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ABSTRACT

The current paper reports on a partial replication of Rivers’ (2012) study which models the perceived value of compulsory undergraduate English classes in Japan. This study confirms that Rivers’ mixed methods approach identifies the value students, rather than governments and institutions, place on learning English by highlighting their motivations and investments towards using English as a foreign language. This paper outlines a recurring phenomenon of competing linguistic identity struggles between a nationalist identity and an imagined English user identity in an attempt to show the generality (Moerman, 1977) between Rivers’ context and the Balearic Island context. Although these students have different languages and come from different regions, the perceived values of the participants in the current study display similar perceived values concerning the purposefulness of learning English as foreign language (EFL) in reference to the increasing influence of English in non-English speaking countries. While this study uses similar mixed methods approaches to collect and analyze the data, it also highlights an additional selective code considering the EFL student values for engaging with English at the local level. Ultimately, the replication study not only confirms that Rivers’ model can be applied in similar contexts to identify the perceived value of compulsory English classes, it also discusses how the same understated and often undervalued student voices need to be addressed in ways like the ones seen in this study.

INTRODUCTION

Shortly after Kachru (1985) created the Three Circle model to explain the world’s relationship with English, the advent of the internet and open-source communication initiated a torrent of new members joining what Kachru described as the Expanding Circle (EC). While Kachru’s version of the EC originally included local people of various languages and
nationalities who have come into contact with *English as an International language* (EIL), in a way, it has become a black hole that has engulfed Kachru’s tidy Three Circle borders, positioning EIL at the center (Canagarajah, 2006). As a result, communication with speakers of other languages has not only become a likely event, but one that societies predict will be no more difficult than opening ones’ front door.

In light of this, societies in which English is not already a majority language in the educational systems or language policies have taken to promoting and, in some cases, mandating compulsory courses in EIL to prepare future generations for the influx of EIL (McKay 2002; Sharifian 2009a; Smith 1976). The foundations for such systemic mandates often rely heavily on the reigning government’s or educational institution’s investment into the imagined commodification of English (Grin, 2001). These investments are then used to promote English as a form of capital with which one could communicate in the global community, build on internationalist ideologies, create potential global economic growth, and gain access to future career opportunities (Brown, 2012). This trend of investment coupled with an increased demand for language testing has language education systems worldwide feeling an increased pressure to check off the English-speaking box.

With so much top-down influence over the importance of learning English, the need to consider the ideologies that influence the learners’ perceptions of the value of studying EFL becomes ever more pressing. One could ask how societies reposition themselves within the global context without losing their local linguistic identities and ideologies. Brown (2012) discusses the importance of acknowledging the value placed on learning English for local purposes in his chapter on EIL Curriculum Design and recommends framing curriculum and materials around a *locally defined EIL* (p. 149). In response to this recommendation, the current paper attempts to address this concern by replicating Damian J. Rivers’ 2012 study in which he models the perceived value of compulsory English classes in a Japanese university. In that article, he investigates, chronicles, and displays the often silenced linguistic identities of EFL learners, highlighting how these learners see themselves as future users of the language, how their local linguistic identity shapes or contrasts these values when learning EIL, and how all of these factors influence their overall perceived value of English.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Drawing on research from various arenas of language studies and social theory, the current paper attempts to define the values students place on the compulsory education of EIL. While much research has been done to discuss why students might study foreign languages, the compulsory aspect in which schools have been choosing the language of study leaves little room for them to express a sense of ownership over their language education. In light of this, Norton (2013) explains, that once a student can begin to understand how they interact with the societal constructs around them and how these interactions are shaped by their past and present, they are able to focus on how to shape and invest in their future selves. Furthermore, this newly created future self rests on the concept of an ever changing identity in which one’s investment into that identity is shaped through negotiations of agency. In respect to the learner’s agency, students who are left with no choice but to take compulsory English classes would, with a sense of agency, be able to find their own form of investment into pursuing whatever future endeavour they choose. At this point, the student’s imagination is revealed through Dörnyei’s (2009) L2 motivational self-system in which the ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and L2 learning self become apparent.

Students that begin to act these various identities out in fluid relation to their language studies, for instance, experience the internal and external pressures of the ought-to L2 self to actualize what is deemed to be a successful L2 language user. On the other hand, a student who experiences an enjoyable classroom atmosphere in conjunction with an engaging teacher who invests in individual student learning needs and desires, enjoys the benefits of actualizing the L2 learning self in lieu of the ought-to L2 self. Finally, when considering global and social constructs or if the education system is particularly interested in promoting EIL, the student might find themselves imagining their future ideal L2 self, one who engages fluently with other English speakers in future imagined communities. The focus for most of the students involved in the current study overwhelmingly include the ought-to and ideal L2 selves of Dörnyei’s (2009) L2 motivational self-system.
Ideologies and Social Constructs

If one considers that language has capital in power relations and that this capital is exchanged symbolically when it is used to position social groups with or against one another, for instance, then it is conceivable that this capital can begin to shape and reshape that social groups’ ideas, values, and belief systems, thus developing one shared ideological system of thought (Fairclough, 1992). In this study, I attempt to dig into the processes L2 learners go through in order to create linguistic capital and how these shared ideologies can display their internal struggle to maintain a sense of self in addition to a sense of community. Woolard (2016) highlights this sense of self when discussing speech and its relationship to identity. She explains how society often values speech for its multidimensionality of creating identity, “not just as an indexical sign associated with a particular group or type of person, but even as an iconic representation, a natural image of the essence of that person” (Woolard, 2016, p. 3).

Therefore, the ability to represent oneself is a form of linguistic capital, one which is undeniably entrenched within the social and geographic regions associated with that language. Thus, the languages’ relationship to a particular community generates a particular linguistic authenticity related to that community (Woolard, 2016, p. 3). When these semiotic systems push communities into making tough choices about their imagined selves and where they will invest their linguistic capital, the hierarchical structures within those social groups become evident (Scollon & Scollon, 2003).

While language ideologies are normally present but unseen, they often rise to the societal surface during conflicts over the hierarchy of languages. Changes in policies concerning how these languages are used and how this use perpetuates further power gains, has been considerably more relevant since English has begun infiltrating non-English speaking countries over the past few decades (Davis & Phyak, 2017). As seen in the current context and in Rivers’ (2012) study, members involved in these tug-of-war type contexts must navigate between maintaining one’s linguistic authenticity and authority as Castilian/Catalan or Japanese speakers while accepting themselves as members of the globalized multilingual English-speaking society. A specific example of this struggle is Catalonia’s campaign for linguistic autonomy during the Franco era in which minority language activism created a sense of linguistic territoriality and authority between speakers of Castilian and Catalan. Struggles like these reignite whenever
nationalist ideals attempt to disrupt the gains either societal group has managed to disseminate. Events like the one mentioned provide salient displays of “explicit and contentious discursive representations of language” (p. 7) and the ways in which society takes part in that public representation is, in effect, ideologically formed by power and the grapple for it (Fairclough, 1989, 1992).

**REPLICATION OVERVIEW**

Port and Richards (2012) emphasizes the importance of replication as “the kind of healthy curiosity and scepticism towards research outcomes that will help move [researchers] forwards—rather than sideways” (p. 291). While pushing the field forward is an undeniable calling, the fact remains that many qualitative studies have been avoided when it comes to replication (Pennycook, 1994); in part due to the considerable difficulty one faces when pinpointing the cause for variable outcomes (Cumming, 1994). However, replication is possible as long as the study uses contexts and data in congruence with the original and new settings (Maxwell, 1992). The intention of this partial replication study is in part to discover whether Rivers’ findings have generalizability and if so, to build on these findings. Therefore, by partially replicating this study, I hope to find a level of confirmability showing that Rivers’ interpretation of data within the model could prove useful for other contexts.

**The Original Research Study**

Rivers 2012 study used a true mixed methods approach to illuminate the values that EFL learners place on the compulsory English classes undergraduate, non-language majors in Japan were required to take in order to obtain their degrees. He discusses the language ideologies within the Japanese context of his study, laying the groundwork for how the participants’ positions on the perceived values of compulsory English courses are situated between the dichotomous relationship of socioeconomic and linguistic power relations. Rivers’ study outlined these ideologies by gathering student essays written for their compulsory English classes, analysed and coded them into three selective codes based on the most prevalent responses for the value of studying English. Following the essay analysis, Rivers produced and administered a 15-
item survey, which he used the results from to create a structural equation model displaying the theoretical connections between students’ perceived values of compulsory English classes.

**REPLICATION OF CONTEXT**

The initial motivation to perform this replication study stemmed from the direct correlation I found between Rivers’ (2012) context and the Mallorquin context in that each has had to deal with the maintenance of linguistic identity in relation to expressing oneself in both local and international communities. Rivers’ article discusses the nature of language globalization in Japan and how this colonialism generates “formidable task of expressing, in language embedded in the Anglo-American culture including Judeo-Christian tradition, their indigenous values” (Hino, 2009, p. 104). Furthermore, in both contexts, these linguistic tensions have been brought to the forefront of societal awareness by means of various political and economic laws and regulations.

In Japan for instance, several businesses have adopted an English only mentality—for example, the internet company Rakutan is now requiring all meetings be held in English and the clothing retail giant Fast Retailing now requires English proficiency testing and minimum English proficiency levels in addition to mandating business-wide English only written internal reports and documentation (Botting, 2010; Tonedachi, 2010). Failure to comply with these new mandates created the potential for transfer, extended hours for training, or termination. Similarly, the Balearic Islands (BI) recently experienced surges in compulsory English mandates for school systems and businesses.

The Integrated Treatment of Language (ITL) policy, for instance, required Spanish public schools to teach one third of content classes in Castilian, Catalan, and English, respectively. This new policy essentially eliminated the Decree of Minimums law which requires schools to use at least fifty percent Catalan as the medium of instruction, cutting the use of Catalan in half and catapulting teachers and students into becoming proficient speakers of the foreign language with a baptism by fire-hydrant methodology (Gené-Gil, Juan-Garau, & Salazar-Noguera, 2015). Unsurprisingly, numerous strikes and school shutdowns followed ITL which all helped to reinstate the Decree of Minimums placing English back into foreign language classrooms.
Spain’s Multilingual Education

In 1986, Catalonia passed the Language Normalization Act which required all children to be able to use Catalan and Spanish correctly by the end of their compulsory education (Gené-Gil et al. 2015). In 1997, the Decree of Minimums required public schools in Catalonia to use at least 50% of all content subjects in Catalan, and finally, in 2004, the European Sections mandated that the foreign language chosen in primary education was to be English (Gené-Gil et al. 2015). The multilingual options for schools in Mallorca are as follows: state schools, subsidized private schools, and fully independent private schools (of which some are Spanish and some international). A majority of Spain’s schools are moving towards privatization, especially universities, largely because of government (Gené-Gil et al. 2015), and, since private schools have the liberty to change the language policy, many prefer to use Spanish and English as the main languages of instruction.

Purposes

Multilingual students’ whose motivations to study English are increasingly forcing them to reconcile their local linguistic identity with their pursuit of an imagined L2-self using English means to do so. It is this struggle that forms the foundation for this replication study; within both studies, the regions and their respective students must come to terms with what values they place on studying English and how to actualize these values. It is through the explication of these values that institutions can aid in the transition and potential envelopment of a new linguistic identity for students in these contexts. To those ends, the following research questions were posed:

1. What perceived values of English do Mallorquin EFL students place on learning English as a compulsory language?
2. How do these perceived values play out in their imagined communities?
3. What are the pedagogical implications of understanding these ELL values?
4. How, if at all, do the linguistic tensions between English and the regional language play out?
METHODS

This partial replication study adhered to Rivers’ methods including data collection, coding, and analysis as will be discussed in detail in the following sections. The replication context included Spanish participants from the Balearic Islands (Majorca, Minorca, Ibiza, & Formentera; hereafter, BI) who attend similar schools with compulsory English as a foreign language courses. In addition to replicating Rivers’ codes found within the essay analysis, the current study also added a selective code and added four survey items to his original survey questions. To complete the structural equation model, I replicated Rivers’ use of the AMOS 25 program and followed as close to the original study’s procedures and analysis as possible.

Participants

The participants in this study consisted of 186 Spanish secondary education students taking compulsory English as a foreign language courses. I selected the school and its participants based on my familiarity with the program after working there for one and a half years. All students at this school belong to a subsidized (public/private) Catholic high school located in Palma, Mallorca, one of the Balearic Islands of Spain. As a tourist driven society, many of the participants, if they do speak more than Castilian and Catalan, also speak German, French, Italian, and Farsi. The socioeconomic status of the participant sample was high, as evidenced by the school’s tuition requirements compared to a sample of public-school tuition requirements. After reviewing the survey data for normality, outliers, linearity, and restrictions of range (Schumacker & Lomax, 2016, p. 241), the final number of survey respondents consisted of 86 female and 89 male students between the ages of 16-18. While the participants in this study had one year less schooling than the original study’s participants, these participants met the study’s requirements to participate because of Spain’s education system which tracks students during their final two years of secondary school into two tracks: university or vocational. Therefore, the students in this context had spent a similar amount of time considering how compulsory English language education does or does not compliment their academic career paths. Most importantly, recruitment of these students relied heavily on the fact that they did not have a choice in studying English as a FL due to Spain’s European Sections policy.
Materials

The current study replicated the Rivers study’s materials including EFL student essays written in English about their perceived value of compulsory English classes in addition to survey questions generated from these essays. The prompt used by the instructors in the current study asked students to write about their beliefs in regard to the school systems’ position that studying English is considered to be important enough to be compulsory, regardless of one’s educational path. The survey materials included a prompt followed by a statement, asking students to use a six-point Likert scale to state how much they agree or disagree with that statement. The prompt, “I believe that studying English as a compulsory subject is important because…” was followed by one of nineteen potential statements displayed in the second column of Table 2. The survey included River’s (2012) 15-item survey in addition to four more questions pertaining to a local engagement orientation shown in Table 2 below in items 18, 20, 21, 22.

Procedures

The following section describes how, with the help of the instructors, the administration and collection procedures of the study were carried out. Overall, the study was carried out in five stages: collection of qualitative data, analysis of qualitative data, creation of the survey items using the qualitative data, conducting the survey and collecting the results, performing factor analysis, and modelling the factor analysis results using the theory gained from the earlier results.

To begin, I collected essays written by the participants about the value of studying English. Because the participants were already enrolled in an English class and the English instructor had already tasked the students to write similar essays like the one being replicated in this study, I was given permission to access them. The instructor shared the digital essays in an encrypted online folder using a secure folder sharing site. Following the essay collection, I began stage two using a multi-step approach to coding the data into selective codes using a Grounded Theory Method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This involved reading the essays several times with breaks between each reading session for a total of five readings over a span of four months.

After comparing my selected codes with River’s and concluding that they were nearly the same, I directly replicated his codes. After this stage, I began creating the survey questions by generating statements grounded in the data analysis results from stage one, again, replicating his
survey questions with the addition of my four additional survey questions. Once created, I translated the survey items from English into Castilian Spanish and checked for clarity and accuracy with the help of a bilingual Castilian Spanish/English speaker.

Once completed, the students’ instructors administered the survey during each of the instructor’s three English classes over the course of a week. Because of the distance and twelve-hour time difference, students accessed the survey using the Free Online Surveys website. The survey was first piloted with 20 students, revised, and re-administered to the group of 175 students in the same fashion. While taking the survey, students were asked to use the school’s computers and labs which were air conditioned, maintained comfortable levels of lighting and quiet, and allowed for the instructor to be present to troubleshoot any potential issues. In addition to the instructors’ presence, I was also available during this time through messenger services to help with any potential questions or concerns. The final stages of the study involved running a factor analysis of the survey results to test Rivers’ three factor structure which was then followed by fitting the qualitative and quantitative results into a theoretically and reliably sound structural equation model. Overall, this study attempted to maintain the same or similar materials used in the original study to maintain a sense of replicability.

RESULTS

The results section is intended to discuss what each of the sets of qualitative and quantitative data uncovered in terms of the research questions. I will display them in the order in which they were collected and analyzed. This will include an explanation of the qualitative Grounded Theory Method results including selected examples from the essays to illustrate the codes. Following this, I will explain how these codes were used to generate the survey items and the labels for the factor loadings the survey items loaded under and how all of these compiled the SEM. Finally, I will cover the significance of the descriptive statistics, the theoretical foundations of the factor analysis of the survey item results, and the results of the structural equation model analyses.
Qualitative Results

Because the Grounded Theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1967) process is often used to identify and explicate features of abstract concepts such as intrinsic value, motivation, imagined self, and imagined community (Dörnyei, 2009), I used this process to help illustrate the participants’ perceptions about their values of compulsory English. This process is described as one that uses a set of guidelines to help the researcher develop theories that are clearly rooted in data—data that has been methodically collected and evaluated.

The use of these guidelines allowed me to concurrently discover and analyze a set of clear emerging patterns within the responses from the outset of data collection. In following this discovery-oriented categorization technique (Charmaz, 2000; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Hadley, 2017), I was able to identify preliminary labels using the QDA Miner Lite V2.0.5 analysis tool, summarizing each line of student responses with an open coding system. An example of one immediate preliminary label was the abundance of students mentioning what they will use English in reference to their future selves. This student sample is one of many from the essays discussing ideas such as, “learning English is the most important thing people must do because it is essential for your future or whatever you want to do…”.

Following the initial coding, I consolidated the preliminary labels into emerging axial codes that included statements about the importance of maintaining future membership of the global community and how this membership will require English as a key to accessing future opportunities within that global community. Finally, after an analysis of the shared relationships between axial codes, I reduced them down into a final set of selective codes: International Career Orientation (ICO), Local Engagement Orientation (LEO), International Engagement Orientation (IEO), and International Friendship Orientation (IFO). To further aid in orienting myself towards a level of discovery rather than confirmation, I relied on a second reader who had not read the Rivers’ article prior to coding to assist me in reading and coding the data. Utilizing a second reader also helped minimize reader bias by confirming or denying that the codes and themes that I had discovered in the data were accurate.

The 186 student essays varied in length and content and provided numerous areas of insight. Within the first stages of the collection process, several key codes already began to emerge from the essays. The Grounded Theory approaches to analyzing the current study’s data resulted in similar selective codes as were discovered in the Japanese students’ essays. Therefore, the
selective codes in this study were given the same categorical names as in Rivers’ (2012) study with the exception of a fourth code: local engagement orientation. Table 1 displays the selective codes in the first column, which were later used as the labels for the factor groupings shown later in the quantitative results section. The codes displayed in Table 1 are in order from the most salient code to least salient.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selective Codes</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Examples of participants’ words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Career Orientation (ICO)</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on using English as an economic value, one used for imagined international jobs or college purposes.</td>
<td>“It is very important to the student’s future because all the companies are looking for employees who must know English”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Friendship Orientation (IFO)</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on obtaining international friendships with English speakers.</td>
<td>“because you can meet people of other countries and with another culture and make friends around the world and not just have friends in the city you live”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Engagement Orientation (IEO)</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on engaging with imagined communities around the world and interacting with other cultures and ideas different from their own.</td>
<td>“…allows you to access to other cultures, information and business all over the world. Moreover, you can interact with people from all over the world and get a global vision”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Engagement Orientation (LEO)</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on local values for communicating in English at the local level, or gaining prestige at the local level</td>
<td>“Also, for Mallorca I think it is very important English, because in Mallorca there are a lot of tourist and if you work in a restaurant, or if they ask you, where is somewhere you have to be able to answered them”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The text is in order from highest percentage of the essay’s text to lowest. ICO=33.6%; IEO=29.3%; IFO=19.7%; and LEO=16.9%
The codes in Table 1 were generated from the overarching ideas students had when discussing their perceived values for English. These were delineated by the properties within each selective code as evidenced by the specific textual examples from student essays.

**Quantitative Results**

Data analysis for the quantitative portion of the study included an evaluation of the item validity, descriptive statistics, and reliability of the survey-item responses, how student responses to the surveys indicated what students valued about English learning, and how these values played out in their imagined communities by means of reducing the survey data into factors and a structural equation model. Tables 2 and 3, and Figure 1 display the quantitative results for the current study including descriptive statistics for each survey item, factor analysis loadings, and a structural equation model to represent it. The results are explained objectively and their implications and comparisons to Rivers’ study are discussed following the results section.

In terms of reliability, I used Cronbach alpha to indicate the reliability of the survey-item responses, which fell between .916 and .936 where, according to Cortina (1993), .70 to .80 is respectable. After analyzing how the reliability of the overall survey would increase after dropping specific items, I dropped items four and twenty-one to raise the reliability of the factor loadings (Brown, 2001).

The descriptive statistics analysis in Table 2 starts with item four, and the selective code the items were generated from, as shown in the far-left column (ICO, IEO, IFO, LEO). Survey items one through three are not listed. However, they include basic participant data including gender, age, and language background. In consideration of content validity, the survey items attempt to further illustrate student perceptions of the value of English and are grounded in the student essay selective codes using a similar set of language and lines of thinking in their construction. The first ICO items in the table ask for information about student orientations towards English and their future careers (four items). This section is followed by IEO questions concerning their engagement with international culture and identity (five items). Third are the (IFO) items soliciting information about meeting international friends (six questions), and finally, the fourth section analyzed student orientations towards local values (LEO) for learning English (four questions).
In addition to the questions and their constructs, Table 2 also includes the number of participants that took the survey (n) which was the same for each item and is thus located just once at the top of the table. Along with each items’ mean (M), the standard deviation, skew and kurtosis, and the lowest and highest responses in that order were also analyzed. Analysis of the descriptive statistics reflected what was seen in the essays in terms of high student values for English when considering the ICO. Additionally, the negative skew showed how survey responses fell heavily on the positive end of the scale for ICO items.

In the essays, the ICO selective code was the most saturated and this result was mirrored in the survey responses as well. The first selected code in Table 2 (ICO) displays how students highly agreed with the statements dealing with values of English in terms of career displayed in their Mean (M) responses as greater than five on the six-point Likert scale. The bolded means display items which had higher than 4.6 as their mean response. Note that each selected code had two or more highly positive mean responses and that ICO had the most positive responses.

Following the descriptive statistics analysis, I ran a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) including a Scree plot with the 2017 statistical analysis tool “Jasp.” Using Cattell’s (1996) analysis method of comparing the number of factors to the number of eigenvalues over one, I found the addition of the four new variables generated four eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and that the variables could in fact load onto a fourth factor in contrast to Rivers’ 3 factor model (Brown, 2009a). I used the Anderson-Rubin method, often used when comparing oblique factors like the ones seen in this study in order to determine which variables load with which factors (Schumacker & Lomax, 2016). Analysis of the correlation matrix displayed variable loadings over .32, therefore I followed Tabachnick’s and Fiddell’s (2007) method of analysis using oblique rotation because there was over ten percent overlap between the factors, in this case, direct oblimin rotation. When analyzing how the variables loaded on each factor, I checked for crossloading products in order to see if it was possible to simplify the factor loadings. Variable crossloadings indicated that item 18 should be eliminated as it generated too many complex variables within each factor (Kline, 2002).

Subsequently, I ran a PCA using the direct oblimin rotation with a loading cut-off of .32 (Brown, 2009b) and manual input of four factors (Brown, 2009c). The four factors were then analyzed and modeled using the same program as Rivers’ (2012) study: AMOS 25 (analysis of moment structures) to test whether the theoretical model fit the representative data.
Table 2

**Survey instrument descriptive statistics n=175**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Survey item (in English)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Low-High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICO</td>
<td>11. Many Spanish companies will need English speaking people in the future</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. I will be able to develop a career as an international person.</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. I want to be part of an international globalized society.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. I will be able to participate in international conferences and events.</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICO</td>
<td>13. I will be able to develop a career as an international person.</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. I want to be part of an international globalized society.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. I will be able to participate in international conferences and events.</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEO</td>
<td>4. I can learn about topics that are not discussed in Spain.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. I have ideas about international issues that I want to discuss in English.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. I want people from different parts of the world to listen to my opinions.</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. It will allow me to become an internationalized person.</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. It will allow me to develop a better worldview.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFO</td>
<td>7. I want to be able to tell foreign people about Spain in English.</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. I want to make friends with people from many different countries.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Interacting with foreign people in English is fun for me.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. I think my life would be more interesting if I had foreign friends.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. I want to interact in English with international students on campus.</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. It will allow me to share my opinions with people from other countries.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO</td>
<td>18. I will be able to communicate locally with fellow Mallorquins who speak other mother tongues</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. I will be able to work locally with foreign tourists.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. I will be able to communicate locally with fellow Mallorquins who speak other mother tongues</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. It will allow me to gain an advantage over other local people to get a local job.</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** All bolded means indicate a $\bar{x} > 4.6$. The standard error of Skewness is .18 and the standard error of Kurtosis is .36, both of which are comparable to the original study (.20 and .41 respectively).
The factor analysis results are displayed in Table 3 in which the variables fit into four factors labelled with the previously drawn-up codes from Rivers’ study and the LEO code label. The remaining variables (see Table 3) and their final grouping under each factor fit well as indicated by standard fit indices. Namely, each item loads over .32 and does not generate any complex variables across factors. The CFA indicated that the added LEO variables loaded well together and that the remaining variables also loaded cleanly into their respective factors. Using Cronbach alpha to estimate the internal consistency estimate for each factor based on the highest loaded variables within them and is listed at the top of Table 3 under the factor labels. The Cronbach alpha estimates for each factor ranged from .690 to .851, where .70 to .80 is respectable according to Cortina (1993). The variables are displayed from highest loading to lowest loading starting with the International Friendship Orientation (IFO) factor which had the highest loading and accounted for 17 percent of the total variance. Subsequently, the Local Engagement Orientation (LEO) factor accounted for 16 percent, followed by the International Career Orientation (ICO) at 14 percent, and finally, the International Engagement Orientation (IEO) which accounted for 11 percent of the variance. As a whole, the four factors accounted for 59.2 percent of the total variance within the survey responses, closely relating to Rivers’ study at 61.3 percent.

Table 3
Factor analysis of 15 survey items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey item (in English)</th>
<th>IFO (α=.851)</th>
<th>LEO (α=.798)</th>
<th>ICO (α=.784)</th>
<th>IEO (α=.690)</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. I want to make friends with people from many different countries</td>
<td>0.831*</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Interacting with foreign people in English is fun for me.</td>
<td>0.763*</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>-0.165</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I think my life would be more interesting if I had foreign friends.</td>
<td>0.817*</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I want to interact in English with international students on campus.</td>
<td>0.719*</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It will allow me to become an internationalized person.</td>
<td>0.811*</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It will allow me to share my opinions with people from other countries.</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.756*</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I will be able to participate in international conferences and events.</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.640*</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Factor Loadings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I will be able to work locally with foreign tourists</td>
<td>0.010 0.683*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It will allow me to gain an advantage over other local people to get a local job</td>
<td>0.275 0.622*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I want to be able to tell foreign people about Spain in English.</td>
<td>0.013 0.516*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Many Spanish companies will need English speaking people in the future</td>
<td>0.129 0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I will be able to develop a career as an international person.</td>
<td>-0.142 0.268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I want to be part of an international globalized society.</td>
<td>0.135 0.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have ideas about international issues that I want to discuss in English.</td>
<td>0.061 0.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I want people from different parts of the world to listen to my opinions.</td>
<td>0.038 0.286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It will allow me to develop a better worldview.</td>
<td>0.135 -0.179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance explained by each factor</td>
<td>0.177 0.161 0.141 0.113 0.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Factor loadings > .40  IFO (International Friendship Orientation); LEO (Local Engagement Orientation); IEO (International Engagement Orientation); ICO (International Career Orientation). 

The factor analysis results aided in the production of the structural equation model (SEM) shown in Figure 1. The hypothesized relationships amongst the latent variables and the observed variables proved to be reflective of the factor analysis findings and the theoretical model was confirmed in the SEM. All observed variables loaded well on their appropriate latent variable constructs at .874 and higher. On the other hand, the factor analysis in relation to the model showed a difference in loadings with the highest loadings on the IFO latent variable where as the model showed the highest loading to be on IEO latent variable at .944. The four latent variables and fifteen observed variables were modelled using the same program as Rivers’ (2012) study: AMOS 25 (analysis of moment structures). While Rivers does not explain the thresholds he used, he does explain which goodness of fit indices were used and those were replicated as follows. The current model results focus on model fit indices according to Jöreskog and Sörbom (1993) recommendations including chi-square ($\chi^2$) where the value is non-significant in relation to the degrees of freedom, $p$-value is less than .05, the goodness-of-fit index (GFI) where the value is close to .90 or .95 reflects a good fit, the minimum value of discrepancy (CMIN) where one to five are acceptable, the comparative fit index (CFI) where scores close to one indicate the best fit.
Figure 1. The structural model showing the ‘perceived value of compulsory English language education’ in secondary education Spanish students. All paths are significant at 0.001.


(Bentler, 1990), the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) where values of .05 to .08 indicates close fit.

The addition of the Local Engagement factor and correlating variables altered how the survey items fell within the overall model in Figure 1 as compared to Rivers’ (2012) model (see Appendix A). However, the current study’s model partially replicated the original study’s results and presented an overall good fit to the data in terms of general standards of structural equation modelling [$\chi^2/DF=1.36$, $p<0.014$; GFI=.919; CMIN=1.365; CFI=.979; RMSEA=.046]. As for measurement invariance, relative changes in the fit indices were observed and multivariate normality (multivariate kurtosis/ critical ratio) = 3.41 where less than 9 is acceptable (Kline, 2005). While some clarifications had to be made with Rivers about the specific indices, I am confident these
results are accurate and useful when deciding on the goodness of fit for the model as a whole.

**DISCUSSION**

The current study tested Rivers’ context, materials, and procedures by basing the production of the quantitative materials and data collection on the qualitative research data and analysis. This created a symbiotic relationship in which the data analyses of one simultaneously relied on and supported the other. When such a relationship exists, it has the potential to create rich, multilayered, enduring explanations of the theories of investment and the imagined L2 self at hand. While there are many take-aways from the framework this study presents, one of the most important concepts is that these studies both provide readers with a means to better understand what values students place on learning English and offers a platform for students to voice these values, expressing how they intend to actualize their imagined L2 selves.

The following discussion provides an interpretation of the qualitative and quantitative results in relation to Rivers study. For the purposes of clarity, I will restate the research questions here and use them to organize the discussion.

1. What perceived values of English do Mallorquin EFL students place on learning English as a compulsory language?
2. How do these perceived values play out in their imagined communities?
3. What are the pedagogical implications of understanding these ELL values?
4. How, if at all, do the linguistic tensions between English and the regional language play out?

In reference to the first research question, both Rivers’ and the current study were able to highlight a multitude of values the students expressed concerning studying compulsory English. Many of the comments from student essays and survey responses in the current study supported what Rivers found in his group of participants. Namely the resounding importance students place on English concerning their future selves within their imagined careers and how these careers in English relate to their desires to gain
international friends and learn about other cultures through international engagement or to improve their lives in their local communities.

**Interpretation of Qualitative Results**

As shown in Table 1, the results of the qualitative essay coding revealed similar codes to Rivers’ study (ICO, IEO, IFO, and LEO). In reference to the first selected code, ICO, numerous students commented on the value of English concerning their future imagined careers:

S1 “I personally believe that nowadays learning English is one of the basic things you have to do to get a job…”
S2 “it is demanded for many jobs…”
S3 “I believe that learning English nowadays is extremely important not only to be able to communicate with native speaker but for future jobs.”
S4 “...allow us to have access to better education, since some schools require [foreign] language for admission”
S5 “…due to the [high] level of businesses and trips for which knowledge of languages is fundamental…”
S6 “Apart from English at school, I am also taking classes at International House to get the First [Cambridge’s First Certificate in English, FCE], which is necessary in order to be able to have a career and be minimally competent in the future.”
S7 “I also think that it is increasingly necessary because, when it comes to looking for work, they are increasingly critical of one’s foreign language training, especially English”
S8 “…the mastery of other languages will always increase your chances for a better future, even in careers that are not related to languages”

Student responses one through eight highlight an almost objective, unequivocal position concerning the value of English in relation to careers. The students describe how the mastery of English will open future doors to education, success in business adventures, and potential jobs.

Dörnyei’s (2009) imagined-self model helps explicate these student positions in terms of the economic value they place on English acquisition. These positions were also
evident in Rivers’ study as he explained student response involved “language learning investment under the anticipation of future reward” and how many of the student responses indicated similar references to the value of English for career purposes (2012, p. 13).

One important factor to note is that some researchers of Spanish students have suggested that student investments in English for career purposes is due to Spain’s economic hardships over the last decade (Busse, 2017). However, the current study’s context, Mallorca and the region of Catalonia as a whole, is actually thriving compared to the rest of Spain because of its tourism industry with over 14 million tourists visiting a year (Limbourgh, 2015). For this reason, Catalonia has been attempting to secede from Spain to separate itself linguistically and economically. In light of this, many of the jobs and careers the students in this study are most familiar with depend on knowing and interacting with English as a globalized language. The Balearic Island’s tourism industry helps explain a portion of the career-oriented desire to learn English and could also explain what Rivers’ has described as the desire to use English as linguistic capital (p. 262).

Discussing imagined communities also leads into the student discussions concerning their desires for international engagement with English. In both studies, the students expressed a desire to learn and grow as globalized citizens and discuss how English is an important aspect to becoming a member of what they consider their future imagined community. One can see evidence of this in their essays in which students identify with and confirm their position of ‘L2 learner’ in comments such as:

S9 “I believe that knowledge of other languages is very important, since that makes you a more cultured, more socialized person …”

S10 “English it’s the most spoken language so it allows you to travel all around the world and discover so many different countries and cultures, even the English culture itself!”

S11 “In my opinion, I think that studying English is very good for everyone, since we can communicate with people from all over the world”
S12 “What is more, you can use English for informed of the news of the world. English is a very important language, the countries have their language but they needed another language to communicate outside.

S13 “Furthermore, learning of a different language usually comes with learning something about its culture, which lets you broaden your knowledge of the world which is a very important aspect of living in a globalized society like we do now a day”

S14 “I think studying English is also important because if all of us talk the same language, the inequality will decrease all over the world”

These comments in conjunction with the previous set also indicate student investment in their L2 selves and in their future communities. The express not only an awareness of other cultures and ideas around them, but also the necessity as global citizens to interact and understand these cultures. S9 and S12 both discuss the need to become a more “cultured, more socialized person” and to be “informed of the news of the world” concepts of awareness, socialization, and world events are all often associated with peaceful co-existence. This was not a rare theme in the current studies essays and brings to light how these students are viewing English as an investment not just in themselves but in their larger communities as well.

The concepts concerning IEO and IFO are closely related in both of the studies in that student responses to both include an openness to learning about and building connections with those outside of their linguistic sphere. The fact that students are mentioning this as a factor for learning English is unique in that it deviates from the top down mentality that EFL courses are all work and no play. Acknowledging that students have strong inclinations to use English as a social factor could have immense implications on the way EFL curriculum is designed. Some students discussed the simple desire to meet new people in their essays as shown below:

S15 “In my personal life, English is very important, because if I want to travel everywhere I need English and if I want to have friends all over the world I also need English”

S16 “English opens doors to all kind of relationships in between cultures and countries which makes learning English a must for our lives.”
S17 “It’s a language known worldwide which can help you make friends in different parts of the world”
S18 “What is more, if you have friends from other countries you will know other cultures”

Finally, while the Local Engagement Orientation was not founded in the Rivers study, this theme does echo Kachru’s Expanding Circle concept including a desire to work with or interact with others in one’s home region and develop one’s own community. Several students discussed finding local jobs, helping their family communicate with non-Spanish speakers, using English as a pidgin to talk with loved ones who speak languages other than Spanish and so forth. The following student comments highlight that English is important to them not only internationally but also in their own region:

S19 “I find that English is a very important subject because of living in a community that largely depends on tourism, so it is very important to communicate with tourists in my hometown”
S20 “getting to know this language is also useful for travelling, talking with tourists in our hometown, or even to make friends from other countries that visit Palma”
S21 “our parents make us go to private English language classes”
S22 “how the English is taught in Spain is wrong, because we are not really prepared to have a normal conversation, to have fluent English conversation... For example, I have every day conversations with my boyfriend in English because he is German”
S23 “We need it to find a good job and to communicate with people when we are abroad and, living in Mallorca, with all the tourism there are here, it’s indispensable”
S24 “I am going to use my English for example when I travel to United States or to another country with my family, because my parents don’t speak English very well and I have to help them”

Even though the essays did not abound with examples from the LEO construct, they did exist, and it is an important factor to consider when discussing the value students place on learning compulsory English overall. For instance, S22 provides an interesting take on the current system of English education in their context and this brings up a valid point that communicating with others to accomplish a task one actually desires to do can
make all the difference in the world for L2 learners to continue engaging with the target language.

**Interpretation of Quantitative Results**

Through their essays and survey responses, it was discovered that the latent variables effectively display what the EFL students in the current study value when studying compulsory English. For instance, the surveys showed the strongest agreement with statements about English’s value in terms of career orientation which was also corroborated in Rivers’ (2012) study. Specifically, the highest majority of the essays commented on career paths towards higher education or potential jobs and the survey results also concluded that the most positive responses (strongly agree) fell on the career oriented items as seen in items 11, 13, 14, and 19. Item 11, “many Spanish companies will need English speaking people in the future” (p. 19). For instance, had the highest mean score ($M = 5.23, s = .73$) and this item was interestingly shown to be the highest in Rivers’ study as well. In reference to the current study, item 11 also had the least amount of deviation between responses, hence showing a high level of agreement between participants in the awareness that learning English could have a significant impact on their ideal-L2 self in a career setting.

When looking at the factor analysis, several similarities between the two studies occurred as well. The factors and their respective variable loadings matched up nicely to corroborate what Rivers found with the Japanese context. The latent variables displayed in the factor analysis showed the strongest loadings for both studies within the International Friendship factor, while the essays and surveys from each study supported each other most in terms of career orientations. The models however showed the most variation between the studies, potentially since I found an added construct with the LEO latent variable. Rivers’ (2012) model shown in Appendix B shows how his model found the IFO construct loaded the highest of all the paths. In contrast, the model in the current study showed strong loadings on all four constructs, but the strongest loading turned out to be the IEO construct. As mentioned earlier, this orientation towards International Engagement could have something to do with the students in the current study living in
the European tourist hub of Mallorca generating an overwhelming sense of engagement with new cultures and ideas. However, further research and testing is warranted.

**CONCLUSION**

Overall, the results and their analysis highlight that English is a valued means for EFL learners to invest in their future L2 selves, whether this is to make international friends, create an international career, engage internationally with others, or to invest in a local interest.

**Limitations**

The initial motivation to perform this replication stemmed from the direct correlation I found within Rivers’ context and the context of the Mallorquins in that each group has dealt with the maintenance of linguistic identity in relation to express oneself in both local and international communities. Both contexts engage in a discussion of linguistic tensions between Japanese or Mallorquin desire to maintain one’s *Japanese-ness* or *Mallorquin-ness* while simultaneously attempting to build one’s global identity using English as the means to do so.

Unfortunately, after spending a great deal of time getting to know Rivers’ and my own understandings of these models and theories, I realized that in both studies, this discussion of tensions is utterly missing in the data. The limitation lies in the fact that both studies’ essay and survey prompts only asked students to discuss the importance of compulsory English education leaving little to no space for students to discuss their thoughts on potential negative aspects of these English classes in their foreign language context. In reference to the descriptive statistics in Table 1 (see Appendix A for Rivers’ descriptive results), a majority of the survey items display a negative skew indicating a potential ceiling in which the respondents were not able to fully express their overwhelming agreement with several statements in the survey.

One qualitative data limitation was the fact that the essays were written in the participants’ L2s. This certainly might have impacted the qualitative results generating shorter and less in-depth essay responses. Longer, more in-depth essays could have
provided a stronger foundation for the theoretical findings on which the surveys, and consequently affected the factor groupings and model built on them. With increased engagement with the essay tasks, the participants may have had stronger connections to the follow up survey questions generated from the essay responses, ultimately having the potential to influence factor loadings.

Additionally, more specific information about where students saw their imagined selves would have been ideal and follow up interviews could have had the potential to elicit deeper reflections into the reasons behind their responses. Student choice for the value of learning English, after the essays rather than the minor follow ups that were already done solely for clarification or the solicitation of concrete place descriptors (concerning local versus international) of language use or such as follow up questions. That is to say, interviews might have led to a clearer picture as to how the emerging themes and central construct orient towards each other.

**Future Research**

In light of these limitations, future research could entail revising the prompts for the essays and surveys to include more opportunities to explore not only the values of compulsory English classes, but the potential negatives students see as well. Also changing the scales on which the students select their responses to provide more room for students to answer more closely to their perceived answers, thus avoiding the potential for skewing the results in one direction or another. In addition to this, follow up interviews could increase the reliability of the qualitative data collection and further the accuracy of the resulting theoretical model.

**Implications**

While the importance of pointing out the relationships and generalizability between Rivers’ and this study is valuable, performing a replication of his study points to a larger gap in the applied linguistics research field: peer review in a peer reviewed community. This study highlights the degree to which Rivers’ (2012) findings are supported and how the implications of this confirmation lie within the generalizability of the models and theories produced in Rivers’ study. In total, they indicate that we as a community of
researchers can build off of each other’s findings in various other communities—communities that are now easily found within Kachru’s ever-expanding circle. This study specifically addresses Pennycook’s (1994) and Cumming’s (1994) assertions that replications, as a whole and the replication of variable outcomes within qualitative studies specifically, is nearly impossible. In fact, the mixed methods collection of qualitative and quantitative data River’s and the current study performed confirm Maxwell’s (1992) assessment that utilizing comparative social contexts and data is not only acceptable but sound as indicated by in the current study. In summation, I hope through the partial replication of Rivers’ study that I have pushed the field further by finding a level of confirmability in my interpretation of the current study’s data, thus suggesting its usefulness for other contexts.

Overall, the results of this replication study help establish a model with which to understand what EFL learners wish to do with their compulsory English education. The combination of the qualitative and quantitative methods is successfully represented in the model and thus certainly has the potential to help curriculum development in terms of teaching English as an International language. A future of student-centered English for academic purposes courses could prove highly successful for student scores.

In addition to curriculum implications, considering student values of local orientations towards studying compulsory English classes could prove to be highly beneficial when looking at student affect and motivation in EFL contexts. The overarching discussions within this partial replication study of the similar phenomena occurring in two completely different regions and the interplay between national pride and the imagined L2 self could ultimately help institutions recognize the importance of developing stronger methods of collecting data concerning student needs and desires and how these differ from government and institutional agendas.
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Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the survey instrument administered to the 188 students (ordered by descending mean value of each item).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey item (in English)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Many Japanese companies will need English speaking people in the future</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I think my life would be more interesting if I had foreign friends</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It will allow me to develop a better worldview</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I want to make friends with people from many different countries.</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I want to be part of an international globalised society</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It will allow me to share my opinions with people from other countries.</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Interacting with foreign people in English is fun for me</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I will be able to participate in international conferences and events</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It will allow me to become an internationalised person</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I will be able to develop a career as an international person.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I want to interact in English with international students on campus</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can learn about topics that are not discussed in Japan</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I want to be able to tell foreign people about Japan in English</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I want people from different parts of the world to listen to my opinions</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have ideas about international issues that I want to discuss in English.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The standard error of skewness is 0.20 and the standard error of kurtosis is 0.41. All responses are based on a six-point Likert Scale (1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree) and are preceded by the statement: 'I believe that studying English as a compulsory subject is important because...
APPENDIX B

Figure 1. The structural model showing the 'perceived value of compulsory English language education' in undergraduate non-language majors of Japanese nationality. All paths are significant at $p < 0.001$. IFO = International Friendship Orientation, ICO = International Career Orientation, IEO = International Engagement Orientation.
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