

The Correlation between Korean Students' Perceptions of Parental Support and Their Classroom Motivation*

Bokyung Murray
Sangmyung University

Murray, Bokyung. (2012). The correlation between Korean students' perceptions of parental support and their classroom motivation. *Modern English Education*, 13(3), 1-19.

The study was an investigation into how Korean middle-school students perceive their parental support to their studies, and what effect this support may have on their classroom autonomous motivation to study English. Two research questions were addressed. The first question examined how these students perceive their parental involvement and support for their autonomy, based on the results of the Perceptions of Parents Scale (POPS) questionnaire. The second question examined the correlation between results of the POPS and these students' classroom motivation, as measured by the Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A). These two questionnaires, the POPS and the SRQ-A, were administered to a total of 167 students, ages 13 to 16, studying English as a Foreign Language (EFL) at two middle schools in Seoul, Korea. A quantitative analysis was performed on the data collected and findings indicated that students' perceptions of parental support and influence were at a moderate to high level; however the correlation of this support with their classroom autonomous motivation was at a very low positive level. The study concluded with a discussion of study limitations and pedagogical implication.

[Korean middle school students/parental support/autonomous classroom motivation/
한국 중학생/학부모 참여/자율학습동기]

I. INTRODUCTION

This study represents an inter-disciplinary approach to understanding a topic of some relevance to researchers in second and foreign language education. It seeks to investigate

* This study was supported by Sangmyung University Research Fund, 2010.

the impact parents may have on their children's academic motivation in terms of parental support to their classroom autonomy and motivation. A primary concern for scholars involved in second or foreign language acquisition (SLA/FLA) has been to determine what are the most significant factors contributing to student success in learning a language. Researchers in various areas of the discipline have placed emphasis on different situational or individual differences as having a primary role to play in this process. What separates the good language learner from others who experience difficulty in the language classroom? Scholars in SLA/FLA have frequently adopted concepts from other disciplines in trying to understand this phenomenon, especially from traditional or educational psychology. This adaptation is central to this particular study as parental influence on children's learning has been the subject of extensive research within traditional and educational psychology.

Also, for this study, the principles contained within Self-Determination Theory (SDT) will be used as a useful framework for understanding this process of motivation. Deci and Ryan (1985) initially outlined the basic concepts of SDT. According to SDT in its basic form, human motivation can be seen to exist on a six-point continuum, from amotivation on the left, through four types of extrinsic motivation, to intrinsic motivation on the right side of the continuum. This continuum is represented schematically below in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Intrinsic-Extrinsic Continuum

Motivation	Extrinsic Motivation				Intrinsic Motivation
Non Regulation	External Regulation	Introjected Regulation	Identified Regulation	Integrated Regulation	Intrinsic Regulation
Non-internalized					Fully-internalized

The purpose of this study was to examine student perceptions of parental influence and support, the pattern of their classroom autonomous motivation from an extrinsic-intrinsic standpoint, and correlate their motivational orientations with their perceptions of parental support and influence. This focus was based on the following two research questions:

- 1) How do these Korean middle school students perceive their parental involvement and support for their classroom autonomous motivation, based on the results of the POPS?
- 2) What is the correlation between results of the POPS and these students' classroom motivation, as measured by SRQ-A?

Despite intuitive expectations that parental support for student autonomy should be

robust, research on this topic has not always produced well-defined results. As indicated in the next section on Literature Review findings have been mixed and not always consistent, with some showing a positive connection and others a more negative connotation. Also, studies on this topic in the Korean educational setting have been few. For these reasons, this study may serve to provide additional insight into this correlation, especially as it may apply to the Korean setting.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Student Perceptions of Parental Support and Influence

For several decades scholars within traditional psychology have recognized the importance of parental support as it relates to student classroom achievement in general, and motivation in particular. Since an early study by Coleman, et al. (1996) and its controversial conclusion that parental influences are the primary factor in children's classroom response, there has been a growing and robust research paradigm concerning this connection within the discipline of psychology. Researchers have identified two important factors of such support that impact student motivation in the classroom: (1) parental involvement, which means providing sufficient resources for the child in terms of showing interest in the child's activities, and spending the necessary time to provide for the child's emotional well-being, (2) parental autonomy support in affirming the child's sense of self-worth as a unique and active human being (Ratelle, Larose, Guay & Senécal, 2005). Despite Coleman et al.'s strong positive affirmations, results from many of these investigations have been mixed, with some showing generally positive relationships, and others indicating a negative correlation.

There is considerable anecdotal and empirical evidence to suggest that the people of Korea, and indeed all of East Asia, have a particularly high enthusiasm for education (Seth, 2002; Weidman & Park, 2000). This eagerness for learning on the part of Koreans has been described as education fever and a national obsession, with elementary, middle, and high school students spending extra study time each evening and on weekends at various types of cram schools (Seth, 2002). Furthermore, the collectivist nature of Korean society might also tend to support this high desire for academic attainment. Hofstede (1991) described Korea as the country that, throughout history, embraced collectivism and the principles of Confucianism more than any other, including China and Japan. With this cultural environment and heritage, it might be expected that Korean parental support and involvement in their children's education would be high and it may have a considerable impact on their classroom motivation and achievement. It is the purpose of this study to

examine this connection between student perceptions of parental support and its effect on their classroom motivation.

As indicated above, many of the important concepts of second language learning have been adapted from traditional contributions to understanding the relationship between parent and child as it relates to motivation and achievement in the classroom (Englund, Luckner, Whaley & Egeland, 2004; Grolnick, 2003; Harris & Goodall, 2008; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Houtenville & Conway, 2008; S. S. Moon & J. H. Lee, 2009; Rogers, Theale, Ryan, Adams & Keating, 2009). S. S. Moon and J. H. Lee studied 1,100 Asian-American kindergarten students and found that parent-child home activity was significantly related to school motivation and achievement, but this relationship was negative. Parental school involvement was also found not to be a significant influence on their classroom achievement or motivation. Englund et al. (2004) found a positive correlation between parental involvement and children's classroom motivation. For Harris and Goodall (2008), parental involvement in school activities had no significant impact, but parental support for in-home learning did have a positive effect on learning. Houtenville and Conway (2008) found a strong connection between parental interest and student motivation to achieve. But for Rogers et al. (2009), father's pressure was predictive of lower achievement and classroom motivation, but mothers made a more positive contribution. Reasons for these conflicting results could be because of differing research populations or different means of measurement, but clearly these studies and others like them convey mixed results.

The POPS questionnaire was first presented in a seminal article on this topic of parental influence in 1991 (Grolnick, Ryan & Deci, 1991). The POPS was developed as part of the framework of Self-Determination Theory, a well-known theoretical model within traditional psychology to explain human autonomous motivation. The Grolnick et al. (1991) article is similar to the current study, although it is not fully comparable because participants were elementary school students studying in the U.S., and three intervening variables, relative autonomy, control understanding, and perceived competence were measured as mediators between parental influence and student classroom response. This is one of the very few articles which has utilized the POPS and related it to the classroom. The basic goal of the Grolnick et al. study was to examine children's perceptions of their parents' support and involvement and the ways these perceptions may affect student classroom motivation and achievement.

Grolnick et al. (1991) suggested that the two main considerations were parental autonomy support versus control and the "degree to which parents encourage children to initiate and make their own choices rather than apply pressure and inducements to control the children's behavior" (p. 509). Another key element was the degree of parental involvement and whether parents show interest, and spend the necessary time and effort to assist in school activities and homework. The findings showed a very low positive or a

negative correlation between parental support for autonomy and parental involvement with their children's classroom motivation. These foregoing paragraphs indicate the lack of clear and definitive results from previous studies on this topic, with low positive or even negative correlations revealed.

A study by Ratelle et al. (2005) on college students showed that perceived parental support sustained students' persistence in pursuing a difficult science curriculum and made a positive overall contribution to their classroom achievement. In one of the very few studies done in relation to language learning (Bartram, 2006), a population of 411 students, equally divided in learning German, French and English, showed a positive reaction to high parental support on their attitudes toward language learning, which in turn also reflected positively on their classroom achievement and motivation.

2. Student Autonomous Motivation

One of the constant themes in second language acquisition (SLA) research has been concerned with the question of why some learners find it easier than others to learn another language and exactly what separates a good learner from the unsuccessful learner. Many studies have suggested that learner individual differences, such as aptitude, learning styles and strategies, affection, personality, learner motivation, age, and gender play an important role in understanding this process of second language learning (Dörnyei, 2005; Ehrman, Leaver & Oxford, 2003). But of all these variables, the concept of student autonomous motivation is perhaps considered to be the most important, and in fact the concept has been the topic of the most study from the standpoint of traditional psychology, educational psychology and SLA (Ellis, 2008). The issue of motivation is an essential component of our everyday lives, and nobody would overlook its important role in human affairs in general, and in language learning in particular (Dörnyei, 2001).

Despite a basic intuitive familiarity with the concept of motivation, scholars differ on its basic nature, how it operates and what drives human motivation. The word "motivation" is derived from the Latin verb "*movere*", which suggests the idea of movement or a drive to complete a particular task (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). For Ryan and Deci (2000), motivation also means an impulse or inspiration to do something and to complete the task. Brophy (1999) describes motivation as a theoretical concept used to describe the initiation, direction, intensity, and persistence of some activity, especially if that activity is goal-directed. The prominent applied linguist Corder goes so far as to say that if motivation exists it is inevitable that a human being will learn a second language, as long as the learner is provided with the appropriate data (Corder, 1981). For purposes of this study, Dörnyei's definition will be used, which is: 1) why people decide to do something, 2) how long they are willing to sustain the activity, and 3) how hard they are going to pursue it (Dörnyei,

2001).

Dörnyei (2001) further describes motivation as a dynamic process that “initiates, directs, coordinates, amplifies, terminates and evaluates the cognitive and motor processes whereby initial wishes and desires are selected, prioritized, operationalized and ... carried out” (p. 9). The foregoing discussion emphasizes the somewhat contradictory pattern of student responses to parental support and involvement in their classroom activities, and the impact this influence may have on classroom motivation and performance.

However, SDT further divides this concept of motivation into three separate categories, autonomous motivation, controlled motivation and amotivation. These three types of motivation lie on a continuum of self-regulation, as depicted in Table 1. Autonomous regulation where learners act out of personal choice and pleasure and intrinsic motivation is the highest quality of such motivation. Controlled motivation, also referred to as extrinsic regulation, is where learners are motivated by reward, or trying to avoid punishment or feelings of guilt for not doing well. This extrinsic motivation is also divided into four distinct levels depending on the degree of self-regulation from the most controlled form, external regulation, through the lesser controlled types of introjected, identified and integrated regulation.

External regulation refers to the situation where the individual performs an activity because of an interpersonal demand such as a monetary incentive or a course credit. As long as the incentive remains, the student will engage in language learning, but once the incentive is removed the learning ceases.

Introjected regulation is similar to external, and incentives are also involved, however, the pressure to learn comes from the person and not from the outside or the context. This type of extrinsic motivation is quite controlling and these behaviors are performed to avoid shame or guilt, or to attain feelings of esteem or self-worth.

Identified regulation is a more self-determined form of motivation as there is a conscious acceptance of the behavior as personally important. This identification with an action allows for a higher degree of self-autonomy and a change in the locus of causality toward the self.

Integrated regulation is the most self-determined form of extrinsic motivation. This form of extrinsic motivation has been internalized and is entirely integrated within the self and brought into congruence with the needs and values that already become part of the self. Thus, this form of motivation shares many of the same qualities as intrinsic motivation, but it is still considered as extrinsic as activities performed for this kind of motivation are driven by external regulation and not done for their inherent interest or enjoyment.

The third type, amotivation, is a condition where there is no motivation at all, neither autonomous nor controlled. Therefore, “SDT posits that autonomous motivation reflects the highest quality of regulation, whereas controlled motivation and amotivation reflect the

intermediate and lowest ends of the quality continuum" (Ratelle, Guay, Vallerand & Senecal, 2007, p. 739).

Therefore, autonomous motivation is one type within the broader concept of motivation and these learners can be clearly defined for their own learning (Little, 1991), and they show initiative in learning and engage in monitoring and evaluating the extent to which their learning is achieved (Schunk, 2005). Learners who are autonomously motivated take an active role in the learning process, generating their own ideas rather than simply reacting to teacher input. Some of the other main characteristics of autonomous learners include: 1) having insights into their learning styles and strategies 2) taking an active approach to the learning task at hand 3) willing to take risks 4) being good guessers 5) paying attention to form as well as content 6) revising and rejecting rules that may not apply 7) having a tolerant and outgoing approach to the target language (Wenden, 1998)

III. METHOD

This investigation was in the form of a survey study, which is defined as a description of the "characteristics/attitudes/opinions of a population by examining a subset of that group, the sample, at a single point in time" (Dörnyei, 2001, p. 216). A quantitative method was used consisting of two survey instruments, the Perceptions of Parents Scale (POPS), and the Self-Regulation Questionnaire (SRQ-A).

1. Participants and Setting

This study was conducted with a total of 167 students studying English as a Foreign Language (EFL) at two separate middle schools in Seoul, Korea. One school was a girls' school, and the other was a co-educational school. These students ranged in age from 13 to 16, consisting of 117 females and 50 males. The reason for the imbalance in gender was that the researcher knew the teachers of the girls' school and access was easier to girls than to the boys in the co-educational classes. For the girls, the survey instruments were explained and administered by this researcher in the presence of the teacher. In the co-educational classes, only the boys were asked to participate in the surveys, and this researcher again explained and administered the instruments. Both of the schools used in this survey were located in a middle class area in the southeast section of Seoul.

In order to ensure the voluntary nature of the study, the researcher made sure the teachers, students, and their parents completely understood the voluntary nature of this type of survey. This went beyond the normal confidentiality statement contained on the consent form, and required additional oral instruction by the researcher prior to their

completing the survey.

2. Research Instruments

The questionnaire is considered one of the most appropriate and the most common methods for collecting data in second language research. Some of the reasons for this wide use of the survey are due to the fact that it is “easy to construct, extremely versatile, and uniquely capable of gathering a large amount of information quickly in a form that is readily processable” (Dörnyei, 2003, p. 1). As indicated above, two questionnaires from SDT were used for this study.

1) Perceptions of Parents Scale (POPS)

One of the advantages in using a questionnaire which has had extensive use in previous research is that its validity and reliability have been established. The presence of these two properties is essential if a survey instrument is to have any value in research. Reliability of the research instrument is essential to allow for confidence that the results will be repeatable if the same behaviors are measured again. Validity is also important because it allows one to determine if the measure does actually measure what one hopes it does (Goodwin, 2002). Cronbach’s alphas for POPS were .53 for maternal autonomy support (MA) .56 for maternal involvement (MI) .67 for paternal autonomy support (FA) and .64 for paternal involvement (FI) (Grolnick et al., 1991). The POPS consists of a 4-point Likert-type ordinal scale with low scores indicating low paternal support. Scale items are worded in both positive and negative directions, with responses ranging from never, usually, sometimes to always.

The POPS is designed to assess children’s perceptions of the degree to which their parents are involved and are supportive of their children’s individual autonomy. Parental involvement means that mothers and fathers are available to their children and are knowledgeable and concerned about their children’s lives. The POPS consists of 22 items, 11 items related to mothers and 11 related to fathers. By factor analysis, the scale has demonstrated a four-factor solution labeled mother autonomy support, mother involvement, father autonomy support, and father involvement. Each parent gets a score on the degree to which they are involved in their children’s lives and are autonomy supportive. The instruments for scoring the scale are included in the survey, and researchers are first to score the following items on a scale from 1 to 4 (i. e., the four options are ordered from being low on the subscale to being high): 1, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 20, 21, then, to score the following items from 4 to 1 (i. e., the four options are ordered from being high on the subscale to being low): 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22. The following subscale

scores are then computed by averaging all items within a given subscale: MA: 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10; MI: 1, 3, 5, 9, 11; FA: 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21; FI: 12, 14, 16, 20, 22. Data collected from this scale were analyzed in accordance with this rubric. Since the questionnaire is so long, some sample questions of the POPS are shown at Appendix A.

2) Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A)

This questionnaire has been used extensively in studies of autonomous educational motivation, and validity and reliability have been tested and proven acceptable. Internal consistency for the SRQ-A subscales range from .62 to .82, and extensive evidence of construct validity has been shown (Ryan & Connell, 1989).

This instrument was designed specifically for use with students in late elementary and middle school. It consists of a total of 32 questions, asking why students do various school-related tasks, and is designed to measure four levels of a participant's educational motivation, using the SDT categories of external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic regulation. The responses to each question are given on a four-point Likert scale of Very True, Sort of True, Not Very True, and Not at All True. The scale also has a built-in scoring system, designating the questions associated with each type of motivation, with Very True scored as four, Sort of True as three and so on. Listed below are the number items associated with each of the four subscales: External Regulation: 2, 6, 9, 14, 20, 24, 25, 28, 32; Introjected Regulation: 1, 4, 10, 12, 17, 18, 26, 29, 31; Identified Regulation: 5, 8, 11, 16, 21, 23, 30; Intrinsic Regulation: 3, 7, 13, 15, 19, 22, 27. These individual subscale scores were also used to produce a Relative Autonomy Index (RAI) for each student and an overall RAI, by use of the following formula: $2 \times \text{Intrinsic} + \text{Identified} - \text{Introjected} - 2 \times \text{External}$. Since the questionnaire is so long, some sample questions of the SRQ-A are shown at Appendix B.

Instructions, the instruments and the entire survey procedure were translated and administered in Korean, and the survey itself was given in Korean, so translation had to be accurate and complete. The procedure used for translation was taken from Brislin (1986), and is referred to as back-translation. This involved one bilingual, the researcher, translating the scale from English to Korean, and another bilingual retranslating from Korean to English without the use of the original scale. No problems or conflicts were found, thus it was assumed there were "readily available words and phrases in the two languages which the translators could use" (Brislin, 1986, p. 160). As Brislin further indicates back-translation is not the final answer to ensuring adequate translation and, if possible, all materials should be pre-tested with a population similar to the one to be used in the study. This pre-testing was also accomplished, with no problems encountered.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Coding of the data was performed using Excel and analysis of the data was conducted by the use of SPSS. Descriptive statistics were developed to show Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges for each of the four parental support and involvement factors, as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Descriptive Statistics for POPS

	MA	MI	FA	FI
Mean	2.485	3.072	2.609	2.580
Std. Dev.	0.440	0.546	0.522	0.636
Range	2.667	2.800	2.833	3.000
N	167	167	167	167

MA: Mother Autonomy Support MI: Mother Involvement
FA: Father Autonomy Support FI: Father Involvement

Table 2 relates to research question #1 and shows how students perceive their parental support and involvement. It is clearly evident that there is a mixed pattern of results, with MI perceived by students as being higher than any other. Comparing MI and FI, the students perceived that their mothers were more involved with their school work than their fathers, but when MA is compared with FA, students thought their father supported their autonomy slightly more than their mothers. Overall, students' perceptions of MI could be interpreted as high, with the other three subscales rated as moderate. So these Korean middle school students studying English are definitely aware of paternal support and involvement in their studies.

The above results were tested to see if the differences between mean scores of the four subscales were statistically significant. This was done by a Test of Within-Subjects Effects which showed that mean differences existed among these four subscales and these mean differences are statistically significant at the .01 level. A Post-Hoc Test (Bonferroni) was also performed to determine which mean differences are statistically significant. Results of this test showed that three pairs, MI and MA; MI and FA; MI and FI are statistically significant at the .005 level. MI is higher than everything else.

Analysis of the data from the SRQ-A survey provided a picture of the motivational stance of these students. These findings showed that most of these students were extrinsically motivated to study English, with identified regulation which is the most internalized form of extrinsic regulation being the most frequent reason cited. This was

followed by external regulation, introjected regulation, and intrinsic regulation was the least often mentioned reason for studying English among these students. This pattern is shown below in Table 3.

TABLE 3
Descriptive Statistics for SRQ-A

	External	Introjected	Identified	Intrinsic
Mean	2.520	2.401	2.654	2.146
Std. Deviation	0.436	0.625	0.630	0.670
Range	2.222	3.000	2.857	3.000
N	167	167	167	167

Valid N (Listwise) 167

As indicated in Table 3, the differences in mean scores appear to be very small, especially between identified and external, and external and introjected. Thus, these results were tested and the differences between the mean scores of the four subscales were found statistically significant. Internal consistency estimates (Cronbach's Alpha) for each reason category ranged from .53 to .72, indicating a moderate level of internal consistency.

Correlations among the subscales of the POPS, total POPS score and the SRQ-A, as indicated by the relative autonomy indices (RAI), are as shown below in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Correlations among Subscales of the POPS, Total POPS, and SRQ-A

	MA	MI	FA	FI	POPS	EX	IJ	ID	IN	RAI
MA										
Corr	--									
Sig										
MI										
Corr	.170*	--								
Sig	.030									
FA										
Corr	.087	.115	--							
Sig	.270	.146								
FI										
Corr	.172*	.356*	.185*	--						
Sig	.029	.000	.019							
POPS										
Corr	.509*	.672*	.549*	.743*	--					
	*	*	*	*						

Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000					
EX									
Corr	.039	.046	.003	-.033	.017	--			
Sig	.625	.565	.969	.679	.832				
IJ									
Corr	.079	.057	-.055	-.062	-.001	.772*	--		
Sig	.318	.469	.490	.435	.986	.000			
ID						.733*	.675*		
Corr	.134	.064	-.044	.033	.068	*	*	--	
Sig	.089	.421	.579	.675	.389	.000	.000		
IN	.255*	.168*			.204*	.536*	.490*	.673*	
Corr	*	*	.000	.133	*	*	*	*	--
Sig	.004	.032	.995	.093	.009	.000	.000	.000	
RAI	.220*				.219*	-			.717*
Corr	*	.138	.002	.192*	*	-.126	.156*	.341*	*
Sig	.005	.080	.977	.014	.005	.106	.044	.000	.000

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. N= 167

MA: Mother Autonomy Support MI: Mother Involvement

FA: Father Autonomy Support FI: Father Involvement

POPS: Total of POPS EX: External Regulation

IJ: Introjected Regulation ID: Identified Regulation

IN: Intrinsic Regulation RAI: Relative Autonomy Index

With regard to research question #2, the data in Table 4 measures the relationship between student motivational patterns and perceptions of parental support, and addressed the question of what kind of impact does perception of parental support and involvement have on student autonomous motivation. The RAI developed from the SRQ-A shows a slightly positive overall relationship at .22 with the POPS, which is statistically significant. The correlations between the RAI and the four subscales of the POPS show MA being the highest at .22, followed by FI at .19, MI at .14, and FA at .002. The figures for MA and FI are statistically significant. The correlations between the POPS and the four subscales of the RAI show intrinsic regulation being the highest at .20, which is statistically significant.

Regarding the correlations among subscales of the RAI, external regulation has the highest relationship with introjected regulation at .77, identified next at .73, and intrinsic at .54. With regard to the correlations among the subscales of the POPS, the correlation between MI and FI is the highest at .36. This figure is statistically significant. The POPS and the four subscales are correlated, with FI being the highest at .74.

For most people, this lack of relationship may be surprising, as intuitively it might be expected that student perceptions of parental influence would have a strong impact on their classroom motivation. However, these results are in line with the data shown in the

Grolnick et al. (1991) study which evidenced a very similar weak relationship with MA at .10, MI at -0.8, FA at .02, and FI at .01 for students in the U.S.

V. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine how Korean middle-school students studying EFL perceived their parental involvement and support and what effect, if any, this perception may have had on these students' classroom autonomous motivation. Overall results showed a mixed pattern, with student perceptions at a moderate to high level, but these perceptions having a very low positive effect on their motivation to learn in the EFL classroom.

When MA is compared with FA, students thought their father supported their autonomy slightly more than their mothers. Mothers were thought to be more involved in the sense that they were perceived to show interest and spend time relating to their child's school activities. On the other hand, fathers were thought to be more supportive to autonomy in the sense that they may be perceived to encourage their children to make their own choices rather than apply pressure to control these choices. It is interesting to note that while these perceptions of FA are relatively strong, as shown in Table 2, FA correlation with classroom motivation is the lowest. A reason for this apparent anomaly may lie in the fact that student perceptions of parental support to autonomy and parental influence should be considered together and not as separate entities. Even though students may report FA as fairly strong, they also report FI to be relatively weak, therefore, one may offset the other and the effect of FA can be diluted by a weak FI. This can be further demonstrated by MI's considerable dominance over FI, again as shown in Table 2 as 3.1 to 2.6, which would be more than enough to offset greater FA, and result in somewhat more of an overall positive correlation of MA and MI to student classroom motivation when considered together.

These findings were very similar to the Grolnick et al. (1991) study mentioned previously under Literature Review, showing generally low positive correlations between parental influence and student classroom motivation to learn. These results may also be surprising as, intuitively and by definition, collectivist-oriented societies might be expected to display a strong and continuing influence between family members throughout life. But as these findings indicate, this influence may be only moderate in nature, at least for these middle school students studying English. While not entirely comparable in terms of the age of participants, these results are similar to those of Grolnick et al. (1991), a study of parental influence done in a western setting.

Also, it may be that student peer relationships have a greater impact on student motivation and general classroom response, and may tend to dilute or modify the influence

of their parents. This would be a matter for further research. Another factor to keep in mind when interpreting these data is that in educational research in general, correlations “in the range of .20 to .40 might be all one should expect to find for many of the relationships between variables studied by educational researchers” (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003, p. 362). But even when viewed this framework, the correlations reported in this study are remarkably low.

In summary, findings of this study would indicate that the majority of these Korean middle school students are not autonomously motivated to learn English, and intrinsic motivation is rated as lowest as a reason for learning. Furthermore, student perceptions of parental influence on their studies are moderate to high, but these perceptions only have a very low correlation on their autonomous motivation to learn.

The relatively small participant size of this study may make it difficult to generalize about findings. Also, confirming the study participants to middle school students may further restrict relevance of results to a broader population. Whatever the results may be, it would be necessary to conduct further research among larger and more varied samples of Korean students studying EFL, to determine its replicability among Korean student populations as a whole. Also, the inclusion of more qualitative research techniques such as conducting interviews of participants might contribute additional insight and provide a means of triangulation of findings. Another study limitation lies in the fact that research data for this study were collected in an EFL classroom. If data were collected in another subject area, the results could be somewhat different, as studying English in Korea has some unique motivational characteristics. Finally, correlation does not necessarily equate to causality, and further research would most likely reveal compounding variables, such as peer influences, which could also impact on this relationship between perceptions of parental support and classroom motivation.

As indicated previously, because of the high value placed on education and academic achievement by Korean families, the findings of this study that parental influence on their children’s actual classroom motivation is low, may be surprising. It is also apparent that student perceptions of parental support to autonomy and student perceptions of parental influence should be considered together in their contribution to classroom autonomy. A strong finding in one factor may be offset by a weaker result in the other; therefore, it would seem that one way to help in enhancing student motivation could be to have both strong parental support and influence on their children’s autonomy on the part of both parents.

These findings may also make teachers more aware that children’s perceptions of their parent’s influence may have a positive impact on their classroom achievement and motivation, but it seems not to be highly significant in the overall picture of making them good language learners. There are many other variables contributing to success and they

need to focus on all of the other individual learner differences, such as learning strategies, learning styles, aptitude and intelligence, affection, age and gender etc. in an effort to promote student motivation and ultimately enhance classroom achievement in learning English.

REFERNCES

- Bartram, B. (2006). An examination of POPS influence on attitudes to language learning. *Journal of Educational Research, 48*(2), 211-221.
- Brislin, R. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross cultural research* (pp. 137-164). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Brophy, J. (1999). Research on motivation in education: Past, present, and future. In T. Urban (Ed.), *The role of context* (pp. 1-44). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Coleman, J., Campbell, H., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., & York, R. (1996). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education.
- Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. New York: Longman.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language learning research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ehrman, M., Leaver, B., & Oxford, R. (2003). A brief review of individual differences in language learning. *System, 31*(3), 313-330.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Englund, M., Luckner, A., Whaley, G., & Egeland, B. (2004). Achievement in early elementary school: Longitudinal effects of parental involvement, expectations and quality of assistance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(4), 723-730.
- Gall, M., Gall, J., & Borg, W. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Goodwin, C. (2002). *Research in psychology: Methods and design* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley.

- Grolnick, W. (2003). *The psychology of parental control: How well-meant parenting backfires*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Grolnick, W., Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (1991). Inner resources for school achievement: Motivational mediators of children's perceptions of their parents. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(4), 508-517.
- Harris, A., & Goodall, J. (2008). Do parents know they matter? Engaging all parents in learning. *Educational Research, 50*(3), 277-289.
- Hill, N., & Tyson, D. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: A meta-analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. *Developmental Psychology, 45*(3), 740-763.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Organizations and cultures: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Houtenville, A., & Conway, K. (2008). Parental effort, school resources, and student achievement. *Journal of Human Resources, xiii*(2), 437-453.
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy: Definitions issues, and problems*. Dublin: Authentic.
- Moon, Sung-Seek, & Lee, Joo-Hi. (2009). Multiple predictors of Asian-American children's school achievement. *Early Education and Development, 20*(1), 129-147.
- Pintrich, P., & Schunk, D. (2002). *Motivation in education: Theory research and applications*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice-Hall.
- Ratelle, C., Guay, F., Vallerand, R., & Senécal, C. (2007). Autonomous, controlled, and amotivation types of academic motivation: A person-oriented analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(4), 734-746.
- Ratelle, C., Larose, S., Guay, F., & Senécal, C. (2005). Perceptions of parental involvement and support as predictors of college students' persistence in a science curriculum. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*(2), 286-293.
- Rogers, M., Theale, J., Ryan, R., Adams, G., & Keating, L. (2009). Parental involvement and children's school achievement: Evidence for mediating processes. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 24*(1), 34-57.
- Ryan, R., & Connell, J. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 749-761.
- Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*, 54-67.
- Schunk, D. (2005). Self-regulated learning: The educational legacy of Paul R. Pintrich. *Educational Psychologist, 40*, 85-94.
- Seth, M. J. (2002). *Education fever: Society, politics, and the pursuit of schooling in South Korea*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

- Weidman, J. C., & Park, N. (2000). (Eds.). *Higher education in Korea*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Wenden, A. (1998). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. London: Prentice-Hall.

APPENDIX A

Perceptions of Parents Scale (POPS)

This survey concerns your parents. Please read carefully, and circle the number which describes your parents the closest. Mother descriptions are items 1 to 11, and father descriptions are items 12 to 22.

1. (1) Some mothers **never have enough time** to talk to their children.
(2) Some mothers **usually don't have enough time** to talk to their children.
(3) Some mothers **sometimes have enough time** to talk to their children.
(4) Some mothers **always have enough time** to talk to their children.
2. (1) Some mothers **always explain** to their children about the way they should behave.
(2) Some mothers **sometimes explain** to their children about the way they should behave.
(3) Some mothers **sometimes make** their children behave because they're the boss.
(4) Some mothers **always make** their children behave because they're the boss.
3. (1) Some mothers **always ask** their children what they did in school that day.
(2) Some mothers **usually ask** their children what they did in school that day.
(3) Some mothers **usually don't ask** their children what they did in school that day.
(4) Some mothers **never ask** their children what they did in school that day.

The following 11 questions are about your father.

12. (1) Some fathers **never have enough time** to talk to their children.
(2) Some fathers **usually don't have enough time** to talk to their children.
(3) Some fathers **sometimes have enough time** to talk to their children.
(4) Some fathers **always have enough time** to talk to their children.
13. (1) Some fathers **always explain** to their children about the way they should behave.
(2) Some fathers **sometimes explain** to their children about the way they should behave.
(3) Some fathers **sometimes make** their children behave because they're the boss.
(4) Some fathers **always make** their children behave because they're the boss.
14. (1) Some fathers **always ask** their children what they did in school that day.
(2) Some fathers **usually ask** their children what they did in school that day.
(3) Some fathers **usually don't ask** their children what they did in school that day.
(4) Some fathers **never ask** their children what they did in school that day.

APPENDIX B
Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A)

There are four major sections (A, B, C, D), and each section contains eight responses. Please read carefully, and circle the number of responses which describes you the closest.

- A. Why do I do my English homework?
- 1. Because I want the teacher to think I'm a good student.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true
 - 2. Because I'll get in trouble if I don't do my English homework.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true
 - 3. Because it's fun to do my English homework.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true
- B. Why do I work on my English class work?
- 9. So that the teacher won't yell at me.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true
 - 10. Because I want the teacher to think I'm a good student.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true
 - 11. Because I want to learn new things.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true
- C. Why do I try to answer hard questions in English class?
- 17. Because I want the other students to think I'm smart.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true
 - 18. Because I feel ashamed of myself when I don't try.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true
 - 19. Because I enjoy answering hard questions.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true
- D. Why do I try to do well in English?
- 25. Because that I'm supposed to do.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true
 - 26. So my English teacher will think I'm a good student.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true
 - 27. Because I enjoy doing my English well.
(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

예시언어(Examples in): English
적용가능 언어(Applicable Languages): English
적용가능 수준(Applicable Levels): Secondary

Bokyung Murray
Department of English Language and Literature
Sangmyung University
300 Anseo-dong, Dongnam-gu
Cheonan, Chungcheongnam-do, 330-720, Korea.
Tel: (041) 550-5146/ H.P.: 010-6340-8316
Email: bokim@smu.ac.kr

Received 4 May 2012
Revised 15 August 2012
Accepted 20 August 2012