Psychology of Language and Communication 2020, Vol. 24, No. 1

sciendo

DOI: 10.2478/plc-2020-0009

MAURICIO VÉLIZ-CAMPOS[1], MICAL POLANCO-SOTO[2], ADRIANA BIEDROŃ[3]
[1] Universidad de Talca, Chile,
[2] Kendal English School, Chile,
[3]Koszalin University of Technology, Poland

L2 MOTIVATIONAL SELF SYSTEM, INTERNATIONAL POSTURE, AND THE SOCIOECONOMIC FACTOR IN EFL AT UNIVERSITY LEVEL: THE CASE OF CHILE

Motivation plays a critical role in L2 language learning and has proven to be a strong predictor of success in learning a foreign language (Biedroń & Pawlak, 2016). The Second Language Motivational Self System (L2MSS) is one of the most prominent theories developed by Dörnyei (2009), which has been studied in relation to different variables affecting language learning motivation. The aim of the present study is to examine the relationship between L2MSS components, international posture, and socioeconomic status among university students. The participants of this study were 134 non-English major university students. The results suggest that the ideal L2 self, and the L2 learning experience are related to international posture insert a comma after posture whereas the L2 learning experience is a stronger predictor of students' motivated behavior. Future research should investigate the development of future selves in instructed language learning contexts conducive to enhancing and increasing motivation to learn English.

Keywords: international posture, L2 motivation L2MSS, socioeconomic status

Address for correspondence: Faculty of Education Sciences, Universidad de Talca; 380, María Auxiliadora St., Linares-Chile

Email: [1]mauricio.veliz@utalca.cl, [1] adriana.biedron@apsl.edu.pl

Introduction

Motivation is regarded as one of the individual differences that greatly influences second language (L2) learning (Biedroń & Pawlak, 2016). L2 learning entails a number of complex processes that seem to be enhanced by the learner's motivated behavior. Indeed, it can be argued that if an individual with remarkable abilities lacks the necessary L2 motivation, they will barely accomplish long-term language learning goals (Dörnyei & Kubanyiova, 2014; Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008).

Motivation is no longer defined as a stable factor (Waninge et al., 2014). Dörnyei's (2001) concept of motivational dynamics is now considered a mainstream motivational theory which has launched a body of research into this area (Dörnyei, 2017; Dörnyei et al., 2016; Henry et al., 2015). Defining motivation from this angle has led to studies on various aspects that affect its dynamics, such as the relationship between motivation and emotions (Henry & Thorsen, 2019; MacIntyre, & Vincze, 2017; Pavelescu, 2019), digital innovations in sustaining learner motivation (Adolphs et al., 2018), and the role of language learning experience in motivation development (Dörnyei, 2019). The factor of motivation inspired researchers into polyglots and linguistically gifted individuals (Biedroń & Pawlak, 2016; Biedroń & Birdsong, 2019; Erard, 2019; Hyltenstam, 2016).

According to the Second Language Motivational Self System (henceforth, L2MSS) devised by Dörnyei (2005), there are three main variables affecting students' motivation: (a) the ideal L2 self (a person's ideal self-image as a competent L2 speaker); (b) the ought-to L2 self (attributes that an individual believes they ought to possess); and (c) the L2 learning experience (situation-specific motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience). The theory conceives motivation as the intention to "lessen the gap between one's actual self and one's ought-to self" (Csizér & Kormos, 2009, p. 99). In the last decade, several scholars have conducted research on the interaction between L2MSS and other variables in SLA research. As a way of illustration, L2MSS has been investigated as related to, influenced by, and/or predicted by other constructs such as intended effort, willingness to communicate, competitiveness, and international posture (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Kong et al., 2018). International posture has gained greater popularity in SLA research probably due to its close relationship with globalization and the role that English plays in an increasingly globalized world (Jenkins et al., 2011), wherein L2 learning involves the learning–and to some extent the adoption–of social and cultural (international) behaviors (Dörnyei, 2005; Yashima, 2009). This connection among people from different countries and speech communities has led to a greater appreciation of English speakers' cultures, and, consciously or subconsciously, English language learners build ideas regarding their possible participation in an English-speaking community (Yashima, 2009). Therefore, their international posture seems affected.

Dörnyei (2005) included the idea of learners' connection with other cultures, indicating that Yashima's (2002) international posture greatly contributes to the vision learners produce of themselves. The construct of international posture suggests that there is no longer one specific English-speaking community to which the learner may want to belong; rather, it suggests an openness to a global or international community of L2 speakers.

One major pervasive issue in Chilean (and Latin American) education deals with socioeconomic differences and segregation. The access to post-secondary education in Chile reveals a reality dominated by segregation, which becomes evident in the "National Socio-Economic Characterization Survey, [which revealed that] more than 62% of the highest income decile, aged 18-24, attend university, while only 28% of the lowest income decile attend university" (Ministerio de Desarrollo Social [Ministry of Social Development], 2018, as cited in Walker-Janzen et al., 2019). This segregation is worth exploring, particularly in relation to whether socioeconomic factors affect the motivation of university students to learn a second language. To the researchers' knowledge, no previous study has yet focused on the relationship between learners' socioeconomic factors, L2MSS, and international posture at the university level in Chile. Therefore, given the current complexities in post-secondary education in Chile, it seems reasonable to examine how the L2MSS components relate to students' international posture (Yashima, 2009) and their socioeconomic backgrounds. This study aims to address the following research questions:

1. To what extent are the L2MSS components associated with non-English major students' international posture?
2. To what extent is L2MSS associated with non-English major students' socioeconomic background?
3. To what extent is international posture associated with non-English major students' socioeconomic background?
4. To what extent is non-English major students' motivated behavior associated with their L2MSS, international posture, and socioeconomic background?

Literature Review

L2 Motivational Self System

The L2MSS theory is composed of the ideal L2 Self, which is the desired image of the learner speaking the target language; the ought-to L2 Self, which refers to the abilities that the learner ought-to possess, is based on the perceived duties, responsibilities, and obligations determined by the society and significant others; and the L2 learning experience, which is the individual's immediate experience learning the language. What is known about L2MSS is largely based upon empirical studies that investigate how the L2MSS components relate to other variables, especially EFL students' motivated behavior (or intended effort) (Alshahrani, 2016; Kormos et al., 2011; Moskovsky et al., 2016; Xie, 2014).

A growing body of research has demonstrated that the ideal L2 Self greatly influences second language learners' motivated behavior (Alshahrani, 2016; Kong, et al., 2018; Wong, 2018; Xie, 2014). Most research studies on the two self-guides of the L2MSS theory have found that the ought-to L2 Self contributes to students' motivated behavior but not as strongly as the ideal L2 Self (Alshahrani, 2016; Islam et al., 2013; Lamb, 2012; Papi, 2010; Taguchi et al., 2009; Wong, 2018). Kormos et al. (2011) obtained different results, reporting that the relationship between the ought-to L2 Self and motivated behavior was insignificant in three age-different learner groups in Chile, which goes counter what has been found in Asian settings. Contrary to the findings of most studies, Islam et al. (2013) found that the ought-to L2 Self had a strong contribution to Pakistani university students' motivated behavior due to the importance of external expectations in students' learning process. The third component of the L2MSS, the L2 learning experience (or attitude), has not been as intensively explored as the two self-guides in Dörnyei's (2005) theory.

Recently, the focus of research has shifted to the underestimated role of foreign language learning experience in learner motivation dynamics (Dörnyei, 2019). Dörnyei suggests that the L2 learning experience is overlooked in the theory of the L2MSS, as it "is not only a strong predictor of various criterion measures but is often the most powerful predictor of motivated behavior" (p. 19). Dörnyei defines L2 learning experience as the perceived quality of the learners' engagement with various aspects of the language learning process, including school context, syllabus and teaching materials, learning tasks, peers, and the teachers (see also Henry & Thorsen, 2019). The role of the social context, which can affect individual motivation, is very important. Next to factors related to group dynamics, socioeconomic position seems to be a significant aspect of motivation for an L2 learner (Dörnyei, 2018; Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2012).

It is worth noting, however, that the manner in which the selves have been explored has come in for criticism. Al-Hoorie (2018) claims that, in previous studies, the L2 learning experience has been found to be a strong predictor of intended effort (or motivated behavior) mostly because of the lack of discriminant validity between these two factors. Similarly, Papi, et al. (2018) propose the 2x2 model of the self-guides, arguing that the items found in scales used in previous studies show elements which refer to both own and other standpoints. These researchers claim that this dichotomy of the items assessing the selves has possibly influenced the results of the studies, which have observed the ideal L2 Self as a strong predictor of intended effort. Hence, Papi et al. (2018) considered the ideal L2 Self own/other and the ought-to L2 Self own/other as the model of their study, which showed the ought-to L2 Self as the strongest predictor of motivated behavior. Notwithstanding the recent criticism, this study conforms to the canonical instruments to examine the possible relationship among the selves, the learning experience, and intended effort as the views require empirical evidence to be sustained.

International Posture

International posture deals with the learners' tendency to become part of the international community (Yashima, 2009, p. 145) and involves students' interest in international affairs, willingness to travel, or readiness to interact with people from foreign cultures (Dörnyei, 2005; Yashima, 2009). Since Yashima (2002) coined the concept of international posture, a number of scholars have investigated the relationship between this concept and Dörnyei's (2005) L2 motivation theory, with a focus on the relationship between international posture and the two possible selves.

Yashima's (2009) work suggested that those learners who show a higher level of international posture and frequency of communication tend to endorse a stronger vision of ideal self (p. 159). In a similar vein, Csizér and Kormos (2009); Xie (2014); and Kong et al. (2018) found that one of the main determinants of students' ideal L2 self is precisely international posture. Kormos et al. (2011) also found that secondary school students' L2 self was strongly influenced by international posture, an important factor that determined their motivated behavior towards learning English because of the possibility to establish connections with other people who are part of a globalized world.

In relation to international posture and ought-to L2 self, studies have exhibited weak (Kim & Lee, 2015), negative (Kong et al., 2018), and no correlations between these two variables (Csizér & Kormos, 2009). Therefore, the role of international posture on students' ought-to L2 self has not been found to be substantially significant.

Socioeconomic Background and Second Language Learning Motivation

Socioeconomic background has been examined as a predictor of students' behavior, self-beliefs, and attitudes towards learning, as well as linguistic, literacy, and social outcomes at both school and university levels (Butler, 2014; Butler & Le, 2018; Devlin, 2013). A growing body of research has investigated the impact of socioeconomic factors on second language in different ESL or EFL contexts (Akram & Ghani, 2013; Butler & Le, 2018; Fan, 2011; Gayton, 2010; Kormos & Kiddle, 2013). However, only a few research studies have focused on the relationship between socioeconomic factors and second language motivation.

Even though there is no agreement as to which aspects define socioeconomic factor (Block, 2015), most research studies examining the relationship between L2 motivation and socioeconomic factors have included aspects such as income, parental involvement, parents' education, and parents' occupation (Butler & Le, 2018; Huang et al., 2018; Shin & So, 2018). Most of these studies have found that social and motivational factors are significantly interrelated (Fan, 2011; Kormos et al., 2011; Lamb, 2012), which indicates that socioeconomic status does not only affect language learning achievement, but also motivation, self-

regulation, self-ability beliefs, and the use of learning strategies (Fan, 2011; Shin & So, 2018). These findings have been attributed to the fact that students from higher socioeconomic status "may have more resources available to assist their L2 learning" (Shin & So, 2018, p. 7), which influences learners' motivation to learn an L2 (Gayton, 2010; Lamb, 2012). In a similar study, Kormos et al. (2011) observed that the participants perceived English as "a stepping stone to higher social status" (p. 509), which contributed to their motivation to learn the second language. This means that their motivation to learn English was affected by the role English language learning plays socially. Similarly, Kormos and Kiddle (2013) found that learners from high social class and upper-middle class demonstrated more favorable motivational characteristics than the participants from the lower, lower-middle, and middle classes.

Due to the fact that the socioeconomic factor has been observed in different ways in past literature, in this study, socioeconomic status is conceived of as a value resulting from the breadwinner's level of education, occupation, and the household income in proportion to the number of family members.

The Role of English in Chilean Education

Chile is one of the few countries in Latin America that has national policies regarding the teaching of English (Cronquist & Fiszbein, 2017). A widely-known public policy took the form of a ministerial department called the English Opens Doors Program (EOD). It was launched in 2003 with the view to improving the level of English language proficiency of students from the fifth to twelfth grade. This goal is to be achieved through the establishment of national standards for the learning of the language, strategies for teachers' professional development, and support to English language teachers in the classroom (Ministerio de Educación, 2018), within the context of low proficiency levels achieved nationally (Education First, 2017).

In light of the need for improved English language proficiency, the National English Strategy 2014-2030, launched in 2013, aims to "strengthen the proficiencies of the Chilean population in the English language" (Gobierno de Chile, 2014, p. 9) through different initiatives to promote English language learning in the society (from early childhood education to professional training). Much of the implementation has focused on teacher education preparation in Chile (Barahona, 2017, 2019; Muñoz Campos, 2017) and the exit English proficiency levels of school-leavers has yielded moderate results (Abrahams & Silva Ríos, 2017; Muñoz Campos, 2017). Also, universities have increasingly incorporated English language learning courses as part of their cross-curricular offerings; indeed, some universities have also moved onto state–either mandatory or expected–exit proficiency levels for their students. All of the aggregated efforts are thus expected to yield more robust results in the mid-to-long term.

A third important policy in Chilean education has been the incorporation of English language assessment into the Measure of Education Quality System (Sistema de Medición de Calidad de la Educación, SIMCE in Spanish), which corresponds to a set of standardized tests that aim at measuring the overall quality of education. The last official English SIMCE test was administered in 2014 to 11th grade students, and the results revealed that the national average score was 51 points for listening and reading comprehension, which correspond to A1 level according to CEFR. Even though the English SIMCE test has sought to report on students' language performance at a national level, it has uncovered a rather notorious socioeconomic bias. The 2014 English SIMCE results revealed that there are significant differences in terms of their achievement in English between student from low and high income families. A report published by the Chilean Ministry of Education indicates that students from the lowest socioeconomic group obtained an average of 35 points, while students from the highest socioeconomic group obtained an average of 86 points (Ministerio de Educación, 2015). A more recent national study using the same test battery, revealed almost identical results. The lowest socioeconomic group obtained an average score of 36 points, the middle socioeconomic group obtained an average of 55 points, while the highest socioeconomic group an average of 81 points (Agencia de la Calidad de la Educación, 2017). These results have demonstrated that the English proficiency levels are greatly influenced by socioeconomic factors (Rodríguez Garcés, 2015).

Method

This study uses a quantitative approach as the objectives aim to establish possible correlations among variables such as L2MSS, international posture, and socioeconomic background. In the present study, a survey design was selected. The survey consisted of two main sections (Appendix A). The first part consisted of a 4-point Likert scale which ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree), which gauged students' L2MSS by exploring their ideal L2 self (8 items), ought-to L2 self (6 items), and L2 learning experience (6 items); motivated behavior (6 items) was included as well. This section was adopted and translated from Taguchi et al. (2009), and included questions aimed at exploring students' international posture (10 items), which corresponds to an adaptation of Yashima's (2009) updated version of her initial instrument (Yashima, 2002).

The second part of the instrument aimed at collecting data about students' socioeconomic background. The items were taken from Asociación de Investigadores de Mercado (Market Researchers Association, AIM for short, 2018), which released a national report that presented and analyzed the new socioeconomic groups in Chile (see table of socioeconomic levels in Chile in Appendix B).

The instrument was administered in the participants' mother tongue to ensure understanding since the participants belonged to courses of various English levels. The data were gathered from three universities over four weeks during class time. The different variables tested in this study were: (1) ideal L2 self, (2) ought-to L2 self, (3) L2 learning experience, (4) international posture, (5) socioeconomic level, and (6) students' motivated behavior.

As far as the reliability of the survey is concerned, the coefficients indicated that the instrument was reliable revealing the following: (a) ideal L2 self: 0.83, (b) ought-to L2 self: 0.72, (c) L2 learning experience: 0.83, (d) international posture: 0.83, and (e) motivated behavior: 0.70. In the case of ought-to L2 self, the original Cronbach analysis indicated a lower coefficient (0.69), which increased when the item "It will have a negative impact on my life if I don't learn English" was excluded for the calculation of this dimension.

Participants

A non-probabilistic sampling procedure was adopted since it allows researchers to choose their respondents based on their convenience and availability (Creswell, 2009). In the present study, eligibility criteria required individuals to be university students who were studying a program in which English was not a core subject. The decision as to who took part in the study was based on the availability of the lecturers of the language courses offered at the time of the data gathering process as well as the students' willingness to participate, which was the case in all three institutions were the data were collected.

University students were chosen for this study since they may have clearer ideas of themselves in comparison to school students (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Kormos & Csizér, 2008). Moreover, university students "are in a period of their lives when they have a fairly stable self-image, but it is still flexible" (Carlson, 1965 as cited in Csizér & Kormos, 2009), so, as suggested by Csizér and Kormos (2009), it can be hypothesized that the ideal L2 self may well be part of students' self-images.

134 non-English major students from three universities in Santiago took part in the study. 35.8% were from university A, 39.5% from university B, and 24.6% from university C. These students pursued different programs and were from different levels (see Table 1 and Table 2 below). From the sample, 45 students (33.6%) were male and 89 (66.4%) were female; the mean age of the participants was 21. The three universities in this study were selected on the basis of the perceived differences they represent. Most of participants belonged to the socioeconomic levels C3 (33.29%) and C1a (20.90%), where A represents the highest socioeconomic group and E the lowest. Table 3 shows the distribution of the participants according to the socioeconomic group.

Table 1 The Participants' Field of Study

	n	%
Speech therapy	2	1.49
Nutrition	11	8.21
Occupational therapy	36	26.87
Elementary education	4	2.99
Early childhood education	14	10.45
Business engineering	12	8.96
Kinesiology	44	32.84
Nursing	11	8.21

Table 2 The Level of English Course Taken by the Participants

	n	%
English I	33	24.63
English III	83	61.94
English IV	18	13.43

Table 3 Distribution According to Socioeconomic Group

	n	%
E	9	6.72
D	18	13.43
C3	30	22.39
C2	19	14.18
C1b	21	15.67
C1a	28	20.9
AB	9	6.72

The participants were asked to read and sign an informed consent letter which clearly described the purpose of the study and assured them anonymity and confidentiality of their personal information and the data gathered. Also, formal permission was sought and granted by the relevant institutional authorities of the three universities.

As far as the data analyses are concerned, due to the correlational nature of the research questions, a series of multiple linear regressions were conducted in order to observe the degree of influence of one (or more than one) independent

variable on one dependent variable and "establish the extent to which one variable can predict the occurrence of another" (Cohen et al., 2003). All the statistical analyses in this study were performed using Stata.

Results

In order to answer the research questions of this study, multiple linear regression models were used. Gender, university, and age were used as control variables. Each of the four research questions are answered below. The descriptive statistics and general correlations of the variables in the study are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among the Variables

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Ideal L2 Self	2.97	0.54	1						
2. Ought-to L2 Self	2.07	0.62	0.1	1					
3. L2 Learning Experience	3.12	0.54	.54***	.03	1				
4. Motivated Behavior	2.80	0.51	.29**	.03	.63***	1			
5. International Posture	3.05	0.52	.55***	.02	.53***	.46***	1		
6. Age	21.01	5.00	.01	–.05	.01	.06	–.09	1	
7. Socioeconomic Status	4.08	1.73	.32***	.06	.06	–.03	.16	–.26**	1

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

As Table 4 shows, the investigated variables show similar mean scores, with the exception of the ought-to L2 self. These scores–around 3–on a scale of 1–4 suggest that the participants agreed with the statements provided for each dimension. The standard deviation among these variables was relatively constant as well. In the case of the ought-to L2 self, the mean score was very close to 2, which means that most participants disagreed with the statements of this dimension, such as "I study English because close friends of mine think it is important." It is important to highlight that the L2 learning experience was the component of the L2MSS with the highest mean score (3.12). Also, the socioeconomic status was measured on a scale ranging from the lowest (1 = E) to the highest (7 = AB) groups, where the mean score was 4.08, which represents level C2.

Table 4 also presents the correlations among the different variables of this study. These correlations are further described and discussed in the subsequent sections answering each of the research questions (RQs) in this study.

RQ 1: Relationship Between L2MSS Components and Students' International Posture

To establish whether there is a possible relationship between L2MSS components and students' international posture, a multiple linear regression model was applied using data gathered from the first part of the questionnaire (items 1 to 36). In this model, International Posture was the dependent variable, whereas, ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and L2 learning experience were the independent variables. The model was statistically significant $F(7, 126) = 11.71$, $p < .001$, explaining 39.41% of the variance in International Posture. Table 5 shows the results for this model.

Table 5 Multiple Linear Regression: International Posture

	b	s.e.	*t*	*p*
Ideal L2 Self	0.38	0.08	4.54	.000
Ought-to L2 Self	-0.04	0.06	-0.64	.521
L2 Learning Experience	0.31	0.08	3.78	.000
Gender	0.01	0.09	0.17	.864
University B	0.12	0.09	1.37	.173
University C	0.05	0.11	0.41	.683
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.31	.193
Constant	1.18	0.32	3.68	.000

The ideal L2 self dimension showed a mean score of 2.97. In other words, the participants across the three universities agreed (near 3 = I agree) with the statements that described their desired future self-images as fluent speakers of the target language. Also, the standard deviation of this dimension was .54, which suggests that the dispersion of participants' answers was clustered around the mean score.

The ideal L2 self was found to correlate positively with international posture, and hence, a one-unit increase in the ideal L2 self dimension involved an increase of .38 in international posture after adjusting for the rest of the variables in the model. Also, as Table 4 shows, international posture and ideal L2 self dimension presented a moderate correlation, $r(134) = .55$, $p < .001$. In other words, these variables are related, even after adjusting for additional variables.

As started above, the ought-to L2 self dimension presented a mean score of 2.07, which suggests an overall disagreement with the statements embedded in this dimension (2 = I disagree). Also, the standard deviation was 0.62, which means a slightly greater dispersion in comparison with the other components of L2MSS. The ought-to L2 self presents a nonsignificant correlation with international posture, $r(134) = .02$, $p = 814$, which was also observed in the regression model, $b = -.04$, $t(126) = -.64$, $p = .521$. This means that the ought-to L2 self does not

predict international posture.

The mean score for learning experience was 3.12. Also, as Table 5 shows, L2 learning experience seems to be another strong predictor of international posture since a one-unit increase in the former variable predicted an increase of 0.3 in the latter. Moreover, these variables presented a moderate correlation, $r(134) = .53$, $p < .001$. In other words, the participants' view of English as a global language together with their interest in foreign affairs are moderately related to their experience in their English lessons.

RQ 2: Relationship Between L2MSS and Students' Socioeconomic Background

To determine whether or not there is a possible relationship between L2MSS and students' socioeconomic background, linear regression models were used for ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and L2 learning experience, where socioeconomic background was the independent variable in the three cases after controlling for gender, university, and age. For this question, data gathered from the questionnaire were used, considering items 1 to 20 as well as participants' socioeconomic status divided into the categories presented above and described earlier.

Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics for the results of each L2MSS components per socioeconomic group. As Table 6 shows, the mean scores are similar for the different socioeconomic groups, with mean scores close to 3 (I agree) for the ideal L2 self, close to 2 (I disagree) for the ought-to L2 self, and close to 3 (I agree) for L2 learning experience. Even though these descriptive statistics do not fully answer the second research question, they do shed light on the behavior of each of the components that make up L2MSS considering the various socioeconomic groups. Hence, they further contribute to the broad overview of participants' responses.

Table 6 Descriptive Statistics for Socioeconomic Groups and L2MSS Components

	Ideal L2 Self		**Ought-to L2 Self**		**L2 Learning Experience**	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
AB	3.38	0.51	1.87	0.80	3.22	0.69
C1a	3.26	0.55	2.23	0.49	3.18	0.48
C1b	2.89	0.63	2.12	0.51	3.01	0.72
C2	2.81	0.54	2.00	0.86	3.11	0.54
C3	2.81	0.40	2.01	0.57	3.17	0.43
D	2.99	0.47	2.11	0.68	3.19	0.42
E	2.60	0.37	1.91	0.50	2.83	0.62

In order to assess the relationship between the ideal L2 self and socioeconomic status, a regression model was used in which the ideal L2 self was the dependent variable and socioeconomic status was the independent variable. The model of this regression was significant $F(5,128) = 4.19$, $p = .002$, explaining 14.08% of the variance in the ideal L2 self. As Table 7 shows, none of the control variables (i.e., gender, age, university) were significant. However, the socioeconomic status and the ideal L2 self showed a weak correlation, $r(134) = .32$, $p < .001$, and socioeconomic status was found to moderately predict the ideal L2 self. In other words, an increase by one unit in socioeconomic status was associated with an increase of 0.13 in the ideal L2 self component.

Table 7 Multiple Linear Regression: Ideal L2 Self

	β	**SE**	**t**	**p**
Socioeconomic Status	0.13	0.04	3.47	.001
Gender	-0.17	0.10	-1.68	.095
University B	-0.05	0.12	-0.44	.661
University C	0.11	0.17	0.64	.523
Age	0.01	0.01	0.98	.327
Constant	2.35	0.30	7.78	.000

The regression model for the ought-to L2 self dimension was statistically significant, $F(5,128) = 3.04$, $p = 0.013$, explaining 10.61% of the variance in ought-to L2 self. The ought-to L2 self and socioeconomic status were not found to correlate, $r(134) = .06$, $p = .466$. Moreover, as Table 8 shows, the linear regression indicated that socioeconomic status did not predict the ought-to L2 self, $\beta = .00$, $t(128) = .07$, $p = .944$.

Table 8 Multiple Linear regression: Ought-to L2 Self

	β	**SE**	**t**	**p**
Socioeconomic Status	0.00	0.04	0.07	.944
Gender	-0.35	0.12	-2.95	.004
University B	0.07	0.14	0.52	.606
University C	-0.25	0.20	-1.22	.226
Age	0.01	0.01	0.47	.638
Constant	2.21	0.35	6.28	.000

The results of the regression model exploring the relationship between L2 learning experience and the socioeconomic background are summarized in Table 9. This model for L2 learning experience was not statistically significant, $F(5,125) = 1.37$, $p = .240$, $R2 = .051$, which means that none of the variables included in the model is related to L2 learning experience.

Table 9 Multiple Linear Regression: L2 Learning Experience

	β	**SE**	**t**	**p**
Socioeconomic Status	0.08	0.04	2.01	.046
Gender	0.04	0.11	0.33	.740
University B	0.09	0.13	0.70	.486
University C	0.41	0.18	2.28	.025
Age	0.00	0.01	-0.40	.690
Constant	2.73	0.32	8.67	.000

RQ3: Relationship Between Students' International Posture and Socioeconomic Background

To answer the third research question regarding the relationship between international posture associated and socioeconomic status, a multiple regression model was performed as in the previous question; however, in this case, international posture was the dependent variable. This model was not significant, $F(5,128) = 1.37$, $p = .241$, $R2 = .051$, indicating that these variables are not associated. Table 10 summarizes the results for this model.

Table 10 Multiple Linear Regression: International Posture

	β	SE	t	p
Socioeconomic Status	0.09	0.04	2.33	.021
Gender	-0.02	0.10	-0.20	.842
University B	0.15	0.13	1.21	.227
University C	0.27	0.18	1.55	.124
Age	-0.01	0.01	-0.83	.408
Constant	2.75	0.31	9.00	.000

RQ 4: Relationship Between Motivated Behavior, L2MSS, International Posture, and Socioeconomic Background

In order to establish whether there is a relationship between motivated behavior, L2MSS, international posture, and socioeconomic background, a multiple regression model was applied in which motivated behavior was the dependent variable while the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self, L2 learning experience, international posture, and socioeconomic status were the independent variables. Additionally, gender, university, and age were included as control variables. The model was statistically significant, $F(9, 124) = 13.29$, $p = <.001$, explaining 49.09% of the variance in motivated behavior. In this model, motivated behavior was only significantly predicted by international posture and L2 learning experience, with coefficients of $\beta = .21$, $t(124) = 2.56$, $p = .012$, and $\beta = .53$, $t(124) = 6.66$, $p < .001$, respectively. Table 11 shows the results for this model.

Table 11 Multiple Linear Regression: Motivated Behavior

	β	SE	t	p
International Posture	0.21	0.08	2.56	.012
Ideal L2 Self	-0.10	0.08	-1.18	.239
Ought-to L2 Self	0.03	0.06	0.60	.548
L2 Learning Experience	0.53	0.08	6.66	.000
Socioeconomic Status	0.04	0.03	1.39	.166
Gender	0.13	0.08	1.64	.104
University B	0.29	0.09	3.14	.002
University C	0.38	0.13	2.86	.005
Age	0.00	0.01	0.25	.805
Constant	0.25	0.32	0.78	.438

Discussion

The findings of this study respond to the overarching objectives which can be conflated into the possible relationships among (i) L2MSS components (ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and learning experience); (ii) international posture; and (iii) socioeconomic background. In this regard, the findings seem to further support what the literature has suggested and what the authors had anticipated regarding the relationship between international posture and students' ideal L2 self (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Yashima, 2002; Xie, 2014) in that it is possible to argue that the perceptions students have about the global aspects of English behave as intrinsic motives closely related to their self-concept (Csizér & Kormos, 2009). This suggests that learners who hold strong future self-images as competent speakers of English are likely to develop a greater interest in international issues concerning the target language. The potential significance of this corroborated finding in the Chilean context begs the question of possible causality (and directionality) between the ideal L2 self and international posture. However, a virtually non-existent relationship between the ought-to L2 self and international posture suggests that learners' interest in the global aspect of English is not determined by their perceived sense of obligation and responsibilities associated with learning English, which is consistent with previous studies (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Kong et al., 2018; Yashima, 2009) that indicated that the ought-to L2 self does not determine international posture as does the ideal L2 self.

This relationship between L2 learning experience and international posture confirms what previous studies have indicated, wherein international posture has been found to be closely related to learning experience (Kong et al., 2018).

Put differently, learners who enjoy L2 learning are more likely to be interested in pursuing an international career or being involved in global aspects, which suggests a major pedagogical significance by hinting that students' development of an international posture hinges upon the teachers' efforts to make the language learning experience an enjoyable one as "most learners' early encounters with the second language (L2) still take place in classrooms" (Kong et al., p. 301). The study has also found that there exists a moderate relationship between the ideal L2 self (but not the ought-to L2 self) and socioeconomic status, which is consistent with previous investigations; for instance, Kormos and Kiddle (2013), who focused on students' motivation and the influence of contextual factors in terms of physical conditions and resources, especially in school settings, concluded that motivation and socioeconomic status were related, and that there was a moderate effect of social class on the ideal L2 self. Also, Lamb (2012) found associations between socioeconomic factors and students' motivation due to regional differences. Hence, it is possible to argue that students' context and socioeconomic status affect their future images as speakers of L2 English. Nevertheless, these results do not allow for further exploration of the role of the socioeconomic factor in students' motivation since an in-depth analysis of socioeconomic factors defining participants' background is necessary, which would require a larger sample size. All in all, it is fair to claim that the results from this study suggest that the only L2MSS component affected by the socioeconomic status is the ideal L2 self.

As far as the relationship between socioeconomic status and international posture goes, and perhaps contrary to what the authors had anticipated, a very weak correlation was found. Unfortunately, the scant research on the impact of socioeconomic status on international posture does not allow for further discussion. Nevertheless, Kormos and Kiddle (2013) found that the difference in mean scores between the highest and lowest social classes for international posture was .57 points, whereas in the present study, there was a difference of .39 points, which adds to the argument made in this study: Socioeconomic factor was not found to play a major role in determining participants' international posture.

Surprisingly, the ideal L2 self did not seem to have a role determining motivated behavior. These results differ from earlier findings in which the ideal L2 self has been found to have a major role in influencing students' motivated behavior (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Wong, 2018). Nevertheless, Lamb (2012) also observed a less prominent role of the ideal L2 self on motivated behavior. Similarly, Sato (2020) conducted a study in which he examined the impact of vision intervention on Chilean students' L2 motivation. He found that vision interventions had a positive impact on participants' ideal L2 self and international posture. Regarding intended effort, he stated that "the current study's results generally contradict previous studies that showed L2 motivation's predictive power of the efforts that learners state" (p. 23). Thus, it can be suggested that the effort that students invest in learning English as a foreign language is weakly determined by their idealized self-images as successful speakers of the language.

Similarly, in this model, the ought-to L2 self was not related to learners' motivated behavior (Kormos et al., 2011). The findings of this study suggest a fairly strong correlation between the participants' experience in their English language lessons and the participants' efforts invested in learning the language, as shown in Papi's (2010) study. This, yet again, underscores the importance of the role of language teachers in instructed learning environments as the quality of learning experience seems to relate to learners' efforts to invest in their own learning process, which is an area that has attracted greater attention over the last decade.

In previous studies, researchers have observed that international posture plays a major role in students' motivated behavior through the influence of the ideal L2 self or L2 learning experience (Csizér & Kormos, 2009, Kong et al., 2018; Lamb, 2012; Xie, 2014), which was corroborated in this study, yet only in relation to L2 learning experience. Therefore, it is possible to claim that intended effort (or motivated behavior), international posture, and L2 learning experience are interrelated. This suggests that learners who hold a strong interest in the global aspects of English are likely to enjoy their English lessons, which may contribute to the effort invested in learning a foreign language. Also, it was possible to observe that the socioeconomic factor did not determine students' motivation as strongly as Kormos and Kiddle (2013) had observed. Hence, these results may seem to suggest that (1) socioeconomic status does not affect students' motivation to learn English or that (2) once students reach university level, their motivation to learn the L2 does not hinge upon contextual factors, but rather on the immediate language learning experience. It is worth mentioning that previous studies such as Kormos and Kiddle's (2013) have focused on high school students, whereas the present study dealt with university students, and therefore, participants' age and maturity may have biased the results. Because university students' motivation is closely related to their positive learning experience (Kormos et al., 2011), the role of the teacher is essential in promoting and fostering students' effort investment (Lamb 2012).

Conclusions

This study aimed to explore the possible relationships between socioeconomic background, international posture, and L2MSS in non-major EFL university students. The study showed that university students' interest in international affairs, i.e., international posture, is related to their future self-images as successful L2 speakers and to their immediate learning experience as foreign language learners. These results suggest that university students' willingness to know about international issues, travel abroad, or interact in a globalized world mediated by English might be enhanced by the implementation of classroom activities that promote stronger future self-images as speakers of English, which adds to the possible applicability of Dörnyei's (2005) motivation theory in the language classroom.

The results of this study also revealed that socioeconomic status does not play a major role in the L2MSS components except for the ideal L2 self; nor does it play a role in students' international posture. Hence, it seems that higher education students' motivational levels are not strongly predicted by their socioeconomic status, which goes partly counter to previous research findings (Kormos & Kiddle, 2013).

Finally, it is worth noting that students' motivated behavior is more strongly determined by their L2 learning experience and weakly predicted by the ideal L2 self, unlike much research in this area had previously concluded (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Kong et al., 2018). This finding supports Dörnyei's (2019) claim that L2 learning experience is the most powerful predictor of motivated behavior, which may indicate that the role of teachers, as well as the methodologies implemented in the language classroom play a pivotal role at university vis-à-vis learners' effort investment.

This study is certainly not without limitations. Having a larger sample size could have helped to examine the role of other contextual and socio-demographic factors affecting students' motivation to learn an L2, as similar studies have shown. Also, it could have potentially allowed for a more evenly distributed representation of different areas of knowledge since the sample employed in the study is fairly skewed towards health-care programs. In addition, a more varied sample from more universities, other tertiary-education institutions, and other cities would have been beneficial in order to increase the heterogeneity in terms of participants' social backgrounds and experiences in learning the foreign language. Therefore, a similar study including greater variety in its sample could be undertaken in order to (dis)confirm whether the socioeconomic factor plays a role in students' motivation to learn a foreign language. Moreover, further research might explore the factors that determine whether EFL university students' motivation (as related to L2 learning experience) is triggered from their participation in class, teaching methodology, teacher rapport, resources, among others.

Acknowledgements

Funding source Chilean National Research Agency Fondecyt, Project number 11170031

References

Abrahams, M.J., & Silva Rios, P. (2017). What happens with English in Chile? Challenges in teacher preparation. In L. D. Kamhi-Stein, G. D. Maggioli, & L. C. De Oliveira (Eds.) *English language teaching in South America: Policy, preparation and practices* (pp. 109-122). Multilingual Matters.

Adolphs, S., Clark, L., Dörnyei, Z., Glover, T., Henry, A., Muir, C., Sánchez--Lozanoc, E., & Valstarc, M. (2018). Digital innovations in L2 motivation: Harnessing the power of the Ideal L2 Self. *System, 78,* 173-185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.07.014

Agencia de la Calidad de la Educación. (2017). Informe de resultados estudio nacional de Inglés [Results report on nationwide study on English proficiency]. Retrieved from http://archivos.agenciaeducacion.cl/ Informe_Estudio_ Nacional_Ingles_III.pdf

Akram, M., & Ghani, M. (2013). The relationship of socioeconomic status with language learning motivation. *International Journal of English and Education, 2*(2), 406-413. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v9n2p89

Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2018). The L2 motivational self system: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 8*(4), 721-754. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.4.2

Alshahrani, A. S. (2016). L2 motivational self system among Arab EFL learners: Saudi perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 5*(5), 145-152. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.5p.145

Asociación de Investigadores de Mercado (AIM) de Chile. (2018). Nuevos grupos socioeconómicos 2018 [New socioeconomic groups 2018]. Retrieved from http: //www.aimchile.cl/wp content/uploads/NuevosGrupos-Socieconómicos-AIM-febrero-2010-FINAL-2.pdf

Barahona, M. (2017). Exploring models of team teaching in initial foreign/second language teacher education: A study situated in situated collaboration. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 42(12), 144-161. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2017v42n12.9

Barahona, M. (2019). What matters to supervisors and is this reflected in what they do? Analysing the work of university supervisors of the practicum. Journal of Education for Teaching, 45(3), 262-276. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2019.1599509

Biedroń, A., & Birdsong, D. (2018). Highly proficient and gifted bilinguals. In A. De Houwer & L. Ortega (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of bilingualism* (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics, pp. 307-323). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316831922.017

Biedroń, A., & Pawlak, M. (2016). New conceptualizations of linguistic giftedness. *Language Teaching 49*(2), 151–185. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444815000439 Block, D. (2015). Social class in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000221

Butler, Y. (2014). Parental factors and early English education as a foreign language: A case study in Mainland China. *Research Papers in Education 29*(4), 410-437. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2013.776625

Butler, Y. G., & Le, V. N. (2018). A longitudinal investigation of parental social-economic status (SES) and young students' learning of English as a foreign language. *System, 73,* 4-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.07.005

Carlson, R. (1965). Stability and change in the adolescent's self-image. *Child Development, 36*(3), 659-666. https://doi.org/10.2307/1126912

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S., & Aiken, L. (2003). *Applied multiple regression /correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Sage.

Cronquist, K., & Fiszbein, A. (2017). English language learning in Latin America. Retrieved from: https://www.thedialogue.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/English-Language-Learning-in-Latin-America-Final.pdf

Csizér, K., & Kormos, J. (2009). Learning experiences, selves and motivated learning behaviour: A comparative analysis of structural models for Hungarian secondary and university learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 98-119). Multilingual Matters.

Devlin, M. (2013). Bridging socio-cultural incongruity: Conceptualizing the success of students from low socio-economic status backgrounds in Australian higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(6), 939–949. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.613991

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Pearson Education.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9-42). Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2017). Conceptualizing L2 learner characteristics in a complex, dynamic world. In L. Ortega & Z. Han (Eds.), *Complexity theory and language development: In celebration of Diane Larsen-Freeman* (pp. 79-96). John Benjamins.

Dörnyei, Z. (2018). Motivating students and teachers. In Liontas, J. I. (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (Vol. 7; pp. 4293-4299). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Dörnyei, Z. (2019). Towards a better understanding of the L2 Learning Experience, the Cinderella of the L2 Motivational Self System. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 9*(1), 19-30. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.1.2

Dörnyei, Z., & Kubanyiova, M. (2014). *Motivating learners, motivating teachers: Building vision in the language classroom.* Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & Muir, C. (2016). *Motivational currents in language learning: Frameworks for focused interventions.* Routledge.

Education First. (2018). English Proficiency Index. Retrieved from https://www.ef.com/__/~/media/centralefcom/epi/downloads/full-reports/v8/ef-epi-2018-english.pdf

Erard, M. (2019). Language aptitude: Insights from hyperpolyglots. Biedroń, A., Li, S., & Sparks, R. (Eds.), *Language aptitude: Advancing theory, testing, research and practice* (pp. 224-251). Rutledge.

Fan, W. (2011). Social influences, school motivation and gender differences: An application of the expectancy□value theory. *Educational Psychology, 31*(2), 157-175. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2010.536525

Gayton, A. (2010). Socioeconomic status and language-learning motivation: To what extent does the former influence the latter? *Scottish Languages Review, 22*(1), 17-28.

Gobierno de Chile. (2014). Estrategia nacional de inglés 2014-2030. [National English Strategy 2014-2030]. Retrieved from https://www.economia.gob.cl/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/140307-Documento-Estrategia-Nacional-de-Ingl%C3%A9s-2014-2030.pdf

Guilloteaux, M. J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(1), 55-77. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00207.x

Henry, A., & Thorsen, C. (2019). Weaving webs of connection: Empathy, perspective taking, and students' motivation. Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 9(1), 31-53. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.1.3

Henry, A., Davydenko, S., & Dörnyei, Z. (2015). The anatomy of Directed Motivational Currents: Exploring intense and enduring periods of L2 motivation. *Modern Language Journal, 99*(2), 329-345. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12214

Huang, B., Chang, Y. H. S., Niu, L., & Zhi, M. (2018). Examining the effects of socio-economic status and language input on adolescent English learners' speech production outcomes. *System, 73,* 27-36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006918768311

Hyltenstam, K. (2016). *Advanced proficiency and exceptional ability in second language.* Mouton de Gruyter.

Islam, M., Lamb, M., & Chambers, G. (2013). The L2 motivational self system and national interest: A Pakistani perspective. *System, 41*(2), 231–244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.025

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching, 44*(3), 281-315. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000115

Kim, C., & Lee, H. (2015). The interaction of L2 motivation constructs and learner variables in Korean middle school learners of English. *Modern English Education, 16*(1), 81-105.

Kong, J. H., Han, J. E., Kim, S., Park, H., Kim, Y. S., & Park, H. (2018). L2 motivational self system, international posture and competitiveness of Korean CTL and LCTL college learners: A structural equation modeling approach. *System, 72,* 178-189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.11.005

Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2008). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behavior. *Language Learning, 58*(2), 327-355. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00443.x

Kormos, J., & Kiddle, T. (2013). The role of socio-economic factors in motivation to learn English as a foreign language: The case of Chile. *System, 41*(2), 399-412. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.03.006

Kormos, J., Kiddle, T., & Csizér, K. (2011). Systems of goals, attitudes, and self--related beliefs in second-language-learning motivation. *Applied Linguistics, 32*(5), 495-516. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amr019

Lamb, M. (2012). A self system perspective on young adolescents' motivation to learn English in urban and rural settings. *Language Learning, 62*(4), 997–1023. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00719.x

Lamb, M. (2017). The motivational dimension of language teaching.Language Teaching, 50(3), 301-346. doi:10.1017/S0261444817000088

MacIntyre, P., & Vincze, L. (2017). Positive and negative emotions underlie motivation for L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 7*(1), 61-88. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2017.7.1.4

Ministerio de Desarrollo Social. (2018). Informe de Desarrollo Social 2018. Observatorio Social, Ministerio de Desarrollo Social, Gobierno de Chile. [Social Development 2018, Social Development Ministry, Government of Chile]. Retrieved from http://www.ministeriodesarrollosocial.gob.cl/storage/docs/Informe_de_Desarrollo_Social_2018.pdf

Ministerio de Educación. (2015). Síntesis resultados de aprendizaje. Simce 2014 Inglés. [Learning outcomes at a glance. Simce 2014 English Results]. Retrieved from http://archivos.agenciaeducacion.cl/resultados-2014 /Sintesis_Resultados_IIIM_2014.pdf

Ministerio de Educación. (2018). ODS4: Garantizar una educación inclusiva y equitativa de calidad y promover oportunidades de aprendizaje. Agenda 2030, objetivos de desarrollo sostenible [Ensuring quality, equitable and inclusive education, and promoting learning opportunities. 2030 agenda, Sustainable development objectives]. Retrieved from http://www.chileagenda2030.gob.cl/storage/docs/ODS4_Acciones_Publicas.pdf

Moskovsky, C., Assulaimani, T., Racheva, S., & Harkins, J. (2016). The L2 motivationalself system and L2 achievement: A study of Saudi EFL learners. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12340

Muñoz Campos, D. (2017). Problem-based learning: An experimental strategy for English language teacher education in Chile. *Profile: Issues in Teacher's Professional Development, 19*(1), 29-40. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v19n1.53310

Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach.System, 38(3), 467-479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.06.011

Papi, M., Bondarenko, A. V., Mansouri, S., Feng, L., & Jiang, C. (2018). Rethinking L2 motivation research: The 2×2 model of L2 self-guides. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 41(2), 337-361. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263118000153

Pavelescu, L. (2019). Motivation and emotion in the EFL learning experience of Romanian adolescent students: Two contrasting cases. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 9*(1), 55-82. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.1.4

Rodríguez Garcés, C. (2015). Competencias comunicativas en idioma inglés: La influencia de la gestión escolar y del nivel socioeconómico en el nivel de logro educativo en L2-inglés. [Communicative competence in English: The influence of socioeconomic status on English L2 achievement], *Perfiles Educativos, 37*(149), 74-93. https://doi.org/10.22201/iisue.24486167e.2015.149

Sato, M. (2020). Generating a roadmap for possible selves via a vision intervention: Alignment of second language motivation and classroom behavior. *TESOL J.* doi:10.1002/tesq.611

Shin, H. W., & So, J. (2018). The moderating role of socioeconomic tatus on smotivation of adolescents' foreign language learning strategy use. *System,73,* 71-79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.11.007

Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 66-97). Multilingual Matters.

Ushioda, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2012). Motivation. In S. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 396-409). Routledge.

Walker-Janzen, W., Véliz-Campos, M., & Veliz, L. (2019). Academic journeys of socially disadvantaged students in a context of more equitable pathways to university entry: The case of Chile. *Issues in Educational Research, 29*(4),1348-1358.

Waninge, F., Dörnyei, Z., & de Bot, K. (2014). Motivational dynamics in language learning: Change, stability and context. *Modern Language Journal, 98*(3), 704-723. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12118

Wong, Y. K. (2018). Structural relationships between self-image and the reading achievement of young Chinese language learners in Hong Kong. *System, 72*(1), 201-214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.12.003

Xie, Y. (2014). L2 self of beginning□level heritage and nonheritage post-secondary learners of Chinese. *Foreign Language Annals, 47*(1), 189-203. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12074

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *Modern Language Journal 86*(1), 54-56. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00136

Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the ideal L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 144-163). Multilingual Matters.

Appendix A: Instrument used to measure L2MSS and socioeconomic level

I. |Instrucciones: En esta sección del cuestionario usted encontrará distintos enunciados sobre los cuales debe expresar su grado de acuerdo o desacuerdo con ellos.

Marque su respuesta con una "X".

Ejemplo:	**Muy en desacuerdo**	**En desacuerdo**	**De acuerdo**	**Muy de acuerdo**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
0. Estudio todos los días.			**X**	
1. Me imagino viviendo en otro país manteniendo una conversación en inglés.				
2. Me imagino en una situación en la que hablo inglés con extranjeros.				
3. Me imagino hablando inglés como si fuese un hablante nativo de ese idioma.				
4. Me imagino hablando en inglés con amigos o colegas internacionales.				
5. Siempre que pienso en mi futura vida laboral me imagino usando inglés.				
6. Las cosas que quiero hacer en el futuro requieren que yo hable inglés.				
7. Me imagino estudiando en una universidad en la que todos mis cursos son impartidos en inglés.				
8. Me imagino escribiendo e-mails en inglés fluidamente.				
9. Estudio inglés porque amigos cercanos creen que es importante.				

1	2	3	4	5
10. Tengo que estudiar inglés porque, si no lo estudio, creo que la gente cercana a mí se sentiría decepcionada.				
11. Estudiar inglés es importante para mí porque una persona educada debiese poder hablar en inglés.				
12. Estudiar inglés es importante para mí ya que puedo ganar la aprobación de mis compañeros/ profesores/ familiares/ jefes.				
13. No aprender inglés podría traer un impacto negativo en mi vida.				
14. Estudiar inglés es importante para mí porque otras personas me respetarían más si tuviese conocimiento de ese idioma.				
15. Me gusta el clima que se forma en las clases de inglés.				
16. Creo que aprender inglés es interesante.				
17. Espero con ansias las clases de inglés.				
18. Disfruto aprender inglés.				
19. Me gustaría tener más horas de inglés en la universidad.				
20. Creo que el tiempo pasa rápido en las clases de inglés.				
21. Si otra asignatura/ ramo fuese impartido en inglés, me gustaría tomarlo.				
22. Creo que estoy dando lo mejor de mí para aprender inglés.				
23. Me gustaría pasar más tiempo estudiando inglés.				
24. Me gustaría concentrarme más en estudiar inglés que otras cosas.				
25. En comparación a mis compañeros, creo que me esfuerzo mucho en aprender inglés.				
26. Estoy dispuesto a hacer mi mayor esfuerzo en aprender inglés.				

1	2	3	4	5
27. Me gustaría hacer amigos internacionales que estudian en Chile.				
28. Me gustaría hablar con un estudiante internacional si hubiese uno en la universidad.				
29. Me gustaría trabajar en otro país.				
30. Me gustaría trabajar en alguna organización internacional como las Naciones Unidas.				
31. Estoy interesado en seguir una carrera/ trabajo internacional.				
32. A menudo leo o veo noticias acerca de otros países.				
33. A menudo hablo con mis amigos o familiares acerca de situaciones o eventos que ocurren en otros países.				
34. Me interesan los asuntos internacionales.				
35. Tengo ideas o pensamientos que me gustaría compartir con personas de otras partes del mundo.				
36. Tengo opiniones claras con respecto a problemas internacionales como, por ejemplo, asuntos medioambientales.				

II. Responda las siguientes preguntas marcando con una "X" cuando corresponda.

1. ¿Cuál es el nivel educacional alcanzado (último año aprobado) por el principal sostenedor o sostenedora del hogar? (Marque con una X).

a. Sin estudios formales.
b. Básica incompleta.
c. Básica completa.
d. Media científico humanista o media técnico profesional incompleta.
e. Media científico humanista o media técnico profesional completa.
f. Instituto técnico (CFT) o instituto profesional incompleto (carreras de 1 a 3 años).
g. Instituto técnico (CFT) o instituto profesional completo (carreras de 1 a 3 años); hasta suboficial de FFAA y Carabineros.
h. Universitaria incompleta (carreras de 4 o más años).
i. Universitaria completa (carreras de 4 o más años); oficial de FFAA y Carabineros.
j. Posgrado (postítulo, magíster, doctorado).

2. ¿Cuál de las siguientes ocupaciones corresponde al trabajo del principal sostenedor o sostenedora del hogar? ***En caso de que el principal sostenedor sostenedor (a) del hogar esté cesante o sea jubilado (a), por favor seleccionar la última ocupación remunerada que tuvo.*** *En caso de que el principal sostenedor (a) tenga más de un trabajo, seleccionar el que le provee mayor ingreso. Marque con una X.*

a. Trabajadores no calificados en ventas y servicios, jornaleros agropecuarios, forestales, construcción, etc.
b. Obreros, operarios y artesanos de artes mecánicas y de otros oficios.
c. Trabajadores de los servicios y vendedores de comercio y mercados.
d. Agricultores y trabajadores calificados agropecuarios y pesqueros.
e. Operadores de instalaciones y máquinas y montadores / conductores de vehículos.
f. Empleados de oficina públicos y privados.
g. Técnicos y profesionales de nivel medio (incluye hasta suboficiales FFAA y Carabineros).
h. Profesionales, científicos e intelectuales (filósofos, sociólogos, cientistas políticos, etc.).
i. Alto ejecutivo (gerente general o gerente de área o sector) de empresas privadas o públicas. Director o dueño de grandes empresas. Alto directivo del poder ejecutivo, de los cuerpos legislativos, y la administración pública (incluye oficiales de la FFAA y Carabineros).
j. Otros grupos no identificados.

3. Incluyéndose usted, ¿cuántas personas viven en su hogar en la actualidad? ***En caso de contar con servicio doméstico puertas adentro, no lo incluya.*** Escriba el número sobre la línea.

4. Por favor, piense en ingreso total de su hogar en un mes promedio, considerando el aporte de todos sus miembros y otros ingresos adicionales como rentas de propiedades, jubilaciones o pensiones.

Seleccione el recuadro según la cantidad de personas que viven en su hogar (colocar una X). Luego encierre en un círculo el número que corresponde al rango de ingreso total en su hogar.

→ 1 miembro

Menos de 120 mil	1
120 mil – 207 mil	2
208 mil – 361 mil	3
362 mil – 630 mil	4
631 mil – 1.099.000	5
1.100.000 – 1.916.000	6
Más de 1.916.000	7

→ 2 miembros

Menos de 194 mil	1
194 mil – 336 mil	2
337 mil – 586 mil	3
587 mil – 1.023.000	4
1.024.000 – 1.785.000	5
1.786.000 – 3.113.000	6
Más de 3.113.000	7

→ 5 miembros

Menos de 367 mil	1
367 mil – 638 mil	2
639 mil – 1.114.000	3
1.115.000 – 1.943.000	4
1.944.000 – 3.389.000	5
3.390.000 – 5.912.000	6
Más de 5.912.000	7

→ 6 miembros

Menos de 417 mil	1
417 mil – 725 mil	2
726 mil – 1.265.000	3
1.266.000 – 2.207.000	4
2.208.000 – 3.850.000	5
3.851.000 – 6.717.000	6
Más de 6.717.000	7

➔ ___ 3 miembros

Menos de 257 mil	1
257 mil – 446 mil	2
447 mil – 779 mil	3
780 mil – 1.359.000	4
1.360.000 – 2.370.000	5
2.371.000 – 4.135.000	6
Más de 4.135.000	7

➔ 4 miembros

Menos de 314 mil	1
314 mil – 546 mil	2
547 mil – 953 mil	3
954 mil – 1.662.000	4
1.663.000 – 2.899.000	5
2.900.000 – 5.057.000	6
Más de 5.057.000	7

➔ 7 ó más

Menos de 464 mil	1
464 mil – 808 mil	2
809 mil – 1.409.000	3
1.410.000 – 2.459.000	4
2.460.000 – 4.289.000	5
4.290.000 – 7.482.000	6
Más de 7.482.000	7

(Cuestionario adaptado de AIM Chile, 2018; Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009; Yashima, 2009)

Muchas gracias por su participación

Appendix B: Classification of socioeconomic groups (AIM Chile, 2018)

EDUCACIÓN DEL PSH	OCUPACIÓN DEL PSH	Tramos de ingreso per cápita						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Sin estudios; básica incompleta (1,2)	Trabajadores no calificados (1)	E	E	D	C3	C3	C2	C2
Básica completa (3)		E	E	D	C3	C3	C2	C2
Sin estudios; básica incompleta (1,2)	Oficiales, Operarios y Artesanos (2)	E	D	D	C3	C3	C2	C2
Básica completa (3)		E	D	D	C3	C2	C2	C2
Media completa o incompleta (4,5)	Trabajadores no calificados (1)	E	D	D	C3	C2	C2	C2
Sin estudios; básica incompleta (1,2)	Operadores de instalaciones y máquinas, agricultores; vendedores, trabajadores de servicios; otros (3, 4, 5, 10)	E	D	D	C3	C2	C2	C2
Básica completa (3)		E	D	D	C3	C2	C2	C2
Media completa o incompleta (4,5)	Oficiales, Operarios y Artesanos (2)	E	D	D	C3	C2	C2	C2
Sin estudios; básica incompleta (1,2)	Empleados de Oficina (6)	E	D	D	C3	C2	C2	C2
Media completa o incompleta (4,5)	Operadores de instalaciones y máquinas, agricultores; vendedores, trabajadores de servicios; otros (3, 4, 5, 10)	E	D	C3	C3	C2	C2	C1b
Básica completa (3)	Empleados de Oficina (6)	E	D	C3	C3	C2	C2	C1b
Técnica completa o incompleta; universitaria incompleta (6,7,8)	Trabajadores no calificados (1)	E	D	C3	C3	C2	C2	C1b
Sin estudios; básica incompleta (1,2)	Técnicos y profesionales de nivel medio (7)	E	D	C3	C3	C2	C2	C1b
Media completa o incompleta (4,5)	Empleados de Oficina (6)	E	D	C3	C3	C2	C2	C1b
Básica completa (3)	Técnicos y profesionales de nivel medio (7)	E	D	C3	C3	C2	C1b	C1b
Técnica completa o incompleta; universitaria incompleta (6,7,8)	Oficiales, Operarios y Artesanos (2)	D	D	C3	C3	C2	C1b	C1b

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Técnica completa o incompleta; universitaria incompleta (6,7,8)	Operadores de instalaciones y máquinas, agricultores; vendedores, trabajadores de servicios; otros (3, 4, 5, 10)	D	D	C3	C2	C2	C1b	C1b
Media completa o incompleta (4,5)	Técnicos y profesionales de nivel medio (7)	D	D	C3	C2	C2	C1b	C1b
Universitaria completa o más (9,10)	Trabajadores no calificados (1)	D	D	C3	C2	C2	C1b	C1b
Sin estudios; básica incompleta (1,2)	Directivos y Profesionales de Nivel Alto (8,9)	D	D	C3	C2	C2	C1b	C1b
Técnica completa o incompleta; universitaria incompleta (6,7,8)	Empleados de Oficina (6)	D	D	C3	C2	C2	C1b	C1b
Básica completa (3)	Directivos y Profesionales de Nivel Alto (8,9)	D	D	C3	C2	C1b	C1b	C1b
Universitaria completa o más (9,10)	Oficiales, Operarios y Artesanos (2)	D	C3	C3	C2	C1b	C1b	C1b
Universitaria completa o más (9,10)	Operadores de instalaciones y máquinas, agricultores; vendedores, trabajadores de servicios; otros (3, 4, 5, 10)	D	C3	C3	C2	C1b	C1b	C1b
Media completa o incompleta (4,5)	Directivos y Profesionales de Nivel Alto (8,9)	D	C3	C3	C2	C1b	C1b	C1a
Técnica completa o incompleta; universitaria incompleta (6,7,8)	Técnicos y profesionales de nivel medio (7)	D	C3	C3	C2	C1b	C1b	C1a
Universitaria completa o más (9,10)	Empleados de Oficina (6)	D	C3	C2	C2	C1b	C1b	C1a
Técnica completa o incompleta; universitaria incompleta (6,7,8)	Directivos y Profesionales de Nivel Alto (8,9)	D	C3	C2	C2	C1b	C1a	C1a
Universitaria completa o más (9,10)	Técnicos y profesionales de nivel medio (7)	D	C3	C2	C2	C1b	C1a	C1a
Universitaria completa o más (9,10)	Directivos y Profesionales de Nivel Alto (8,9)	C3	C3	C2	C1b	C1a	C1a	AB

(Cuestionario adaptado de AIM Chile, 2018; Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009; Yashima, 2009)