these countries? (Write 0 if you don’t know them.) |
| 20. How much do you like the people who live in these countries? |
| 21. How often do you see films/TV programs made in these countries? |
| 22. How much do you like the magazines made in these countries? (Write 0 if you don’t know them.) |
| 23. How often do you meet foreigners (e.g., in the street, restaurants, public places) coming from these countries here in South Tyrol? |
| 24. How much do you like the music of these countries? (Write 0 if you don’t know it.) |
| 25. How much would you like to study in these countries? |
| 26. How much would you like to work in these countries? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>France</th>
<th>Britain</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Next you find statements some people agree with and some people don’t. I would like you to indicate to what extent they describe your feelings or situation. There are 5 possible answers. Please click on that answer which best expresses how true the statement is for you. Here is an example for someone who loves skiing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I love skiing.</th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Not really true</th>
<th>Partly true</th>
<th>Mostly true</th>
<th>Absolutely true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
There are also no right or wrong answers, your personal opinion is important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Not really true</th>
<th>Partly true partly untrue</th>
<th>Mostly true</th>
<th>Absolutely true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. I have a lot of friends who have another mother tongue than me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I am sure I will be able to learn a foreign language well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I think I am the type who would feel anxious and ill at ease if I had to speak to someone in a foreign language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. People around me tend to think that it is a good thing to know foreign languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I don't think that foreign languages are important school subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I often watch foreign-language films, videos, series on the Internet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. My parents do not consider foreign languages important school subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Learning a foreign language is a difficult task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I often chat with people from foreign countries in social networks like Facebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Learning three languages since primary school motivates me to learn more foreign languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Learning foreign languages supports me to further develop my mother tongue skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Learning German and Italian (and Ladin) since my first school year has been an advantage for me when it comes to learning foreign languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I am anxious that because of learning foreign languages I don’t have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enough time to further develop and increase my mother tongue.

40. I think growing up in a multi-lingual country like South Tyrol is great.

41. I think growing up in a multi-lingual country is advantageous for my future career.

3. Finally, please answer a few personal questions.

42. If you could choose, which foreign languages would you choose to learn next year at school (or work)? Please mark three languages in order of importance.....
   1) ...
   2) ...
   3) ...

43. Gender
44. Year of birth
45. What is your mother tongue? German, Italian, Ladin, others
46. Which language(s) do you speak at home?
47. Have you got any relatives who speak another language than you?
48. If so, which ones?
49. What foreign language(s) are you learning at school?
50. Have you ever learnt a foreign language outside school?
51. If so, which ones?
52. Are you currently learning a foreign language outside school?
53. If so, which ones?
54. At what age did you start learning a foreign language?

55. Have you ever been abroad for longer than six months (e.g., when your parents worked there or because you made a language holiday or participated in a students exchange)?
56. If so where were you?

57. If so, how long did you stay there?

58. Where do you live? In a city, in a municipality with 5,000 or more inhabitants, in a municipality with less than 5,000 inhabitants

Thank you for your support!
Appendix 7 – German Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragebogen zu deiner Einstellung zu Fremdsprachen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Im folgenden Abschnitt bitte ich dich ein paar Fragen zu beantworten, indem du einfach Punkte von 1-5 für jede Frage und Sprache vergibst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5= sehr 4= ziemlich 3= geht so 2= nicht wirklich 1= überhaupt nicht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zum Beispiel, wenn du „Hamburger“ sehr gerne hast, „Gerstensuppe“ nicht so gerne und „Spinat“ gar nicht, dann vergib die Punkte so:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie gerne magst du diese Gerichte?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wie gefällt dir diese Sprache?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Würdest du dich das Beherrschen dieser Sprache zu einer besseren ausgebildeten Person machen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wie wichtig ist die jeweilige Sprache deiner Meinung nach heutzutage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wie wichtig ist es deiner Meinung nach diese Sprache zu lernen, um mehr über die Kultur dieses Landes zu lernen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wie viel Einsatz bist du bereit für das Lernen dieser Sprache zu zeigen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wie sehr würdest du das Beherrschen dieser Sprachen bei deinen zukünftigen Reisen helfen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wie sehr würdest du das Beherrschen dieser Sprache in deinem zukünftigen Beruf helfen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Wie gut spricht deine Mutter diese Sprache?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wie gut spricht dein Vater diese Sprache?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Wie gerne schaust du Filme, Videos, Serien, usw. in dieser Sprache?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Wie sehr möchtest du den Menschen ähnlich werden, die diese Sprache als Muttersprache sprechen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wie würde es dir zufallen, wenn ein Fach wie Geographie oder Geschichte in dieser Sprache unterrichtet würde?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Italienisch</th>
<th>Englisch</th>
<th>Französisch</th>
<th>Spanisch</th>
<th>Russisch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Wie hilfreich für das Erlernen dieser Sprache wäre es für dich, wenn ein Fach wie Geografie oder Geschichte in dieser Sprache unterrichtet würde?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Wie gerne würdest du dieses Land besuchen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Wie reich und wirtschaftlich entwickelt ist dieses Land deiner Meinung nach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Wie wichtig ist die Rolle dieses Landes weltweit deiner Meinung nach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Wie sehr gefällt es dir, Bewohner dieser Länder zu treffen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Wie sehr gefallen dir Filme, die in diesem Land gedreht wurden? (Trage eine 0 ein, wenn du keinen kennst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Wie sehr gefallen dir Fernsehprogramme, die in diesem Land gedreht wurden? (Trage eine 0 ein, wenn du keines kennst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Wie sehr magst du die Menschen, die in diesen Ländern leben?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Wie oft schaust du Filme/Fernsehprogramme, die in diesen Ländern gemacht wurden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Wie sehr magst du Zeitschriften dieses Landes? (Trage eine 0 ein, wenn du keine kennst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Wie oft triffst du Bewohner dieses Landes hier in Südtirol (z.B. auf der Straße, in Restaurants, auf öffentlichen Plätzen)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Wie sehr magst du die Musik aus diesem Land? (Trage eine 0 ein, wenn du keine kennst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Wie gerne möchtest du in diesem Land studieren?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Wie gerne möchtest du in diesem Land arbeiten?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frankreich</th>
<th>Großbritannien</th>
<th>Russland</th>
<th>Spanien</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Als nächstes findest du Aussagen, denen einige Menschen zustimmen, andere hingegen nicht zustimmen würden. Ich möchte dich bitten anzugeben, in wie fern die Aussagen auf deine Gefühle und auf deine Situation zutreffen. Für jede Aussage gibt es 5 Antwortmöglichkeiten. Bitte kreuze jene an, welche am ehesten auf dich zutrifft. Hier ein Beispiel für jemanden, der Ski fahren liebt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trifft überhaupt nicht zu</th>
<th>trifft größtenteils nicht zu</th>
<th>trifft nur teilweise zu</th>
<th>trifft größtenteils zu</th>
<th>trifft absolut zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ich liebe Ski fahren.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Auch hier gibt es keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten, wichtig ist deine persönliche Meinung.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trifft überhaupt nicht zu</th>
<th>trifft größtenteils nicht zu</th>
<th>trifft nur teilweise zu</th>
<th>trifft größtenteils zu</th>
<th>trifft absolut zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Ich habe viele Freunde, die eine andere Muttersprache als ich haben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Ich bin mir sicher, ich schaffe es, eine Fremdsprache gut zu lernen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Ich denke, ich bin jemand, der Angst hätte und sich nicht wohlfühlen würde, wenn er mit jemandem in einer fremden Sprache sprechen müsste.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Menschen aus meinem Umfeld (Familien- und Freundeskreis) denken, es ist gut Fremdsprachen zu beherrschen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Ich denke, dass Fremdsprachen keine wichtigen Schulfächer sind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Ich schaue oft fremdsprachige Filme, Videos, Serien im Internet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Meine Eltern denken, dass Fremdsprachen keine wichtigen Schulfächer sind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Das Lernen von Fremdsprachen ist schwierig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Ich chatte oft mit Menschen aus fremdsprachigen Ländern in sozialen Netzwerken wie Facebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Das Lernen von drei Sprachen seit der Grundschule motiviert mich weitere Fremdsprachen zu lernen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Das Lernen von Fremdsprachen unterstützt mich dabei, meine Kompetenzen in meiner Muttersprache zu erweitern.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Es ist für mich ein Vorteil für das Lernen von Fremdsprachen, dass ich Deutsch und Italienisch seit meinem Schulbeginn lerne.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Ich habe Angst, durch das Lernen von Fremdsprachen zu wenig Zeit zu haben, um meine Muttersprache weiter zu entwickeln und auszubauen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Ich finde es toll in einem mehrsprachigen Land wie Südtirol aufzuwachsen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Ich finde es vorteilhaft für meinen späteren Beruf, dass ich in einem mehrsprachigen Land aufwachse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abschließend beantworte bitte noch ein paar persönliche Fragen.

   1) ....
   2) ...
   3) ...

43. Geschlecht? männlich/ weiblich
44. Geburtsjahr
45. Was ist deine Muttersprache? Deutsch/ Italienisch/ Ladinisch/ andere
46. Welche Sprache(n) sprichst du zu Hause?
47. Hast du Verwandte, die eine andere Muttersprache haben als du?
48. Wenn ja, welche?
49. Welche Fremdsprache(n) lernst du in der Schule?
50. Hast du schon einmal eine Fremdsprache außerhalb des Schulunterrichts gelernt?
51. Wenn ja, welche?
52. Lernst du zur Zeit noch eine Fremdsprache außerhalb des Schulunterrichts?
53. Wenn ja, welche?
54. Wie alt warst du, als du mit dem Lernen einer Fremdsprache begonnen hast?
55. Warst du schon einmal länger als sechs Monate im Ausland (z.B. weil deine Eltern dort gearbeitet haben oder weil du einen Sprachaufenthalt oder Schüleraustausch gemacht hast)?
56. Wenn ja, gib bitte an, wo du warst?
57. Wenn ja, gib bitte auch an, wie lange du dort warst?
58. Wo wohnst du? In einer Stadt, in einer Gemeinde mit 5.000 oder mehr Einwohnern, in einer Gemeinde mit weniger als 5.000 Einwohnern

Vielen Dank für deine Unterstützung.
Appendix 8 – Italian Questionnaire

Qual è il tuo rapporto con la lingua straniere?

Ti chiedo di aiutarmi nella mia ricerca compilando il seguente questionario e rispondendo cortesemente alle domande riguardanti l'apprendimento delle lingue straniere. Si tratta di un test anonimo in cui non ci sono risposte "giuste" o "sbagliate". Mi interessa la tua opinione personale. Se rispondi con sincerità, la mia ricerca avrà successo. Ti ringrazio per la tua disponibilità.

1. Nella prima parte ti chiedo di rispondere ad alcune domande dando un punteggio compreso tra 1 e 5 per ogni domanda e ogni lingua.

5= molto 4= abbastanza 3= così così 2= non proprio 1= assolutamente no

Per esempio, se ti piacciono molto gli “hamburger”, non proprio “la zuppa d’orzo” e assolutamente no gli “spinaci”, compila in base all’esempio dato:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hamburger</th>
<th>zuppa d’orzo</th>
<th>spinaci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Mangi volentieri questi cibi?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hamburger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zuppa d’orzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinaci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Ti renderebbe una persona più competente padroneggiare questa lingua? |
| 3. Secondo te, quanto è attualmente importante questa lingua? |
| 4. Secondo te, quanto è importante imparare questa lingua per apprendere più cose sulla cultura dei rispettivi parlanti? |
| 5. Quanto impegno sei disposto a metterci per apprendere questa lingua? |
| 6. Quanto ti aiuterrebbe nei tuoi viaggi futuri padroneggiare questa lingua? |
| 7. Quanto ti aiuterrebbe nella tua professione futuro padroneggiare questa lingua? |
| 8. Parla bene tua madre questa lingua? |
| 9. Parla bene tuo padre questa lingua? |
| 10. Guardi volentieri film, video, serie, etc. in questa lingua? |
| 11. Quanto vorresti assimilare alle persone che parlano questa lingua? |
| 12. Ti piacerebbe che una materia come Geografia o Storia fosse insegnata in questa lingua? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tedesco</th>
<th>inglese</th>
<th>francese</th>
<th>spagnolo</th>
<th>russo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Quanto ti aiuterebbe ad imparare questa lingua se una materia come Geografia o Storia fosse insegnata in questa lingua?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Francia</th>
<th>Gran Bretagna</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Spagna</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Ti piacerebbe visitare questo Paese?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Secondo te, quanto è ricco ed economicamente sviluppato questo Paese?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Secondo te, quanto è importante il ruolo di questo Paese nel mondo?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ti piace incontrare abitanti di questo Paese?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ti piacciono film girati in questo Paese? (Se non ne conosci uno, metti 0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ti piacciono programmi televisivi girati in questo Paese? (Se non ne conosci uno, metti 0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Ti piacciono le persone che vivono in questo Paese?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Guardi spesso film/programmi televisivi girati in questo paese?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Ti piacciono riviste pubblicate in questo Paese? (Se non ne conosci una, metti 0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Ti capita (in Alto Adige) d’incontrare frequentemente abitanti di questo Paese (per strada, al ristorante, in ambienti pubblici)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Ti piace la musica di questo Paese? (Se non ne conosci, metti 0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Ti piacerebbe studiare in questo Paese?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Ti piacerebbe lavorare in questo Paese?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nella seconda parte sono riportate delle affermazioni che possono essere condivisibili o meno. Ti chiedo di esprimere un’opinione facendo riferimento ai tuoi sentimenti e alla tua situazione personale. Per ogni affermazione sono previste 5 possibilità di risposta. Scegli quella che ritieni più adeguata. Un esempio per chi ama sciare:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>assolutamente no.</th>
<th>per la maggior parte no.</th>
<th>solo in parte si.</th>
<th>per la maggior parte si.</th>
<th>assolutamente si.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mi piace sciare.</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non ci sono risposte giuste o sbagliate, per me è molto importante la tua opinione.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27. Ho tanti amici che hanno una madrelingua diversa dalla mia.</th>
<th>assolutamente no.</th>
<th>per la maggior parte no.</th>
<th>solo in parte si.</th>
<th>per la maggior parte si.</th>
<th>assolutamente si.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Sono sicuro/a di riuscire ad imparare una lingua straniera.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Penso di essere una persona che si impaurisce e non si sente a suo agio nel momento in cui deve parlare con qualcuno in una lingua straniera.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I miei conoscenti e familiari pensano che sia importante sapere le lingue straniere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Penso che le lingue straniere siano materie scolastiche solo di secondaria importanza.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Guardo spesso programmi televisivi su canali satellitari.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I miei genitori pensano che le lingue straniere siano materie scolastiche solo di secondaria importanza.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Lo studio delle lingue straniere è difficile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Chatto spesso su social networks come Facebook con persone che vivono all’estero e parlano un’altra lingua.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Lo studio di tre lingue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dalla scuola primaria mi sprona a studiare altre lingue straniere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Lo studio di lingue straniere mi aiuta ad ampliare le mie competenze nella mia madrelingua.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. L’aver studiato tedesco ed italiano dall’inizio del mio percorso scolastico è per me un vantaggio per l’apprendimento di altre lingue straniere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Temo di sentirmi meno altoatesino/a se imparo le lingue straniere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. È forte essere cresciuto in un Paese plurilinguistico come l’Alto Adige.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Penso che sia vantaggioso per la mia professione futura essere cresciuto in un Paese plurilinguistico come l’Alto Adige.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In seguito ti chiedo di rispondere gentilmente ad alcune domande generali.

42. Se tu potessi scegliere, quale lingua straniera vorresti imparare a scuola (o al lavoro) l’anno prossimo? Scrivi, per favore, tre lingue. Comincia con quella che ritieni più importante.
   1) ...
   2) ...
   3) ...

43. Genere? maschile femminile

44. Anno di nascita

45. Qual è la tua madrelingua?

46. Quale/la lingua/e parli a casa?

47. Hai parenti che hanno la madrelingua diversa dalla tua?

48. Se sì, quale?

49. Quale/la lingua/e straniera/e studi a scuola?

50. Hai già studiato una lingua straniera al di fuori della scuola?
51. Se sì, quale/i?

52. Stai studiando una lingua straniera al di fuori della scuola?

53. Se sì, quale/i?

54. Quanti anni avevi quando hai iniziato ad imparare una lingua straniera?

55. Hai vissuto all’estero più di sei mesi (per esempio per motivi di lavoro dei tuoi genitori, o per un soggiorno linguistico o per un gemellaggio)

56. Se sì, dove?

57. Se sì, per quanto tempo?

58. Dove abiti? In città, in un comune con 5.000 o più abitanti, in un comune con meno di 5.000 abitanti

Ti ringrazio per l’aiuto.
Appendix 9 – Ladin Questionnaire

Ce rapport es'ta tu cun la rujenedes fulestieres?
Te damande de me judé te mi nrescida responder a la dumandes chie te feje tio cossot n cont di mparé na rujena fulestiera. Chésc ne n’ie nia n test, perch’èl ne vénieil nia desferenzi danter respostes “drètes” o “faouzes” y te ne muezes nia dè séura n inuèm. L me interessee mé ti minong. 
Sce te respuendes cun sinzierità sarà mi nrescida garateda. Te rengrazie per i tèmp che te des ca.

1. Ti prima pert te damandè de respuender a n valguna dumandes daian danter 1 y 5 ponc per uni dumanda y uni rujeneda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5= sciiali</td>
<td>4= assè</td>
<td>3= mesanmênter</td>
<td>2= puech</td>
<td>1= nèt nia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per fé n ejëmpl: sce te sà sciiali boni i “hamburger”, mesanmênter “a panicia” y propi nia “ula vèrda”, po’ scrì ora sciche tio dessot:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maies’a gen chësta spéisa?</th>
<th>hamburger</th>
<th>panicia</th>
<th>ula vèrda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Tan bela te sà pa chësta rujena?</th>
<th>tudèsch</th>
<th>nglesc</th>
<th>franzèus</th>
<th>spanuel</th>
<th>rus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Te sentesses’a na persona plu cumpetènta sce te savésses da rujenè chësta rujena?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do ti minONGa, tan impruntas ic pa el mument uniuna de chësta rujenades?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tan imprunt iel pa do ti minonga savéi da rujenè i lingaz do n cèr popul per capi si cultura?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tan de mpeni mienes’à che te pudésses meté tìc per mparé una de chësta nuova rujenades?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do ti minonga, tant mienes’à che l pudéssae te judé, per ti prósìmi viages, a savei da rujenè chësta rujena?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do ti minonga, tant mienes’à che l pudéssca tu judé, per ti liur di daunì, a savei da rujenè chësta rujena?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tan bàn rejonà pa ti oma chësta rujena?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tan bàn rejonà pa ti pore chësta rujena?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cel’era gen filmes, videos, series y nsci inant te chësta rujenèa?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Te identifiehes’à tu cun chisc atiùres y te motovei pa a ulài rujenè si rujenèa?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tan bel te savèssel pa sce materies sciche per ejëmpl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Franza</td>
<td>Gran Bretania</td>
<td>Ruscia</td>
<td>Spania</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tant te judëssel pa sce materies sciche per ejëmpl geografia o storia unissa nseniedes te chësta rujeneda?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Te savëssel pa bel a vijité chësc paesc?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do ti minonga, tan rich y tan svilupà economicamënter ie pa chësc paesc?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do ti minonga, tan murtanta y sterscia ie pa chësta nacion tl mond?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Te sal pa bel a te ancùntë cun persones de chësta nacion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Te plej pa i films che ie unic fac te chësta nacion? (Sce ne te cunësces degun, mët 0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Te plej pa i programs televisifs che ie unic fac te chësta nacion? (Sce ne te cunësces degun, mët 0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Te plej pa la persones che viv te chësc paesc?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cëles’a suvënz films y programs televisifs che ie unic fac te chësc paesc?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Te plej pa zaites y publicazions che ie unides fates te chësc paesc? (Sce ne te cunësces deguna, mët 0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Te suzedel pa suvënz de ancùntë abitanc de chësc paesc tlo da nésus (Südtirol)? Per ejëmpl sun streda, te na ustarla, te strutures publiches)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Te plej pa la mujiga de chësc paesc? (Sce ne te cunësces deguna, mët 0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Te savëssel pa bel a studiè te chësc paesc?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Te savëssel pa bel a lauré te chësc paesc?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Es’a respundù a uni dumanda? De gra!
Tla segonda pert vèn purtedes dant afirmazions cun chèles che te pudésses vester a una o manco. Te damande de me di ti minonga tenian cont de ti sentimènc y de ti situazion personela. Per un afirmazion iel udù dant 5 puscibiteles de resposta. Chier ora chèla che te vèn dant l plu adateda. N ejèmpl per chiche va gèn cun i schi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>propi nia</th>
<th>belau mei</th>
<th>sci, datrai</th>
<th>belau for</th>
<th>sci, for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vede gèn cun i schi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nce tlo ne n’iel nia respostes drètes o fauzes, l ie de mpurtanza ti minonga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>propi nia</th>
<th>belau mei</th>
<th>sci, datrai</th>
<th>belau for</th>
<th>sci, for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. É truep cumpanies che à n’autra rujeneda de l’oma che la mia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Son segur/a de vester bon/a de mparé na rujeneda fulestiera.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Rate de vester na persona che à tèma canche la se trata de rujené cun na persona te na rujeneda defrènèt da mi rujeneda d’oma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Mi cunescènc y mi familia le dla minonga che l le de mpurtanza savèi da rujené na rujeneda fulestiera.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Son dla minonga che la rujenedes fulesteres ne sibe nia materies de nseniàment mpurtantes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Cèle suvènz programs tla televigion sun canai satéltieres y te internet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Mi genitores miena che la rujenedes fulesteres ne sibe nia materies de nseniàment mpurtantes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Mparé na rujeneda fulestiera le rie.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. le scrije suvènz, tres i social networks coche per ejèmpl Facebook, cun persones che viv oradeçà y che rejona n’autra rujeneda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Mparé trèi rujenede a scola me mutieve a uléi mparé mo d’autra rujenedes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Mparé d’autra rujenedes me juda a avèi de majera cumpètènzes te mi rujeneda d’oma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>