

Jennifer Ament*, Júlia Barón-Parés and Carmen Pérez-Vidal

Exploring the relationship between motivations, emotions and pragmatic marker use in English-medium instruction learners

<https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2020-2030>

Abstract: The aim of the present study is twofold: first, it compares full-English-medium instruction (EMI) and semi-EMI learners on a series of motivational and emotional factors (the ought to, and the ideal L2 self-motivational orientations, attitudes towards English, and foreign language anxiety and enjoyment). Second, it investigates the relationship between these individual differences (IDs) and pragmatic marker (PM) use. No previous studies have investigated these phenomena among semi and full EMI learners, despite the recognized need for more research into the effects of IDs and pragmatic learning in EMI settings. Participants were second and third-year EMI students. A monologue and an interaction task were used to obtain oral data, and questionnaires were used to gather data on IDs. Results showed that EMI and semi-EMI groups did not differ according to motivational orientation. However, there were significant differences between learner's motivations depending on the year of study, where third year learners were more ought to self-motivated than second-year learners. Other findings revealed that both strong ought to L2 self-oriented learners as well as learners who enjoyed EMI demonstrated an increased frequency of PM use and that learners with positive attitudes towards English reported stronger ideal L2 selves.

Keywords: second language motivations, individual differences, English-medium instruction, pragmatic markers

***Corresponding author: Jennifer Ament**, Department of English and German Studies, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, E-mail: jenniferrose.ament@uab.cat

Júlia Barón-Parés, Department of Modern Languages and English Studies, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

Carmen Pérez-Vidal, Department of translation and language sciences, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain

1 Introduction

The present study investigates two main affective variables: (i) motivational orientation (either ideal or ought to motivational selves) and (ii) second language (L2) learning experience (measured by three factors: attitudes towards English, emotions of anxiety and enjoyment experienced in class) and their relationship to the production of pragmatic markers (PMs) amongst full and semi-English-medium instruction (EMI) undergraduate students in Catalonia. Motivation in second language acquisition (SLA) has been operationalized as a psychological quality that leads one to achieve the goal of mastering a language (Eagly and Chaiken 1993). Attitudes refer to subjective evaluations made by either individuals or groups of speakers and the language varieties they use (Myers-Scotton 2006). Emotions are broken down into foreign language anxiety and enjoyment. Anxiety is operationalized as “the worry and usually negative emotional reaction aroused when learning or using an L2” (MacIntyre 2007: 565), whereas enjoyment is the positive emotional arousal from interacting through an additional language (Dewaele 2015). These factors have been identified as potential predictors of overall achievement and proficiency in L2 learners (Gardner 2007). Despite the large body of research on individual differences (IDs) in SLA, there are relatively few studies investigating them in the context of EMI (Lasagabaster 2016), and even fewer comparing semi to full-EMI learners.

EMI can be described as the process when English is used as the medium of instruction in otherwise non-English speaking environments usually involving non-native speakers of English (Hellekjær and Hellekjær 2015), a phenomenon which has been on the rise across Europe and the world over the last decade (Pérez-Vidal 2015; Wachter and Maiworm 2014). EMI can be considered a natural context of acquisition, where English is used for authentic communication, something which has been considered a powerful factor in SLA (García-Mayo and Lázaro-Ibarrola 2015). One issue that has received little attention is the different degrees of intensity in EMI (Housen 2012). In addition to IDs and the context of learning, the present study also considers the use of PMs in oral communication. PMs play a paramount role in first and second language communication, as reflected by their constant use during interaction by native (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS). In fact, they are thought to reflect a speaker’s oral fluency (Barón and Celaya 2010; Hasselgreen 2004; Trenchs-Parera 2009) and overall communicative competence (Alcón and Safont Jordà 2008; Bachman 1990; Halliday et al. 1976). Thus, the aim of the present study is to shed light on how learners in different intensities of EMI feel towards their classes by reporting on their motivations, attitudes, anxieties and enjoyment and furthermore, to investigate how these factors interact with pragmatic learning.

2 Individual differences and SLA

2.1 The L2 self-motivational system, ideal or ought to self-orientation

Recently, two important shifts have occurred in the field of IDs and SLA. Firstly, in order to incorporate current ideologies, social changes, and the latest findings in the field, SLA researchers have re-conceptualized the learner motivation construct originally proposed by Gardner and associates (see Gardner 2001; Masgoret and Gardner 2003). Secondly, factors such as internationalization, multilingual societies, and English as a dominant language in business, science, and academia (Block 2003; LoCastro 2001) have put English into a position where it is no longer connected with a specific culture or people (Crystal 2003), but has become a *lingua franca*, making it impossible for learners to integrate with an L1 culture (Coetzee-Van Rooy 2006). The latter important shift indicates that SLA researchers have begun to regard the learner as a whole person with many affective factors that are dynamic and constantly changing rather than as static and separate from the rest of the learner's character (Ushioda 2009; Yashima and Arano 2015). Out of these shifting perspectives, the L2 motivational self-system model was proposed by Csizér and Dörnyei (2005) and Dörnyei (2009). The L2 motivational self-system comprises three features: (i) the ideal L2 self, which mainly encompasses intrinsic motivational factors, (ii) the ought to L2 self, which mainly encompasses extrinsic motivational factors, and (iii) the L2 learner experience, which particularly includes affective factors related to the learning environment, such as attitudes and emotions towards peers and professors. According to this model, L2 motivational orientation is formed predominantly by either internal or external forces. The ideal L2 self is created and maintained by internal factors, such as the positive disposition and willingness to put effort into learning, as well as a series of promotional or behavioral measures such as learning patterns that enable achievement of the desired outcome or goal. The ought to L2 self-motivational orientation, on the other hand, is driven and formed by external factors, for example, family influences, and behaviors and measures such as learning patterns which aim to avoid a negative outcome. Ought to L2 self-motivated individuals tend to feel the pressures of their society, community or culture and seek to match these perceived expectations. In either case, such internal or external factors influence the learners' actions, behaviors and decisions and, therefore, their language learning outcomes in the long run.

2.2 The L2 learning experience

The L2 learning experience includes such factors as the individual's attitudes and emotions experienced while learning a language. These factors are thought to be closely connected to the learning environment and content and seem to shape motivational orientation over time (Deci and Ryan 1985; Ryan and Dörnyei 2013). This link between the L2 learning experience and motivational orientation has been confirmed by empirical research. Gao (2008) for example, found that learner attitudes towards a language affect language learning outcomes by influencing the decisions the learners makes, while González Ardeo (2016) reported that the L2 learning experience has a significant effect on learners' choices regarding language learning strategies, activities and behaviors. Additionally, L2 learning experience affects learner's emotions which in turn, impact behaviors, decisions, and language learning outcomes as evidenced in Afungmeyu Abongdia's study (2014). The self-discrepancy model proposed by Deci and Ryan (1985) and Higgins (1987) explains that learners become aware of the differences between their actual behavior and performance in comparison to their expected or desired behavior and performance. The realization of the difference between the actual and desired is what stimulates the learner to change their current situation in order to approximate either the ideal or the ought to self-image by engaging in activities to stimulate language learning. In brief, the L2 self-model proposes three primary sources of motivation: the internal factors (i.e., the ideal L2 self), the external factors (i.e., the ought to L2 self), and the learners' L2 experience (i.e., attitudes and emotions). The L2 experience is particularly important because it comprises the dynamic factors of attitudes and emotions such as enjoyment and anxiety, factors that have been shown to shape learner motivations, which in turn dictate learner behaviors and learning outcomes.

Research into the relationship between L2 learning experience and emotions have mainly studied the variable of anxiety, and results show that the experience of anxiety in the language learning context can trigger a variety of negative effects that can severely inhibit progression in SLA (Gardner et al. 1992). For instance, learners who experience foreign language anxiety tend to avoid situations where they would be required to speak the foreign language; this, combined with a fear of negative evaluation, inhibits them from enrolling in courses mediated through a foreign language. In fact, this is why some researchers have emphasised the importance of implementing strategies to reduce language anxiety in EMI classrooms (Hengsadeekul et al. 2014) or increasing risk-taking. In line with this, Pyun et al. (2014) advocate the importance of encouraging risk-taking in the L2 classroom and how it is positively related to language achievement and linguistic

self-confidence. In contrast, others report that a certain degree of anxiety can actually encourage learners to work harder to achieve their language learning goals. This seems to be especially true of learners who are oriented towards the ought to L2 self rather than ideal L2 self (Gao 2008). In point of fact, Teimouri (2017) and Li (2014) reported that ought to learners were more driven and better able to focus their anxiety for positive outcomes compared to ideal L2 self-learners, who tended to be more driven by enjoyment. Compared to anxiety, research into other emotions such as enjoyment or attitudes towards the L2 is limited, which is a contribution the present study would like to make.

2.3 Motivation and attitudes in EMI

Regarding motivations and attitudes, EMI learners may be different from their non-EMI peers in a number of ways. Firstly, EMI learners seem to have more positive and constructive attitudes towards languages and learning (Rivero-Menédez et al. 2017). Additionally, it seems that when ought to self-motivated students choose to study via EMI, it is because they anticipate an eventual payoff or reward in the future, while highly ideal L2 self-motivated students enroll in EMI because they perceive themselves as academically competent and tend to be more persistent and confident (Li 2014). It has also been reported that many learners in Europe consider English to be a natural incorporation in higher education and a necessary tool for career advancement. These attitudes and beliefs seem to foster the development of hybrid identities and positive attitudes towards incorporating English into their lives, and thus, the creation of both a local and a global identity (Henry and Goddard 2015).

While a large body of research exists on motivation and SLA, relatively few studies have investigated motivations and attitudes in the EMI context but with some exceptions. Gao (2008) followed Chinese EMI students in Hong Kong during their first two years at university and noted that their motivations towards English changed over time. Specifically, learners started off more ought to self-oriented, and became more ideal L2 self-motivated. The author suggested that both the learners' prior learning experiences and societal pressures were factors that impacted on their initial motivational orientations and that their orientations changed for three reasons: (i) a rapid increase of personal experiences using English for authentic communication, (ii) personally meaningful and interest in speaking English, and (iii) the experience of moments where the learner identified with English. In actual fact, the learners began to integrate their new experiences and began to construct their ideal L2 self, thus transforming their motivational orientation. Similarly, Wang and Liu (2017) followed Chinese learners studying

German over two university years and reported that learners' ideal L2 selves strengthened while the students were attending the course, but then weakened again with time, while the ought to L2 self-orientation just seemed to weaken over time. These changes were thought to relate to the emotions that learners experience in the context of learning, the opportunities to use the language outside class, and learners' attitudes towards the language. In line with these studies, Chen and Kraklow (2015) compared EMI and non-EMI students in Taiwan. Participants' motivations towards English and engagement with the language in internationalization in the home¹ context were measured. EMI learners were found to have higher levels of ideal self-motivation and engagement with English.

Turning to the Spanish context, Rivero-Menéndez et al. (2017) compared EMI and non-EMI Business Administration students in Madrid, where they reported that EMI learners were more self-confident and motivated in their EMI courses. The authors also noted that EMI learners were willing to dedicate more time to their courses and had better learning strategies than non-EMI learners. In a different study, Lasagabaster (2016) analyzed EMI motivations among undergraduates in the Basque country and found that in an EMI context motivation was created by the strengthening of learners' ideal L2 selves through their L2 learning experiences, attitudes and emotions; furthermore, they were strongly influenced by family and other societal pressures. To summarize, studies show that learners tend to begin their university careers with strongly developed ought to L2 self-orientations and that over time, motivation orientation shifts and a stronger ideal L2 self is developed. This is thought to be cultivated through positive, authentic and personally meaningful L2 experiences, although some research also highlights the strong influences family and prevention have on learner motivational orientation.

2.4 Individual differences and pragmatic learning

The importance of correct PM usage is a key element in language fluency (House 2013). Individual differences and pragmatic learning carry out essential and complex functions in conversation, so much so, that they are considered to be one of the key elements in communicative competence (Shively 2015). Without a strong grasp of the accurate use of these markers, learners may become lost by failing to properly interpret discourse cues. They are equally likely to be misunderstood for reasons such as not adequately signposting, or not marking the relationship of

¹ 'Internationalization at home' is a process whereby the learners' who study at their home institutions can reap the benefits of international exposure via interaction with international students studying at their local university (Llurda et al. 2013; Thøgersen 2013).

distinct parts of discourse or by not marking how their discourse relates to the context. Under a functional pragmatic approach, PMs may belong to one of two categories depending on their function: interpersonal or textual (Andersen 2001). Interpersonal PMs are thought to express social functions and show the speaker's relationship towards what is being communicated. They also mark their own and their interlocutor's relationship to an utterance (Andersen 2001). Furthermore, interpersonal PMs maintain and encourage interaction, manage and create interpersonal relationships, and as such, are closely related to and reflect one's identity (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004). In contrast, textual markers are used to express relationships between units of discourse and involve how the speaker perceives the structural relationship between utterances. These markers are more closely related to organizational competence, logically structuring and marking arguments, and explaining processes clearly; they are closely related to grammatical accuracy (Bachman and Palmer 1996) and are what is typically taught in L2 classrooms.

Studies on PMs have found that learners tend to use these items for a much narrower scope and less frequently than NSs do. For example, Bu (2013) found that while learners used the same PMs as NSs, they did not use them for the same functions as the NSs, resulting in both a restricted range and an unnatural use of PMs. It has also been found that exposure makes a difference, as shown in Liu (2016), who compared a high and low exposure group and found that the high exposure group used PMs at a higher rate than the low exposure group. Similarly, Fung and Carter (2007) investigated the types of PMs used, and found that learners in instructed L2 contexts used textual markers very frequently and interpersonal markers more sparingly, and that NSs used PMs for a much wider variety of functions. Similar results were found by Ament and Barón-Parés (2018) who compared EMI and non-EMI learners and found that EMI students produced more PMs than non-EMI and that EMI students signposted more clearly through the use of more structural PMs² while non-EMI used more referential PMs³. In another study by Ament et al. (2018), it was found that both full-EMI and semi-EMI increased the frequency and variety of PM use over a two-year period, however, only the full-EMI group experienced an increase in the use of textual markers. It seems that the outcomes were due to the context of learning. In brief, it seems that learners are slow to acquire PMs and they tend to use them at different frequencies and in different varieties when compared to NSs. When considering types of PMs used, it seems that textual PMs are acquired more easily and rapidly than interpersonal markers especially through instructed and EMI learning contexts.

2 Used for functions such as to open and close topics, mark sequences, and summarise.

3 Used for functions such as to show cause, contrast, or consequence.

The present study is exploratory in nature and seeks to shed light on the relationship between the IDs discussed here and their relationship with pragmatic learning, which has not been addressed thus far. Furthermore, there are no studies investigating how motivation affects the learning of PMs thus. The present study aims to contribute to this research area specifically by answering the following research questions:

1. Are there differences *between* full-EMI and semi-EMI groups according to the IDs, ideal L2 self, ought to self, and L2 learning experience? When compared all together, at the second year, and at the third year of studies.
2. Are there differences *within* the full-EMI and semi-EMI groups according to the IDs, ideal L2 self, ought to self, and L2 learning experience? When comparing second to third-year students.
3. Are there any relationships between learner's IDs, ideal L2 self, ought to self, and L2 language experience and PM use?

3 Methodology

3.1 Design and participants

The participants were 96 students enrolled in an undergraduate degree at a university in Catalonia. A cross-sectional design was adopted, in which four different groups were studied and compared: IM2 (full-EMI second-year students), IM3, (full-EMI third-year students), SIM2 (semi-EMI second-year students), and SIM3 (semi-EMI third-year students). The participants in the full-EMI groups were enrolled on an International Business degree in which all courses are EMI. The participants in the semi-EMI groups were enrolled on either an Economics or Business Administration degree in the same faculty but had only two EMI courses per year. Each degree program consists of 420 contact hours per academic year, thus the exposure for the full-EMI group is 420 h per year, while the semi-EMI group had an exposure of 35 h per year. Results from the language background questionnaire are reported in Table 1. In addition, the questionnaire revealed that 88% of the participants were Spanish/Catalan bilinguals, while 12% were from other language backgrounds. All participants reported English as a third language.

Table 1: Participants, design, and hours of exposure to EMI.

Groups	IM2	IM3	SIM2	SIM3
Number	21	25	24	26
Age	19	20	19	20
Cumulative hours of EMI	840	1260	35	70

3.2 Instruments

Six instruments were used for data collection. These were four questionnaires: a language background questionnaire, a language proficiency test, a motivational questionnaire, and an L2 anxiety and enjoyment questionnaire. There were also two oral tasks: a monologue and an interaction task. All instruments were piloted before the study and were found to be effective and adequate at eliciting the desired type of language (Ament and Barón-Parés 2018).

In order to control for language proficiency at the onset of the study, a language background questionnaire was administered, which established the participants' previous exposure to English as well as their English language learning backgrounds. Thus, the online Cambridge placement test was administered to control for proficiency and all participants were found to score between a B2 and C1 level.

To measure the motivational self-orientation, originally identified by Dörnyei (2009), a motivational questionnaire based upon well-established questionnaires previously adopted by other researchers (Lasagabaster 2016; Taguchi et al. 2009; Teimouri 2017) was used, with a slight adaptation to fit our EMI context. The motivational questionnaire also included questions regarding the factor of attitude relating to L2 learning experience. There were 36 items, 12 questions targeting each of the three variables. Participants responded according to a 5-point Likert scale and were given a total score for each type of motivational orientation. Then, in order to measure the other two factors related to L2 learning experience, an L2 anxiety and enjoyment questionnaire was designed. It was based on Dewaele and MacIntyre's (2014) questionnaire, which was originally created by Horwitz et al. (1986). The questions were adapted to fit our EMI context. The questionnaire contained 26 items. Participants responded according to a 5-point Likert scale and were given a total score for each anxiety and enjoyment scales.

The monologue task (henceforth MON) was completed individually. Participants were asked to introduce themselves to the researcher and included information regarding the languages they spoke, their English language learning experience, which degree they were taking and why they had chosen to take it in English. This task was used since it has been found that learners are required to maintain longer stretches of speech, thus stimulating the need for increased discourse marking (Cribb 2012; González 2005). On the other hand, the interaction task (henceforth INT) required participants to engage in conversation with another participant. Participants were asked three different questions that were related to their field of study. This method of data collection was chosen because this type of procedure can elicit interpersonal functions, coordinated speaker-listener functions, turn-taking, and back-channeling, and also due to the fact that it has been

argued that elicited conversation can tap into learners interactional competence, which involves the management of PMs (Kasper and Rose 2002).

3.3 Procedure

Participants completed the questionnaires and the proficiency test online prior to the oral data collection. Oral tests were carried out in sound attenuated cabins. The MON task was carried out first and the participants were given 2 min to record their responses. This was followed by the INT task in which participants were organized into pairs, and recorded. Participants were asked to discuss each question for 2 min.

3.4 Analysis

The motivational and L2 anxiety and enjoyment questionnaires were analyzed by totalling the score of each participant; reverse worded questions were corrected before tallying the scores. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was calculated for each of the variables on the questionnaires, the values are ideal L2 self 0.332, ought to self 0.749, attitudes towards English 0.535, anxiety 0.908 and enjoyment 0.641. All Cronbach's alpha scores were within the acceptable to excellent range with the exception of the ideal L2 self-measurement. The results regarding this variable are drawn bearing this in mind.

Audio recordings were transcribed in CLAN and the transcriptions were checked twice to ensure accuracy. Following that, and on the basis of previous studies (Andersen 2001; Ament et al. 2018; Fischer 2013), each PM used and transcribed was tagged, according to the specific function the marker performed in the given context, within either the interpersonal or the textual category. This was done by examining the context before and after the item. Table 2 includes examples from the data, which were coded as interpersonal PMs, and Table 3 includes examples from the data, which were coded as Textual PMs. In order to ensure accuracy of coding, the researchers were very strict when controlling the coding; one researcher performed two checks on all coded data, and another researcher re-coded 25%. Any discrepancies were discussed and an agreement was made on how to code them.

In order to address the research questions established above, and to detect significant differences between and within the groups, independent samples *t*-tests were carried out using SPSS. Pearson correlations were conducted to detect any relationships between PM use and the ID variables measured. In preparing the data for analysis, the assumptions for normality and homogeneity were tested and met.

Table 2: Interpersonal PMs: functions and examples of items from the data.

Functions of interpersonal markers	Items found in the data
To signal receipt of information	<i>Okay, right, yeah</i>
To show support to the interlocutor	<i>Okay, great, I know, exactly, sure</i>
To align oneself with the speaker	<i>Exactly, I agree, totally, yeah</i>
To signal joint construction of knowledge	<i>I agree, totally, that's right, yes, exactly, and, in addition</i>
To stimulate interaction	<i>Right? Yeah? Really? Great!</i>
To hesitate or show repair	<i>I mean, well, sort of, kind of, I think</i>
To denote thinking processes	<i>Well, I think</i>
To assess the interlocutor's knowledge	<i>Right? You know what I mean?</i>
To act as a hedging device	<i>I think I'm not sure, kind of, sort of, you know?</i>
To indicate attitudes	<i>I think, definitely, basically, absolutely, exactly</i>

Table 3: Textual PMs: functions and examples of items from the data.

Functions of textual markers	Items found in the data
To show causal relationships	<i>Because, so, and</i>
To indicate results/summary	<i>So, like, well, and, yeah</i>
To indicate conclusions	<i>Finally, then</i>
To mark contrast	<i>But, however, and, although</i>
To mark disjunction or digression	<i>Or, anyway, or something, or so, whatever</i>
To signal opening or closing of discourse	<i>Okay, right, alright, so, let's start, to conclude/ in conclusion, yeah, that's it, that's all</i>
To signal shifts or transition of discourse	<i>So, well, and then, and what about, and how about, and yeah, but</i>
To show temporal sequence	<i>First, firstly, secondly, next, then, finally, now, first of all</i>
To show the continuation of discourse	<i>And, yeah, because, so</i>
To elaborate or reformulate	<i>I mean, like, and, it's like, that is, for example</i>

4 Results

4.1 Full-EMI and semi-EMI compared: between-group differences in motivation, and L2 learning experience

Research question 1 inquired whether there were any differences *between* full-EMI and semi-EMI groups according to the IDs, ideal L2 self, ought to self, and L2

learning experience. To answer this question, three different tests were carried out. First, a comparison of all IM participants to all SIM participants was performed. Results showed no significant differences between the IM and SIM groups on the motivational scales, and between the groups according to their attitudes towards the L2 anxiety or enjoyment. Descriptive statistics for each group are reported in Table 4 and the results from the *t*-test comparing IM to SIM are reported in Table 5.

Secondly, a *t*-test was performed comparing the SIM2 and IM2 groups (see Table 5). No significant differences were detected on any of the scales measured. Thirdly, a *t*-test was performed comparing the SIM3 and IM3 groups (see Table 5). Results showed no significant differences.

4.2 Second and third year EMI compared: Within-group differences in motivation, and L2 learning experience

Research question 2 aimed at examining the differences *within* the full-EMI and semi-EMI groups according to the IDs, ideal L2 self, ought to self, and L2 learning experience. To answer this question, two tests were performed. First, a *t*-test was carried out on the data from the IM2 and IM3 groups (see Table 6). Results show a significant difference according to the ought to L2 self-orientation, the latter being higher at T2 for both groups as shown in Table 4. However, the other variables measured were not found to be statistically significant.

Second, a *t*-test was performed on the data from the SIM2 and SIM3 group (see Table 6). Results reveal the same pattern as with the IM groups, specifically, a statistically significant difference between the groups according to ought to L2 self-orientation. No other significant differences were detected between SIM2 and SIM3.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics according to group and motivational scales.

Motivational scales	IM2		IM3		SIM2		SIM3	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Ideal L2 self	16.43	3.19	16.60	3.49	18.54	5.52	17.19	4.71
Ought to self	21.95	6.45	28.04	11.32	22.13	9.23	27.27	7.81
L2 Attitudes	17.14	3.92	18.40	4.02	17.04	5.37	18.42	5.05
L2 Anxiety	13.00	5.48	13.84	5.31	13.79	4.83	14.46	4.90
L2 Enjoyment	21.14	4.00	21.40	5.05	20.63	3.91	22.27	3.87

Table 5: Between group differences.

Variable	Between IM and SIM modality differences			Between IM2 and SIM2 group differences			Between IM3 and SIM3 group differences		
	Degrees of freedom	t-test score	p-value	Degrees of freedom	t-test score	p-value	Degrees of freedom	t-test score	p-value
Ideal L2 self	94	1.51	0.134	43	1.543	0.130	49	0.509	0.613
Ought to self	94	0.242	0.809	43	0.072	0.943	49	0.284	0.778
L2 Attitudes	94	0.070	0.945	43	0.071	0.943	49	0.018	0.986
L2 Anxiety	94	0.658	0.512	43	0.515	0.609	49	0.435	0.666
L2 Enjoyment	94	0.228	0.820	43	0.439	0.663	49	0.691	0.493

4.3 An exploration of the relationship between IDs and PMs in EMI learners

Research question 3 aimed to identify whether there were any relationships between learners’ IDs and PM use. Consequently, Pearson correlations were carried out on the data analyzing the relationship between the amount of PMs used and the scores from the IDs questionnaires. Three trends emerged from the data. The first trend showed that the ought to L2 self-learner orientation positively correlated with the total PMs used $r(48) = 0.313$ $p = 0.002$, total interpersonal PMs used $r(48) = 0.230$, $p = 0.023$, and total textual PMs used $r(48) = 0.214$, $p = 0.034$. The second trend showed that the level of enjoyment positively correlated with an increased use of interpersonal PMs $r(48) = 0.206$, $p = 0.043$, and the third trend showed that a positive relationship was found between the ideal L2 self-orientation and attitudes $r(48) = 0.428$, $p = 0.00$.

Table 6: Within group differences.

Variable	Within IM2 and IM3 groups differences			Within SIM2 and SIM3 group differences		
	Degrees of freedom	t-test score	p-value	Degrees of freedom	t-test score	p-value
Ideal L2 self	44	0.173	0.864	48	0.933	0.355
Ought to self	44	2.283	0.028	48	2.135	0.038
L2 Attitudes	44	1.069	0.291	48	0.938	0.353
L2 Anxiety	44	0.527	0.601	48	0.489	0.629
L2 Enjoyment	44	0.189	0.851	48	1.495	0.141

5 Discussion

One of the main contributions of the present study is based on the results from research question one, which showed that full and semi-EMI participants seem to be more similarly motivated to use English than what might be expected. Indeed, in our results no motivational differences between the full-EMI and semi-EMI modalities were detected. This finding suggests that those students who opt for even a few hours of EMI courses are quite positive towards English just as the full-EMI learners are. It additionally suggests that participation in only a few classes of EMI can have the same positive benefits on attitudes and motivation towards English as participation in a full-EMI course does. These groups might be similar for a number of reasons. To begin with, as discovered by the background questionnaire, both groups come from similar demographics and have similar learning histories and exposure to English. They are also from the same cultural context, so they may experience similar external pressures and be subject to the same types of societal expectations. These factors might lead to similar motivational profiles when entering university. This finding also highlights the changing attitudes towards English in Spain and Europe at large, as confirmed by González Ardeo (2016) and Henry and Goddard (2015), who reported that Young Europeans today consider English a natural incorporation in higher education; moreover, there is a measurable increase in positive attitudes towards English amongst Spanish undergraduate students. These factors may thus account for the lack of difference between the groups focussed on in the current study. However, the trends uncovered show a complexity and variability of IDs, and more specifically motivation, in the study of SLA, which may help to complete the picture and complement what has been discovered thus far in the literature.

Our findings contrast with Rivero-Menéndez et al.'s (2017) who found that EMI learners were more motivated, worked harder, were more persistent and better time managers than non-EMI learners. They also contrast with findings in the Asian context since, as reported by Chen and Kraklow (2015), EMI learners were also more ideal L2 self-motivated compared to non-EMI learners and they scored higher on attitude measures than the non-EMI group. Such differences with our results might be due to the fact that the present study compared full-EMI to semi-EMI.

Regarding research question two, within-modality differences, the main contribution is that both EMI and semi-EMI behave similarly from year 2 to year 3 of their studies, irrespective of the EMI program they follow. Specifically, the third year students in both groups identify significantly more with the ought to L2 self-orientation than those in their second year of studies. A possible interpretation of this finding could be that in year three of their studies, as a result of their

encounters with English via EMI, learners collect more international experiences through an internationalization at home setting, and may begin to experience firsthand the external pressures to have a high proficiency in English (Leask 2015). It may be that these external pressures become a stronger reality in the third year of studies, which could be when they begin to look to future job prospects. These findings and interpretations parallel Lasagabaster's (2016) study, in which it was reported that family influence and instrumental factors drove the motivation orientation of his participants. Furthermore, the shift in motivations from year 2 to year 3 of studies may be due, in part, to the status of English in academia and current European society that drives both groups, to experience and internalize the external pressures to learn English, equally and increasingly over their degree program. This shift in motivational orientation was also reported in Gao's (2008) study, in which it was noted that learner motivations were dynamic and constantly changing. Although differently to Gao's participants, who became increasingly ideal L2 self-oriented, the learners in the present study became more ought to L2 self-oriented. To summarize, it seems that whether learners opt to study via EMI or not, they are keenly aware of the benefits, expectations, and future uses of English and its relationship to their careers, which seems to be a powerful ought to self-motivator. Thus, the experience of EMI may be a process whereby the needs and expectations of society come to the forefront and shift prominently into the reality of the learners' lives in a way they were not when they were attending high school or in previous education. As Lasagabaster (2016: 327) states "social factors are playing a paramount role in the widespread belief that English is an indispensable component of Spanish university students' cultural capital".

Finally, three main findings emerge regarding the relationship between IDs and PM use. Firstly, it seems that ought to L2 self-oriented learners tend to produce more PMs of both types, interpersonal and textual, which was not found in relation to the other motivational profiles. Consequently, more PMs were produced by third-year learners than second-year learners. This trend could be interpreted in two ways. Firstly, it could be that the third-year learners have had more exposure to EMI and thus have had more time to acquire and integrate more different functions of PMs into their use of English. Exposure to EMI has been shown to have positive effects on the use of textual PMs in particular, as was found in Ament et al. (2020), mainly thought to be due to the influence of readings, lectures and classroom interactions. Or interpreted in another way, the finding may be because the more ought to L2 self-oriented participants were increasingly motivated to communicate effectively through English. This and that may have caused them to notice the difference between their language production compared to target-like production, modelled through the lectures they receive, the readings they carry out, or the interactions they have with other English speakers in the EMI context.

Having contact with a variety of language functions would, according to the self-discrepancy model, have a positive impact on the learners and in this case help them incorporate more PMs into their language output. What is interesting about the findings from this study is that both textual and interpersonal markers were found to be used more frequently among the ought to self-motivated learners, in previous studies i.e., Ament et al. (2018) found that only textual markers were used more when measuring the effect of EMI hours on the use of PMs. This points towards the importance of the factor of motivation and how it interacts with pragmatic learning, in this case, ought to self-motivation positively impacts interpersonal PM use. The second discovery was that learners who score high on L2 enjoyment also tend to produce higher frequencies of interpersonal PMs. Interpersonal PMs seem to be more closely related to personal and affective factors than textual PMs are. For instance, textual markers are related to the grammatical aspects of language (Bachman and Palmer 1996) while the interpersonal ones are related to the social aspects of language (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004). This might be why ID factors such as enjoyment play a role in the use of interpersonal markers. Thus, this finding might be a reflection of their confidence and level of comfort when communicating through English. Increased confidence may lead them to engage with the language and their interlocutors more freely, additionally, they may be more comfortable when risk-taking and this may involve the confidence in themselves to properly incorporate new PMs and functions of those PMs into their speech. This interpretation is in line with Pyun et al.'s (2014) report that risk-taking was positively correlated with oral language achievement, as well as to Rivero-Menéndez et al. (2017) who found that confident learners performed better than those that were less self-confident. The third discovery is the relationship between ideal L2 self-learners and positive attitudes towards English. In fact, those who had positive attitudes towards English also tended to be able to easily imagine themselves becoming members of the English speaking community. This finding is in line with findings such as the ones by Lasagabaster (2016), Gao (2008), and González Ardeo (2016) who have suggested that it is through one's attitudes that one's motivational orientation can be changed.

6 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to contribute to what is known regarding IDs, and more specifically motivation and L2 learning experience, among EMI students, as well as to identify incidental pragmatic learning and whether there were any relationships between PM use and IDs. The main findings suggest that full-EMI and semi-EMI do not differ greatly according to the IDs measured. However, within-modality

differences were found, both groups were similarly and significantly more ought to self motivationally oriented in the third year compared to the second year of studies. Regarding the relationship between PMs and IDs, the ought to L2 self-motivated learners produced more PMs, both interpersonal and textual ones. Another correlation was confirmed between enjoyment and PM production. A limitation of the present study is that the data were cross-sectional, so the participants from year 2 to year 3 were different individuals, longitudinal data being ideal in any study. However, despite the limitations, the present study makes a valuable contribution in the way of IDs and motivation in the EMI context. Specifically, the fact that L2 self-motivation seems to be dynamic and constantly changing and that societal pressures are important, influences on young learners become more prominent from year 2 to year 3 of university studies. Regarding the relationship between IDs and the use of PMs, the study reveals that through self-confidence and a positive L2 learning environment, learners might be more apt to approach the target-like use of PMs. And finally, positive attitudes towards English and the L2 learning experience were shown to encourage stronger ideal L2 self-motivational orientation.

The implications of this study are that full-EMI programs may not be more beneficial than semi-EMI in either motivating students or linguistic outcomes. This can allow for more room for L1 education or other language education in the curriculum. More specifically, language learning programs and Language Centers might be able to contribute positively by encouraging and creating positive learning experiences for EMI students. This could aid learners in creating more positive ideal-L2 selves, as well as increased confidence and enjoyment, which would also have a positive impact on pragmatic learning and perhaps a greater impact on long-term language learning outcomes.

References

- Afungmeyu Abongdia, Jane-Francis. 2014. Ideologies and attitudes of foundation students at a multilingual university. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences MCSEER Publishing* 5(4). 415–422.
- Alcón, Eva & Pilar Safont Jordà. 2008. Pragmatic awareness in second language acquisition. In Jasone Cenoz & Nancy H. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language Education*, vol. 6, 193–204. The Netherlands: Springer Science and Business Media LLC.
- Ament, Jennifer R. & Júlia Barón-Parés. 2018. The acquisition of pragmatic markers in the English-medium instruction context. In Carmen Pérez-Vidal, Sonia López-Serano, Jennifer R. Ament & Dakota Thomas-Wilhelm (eds). *Learning effects: study abroad, formal instruction and international immersion classrooms. EuroSLA Studies*, vol. 1, 44–74. Berlin: Language Science Press.

- Ament, Jennifer R., Júlia Barón-Parés & Carmen Pérez-Vidal. 2020. On the use of textual pragmatic markers, a comparison between native speakers and English-medium instruction learners. Special edition: Pragmatic Markers and their Functions: Applied Perspectives. *The Journal of Pragmatics* 156. 41–53.
- Ament, Jennifer R., Carmen Pérez-Vidal & Júlia Barón-Parés. 2018. The effects of English-medium instruction on the use of textual and interpersonal pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics* 28(4). 517–546.
- Andersen, Gisle. 2001. *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation*. Philadelphia, NL: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bachman, Lyle F. 1990. *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, Lyle F. & Adrian S. Palmer. 1996. *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barón, Júlia & María Luz Celaya. 2010. *Developing pragmatic fluency in an EFL context*. *EuroSLA Yearbook*, vol. 10, 38–61. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Block, David. 2003. *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Bu, Jiemin. 2013. A study of the acquisition of discourse markers by Chinese learners of English. *International Journal of English Studies JN - International Journal of English Studies* 13(1). 29–50.
- Chen, Yih-Lan Ellen & Deborah Kraklow. 2015. Taiwanese college students' motivation and engagement for English learning in the context of internationalization at home: A comparison of students in EMI and non-EMI programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 19(1). 46–64.
- Coetzee-Van Rooy, Susan. 2006. Integrativeness: Untenable for world Englishes learners? *World Englishes* 25(3–4). 437–450.
- Cribb, Michael. 2012. Semantic and pragmatic miscues in non-native spoken extended discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(1). 71–82.
- Crystal, David. 2003. *English as a global language*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Csizér, Kata & Zoltán Dörnyei. 2005. Language learners' motivational profiles and their motivated learning behaviour. *Language Learning* 55(4). 613–659.
- Deci, Edward L. & Richard M. Ryan. 1985. The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. *Journal of Research in Personality* 19(2). 109–134.
- Dewaele, Jean-Mark. 2015. On emotions in foreign language learning and use. *The Language Teacher* 39(3). 13–5.
- Dewaele, Jean-Mark & Peter. D. MacIntyre. 2014. The two faces of Janus? Anxiety and enjoyment in the foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 2. 237–274.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2009. L2 Motivational self system. In Zoltán Dörnyei & Emma Ushioda (eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*, vol. 59, 9–42. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Eagly, Alice H. & Shelly Chaiken. 1993. *The psychology of attitudes*. Washington: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Fischer, Kerstin. 2013. Discourse markers. In Klaus P. Schneider & Anne Barron. (eds.) *The Encyclopedia of applied linguistics*, vol. 57, 1743–1738. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Fung, Loretta & Ronald Carter. 2007. Discourse markers and spoken English: Native and learner use in pedagogic settings. *Applied Linguistics* 28(3). 410–439.

- Gao, Xuesong. 2008. Shifting motivational discourses among mainland Chinese students in an English medium tertiary institution in Hong Kong: A longitudinal inquiry. *Studies in Higher Education* 33(5). 599–614.
- García-Mayo, María del Pilar & Amparo Lázaro-Ibarrola. 2015. Do children negotiate for meaning in task-based interaction? Evidence from CLIL and EFL settings. *System* (54). 40–54.
- Gardner, Robert C. 2001. Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. In Zoltán Dörnyei & Richard Schmidt (eds.) *Motivation and second language acquisition*, 1–19. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- Gardner, Robert C. 2007. Motivation and second language acquisition. *Porta Linguarium* 8. 9–20.
- Gardner, Robert C., Jenny B. Day & Peter D. MacIntyre. 1992. Integrative motivation, induced anxiety, and language learning in a controlled environment. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 2. 197–214.
- González Ardeo, Joseba M. 2016. Engineering student's instrumental motivation and positive attitude towards learning English in a trilingual tertiary setting. *Ibérica* 32. 179–200.
- González, Montserrat. 2005. Pragmatic markers and discourse coherence relations in English and Catalan oral narrative. *Discourse Studies* 7(1). 53–86.
- Halliday, Michael, Alexander Kirkwood & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hasselgreen, Angela. 2004. Testing the spoken English of young Norwegians. *Studies in Language Testing* 29(3). 486–487.
- Hellekjær, Glenn Ole & Anne Inger Hellekjær. 2015. Is anglophone complacency a virtue of necessity? The gap between the need for and supply of occupational second foreign language skills in Norwegian business and government. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 59(2). 143–161.
- Hengsadeekul, Chadarat, Chadarat Koul & Sittichai Kaewkuekool. 2014. Motivational orientation and preference for English-medium programs in Thailand. *International Journal of Educational Research* 66. 35–44.
- Henry, Alastair & Angela Goddard. 2015. Bicultural or hybrid? The second language identities of students on an English-mediated university program in Sweden. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 14(4). 255–274.
- Higgins, Tory E. 1987. Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review* 94(3). 319–340.
- Horwitz, Elaine K., Michael B. Horwitz & Joann Cope. 1986. Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal* 70(2). 125–132.
- House, Juliane. 2013. Developing pragmatic competence in English as a lingua franca: Using discourse markers to express (inter)subjectivity and connectivity. *Journal of Pragmatics* 59. 57–67.
- Housen, Alex. 2012. Time and amount of L2 contact inside and outside the school—Insights from European schools. In Carmen Muñoz (ed.), *Intensive exposure experiences in second language learning*, vol. 65, 111–140. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Kasper, Gabriele, & Kenneth R. Rose. 2002. *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language. Language Learning*, vol. 52. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Lasagabaster, David. 2016. The relationship between motivation, gender, L1 and possible selves in English-medium instruction. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 13(3). 315–332.
- Leask, Betty. 2015. *Internationalizing the curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Li, Qi. 2014. Differences in the motivation of Chinese learners of English in a foreign and second language context. *System* 42(1). 451–461.

- Liu, Binmei. 2016. Effect of L2 exposure: From a perspective of discourse markers. *Applied Linguistics Review* 7(1). 73–98.
- Llurda, Enric, Josep M. Cots & Lurdes Armengol. 2013. Expanding language borders in a bilingual institution aiming at trilingualism. In Hartmut Haberland, Dorte Lønsmann & Bent Preisler (eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education*, 203–222. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer Science and Business Media LLC.
- LoCastro, Virginia. 2001. Individual differences in second language acquisition: Attitudes, learner subjectivity, and L2 pragmatic norms. *System* 29(1). 69–89.
- MacIntyre, Peter D. 2007. Willingness to communicate in the second language: Understanding the decision to speak as a volitional process. *The Modern Language Journal* 91(4). 564–576.
- Masgoret, Anne-Marie & Richard C. Gardner. 2003. Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language Learning* 53(S1). 167–210.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2006. Natural codeswitching knocks on the laboratory door. *Bilingualism* 9(2). 203–212.
- Pavlenko, Aneta & Adrian Blackledge. 2004. Introduction: New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities. In Aneta Pavlenko & Adrian Blackledge (eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*, vol. 45, 1–33. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pérez-Vidal, Carmen. 2015. Languages for All in Education: CLIL and ICLHE at the Crossroads of Multilingualism, Mobility and Internationalisation. In Maria Juan-Garau & Joana Salazar-Norguera (eds.), *Content-based Language Learning in Multilingual Educational Environments*, vol. 23, 31–50. Switzerland: Springer.
- Pyun, Danielle O., Jung Sup Kim, Hyun Yong Cho & Jung Hee Lee. 2014. Impact of affective variables on Korean as a foreign language learners' oral achievement. *System* 47. 53–63.
- Rivero-Menéndez, Ma José, Elena Urquía-Grande, Pilar López-Sánchez & Maria del Mar Camacho-Miñano. 2017. Motivation learner strategies in Accounting: Are there differences in English as a medium of instruction (EMI) vs. non EMI learners? *Spanish Accounting Review* 21(2). 128–139.
- Ryan, Stephen & Zoltán Dörnyei. 2013. The long-term evolution of language motivation and the L2 self. In Berndt A. (ed.), *Fremdspachen in der Perspektive lebenslangen Lernens*, 89–100. Frankfurt.
- Shively, Rachel. L. 2015. Developing interactional competence during study abroad: Listener responses in L2 Spanish. *System* 48. 86–98.
- Taguchi, Tatsuya, Michale Magid & Mostafa Papi. 2009. The L2 motivational self system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Zoltán Dörnyei & Ema Ushioda (eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self Language*, 66–97. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Teimouri, Yasser. 2017. L2 Selves, emotions, and motivated behaviours'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 39(4). 681–709.
- Thøgersen, Jacob. 2013. Stylistic and pedagogical consequences of university teaching in Europe. In Harmut Haberland, Dorte Lønsmann & Bent Preisler (eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education*, 181–199. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer Science and Business Media LLC.
- Trenchs-Parera, Mireia. 2009. Effects of formal instruction and a stay abroad on the acquisition of native-like oral fluency. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 65(3). 365–393.

- Ushioda, Ema. 2009. A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity. In Zoltán Dörnyei & Ema Ushioda (eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*, vol. 36, 215–228. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Wachter, Bernd & Friedhelm Maiworm. 2014. *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The state of play in 2014*. Bonn: Lemmens Medien GmbH.
- Wang, Tianyi & Yongcan Liu. 2017. Dynamic L3 selves: A longitudinal study of five university L3 learners' motivational trajectories in China. *The Language Learning Journal* 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1375549>.
- Yashima, Tomoko & Kumiko Arano. 2015. Understanding EFL learners' motivational dynamics: A three-level model from a dynamic systems and sociocultural perspective. In Zoltán Dörnyei, Alastair Henry & Peter D. MacIntyre (eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning*, 285–314. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.