

## **MOTIVATIONAL SELF SYSTEM AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOLS STUDENTS IN URBAN AND RURAL PLACE**

**Alif Alfiah**

English Education, Faculty of Language and Art, Universitas Negeri Surabaya  
alifalfiah16020084024@mhs.unesa.ac.id

### **Abstrak**

Penelitian ini menyelidiki sistem motivasi diri dalam Bahasa kedua dari siswa sekolah menengah di perkotaan dan pedesaan. Hal ini bertujuan untuk menemukan apakah ada sistem motivasi diri dalam Bahasa kedua yang berbeda dari siswa di dua tempat belajar yang berbeda dan dua tingkat belajar yang berbeda. Angket disebarkan ke murid sekolah menengah di Surabaya dan Lamongan dan hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa aspek ideal L2 self mendapat nilai tertinggi di descriptive statistic dari dua tempat belajar yang berbeda. Kemudian, independent t-test menunjukkan bahwa siswa di kota dan desa mengalami perbedaan kondisi pembelajaran yang menyebabkan mereka mendapat dukungan yang berbeda dalam pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris. Hasil lain yang berbeda juga ditemukan di aspek lain yang berhubungan keciali aspek kecemasan berbahasa, pengaruh teman sebaya, dan pengaruh keluarga. Selanjutnya, siswa menengah bawah dan siswa menengah atas ditemukan berbeda secara statistic hanya di aspek pengalaman belajar di sekolah.

**Kata kunci:** Motivasi bahasa kedua, sistem motivasi diri, sekolah perkotaan dan pedesaan, siswa sekolah menengah

### **Abstract**

The current study investigated the L2 motivational self-system among students in secondary schools from urban and rural place. It was aimed to see whether any different L2 motivational self-system among students in two different learning places also in two different levels of study. The questionnaires were distributed to secondary schools' students in Surabaya and Lamongan and the result showed that ideal L2 self aspect got the highest score in descriptive statistic from the two different learning places. Later, the independent t-test indicated that students in urban and rural place experienced different learning environment that lead them to have different support in learning English. The other significant results were also found in the other related aspects except language anxiety, peer influence and family influence. Furthermore, junior high school and senior high school students were found statistically different only in aspect of L2 learning experience in school.

**Keywords:** L2 motivation, motivational self-system, urban and rural schools, secondary schools' students

### **INTRODUCTION**

Learning English as a foreign language is seen as a big challenge for students. As a foreign language, English is not used to communicate every day so that students are not familiar with the language in their daily. Some challenges such as he unfamiliar words, topics, and context appeared in the language learning due to the role of language that is not as the daily language (Hiew, 2012). Learners believe that English teachers were responsible for creating an excellent teaching-learning process so that they could learn the language quickly (Hiew, 2012). However, motivation also has an essential role in students' success in learning English. It is the most influential factor that affects the students' behavior because it brings a desire to do and experience activities that produce the efforts to learn the language (Khan, 2015). Therefore, the students' attainment in learning

language is affected by motivation. Teachers may detect the learners' achievement in learning L2 through observing their attitude toward the learning process that shows whether they are highly motivated or low motivated. According to Dörnyei, motivation is one of the parameters of students' achievement in learning English. Dörnyei and Skehan (2003: 589) state that besides the aptitude, motivation is also reliable to predict the students' learning achievement (Pickering et al., 2015). They claimed that motivation has a positive correlation with students' success in learning English (Pickering et al., 2015). Khan (2015) stated in his paper that Arabian students have low achievement in learning English due to their low motivation (Khan & Arabia, 2015). Additionally, motivation may support the students before and during learning so they could survive in the L2 learning process. Without motivation, someone who has a high ability will not get good results in L2 learning (Dörnyei, 2005).

Several factors are related to the level of learners' L2 motivation. Intrinsically, the interest of the students and the need for learning the second language may affect the motivation in second language acquisition (Ushioda, 2013). Then, motivation may be affected extrinsically by the language learners' social, cultural, linguistic, and economic context (Kormos & Kiddle, 2013). Regarding the external factor, one of the factors that affect motivation is the condition where the learning process takes place. For example, the students in urban schools might have a different motivation level with students in a rural school. However, the students' motivational level is very influential on students' achievement. Inequality of social classes between urban and rural areas that often occurred, especially in developing countries where learning English as a foreign language, often caused different achievements in education in each social class (Lamb, 2013). Martin Lam (2012) found that several schools in urban places had the same level and character of L2 motivation while it is different from schools in rural places (Lamb, 2012). Besides, the differences among learners might influence their level of L2 motivation. The study conducted by Anna Martinović (2018) concluded that the grades level and gender differences among learners brought a different level of L2 motivation (Martinović, 2018). Tae-Young Kim (2012) also found that there was a significant different L2 motivation among junior high school students and senior high school students (Kim & Kim, 2012).

In 2005, Dörnyei proposed the new framework of motivation named Motivational Self System. Currently, it is a relevant framework since it had been adjusted to global English. L2 Motivational Self System was defined as a reconceptualization of language learning motivation based on socio-educational (Dörnyei, 2009). It viewed the motivation as containing three main components, which are ideal L2 self, the ought-to self, and the learning experience (Dörnyei, 2005:217). Those three components lead this new framework differ from other models. The components included in this frame work were the important motivational identifications that come from the individual prospect (Dörnyei, 2009). The ideal L2 self is related to something inside the individual that raises the desires, hopes, aspirations to get what they want as the goals (Dörnyei, 2005:217). It means that it is the significant of the self as the language user in the future (Lamb, 2012). In addition, this model is not appropriate for pre-secondary students because their ideal selves emerged relatively unstable (Dörnyei, 2009). Then, ought-to L2 self is linked to external aspects come to meet other people's expectation. It refers to other people's belief towards the ought to possess someone due to duty, obligations, or responsibility (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009). It means that representation of someone's duty, obligations, or responsibilities require someone to learn English because other people expect that s/he could do so. While the learning experience is related to everything regarding the students learning process (Dörnyei, 2005:217),

it includes the learners' attitudes and responses during the learning process both inside or outside the classroom (Lamb, 2012). This framework is useful in measuring the students' level of motivation. The study conducted by Tae-Young Kim (2011) found that comparing with Gardner's (1985), the L2 motivational self-system framework predicts the students' self-motivation better (Kim & Kim, 2012). In addition, the finding also indicated that the ideal L2 self has a more prominent role than the ought-to self in students' L2 motivational self-system (Kim & Kim, 2012).

L2 motivational self-system has an important role in students' EFL learning. It may be a predictor of students' attainment in learning the language. A study conducted by Gholam Hassan Khajavy (2011) found that regarding L2 Motivational Self-System, the students' attainment in learning English are vary due to the various reasons underlying students' learning (Khajavy, 2011). Further, students tend to have more effort in the EFL learning if they have a high L2 motivational self-system. Azizah Rajab, Hamid Roohbakhsh Far, and Atika Etemadzadeh conducted a study examining the relationship between L2 motivational self-system and L2 learning and the finding shows that L2 motivational self-system affected the amount of students' effort in learning English (Rajab, et.al., 2012).

There should be a different level of motivation among learners due to the different interest, need, and external factor of each student. Therefore, it is quite clear that motivation among learners is different regarding the various background of the students. The difference that could affect students' motivation may appear from the language learners' social, cultural, linguistic, and economic context (Kormos & Kiddle, 2013). The differences among students bring a difference motivational self-system level. A study conducted by Maryam Azarnoosh and Parviz Birjandi (2012) found that gender difference among junior high school students affects their level of motivational self-system (Azarnoosh & Birjandi, 2012). Even though male and female students have the same attitude towards English learning, but they have a different tendency in L2 motivational self-system components. The finding indicates that female students have a higher level of Ideal L2 Self and intended effort while male students have a higher level of Ought-to L2 Self (Azarnoosh & Birjandi, 2012). Based on the study conducted by Lamb (2012) about students' motivational self-system among students in three learning settings found that regarding with L2 Motivational Self System, the most important factor that motivates the urban learners in second language acquisition is the role of parents. Moreover, the L2 Motivational Self System among students are different due to the difference in an educational setting in those three different learning setting (Lamb, 2012). In addition, the age of learning also affects the students' self-motivational system. Based on the study conducted by Tae-Young Kim (2011), elementary school students are

demotivated along with the increasing level of their education in older age (Kim & Kim, 2012).

L2 motivational self-system has not received due attention among English language teaching researchers. Most of the researchers focus on investigating the motivation in pedagogical and practical aspects, such as motivational strategies used by the teacher in a class (Ushioda, 2013). However, most of the few studies about L2 motivational self-system had been done abroad. There were a few studies investigated the L2 motivational self-system in Indonesia (Lamb, 2013; Cynara & Hadisantosa, 2018; Zansabil, 2019). In 2018 Xena Cynara and Nilawati Hadisantosa conducted a case study about the L2 motivational self-system among Indonesian undergraduate students. The finding was that the undergraduate students have four dominant variables from L2 motivational self-system, which are motivated learning behavior, language contact, ideal L2 self, and ought-to L2 self (Cynara & Hadisantosa, 2018). Another research had been done by Karima Zansabil (2019) investigating the relationship between L2 motivational self-system with L2 anxiety and school location among the tenth graders. The finding was that there was a significant difference in L2 attainment between urban and rural students due to the different L2 motivational self-system among two different school locations. However, it does not affect the students' anxiety both in a rural and urban school (Zansabil, 2019). Previously, Martin Lamb had conducted a study about L2 motivational self-system among urban and rural junior high school students, and the finding indicates that there was a different dominant variable among them due to the different learning settings. Nevertheless, those previous studies only take the participants from one level of study, takes both junior and senior high school students.

Considering the lack of scientific references on this topic in Indonesia, research about L2 motivational self-system is still needed. However, most of the previous studies focused in the aspect of pedagogy and practice. Therefore, the current study investigated L2 motivational self-system among high school students in the different learning place. The research problems were designed as follow:

1. What is the L2 motivational self-system of secondary school students in an urban and rural place?
2. Do the L2 motivational self-system of rural high school students differ from that of urban high school students?
3. Do the L2 motivational self-system of junior high school students differ from that of senior high school students?

This study was limited in the difference L2 motivational self-system among learners in the two different learning place and level of studies. Therefore, the results might not be generalized for all English learning context.

## **METHOD**

The current study used a quantitative approach with the ex-post-facto design. The data were gathered from the questionnaire that had been distributed to secondary schools' students in Lamongan and Surabaya. There were 53 second grades students in a junior high school and 56 second graders students in a senior high school form Surabaya. While from Lamongan, there were 50 second grades students a junior high school and were 50 second grades students in a senior high school. The questionnaire was adopted from the previous study by Martin Lamb (2012) which had been valid with alpha value .92.

There were four main criteria that measured in the questionnaire. First, criterion measure referred to students motivated behavior which consisted of five number of questions. Second, future self-guide consisted of six question about ideal L2 self and six question about ought-to L2 self. Third, other well-established motivational factors consisted of four learning experience in school, learning experience out of school, international posture, instrumentality, and language anxiety. There were four items of question in each variable except international posture which had five items of question. Last, social influence on L2 motivation consisted of four question about family influence, five question about peer influence, and three questions about teacher influence. All of the questions were formed as linked scale question with 1 for strongly disagree until 6 for strongly agree.

In collecting the data from each school, the researcher followed some procedures. First of all, the researcher came to the school to ask for permission to conduct the study in that schools. After getting the approval, the researcher made an appointment with the teacher. Lastly, the researcher came to the class and distributed the questionnaire. It spent about two months to came to the school one by one. The students were given about 40 minutes to fill the questionnaire. The order in which the researcher visited the school was a senior high school in Surabaya, a senior high school in Lamongan, a junior high school in Lamongan, and a junior high school in Surabaya. However, due to the pandemic situation, one school should have a different procedure. The data from a junior high school in Surabaya were collected online using online questionnaire that had been formed in google form.

The data collected from the questionnaire were entered into a statistical analysis software, which is SPSS 16. Then all of the data were analyzed using that software. The next step is computing the main value for each variable together with standard deviation mean in order to see to what extent mean of a determined variable reflects the sample. To answer the first research question, the data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics through computing the mean and standard deviation. Then, from the descriptive statistice, the

data were interpreted. After that, independent t-test will be used to answer the second and third questions. Lastly, the researcher interpreted the results of the descriptive statistics and the independent t tests.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Result

This study examined the L2 motivational self-system among students in high schools from urban and rural place in order to find out whether the L2 motivational self-system among them was different. It also examined the L2 motivational self-system L2 in two different levels of study in order to find out the L2 motivational self-system among them was different. The instrument used is a questionnaire adopted from Martin Lamb (2011).

### The L2 motivational self-system of secondary school students in an urban and rural place.

Firstly, the data were analyzed using descriptive statistic in SPSS in order to find out the L2 motivational self-system of secondary school students in an urban and rural place. Table 4.3. shows the result of the data analysis from 109 students in urban schools and 100 students in rural schools.

Scales Measured	Urban Schools (N=109)		Rural Schools (N=100)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Motivated learning behavior	21.46	3.77	22.58	4.22
Ideal L2 self	29.65	4.82	29.95	4.39
Ought-to L2 self	24.39	4.67	24.72	4.74
International posture	26.08	3.81	24.54	3.98
Instrumentality	20.01	3.05	18.33	3.71
L2 learning experience in school	15.89	2.64	16.90	2.97
L2 learning experience outside school	19.75	3.60	17.96	3.19
Language anxiety	16.57	4.78	17.30	4.03
Family influence	16.27	3.48	16.78	3.93
Peer influence	20.76	3.88	21.76	3.91
Teacher influence	14.07	2.78	15.29	2.45

Based on the table above, students in urban and rural place were mostly learn English because of their self-willingness. It was proved in the table statistic, the ideal L2

self has the highest score in urban schools with the mean score 29.66 and rural schools with the mean score 29.95.

Besides, their self-awareness in the importance of English for their future were statistically high as it showed in the table, for ought-to L2 self, urban students got 24.39 average score aspect, and rural students get 24.72 average score. Then, their environment outside schools might support them more in learning English since it got the higher average both in urban and rural schools. In urban schools, the mean was 15.89 for L2 learning experience in school, and 19.75 for L2 learning experience in outside school while in rural schools, the mean was 16.9 for L2 learning experience in school, and 17.96 for L2 learning experience in outside school.

Later, in the other influential aspects, urban students had 21.46 mean and rural students had 22.58 mean in motivated learning behavior which showed that their effort in learning English was quite high even in their outside schools environment. They also believed that English is useful for them in order to fulfill the requirement to pass their study to get a better future and they need English because the international exposure. It was indicated from the high mean in the statistic from urban place with 26.08 mean in international posture, and 20.02 mean in instrumentality also rural place with 22.54 mean in international posture and 18.33 mean in instrumentality. Then, their mean in the language anxiety were 16.27 in urban schools and 17.3 in rural schools. It showed that they were still tend to be anxious when they use English to communicate and even for practicing in the school.

Furthermore, peer influence aspect got the highest statistic score in the social influence. Urban students got 20.76 mean and rural students got 21.76 mean. It means that they had friends with a good attitude towards English who may be a reason for learning English. On the other hand, they had no enough support from their family in learning English as evidenced by the mean score of urban students was 16.27 and rural students was 16.78. Also, the teachers' support in their learning was showed not big enough since the mean of urban students was 14.07 and rural students was 15.29.

### Comparison of L2 motivational self-system of urban students and rural students

Secondly, to find out whether the L2 motivational self-system of rural high school students differs from that of urban high school students, independent sample t test was applied.

Table 4.1.2.1. Independent Samples Test of Urban Schools and Rural Schools

	<i>t</i>	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Motivated learning behavior	-2.029	207	.044
Ideal L2 self	-.467	207	.641

*Motivational Self System among Secondary Schools Students in Urban and Rural Place*

Ought-to L2 self	-.514	207	.608
International posture	2.862	207	.005
Instrumentally	3.602	207	.000
L2 learning experience in school	-	207	.010
L2 learning experience outside school	3.792	207	.000
Language anxiety	-	207	.236
Family influence	-	207	.318
Peer influence	-	207	.066
Teacher influence	-	207	.001

The table above shows the results of independent t tests among two groups. The result showed that there was a significant difference in the motivated learning behavior scores for students in urban place ( $M=21.46$ ,  $SD=3.76$ ) and rural place ( $M=22.58$ ,  $SD=4.22$ );  $t(207)=-2.03$ ,  $p=0.04$  with small size effect ( $\eta^2 = .02$ ) in the means (mean difference=-1.12, 95% CI: -2.21 to -0.03). It indicated that students in different learning place has a different learning. Urban students had different attitude toward English learning from rural students.

In the motivational self-system components, it found no significant difference in the ideal L2-self scores for urban ( $M=29.65$ ,  $SD=4.82$ ) and rural ( $M=29.95$ ,  $SD= 4.39$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=-0.47$ ,  $p=0.64$  with very small difference ( $\eta^2 = .001$ ) in the means (mean difference=-0.3 95% CI: -1.56 to 0.96). It meant that students in the different learning areas had the same belief in the use of learning English for them-selves and wanted to success in their learning to achieve other people expectation on them-selves. Other people in their environment areas required them to be good in English. It evidenced by the finding that no significant difference in ought-to L2 self for urban ( $M=24.39$ ,  $SD=4.67$ ) and rural high schools ( $M=24.72$ ,  $SD=4.74$ );  $t(207)=-0.51$ ,  $p=0.61$  with very small level of differences ( $\eta^2 = .001$ ) in the means (mean difference=-0.33, 95% CI: -1.62 to 0.95). However, learning experience's result showed that there was a significant difference in the L2 learning experience from urban high schools ( $M=15.89$ ,  $SD=2.64$ ) and rural high schools ( $M=16.90$ ,  $SD=2.97$ );  $t(207)=-2.6$ ,  $p=0.01$  with a small effect size ( $\eta^2 = .03$ ) in the means (mean difference=-1.01, 95% CI: -1.77 to -0.25). Students experienced different learning situation and environment in the different school locations due to the different teacher and class condition. The same result was found in the L2 learning experience outside school from urban high schools ( $M=19.75$ ,  $SD=3.60$ ) and rural high schools ( $M=17.96$ ,  $SD=3.19$ );  $t(207)=3.79$ ,  $p=0.00$  with very big effect size ( $\eta^2 = .06$ ) in the means (mean difference=1.79, 95% CI: 0.86 to 2.72). Students in urban rural place had different effort in learning English in outside school environment. They had different curiosity of English words and different interest in learning through song, film, and anything else in their around.

Afterwards, urban students and rural students had different interest toward the global world as they had the different desire to join in an international environment. It was showed from the results that there was a significant difference in the international posture scores for urban high schools ( $M=26.08$ ,  $SD=3.81$ ) and rural high schools ( $M=24.54$ ,  $SD=3.98$ ) students' motivation;  $t(207)=2.86$ ,  $p=0.005$ , with small ( $\eta^2 = .03$ ) size of the difference in the means (mean difference = 1.54, 95% CI: 0.48 to 2.61). The results also showed that there was a significant difference in the instrumentality scores for urban high schools ( $M=20.01$   $SD=3.05$ ) and rural high schools ( $M=18.33$ ,  $SD=3.71$ ) students' motivation;  $t(207)=3.6$ ,  $p=0.00$ . The size of the difference in the means (mean difference = 1.69, 95% CI: 0.76 to 2.61) was big ( $\eta^2 = .06$ ). It proved that students in urban and rural place had different intention in learning English for their need whether to support their hobbies, education, and even their future life.

Later, social influence aspect showed that there was no significant different in the family influence scores for urban high schools ( $M=16.57$ ,  $SD=4.78$ ) and rural high schools ( $M=16.78$ ,  $SD=3.94$ ) students' motivation;  $t(207)=-1.002$ ,  $p=0.32$ . The magnitude of the difference was very small ( $\eta^2 = .0004$ ) in the means (mean difference = -0.51, 95% CI: -1.52 to 0.5). It represented that there was same attitude toward family of urban students and rural students. Their family had the same perception and urgency in the students' English learning achievement so that students both in urban and rural place got the same support from their family to learn English. Besides, they also had at least a friend who had good attitude toward English and influenced them in learning English. Friends gave the same influence to students in two different places in learning English. As the result found no significant difference in the peer influence scores for urban ( $M=20.76$ ,  $SD=3.88$ ) and rural ( $M=21.76$ ,  $SD=3.92$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=-1.85$ ,  $p=0.07$ . It gave the small magnitude ( $\eta^2 = .02$ ) of difference in means (mean difference = -0.1, 95% CI: -2.06 to 0.07). On the other hand, a significant difference was found in the teacher influence scores for urban high schools ( $M=14.07$ ,  $SD=2.78$ ) and rural high schools ( $M=15.29$ ,  $SD=2.45$ ) students' motivation;  $t(207)=-3.34$ ,  $p=0.001$  with a quite big size effect ( $\eta^2 = 0.05$ ) in the teacher influence means (mean difference= -1.22, 95% CI: -1.93 to -0.5). It indicated that the role of teacher in the English learning gave the different influence toward the students English learning

in the different learning areas. Student in different schools' location had different support from their teacher.

Furthermore, there was no significant difference in the language anxiety scores for urban ( $M=16.57$ ,  $SD=4.78$ ) and rural ( $M=17.3$ ,  $SD=4.03$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=-1.19$ ,  $p=0.24$ . The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference =  $-0.73$ , 95% CI:  $-1.94$  to  $0.48$ ) was very small (eta squared =  $.006$ ). It showed that students from urban school had different level of anxiety from students from rural schools which means that what was felt by urban students when using English was different from what was felt by rural students.

### Comparison of L2 motivational self-system of junior and high school students

Lastly, to address how the L2 motivational self-system of junior high school students differs from that of the senior high school students, the data were analyzed using Independent sample t test. There were 103 participants from junior high schools and 106 participants from senior high schools.

Table 4.1.2.1. Independent Samples Test of Junior High School and Senior High School

	<i>t</i>	Df	Sig. (2- tailed)
Motivated learning behavior	1.536	207	.126
Ideal L2 self	1.267	207	.206
Ought-to L2 self	.259	207	.796
International posture	1.881	207	.061
Instrumentally	1.770	207	.078
L2 learning experience in school	4.015	207	.000
L2 learning experience outside school	1.571	207	.118
Language anxiety	-.672	207	.502
Family influence	.122	207	.903
Peer influence	-.304	207	.761
Teacher influence	1.208	207	.229

The results above shows that a significant difference was only found in the L2 learning experience in schools. In the motivated learning behavior the result showed that there was no significant difference scores for junior ( $M=22.43$ ,  $SD=4.2$ ) and senior ( $M=21.58$ ,  $SD=3.81$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=1.54$ ,  $p=0.126$ . The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference =  $0.85$ , 95% CI:  $-0.24$  to  $1.94$ ) was very small (eta squared =  $.01$ ). It indicated that even though they were in the different level of study, junior high school students and senior high school students had the same attitude toward the English learning. They showed the same effort in their learning through the time that they had spent and anything that they had done for their learning.

In the motivational self-system components, the result showed that there was no significant difference in all components except the L2 learning experience outside school. It suggested that students in the two different levels of study had the same awareness in the use of English for them-selves. They expected the same future-self with a good English. It was proved in the statistic which found no significant difference in the ideal L2 self's scores for junior ( $M=30.2$ ,  $SD=4.74$ ) and senior ( $M=29.4$ ,  $SD=4.47$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=0.27$ ,  $p=0.206$  with very small (eta squared =  $.01$ ) magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference =  $0.81$ , 95% CI:  $-0.45$  to  $2.06$ ). Also, they were expected to be good in English by the people in their environment. People assumed that students in secondary levels of study would be good students if they mastered English. They had the same burden because of people's expectation. As it showed in the statistic that there were no any difference found in the ought-to L2 self from junior ( $M=24.63$ ,  $SD=4.77$ ) and senior ( $M=24.46$ ,  $SD=4.72$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=0.26$ ,  $p=0.796$  with very small (eta squared =  $.0003$ ) magnitude of the difference in the means (mean difference =  $0.17$ , 95% CI:  $-1.11$  to  $1.45$ ). The same result also found in the L2 learning experience outside school for junior ( $M=19.28$ ,  $SD=3.38$ ) and senior ( $M=18.57$ ,  $SD=3.44$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=1.57$ ,  $p=0.118$  with very small (eta squared =  $.01$ ) level of the difference in the means (mean difference =  $0.76$ , 95% CI:  $-0.19$  to  $1.72$ ). It represented that junior high school students and senior high school students experienced the same thing when they learning in the outside school environment. They had the same attitude toward English learning through something around them such as song, movie and so on. However, the L2 learning experience in school showed different result. There was a significant difference scores for junior ( $M=17.15$ ,  $SD=2.54$ ) and senior ( $M=15.62$ ,  $SD=2.92$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=4.02$ ,  $p=0.00$ , with quite big (eta squared =  $.07$ ) the level of the differences in the means (mean difference =  $1.52$ , 95% CI:  $0.78$  to  $2.27$ ). It meant that even though students were from different level of study, they had a similar learning situation and environment in school. They had the same perception about their class condition and the teacher they had for supporting their learning.

Later, from the other aspects of motivation, the result find that there was no significant different in the international posture scores for junior ( $M=25.86$ ,  $SD=3.67$ ) and senior ( $M=24.84$ ,  $SD=4.18$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=1.88$ ,  $p=0.061$ , with very small (eta squared =  $.02$ ) level of the differences in the means (mean difference =  $1.02$ , 95% CI:  $-0.05$  to  $2.1$ ). It showed that junior high students and senior highs students had the same ideas in the importance of English in the global world. They had the same need towards English language to communicate in the global world. As well as in the international posture, students in junior high school and senior high school also had the same ideas in the importance of English to full fill the requirement in their

education and even for their further need such as applying for a job. The statistic proved that there was no significant different in the instrumentality scores for junior ( $M=19.64$ ,  $SD=3.41$ ) and senior ( $M=18.79$ ,  $SD=3.52$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=1.77$ ,  $p=0.078$ , with very small ( $\eta^2 = .01$ ) level of the differences in the means (mean difference = 0.85, 95% CI: -0.1 to 1.73).

Furthermore, social influence aspect, there was no significant difference in the family influence scores for junior ( $M=16.54$ ,  $SD=4.02$ ) and senior ( $M=16.48$ ,  $SD=3.38$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=0.112$ ,  $p=0.903$ , with the very small ( $\eta^2 = 0.000$ ) size of the difference in the means (mean difference = 0.06, 95% CI: -0.95 to 1.08). It evidenced that families gave the same support to the students both in junior high level and senior high levels. They had the same attitude and concerns towards the students English learning. Beside family, friends gave the same influence the students English learning in junior high school and senior high school. Friends with a good attitude in English learning brought the same effect to students' performance in learning English. As the statistic result, that is there was no significant difference in the peer influence scores for junior ( $M=21.16$ ,  $SD=4.01$ ) and senior ( $M=21.32$ ,  $SD=3.84$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=-0.304$ ,  $p=0.761$ , with very small ( $\eta^2 = .002$ ) size of the difference in the means (mean difference = -0.17, 95% CI: -1.24 to 0.91). Then, teachers in junior high school and senior high school also gave the same influence to the students' attitude in learning English in. Students in the different levels of study got the same support from the teacher. As it evidenced in the statistic which found no significant difference for junior ( $M=14.88$ ,  $SD=2.58$ ) and senior ( $M=14.43$ ,  $SD=2.8$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=1.21$ ,  $p=0.229$ . The size of the difference in the means (mean difference = 0.45, 95% CI: -0.28 to 1.18) is very small ( $\eta^2 = .0003$ ).

Finally, the result shows that there was no significant difference in the language anxiety scores for junior ( $M=16.71$ ,  $SD=4.85$ ) and senior ( $M=17.12$ ,  $SD=4.03$ ) high schools;  $t(207)=-0.67$ ,  $p=0.502$ . The level of the differences in the means (mean difference = -1.63, 95% CI: 0.8 to 0.78) is very small ( $\eta^2 = .002$ ). It suggested that students in junior high school and senior high school experienced the same way when they practicing English in the class and using English in their daily.

## **Discussion**

### **The L2 motivational self-system of secondary school students in urban and rural place**

The analysis of descriptive statistic in table 4.4.1. found that in L2 motivational self-system, ideal L2 self aspect has the highest score in both urban and rural school. The previous study conducted by Zansabil (2019) also found that the ideal L2 self was scored highest in L2 motivational self-system

aspect. This finding is in line with the previous study conducted by Martin Lamb (2012) which found the ideal L2 self was the most important factor in students' motivation in learning English (Lamb, 2012). It indicates that students in urban and rural place were mostly learn English because of their self-desire

### **L2 motivational self-system among students in different school locations**

Later, the independent t test result shows that students in urban schools and rural schools had no significant different in the ideal L2 self and ought-to be self. However, they had a significant different in the learning experience. Students in rural school were seemed to be more enjoy learning language in school while the urban language were seemed to be more enjoy learning outside school. It was mentioned in the study conducted by Normazidah Che Musa, Koo Yew Lie, and Hazita Azman (2012) that students in rural school learn the language through a formal process which highly conceptualized through school experience because they had less environmental and community support outside schools (Musa, C. M., etc, 2012). In the other related factors, even though both rural and urban students believed that English is important for their future (Musa, C. M., etc, 2012), the finding was there was a significant different in the international posture and instrumentality. Afterwards, in language anxiety and the social influence aspects, the study found that urban students and rural students were statistically different only in the teacher influence. Contrasting with the current study, a previous study conducted by Rafael Alejo and Ana Piquer-Píriz (2016) found that there was a significant difference the family influence from urban schools' students and rural schools' students which urban families will give more support in the students learning due to their sociocultural background, also the slightly difference was found in the language anxiety which the rural students had the higher level of anxiety (Alejo, R., & Piquer-Priz, Ana., 2016).

### **L2 motivational self-system among students in different level of studies**

Lastly, in the different level of study, from all the aspect measured the difference was found only in the L2 learning experience in school. Junior high school students experienced more practice the L2 learning in school while senior high school students more focus on the theory due to the examination (Zhang, Q. M., & Kim, T. Y., 2013). However, this finding was in contrast with the previous studies. Maryam Azarnoosh (2014) found that there was a significant different in the L2 motivational self-system components as well as in the international posture which junior high school students were assumed to have the higher level in L2 motivational self-system while the higher level's

students were higher in the international posture (Azarnoosh, M., 2014). Previously, a cross-grade analysis by Qian-Mei Zhang & Tae-Young Kim found that there was the same finding in the international posture and peer influence junior high school students differ from senior high school students in the aspect of instrumentality which junior high school was statistically got the higher level as their objective in learning English was to fulfill the schools' requirement as same as in the social influence including family, friends and teacher influence because junior high school students would have more support from their social environment (Zhang, Q. M., & Kim, T. Y., 2013). Moreover, even though they believed that teachers' reward and penalties concept in the language learning were highly influenced them (Gbollie, C., & Keamu, H. P., 2017), their way in delivering the materials often affected the students desire in learning English (Azarnoosh, M., 2014). Regarding the language anxiety, the previous study found that senior high school students had significantly higher level of anxiety since they had lack of practicing the language in school (Ueki, M., 2013).

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study and the discussion in the previous chapter, there were some conclusions answered the research questions. First, the ideal L2 self was found as the highest scored in statistic among both urban schools' students and rural schools' students. While the smallest score was found in the aspect of teacher influence in both students from urban schools and rural schools.

Second, urban students and rural students were found in same level of motivational self-system in the ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self components. However, they were found different in the aspect of L2 learning experience where the urban students were scored higher in L2 learning outside school while rural students were scored higher in the L2 learning in school. In other related aspects urban students differ from rural students in the international posture and instrumentality. The social influence aspects this study found that there was no significant difference among secondary schools' students in urban and rural place for family influence and peer influence. However, they were statistically different in the family influence. This study also found that urban students and rural students had different level of language anxiety.

Third, based on the level of study, the finding of this study was there was no significant different in the level of student motivational self-system regarding some components which are the ideal L2 self, ought to L2 self, and the L2 learning experience outside schools. On the other hand, the significant difference was found in the L2 learning experience in school. Contrasting with the previous studies, from the other aspects measured there were no any differences found in this study.

## REFERENCES

- Alejo, R., & Piquer-Piriz, A. (2016). Urban vs. rural CLIL: an analysis of input-related variables, motivation and language attainment, *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2016.1154068
- Azarnoosh, M. (2014). When learning English is compulsory at school: Fluctuations in L2 motivational self system. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 3(6), 102-112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.6p.102>
- Azarnoosh, M., & Birjandi, P. (2012) Junior high school students' L2 motivational self system: Any gender differences? *World Applied Sciences Journal*. 20(4), 577-584. DOI: 10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.20.04.2732
- Cynara, X. & Hadisantosa, N. (2018). The L2 Motivational Self System Among Indonesian Learners of English: A Case Study.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005.). *The Psychology Of The Language Learner: Individual Differences In Second Language Acquisition*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Hiew, W. (2012). English Language Teaching and Learning Issues in Malaysia: Learners' Perceptions Via Dialogue Journal. *International Refereed Research Journal*, 3(1).
- Khajavy, G. H. (2011). L2 Motivation and Persinality as Predictors of Second Language Proficiency: Role of the Big Five Traits and L2 Motivational Self-System. *Canadian Social Science*. 7(6). 148-155.
- Khan, M. R. (2015). Analyzing the Relationship between L2 Motivational Selves and L2 Achievement: A Saudi Perspective, 2(1), 68-75. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijelt.v2n1p68>
- Kim, T., & Kim, T. (2012). The L2 Motivational Self System of Korean EFL Students : Cross-grade Survey Analysis.
- 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*, 20, 1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.03.006>
- Lamb, M. (2012). A Self System Perspective on Young Adolescents ' Motivation to Learn English in Urban and Rural Settings, (December), 997-1023. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00719.x>
- Lamb, M. (2013). Journal of Multilingual and ' Your mum and dad can ' t teach you !': constraints on agency among rural learners of English in the developing world, (October 2014), 37-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.697467>
- Martinovi, A. (2018). The L2 motivational self system : Differences among learners, 1, 133-157.
- Musa, N. C., Lie, K. Y., & Azman, H. (2012). Exploring English language learning and teaching in Malaysia. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies*, 12(1), 35-51.



- Pickering, A., Wilkinson, S., & Palombizio, C. (2015). The L2 Motivational Self System among Italian learners of English in the context of Italian public high school . An examination of the different facets of integrativeness in an EFL context.
- Rajab, A., et. al. (2012). The Relationship between L2 Motivational Self-System and L2 Learning among TESL Students in Iran. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science*. 66. 419-424.
- Ushioda, E. (2013). Motivation and ELT: Global Issues and Local Concerns. *International Perspectives on Motivation*.
- Ueki, M. (2013). L2 communication anxiety in relation to different communication partners: An empirical study in Japanese EFL classroom. *JACET Kansai Journal*, 15, 25-39.
- Zansabil, K. (2019). Indonesian Tenth Graders' L2 Motivational Self System: In Relation to L2 Anxiety and School Location. *RETAIN*, 7(2), 48-57.
- Zhang, Q. M., & Kim, T. Y. (2013). Cross-grade analysis of Chinese students' English learning motivation: A mixed-methods study. *Asia Pacific Education*, 14, 615-627. DOI 10.1007/s12564-013-9288-3